

**AGENDA**

**TELE-CONFERENCE  
SPECIAL MEETING**

of the

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE (I-BOND)  
PUBLIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

---

**MEMBERSHIP**

Ellen Wu, Chairperson  
Daniel Swafford, Vice Chairperson  
Gloria Bailey-Ray, Member  
Baldomero Gonzalez, Member  
Anne Griffith, Member  
Danielle J. Harris, Member  
Tia Hicks, Member  
Gary Jimenez, Member  
Christopher Johnson, Member

---

**DATE: Monday, January 9, 2023**  
**TIME: 5:00 pm – 7:00pm**  
**PLACE: Tele-Conference**  
**Please see the agenda to participate in the meeting**

---

**Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, all members of the Committee Members as well as City staff from the Finance Department will join the meeting via phone/video conference and no physical teleconference locations are required.**

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The public may observe and/or participate in this meeting many ways.

**OBSERVE:**

- To observe the meeting by video conference, please click on this link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84375727506> at the noticed meeting time.
- To listen to the meeting by phone, please call the numbers below at the noticed meeting time: *One tap mobile:* US: +16694449171,,84375727506# or +16699009128,,84375727506, OR *Telephone Dial* (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location US: +1 669 444 9171 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 719 359 4580 or +1 253 205 0468 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 689 278 1000 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 305 224 1968 or +1 309 205 3325 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 360 209 5623 or +1 386 347 5053 or +1 507 473 4847

Webinar ID: 843 7572 7506 ; If asked for a participant ID or code, press #.

**Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond (I-Bond)  
Tele-Conference  
Oakland, California 94612**

There are three ways to submit public comments.

- eComment. To send your comment directly to staff BEFORE the meeting starts, please email to [dhort@oaklandca.gov](mailto:dhort@oaklandca.gov) with “I-Bond Oversight Committee Meeting” in the subject line for the corresponding meeting. Please note that eComment submission **closes two (2) hours before posted meeting time.**
- To comment by Zoom video conference, click the “Raise Your Hand” button to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on an eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. You will be permitted to speak during your turn, allowed to comment, and after the allotted time, re-muted. Instructions on how to “Raise Your Hand” is available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/205566129>, which is a webpage entitled “Raise Hand In Webinar.”
- To comment by phone, please call on one of the above listed phone numbers. You will be prompted to “Raise Your Hand” by pressing “\*9” to speak when Public Comment is taken. You will be permitted to speak during your turn, allowed to comment, and after the allotted time, re-muted. Please unmute yourself by pressing \*6. Instructions of how to raise your hand by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled “Joining a Meeting by Phone.”

If you have any questions, please email Dawn Hort, Assistant Treasury Administrator at [dhort@oaklandca.gov](mailto:dhort@oaklandca.gov).

---

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

- I. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum
- II. **Subject:** Adopt a continuing resolution as per AB 361 establishing findings justifying the ongoing need for virtual meetings.  
**From:** Staff of the I-Bond Committee  
**Recommendation:** Adopt Resolution No. \_\_\_ Determining That Conducting In-Person Meetings of The Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee And Its Committees Would Present Imminent Risks To Attendee’s Health, And Electing To Continue Conducting Meetings Using Teleconference In Accordance With California Government Code Section 54953(e), A Provision of AB-361. (Attachment A)
- III. Public Comments
- IV. Approval of Draft Minutes from the Committee SPECIAL meeting of June 6, 2022 minutes (Attachment B)
- V. Approval of Draft Minutes from the Committee meeting of September 12, 2022 minutes (Attachment C)

**Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond (I-Bond)**  
**Tele-Conference**  
**Oakland, California 94612**

- VI. Full Interactive Website of Project Map (DOT and OPW)
  - a. [OPW & DOT Measure KK Capital Project Map Link](#)
- VII. Updates from Housing and Community Development
  - a. Interactive Map
  - b. Excel Spreadsheet
- VIII. Discussion of Next Steps
  - a. Identify Future Agenda Items
  - b. Confirm next meeting
- IX. Open Forum
- X. Adjournment

# ATTACHMENT A

## OAKLAND AFFORDABLE HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PUBLIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

---

**ADOPT A RESOLUTION DETERMINING THAT CONDUCTING IN-PERSON MEETINGS OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PUBLIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND ITS COMMITTEES WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO ATTENDEES' HEALTH, AND ELECTING TO CONTINUE CONDUCTING MEETINGS USING TELECONFERENCING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e), A PROVISION OF AB-361.**

**WHEREAS**, on March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency related to COVID-19, pursuant to Government Code Section 8625, and such declaration has not been lifted or rescinded. *See* <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/3.4.20-Coronavirus-SOE-Proclamation.pdf>; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 9, 2020, the City Administrator in their capacity as the Director of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), issued a proclamation of local emergency due to the spread of COVID-19 in Oakland, and on March 12, 2020, the City Council passed Resolution No. 88075 C.M.S. ratifying the proclamation of local emergency pursuant to Oakland Municipal Code (O.M.C.) section 8.50.050(C); and

**WHEREAS**, City Council Resolution No. 88075 remains in full force and effect to date; and

**WHEREAS**, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommends physical distancing of at least six (6) feet whenever possible, avoiding crowds, and avoiding spaces that do not offer fresh air from the outdoors, particularly for people who are not fully vaccinated or who are at higher risk of getting very sick from COVID-19. *See* <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC recommends that people who live with unvaccinated people avoid activities that make physical distancing hard. *See* <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/about-covid-19/caring-for-children/families.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC recommends that older adults limit in-person interactions as much as possible, particularly when indoors. See <https://www.cdc.gov/aging/covid19/covid19-older-adults.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC, the California Department of Public Health, and the Alameda County Public Health Department all recommend that people experiencing COVID-19 symptoms stay home. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, persons without symptoms may be able to spread the COVID-19 virus. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, fully vaccinated persons who become infected with the COVID-19 Delta variant can spread the virus to others. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/fully-vaccinated.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the City's public-meeting facilities are indoor facilities that do not ensure circulation of fresh / outdoor air, particularly during periods of cold and/or rainy weather, and were not designed to ensure that attendees can remain six (6) feet apart; and

**WHEREAS**, holding in-person meetings would encourage community members to come to City facilities to participate in local government, and some of them would be at high risk of getting very sick from COVID-19 and/or would live with someone who is at high risk; and

**WHEREAS**, in-person meetings would tempt community members who are experiencing COVID-19 symptoms to leave their homes in order to come to City facilities and participate in local government; and

**WHEREAS**, attendees would use ride-share services and/or public transit to travel to in-person meetings, thereby putting them in close and prolonged contact with additional people outside of their households; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 14, 2022 the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee adopted a resolution determining that conducting in-person meetings would present imminent risks to attendees' health, and electing to continue conducting meetings using teleconferencing in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; now therefore be it:

**RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and hereby adopts and incorporates them into this resolution; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that, based on these determinations and consistent with federal, state and local health guidance, the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee renews its determination that conducting in-person meetings would pose imminent risks to the health of attendees; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee firmly believes that the community's health and safety and the community's right to participate in local government, are both critically important, and is committed to balancing the two by continuing to use teleconferencing to conduct public meetings, in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee will renew these (or similar) findings at least every thirty (30) days in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e) until the state of emergency related to COVID-19 has been lifted, or the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee finds that in-person meetings no longer pose imminent risks to the health of attendees, whichever occurs first.

**A SPECIAL COMMITTEE MEETING** of the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond (I-Bond) Public Oversight Committee (the “I-Bond Committee”) was held on June 6, 2022 via Tele-Conference.

**I. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Committee Members

**Present:**

- Ellen Wu, Chairperson
- Daniel Swafford, Vice Chairperson
- Danielle J. Harris, Member
- Tia Hicks, Member
- Christopher Johnson, Member
- Gloria Bailey-Ray, Member

Committee Members

**Absent:**

- Gary Jimenez, Member (Excused)
- Anne Griffith, Member
- Baldomero Gonzalez, Member

Additional Attendees:

- David Jones, Secretary to the Committee
- Dawn Hort, Staff to Committee

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 pm by David Jones.

**II. ADOPT A CONTINUING RESOLUTION as per AB 361** establishing findings justifying the ongoing need for virtual meeting (Exhibit A)

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Gloria Bailey-Ray.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 6 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

**III. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- IV. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES** with modifications to the minutes from previous SPECIAL meeting of **May 2, 2022**, referencing reports as presented by the public speaker (Exhibit B)

**MOTION:** Member Danielle Harris made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Christopher Johnson.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]

(AYES: 6 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

- V. Finalize Measure KK Investments Report – Amanda Fukutome (Exhibit C)**

Ms. Amanda Fukutome presented a revised report based on comments received from the commissioners, which now includes a departmental section looking at investments in relation to the concentration of different ethnicities. This is to show relationships of geographic indexes and racial equity since all geographic indexes use race and ethnicity as their primary indicators. Also, Ms. Fukutome added an executive summary section highlighting a need for more formal processes of evaluation.

- VI. Finalize Committee’s Annual Report (Exhibit D)**

Chairperson Wu provided three options for the annual report structure:

- 1) Use the department’s proposed structure and work with the departments.
- 2) Step back and identify the context and information the Committee wants to communicate about Measure KK funds to Council and the public.
- 3) Continue the same process but pare down unnecessary information.

**APPROVAL OF THE FORMATION OF AN AD-HOC COMMITTEE** to address reporting and structure issues of the Oversight Committee’s board consisting of Member Tia Hicks, Member Christopher Johnson, Member Gloria Bailey-Ray, and Chairperson Ellen Wu.

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Gloria Bailey-Ray.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]

(AYES: 6 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

**VII. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS**

- a. Identify Future Agenda Items
  - Finalize and vote on the Measure KK Investments Report
  - Discuss the Ad-Hoc Committee’s recommendations for the Annual Report
- b. Confirm next meeting
  - Monday, September 12, 2022 at 5:00PM-7:00PM
  - Monday, December 12, 2022 at 5:00PM-7:00PM

**VIII. OPEN FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Tia Hicks. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 6 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

---

DAVID JONES, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

December 12, 2022  
DATE

# EXHIBIT A

## OAKLAND AFFORDABLE HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PUBLIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION NO.       3      

---

**ADOPT A RESOLUTION DETERMINING THAT CONDUCTING IN-PERSON MEETINGS OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PUBLIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND ITS COMMITTEES WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO ATTENDEES' HEALTH, AND ELECTING TO CONTINUE CONDUCTING MEETINGS USING TELECONFERENCING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e), A PROVISION OF AB-361.**

**WHEREAS**, on March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency related to COVID-19, pursuant to Government Code Section 8625, and such declaration has not been lifted or rescinded. *See* <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/3.4.20-Coronavirus-SOE-Proclamation.pdf>; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 9, 2020, the City Administrator in their capacity as the Director of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), issued a proclamation of local emergency due to the spread of COVID-19 in Oakland, and on March 12, 2020, the City Council passed Resolution No. 88075 C.M.S. ratifying the proclamation of local emergency pursuant to Oakland Municipal Code (O.M.C.) section 8.50.050(C); and

**WHEREAS**, City Council Resolution No. 88075 remains in full force and effect to date; and

**WHEREAS**, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommends physical distancing of at least six (6) feet whenever possible, avoiding crowds, and avoiding spaces that do not offer fresh air from the outdoors, particularly for people who are not fully vaccinated or who are at higher risk of getting very sick from COVID-19. *See* <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC recommends that people who live with unvaccinated people avoid activities that make physical distancing hard. *See* <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/about-covid-19/caring-for-children/families.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC recommends that older adults limit in-person interactions as much as possible, particularly when indoors. See <https://www.cdc.gov/aging/covid19/covid19-older-adults.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC, the California Department of Public Health, and the Alameda County Public Health Department all recommend that people experiencing COVID-19 symptoms stay home. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, persons without symptoms may be able to spread the COVID-19 virus. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, fully vaccinated persons who become infected with the COVID-19 Delta variant can spread the virus to others. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/fully-vaccinated.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the City's public-meeting facilities are indoor facilities that do not ensure circulation of fresh / outdoor air, particularly during periods of cold and/or rainy weather, and were not designed to ensure that attendees can remain six (6) feet apart; and

**WHEREAS**, holding in-person meetings would encourage community members to come to City facilities to participate in local government, and some of them would be at high risk of getting very sick from COVID-19 and/or would live with someone who is at high risk; and

**WHEREAS**, in-person meetings would tempt community members who are experiencing COVID-19 symptoms to leave their homes in order to come to City facilities and participate in local government; and

**WHEREAS**, attendees would use ride-share services and/or public transit to travel to in-person meetings, thereby putting them in close and prolonged contact with additional people outside of their households; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 14, 2022 the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee adopted a resolution determining that conducting in-person meetings would present imminent risks to attendees' health, and electing to continue conducting meetings using teleconferencing in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; now therefore be it:

**RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and hereby adopts and incorporates them into this resolution; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that, based on these determinations and consistent with federal, state and local health guidance, the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee renews its determination that conducting in-person meetings would pose imminent risks to the health of attendees; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee firmly believes that the community's health and safety and the community's right to participate in local government, are both critically important, and is committed to balancing the two by continuing to use teleconferencing to conduct public meetings, in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee will renew these (or similar) findings at least every thirty (30) days in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e) until the state of emergency related to COVID-19 has been lifted, or the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee finds that in-person meetings no longer pose imminent risks to the health of attendees, whichever occurs first.

PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTES:

AYES: 6 - BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y

NOES: 0

ABSENT: 3

ABSTENTION: 0

JUNE 6, 2022

**A SPECIAL COMMITTEE MEETING** of the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond (I-Bond) Public Oversight Committee (the “I-Bond Committee”) was held on May 2, 2022 via Tele-Conference.

**I. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Committee Members

**Present:**

- Ellen Wu, Chairperson
- Daniel Swafford, Vice Chairperson
- Anne Griffith, Member
- Danielle J. Harris, Member
- Tia Hicks, Member
- Baldomero Gonzalez, Member
- Christopher Johnson, Member

Committee Members

**Absent:**

- Gary Jimenez, Member
- Gloria Bailey-Ray, Member (Excused)

Additional Attendees:

- David Jones, Secretary to the Committee
- Dawn Hort, Staff to Committee

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 pm by David Jones.

**II. ADOPT A CONTINUING RESOLUTION as per AB 361** establishing findings justifying the ongoing need for virtual meeting (Exhibit A)

**MOTION:** Member Anne Griffith made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Daniel Swafford.

[GRIFFITH-Y/ GONZALEZ-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 7 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

**III. OPEN FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Ms. Assata Olugbala**

Ms. Olugbala expressed concerns about race equity not being addressed in the Report, as the report only includes equity based on geographic points. She doesn't see how the city is dealing with construction, housing, and development while not taking into consideration the disproportion of races in the city, especially African Americans.

**IV. INTRODUCTION to new member, Christopher Johnson**

Chairperson Wu welcomed newest member Johnson.

**V. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES** from the Committee SPECIAL and REGULAR meetings of **December 13, 2021**, minutes with correction of Anne Griffith's name (Exhibit B)

**MOTION:** Member Danielle Harris made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Anne Griffith.

[GRIFFITH-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y / SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 5 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

**VI. AMANDA FUKUTOME – Updates on Measure KK Investments (Exhibit C)**

Ms. Amanda Fukutome provided the Committee a draft report on the equity short-term of her Measure KK evaluation as well as recommendations of medium and long term equity impact.

The analysis found that Oakland Public Works (OPW) made highest/high priority neighborhoods receive the most projects and funding. The same goes for places that classify as susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification. The Department of Transportation (DOT) prioritizes paving of major streets and corridors in vulnerable areas and ensure Measure KK dollars were equitably distributed between Flatlands and Hills, with more funding going towards the Flatlands. The Housing and Community Development Department prioritized supporting and rehabilitating a high number of low income and colored neighborhoods.

Ms. Fukutome provided a summary and future evaluations focusing on the medium and long-term impacts of the project such as measurable impacts in neighborhoods, improving the quality of data measurements, and state of social equity after these investments. Ms. Fukutome seeks comments from the Committee members in the next two weeks and will continue making revisions for the upcoming June meeting.

**VII. REVISION OF COMMITTEE REPORT STRUCTURE (Exhibit D)**

Chairperson Wu lead the discussion on reassessing whether or not to continue with the same process and reporting template or revise the annual report structure. Each commissioner can email Chairperson Wu their preference.

Chairperson Wu provided three options:

- 1) Use the department's proposed structure and work with the departments.
- 2) Step back and identify the context and information the Committee wants to communicate about Measure KK funds to Council and the public.
- 3) Continue the same process but pare down unnecessary information.

**VIII. STATUS UPDATES ON NEW BOND ISSUANCE (3<sup>rd</sup> Tranche)**

Secretary Jones provided an update to the 3<sup>rd</sup> bond issuance for Measure KK, which was successfully priced and closed in February 2022, for street paving and capital improvements to facilities, approximately \$200 million.

**IX. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS**

- a. Identify Future Agenda Items
  - Finalize report from Amanda Fukutome
  - Finalize Committee Report Structure
  - Updates on status on new bond measure
- b. Confirm next meeting
  - Monday, June 6, 2022 at 5:00PM-7:00PM (Special Meeting)
  - Monday, September 12, 2022 at 5:00PM-7:00PM
  - Monday, December 12, 2022 at 5:00PM-7:00PM

**X. OPEN FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Ms. Assata Olugbala**

Ms. Olugbala expressed concerns that many reports generated by commission and boards goes into "informational memo" rather than to Council. She also raised concerns on Measure KK funds needing to be used appropriately and following the strategic plan

(ex. A library being created that was different from what was planned). She finalized her comments with city departments not using racial breakdown data in reports concerning equity.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Anne Griffith. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 6:46 pm.

[GRIFFITH-Y/ GONZALEZ-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y / JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 7 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)



---

DAVID JONES, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

June 6, 2022

---

DATE

# EXHIBIT C

## Measure KK Evaluation



Amanda Fukutome, MCP

# Background

- **Short Term Equity Impacts**
  - How are investments spatially distributed?
  - Who is being impacted by investments?
  - How well have the new equity criteria for identifying Capital Improvement Projects/Street Projects worked?
- **Medium and long term equity impacts**

- What's changed from first draft?
  - Racial equity
  - Executive summary
  - Smaller edits

# Evaluation Structure




**This evaluation is divided into the following sections:**

- (1) Report Methods and Limitations
- (2) Oakland Public Works
- (3) Department of Transportation
- (4) Housing and Community Development
- (5) Summary
- (6) Future Evaluations

# Report Methods

- Defining Areas of Priority- OEI Priority Neighborhoods and Composite Score Priority Neighborhoods
- Sources of Data
  - Internal data- e.g. department data and meetings
  - Public data- e.g. Urban Displacement Project, Social Vulnerability Index, CalEnviroscreen, American Community Survey
- Limitations
  - Dates of data/changes in the future
  - Missing addresses
  - Projects with multiple locations or overlapping geographies



# Oakland Public Works (OPW)



# Oakland Public Works (OPW)

- Highest and high priority neighborhoods received the most number of projects and the most funding for projects
- Typologies that are susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification received the highest number of projects and the most funding for projects
- CIP prioritization process supported 1) the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way and 2) funding need over funding leverage




# Oakland Department of Transportation (OakDOT)



# Department of Transportation (OakDOT)

- Prioritized the paving of major streets and other corridors in vulnerable areas, particularly East and West Oakland
- Ensured that Measure KK transportation dollars were equitably distributed between the Flatlands and Hills, with far more funding going towards the Flatlands than the Hills (the top three funded Council Districts represented West, Central, and East Oakland)
- CIP prioritization process supported the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way

# Housing and Community Development (HCD)



# Housing and Community Development (HCD)

- Constructed, acquired, and rehabbed a high number of low and extremely-low income units
- Supported high proportions of people of color
- Helped stabilize neighborhoods classified as high and highest priority by performing a high number of acquisitions and rehabs in those neighborhoods
- Made a large push to increase housing stock in neighborhoods that were classified as early/ongoing gentrification, low income/susceptible to displacement, and at risk of gentrification typologies

# Summary and Future Evaluations

## FUTURE EVALUATIONS

Future evaluations should be conducted to determine the medium and long term impacts of the project. Suggestions for these evaluations are listed below:

### Medium Term Evaluation:

*Are there measurable impacts in neighborhoods/among stakeholders?*

*What types of affordable housing investments are being made, how are they distributed and how do they interact with capital/street improvements?*

- **How have the investments impacted lower income neighborhoods and their residents?**
  - Are the originally targeted residents benefiting from the improvements?
    - What do area demographics tell us about neighborhood stability?
      - Are the same residents still there?
      - How have the demographics shifted from five years ago?
  - **What is the usage rate (pre and post) for facilities funded by KK funds?**
    - How much are facilities being used (increased usage)?
    - Who is using the facilities (pre and post)?
- **Incorporate qualitative data**
  - Interviews
  - Focus Groups
  - Photovoice- particularly among younger demographic
- **Investigate neighborhoods with the highest amounts of Measure KK funding (priority neighborhoods)**
  - Is there a distinction between the neighborhoods now and when Measure KK funds were implemented?
  - Have there been any demographic changes in these neighborhoods or is the population relatively stable?
- **Economic Impacts**
  - Additional revenue generated in the neighborhood?
  - Are there additional neighborhood investments/growth correlated with Measure KK projects?
- **How do new/rehabbed housing units interact with other anti-displacement and affordable housing initiatives?**
  - Evaluation of effectiveness of investing in new affordable housing development vs rehabbing housing

## Long-Term Evaluation of Social Equity Impacts

*Have there been measurable increases in social equity and any adverse impacts to low-income communities of color from Measure KK funded projects?*

- **Perceptions of Investments**
  - Survey that measures impact and use
- **Have Investments been connected with other Investments and other Infrastructure/transportation/economic development projects? Were these standalone one-off projects or were they connected to a larger goal?**
  - Were neighborhoods with projects that emphasized "connection" to other goals create larger neighborhood impacts? If so, were these "good" impacts or "bad" impacts (i.e. displacement)?
- **How to understand why Investments were foundational in neighborhood change?**
  - Qualitative data collected from neighborhood residents and city staff
  - Studying pre and post intervention statistics around crime, economy, individual outcomes
- **Have the Investments contributed to increasing social equity?**
  - Have equity gaps among residents in vulnerable neighborhoods improved?
  - Educational attainment
  - Poverty
  - Income
  - Health
  - Economic development (revenue generation)
  - Access to social infrastructure and facilities
  - Access to neighborhood amenities
  - Access to park and open space
  - Feelings and perceptions of safety
  - Violent crime density analysis
- **Is there a lower rental housing cost burden?**
- **Is there a narrowing of the racial wealth gap?**
- **Is there a narrowing of the unemployment rate?**
- **How have Investments worked in concert with other funding and programs to contribute to increasing social equity?**
- **How have the Investments impacted the displacement of low-income communities and communities of color?**
  - How have neighborhood demographics changed (descriptive statistics)?
  - American Community Survey data
  - Change in cost of rents
  - Change in home values
  - Anecdotal/qualitative data
- **Spatial mapping of demographics and change over time**
- **Gentrification mapping analysis**
  - Urban Displacement Project

# Exhibit C-1

## Measure KK Evaluation Spring 2022

DRAFT

Amanda Fukutome, MCP

# BACKGROUND

Measure KK was approved on November 8, 2016. This Measure authorized the City to issue \$600M in general bonds to “improve public safety and invest in neighborhoods throughout Oakland.” In the years that followed, three city departments, Oakland Public Works Department, Oakland Department of Transportation, and Oakland Department of Housing and Community Development, funded projects with Measure KK bonds to improve neighborhoods throughout the city.

In line with the City’s priorities of social and racial equity, the Departments utilized different criteria to promote project investment and siting in a way that advances social equity. Measure KK’s Oversight Committee is tasked with evaluating whether or not Measure KK funds supported the advancement of social equity and anti-displacement efforts. This evaluation is intended to be the beginning of that exploration. This report evaluated the short-term impacts of Measure KK funding, while providing suggestions for a medium and long-term evaluation.

Some key findings from the report are below:

## **Office of Public Works**

- Highest and high priority neighborhoods received the most number of projects and the most funding for project, and susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification categories received the highest number of projects and the most funding for projects
- CIP prioritization process supported 1) the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way and 2) funding need over funding leverage

## **Department of Transportation**

- Ensured that Measure KK transportation dollars were equitably distributed between the Flatlands and Hills, with far more funding going towards the Flatlands than the Hills (the top three funded Council Districts represented West, Central, and East Oakland)
- New equity analysis supported the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way.

## **Housing and Community Development**

- Constructed, acquired, and rehabbed a high number of low and extremely-low income units, and helped stabilize neighborhoods classified as high and highest priority by performing a high number of acquisitions and rehabs in those neighborhoods

This report found that Measure KK funding was equitably distributed throughout the City of Oakland, and new prioritization processes are helping to ensure that Oakland’s most vulnerable residents are receiving a majority of Measure KK investment. However, there are a few outliers, which are identified in the report, and future prioritization processes should look for ways to ensure these outliers receive funding and prioritization in the future.

# BACKGROUND

## **Measure KK**

On November 8, 2016, voters from Oakland, CA approved Measure KK, which authorized the City to issue \$600M in general bonds to “improve public safety and invest in neighborhoods throughout Oakland by re-paving streets, which included to remove potholes, rebuilding cracked and deteriorating sidewalks, funding bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements, funding affordable housing for Oaklanders, and providing funds for facility improvements, such as, neighborhood recreation centers, playgrounds and libraries” (City of Oakland, 2021).

**Projects being supported by Measure KK funds, include the following:**

### **Streets and Roads Projects in the amount of \$350 million**

- Street paving and reconstruction
- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements; bikeways, sidewalks, paths, stairs, streetscape, curb ramps
- Traffic calming improvements

### **2. Facilities Projects in the amount of \$150 million**

- Fire Facilities (\$40 million)
- Police Facility (\$40 million)
- Libraries (\$15 million)
- Parks, Recreation and Senior Facilities (\$35 million)
- Water, energy and seismic improvements consistent with the City’s Energy and Climate Action Plan (\$20 million)

### **3. Anti-Displacement and Affordable Housing Preservation Projects in the amount of \$100 million**

- Funds may be spent on the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of affordable housing as set forth in the Affordable Bond Law Ordinance.

“On December 12, 2017, the Mayor appointed nine (9) members to serve on the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Public Oversight Committee (the “Public Oversight Committee”) and the appointments were confirmed by City Council on December 18, 2017” (City of Oakland, 2021).

“Measure KK requires the creation of the Public Oversight Committee to review financial and operational reports related to the expenditure of bond proceeds to confirm that the funds were used in a manner permitted under Measure KK and to evaluate the impacts and outcomes of the bond expenditures on Measure KK’s stated goals, including social equity, anti-displacement, and affordable housing. The Public Oversight Committee reports to the City Council” (City of Oakland, 2021).

“One of the outcomes the Public Oversight Committee is charged to evaluate, related to the expenditures of the bond proceeds, is social equity and anti-displacement.” (City of Oakland, 2021). This report is intended to respond to the charge of evaluating expenditures as they pertain to social equity and anti-displacement. It seeks to understand if Measure KK funded investments were distributed in an equitable way, and offers suggestions for future evaluations to understand if these investments will support anti-displacement efforts.

For more information on Measure KK and the Public Oversight Committee, please visit: <https://oakland.granicus.com/boards/w/8552f8c4c0e15460/boards/17813>

# REPORT METHODS AND SOURCES

## *Report Methods*

### *Defining Areas of Priority*

In order to determine if projects funded by Measure KK are advancing social equity, areas of priority need to be established using an index or multiple indexes. (To determine if social equity is being advanced, distribution assumes that a higher proportion of projects and funding will be located in areas with more priority and experiencing higher need. In this evaluation, equitable distribution implies distribution that will advance social equity.)

This evaluation uses two primary indexes to evaluate if projects were equitably distributed across the city: (1) the designated 'Priority Neighborhoods' from the Oakland Equity Index (OEI) in OakDOT's Equity Toolkit and (2) a composite index derived from three sources: the 'Priority Neighborhoods' layer from OakDOT, the Social Vulnerability Index from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and CalEnviroScreen from the CA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. Both of these indexes heavily weigh demographic indicators, like race/ethnicity, income, educational attainment, and linguistic isolation. The composite index was created by creating quintile scores for each index, ranging from one to five. One indicated the lowest priority/lowest vulnerability/lowest environmental burden and five indicated the highest priority/highest vulnerability/highest need. Scores for each index were summed, creating a composite index. Both of these indexes utilize census tract geographies.

Areas of priority are defined as:

High or highest priority neighborhoods (tracts), as defined by the 'Priority Neighborhoods' layer from the Oakland Equity Toolkit, or Census tracts with a composite score of 11 - 13 (high priority) or 13 - 15 (highest priority).

Categories developed by the Urban Displacement Project ([urbandisplacement.org](http://urbandisplacement.org)) are also used to look at project distribution.

## *Sources*

### *Internal Data*

Internal data sources include quantitative and qualitative data from the Oakland Public Works Department, Oakland's Department of Transportation, and Oakland's Department of Housing and Community Development. Quantitative data was gathered using a spreadsheet developed by the Oversight Committee and the Departments for reporting purposes, and qualitative data was gathered from questionnaires and conversations with City staff.

### *Public Data*

Public data sources include the Oakland Equity Toolkit, the Social Vulnerability Index, CalEnviroScreen, the Urban Displacement Project, American Community Survey data (2019 and 2020 data), spatial data from the City of Oakland and the United States Census Bureau.


### *Limitations*

A major limitation of this evaluation is that distribution of all Measure KK funding has not been completed. This means that future data may differ from the data in this report. Therefore, it will be important to revisit the data as subsequent evaluations (medium and long-term are completed). Another limitation is that this report relies primarily on spatial analysis; however, it was not possible to get addresses/coordinates for all Measure KK funded projects and multiple projects had either no location or locations across multiple sites. Therefore, there was a bit of estimation that had to be done. For instance, if there was a project that had two sites listed, funding amounts were approximated to be equally split, though that might not be completely accurate. And, if a project crossed boundaries (like in OakDOT projects), the project was counted as a project in both districts, with the funding equally split between both districts, which again might not be completely accurate. Projects without an address had to be excluded from the analysis.


# REFERENCE MAPS AND DEMOGRAPHICS

The following reference maps are larger versions of the base maps used throughout the report. The OEI Priority Neighborhoods and the Composite Index maps also include select demographic information for reference.

Map 1: Council District Map



Map 2: Urban Displacement Categories



District 1	Dan Kalb
District 2	Nikki Fortunato Bas
District 3	Carroll Fife
District 4	Sheng Thao
District 5	Noel Gallo
District 6	Loren Taylor
District 7	Treva Reid

- Low Income/Susceptible to Displacement
- Ongoing Displacement
- At Risk of Gentrification
- Early/Ongoing Gentrification
- Advanced Gentrification
- Stable Moderate/Mixed Income
- At Risk of Becoming Exclusive
- Becoming Exclusive
- Stable/Advanced Exclusion
- High Student Population

Map 3: OEI Priority Neighborhoods Map




Table 1: Select Demographics by OEI Priority Neighborhood

	% API	% Black	% Hispanic	% White	% Children Living in Poverty	% Under 25	% Renters	% Bachelor's Degree or Higher
<b>Highest</b>	13.9%	27.3%	47.0%	8.0%	38.3%	35.8%	72.9%	19.3%
<b>High</b>	15.8%	29.2%	38.3%	12.0%	28.4%	32.5%	64.9%	24.9%
<b>Medium</b>	20.7%	27.1%	22.8%	23.9%	29.7%	24.2%	69.2%	40.5%
<b>Low</b>	15.1%	22.0%	14.6%	40.9%	9.8%	21.0%	55.4%	58.2%
<b>Lowest</b>	13.7%	9.0%	8.2%	62.0%	2.3%	21.8%	37.4%	75.2%

Map 4: Composite Index  
Priority Neighborhoods Map




Table 2: Select Demographics by  
Composite Index Priority Neighborhood

	% API	% Black	% Hispanic	% White	% Children Living in Poverty	% Under 25	% Renters	% Bachelor's Degree or Higher
<b>Highest</b>	15.4%	24.4%	49.5%	7.0%	39.7%	36.5%	68.2%	17.3%
<b>High</b>	20.5%	27.7%	31.9%	15.5%	27.0%	29.1%	70.6%	30.1%
<b>Medium</b>	12.1%	30.2%	26.8%	24.8%	25.3%	26.8%	64.2%	39.7%
<b>Low</b>	17.6%	20.0%	10.8%	44.7%	9.7%	20.8%	54.7%	63.2%
<b>Lowest</b>	13.8%	13.3%	11.3%	54.4%	5.1%	22.1%	42.5%	67.8%


# SELECT CITY OF OAKLAND DEMOGRAPHICS

46.1% of residents have Bachelor's Degree or higher

Median household income for residents is **\$80,143**

21% of children are living in poverty and 13% of adults (18-64) are living in poverty

59.2% renter occupied households



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020

Asian & NHOPI **16%**

Black **22%**

Hispanic **27%**

White **28.5%**

**.51**

GINI Index of Inequality

(GINI measures income inequality on a scale of 0 to 1. 0 is perfect equality and 1 is perfect inequality)


**422,575**  
residents

**6%**  
unemployed  
(note: 2020)


Advancing racial equity is core goal for the City of Oakland. In addition to providing needed improvements, Measure KK funding seeks to promote social equity through project prioritization processes, like the new CIP Prioritization Criteria and OakDOT's equity analysis. A critical component of social equity is racial equity and ensuring that Oakland's Black and Brown communities are being equitably served. The evaluation focuses on geographic

equity; however, race/ethnicity is a core component of each one of the indexes that were used and is deeply integrated into the identification of vulnerable communities. Maps 5-8 show how Oakland's BIPOC residents are distributed throughout the City, and these maps are used in a racial equity section at the end of each departmental section.


Map 7. Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2019)




Map 5. Percent Population BIPOC (2019)



Map 6. Percent Population Black (2019)



Map 8. Percent Population Asian or NHOPI (2019)



# EVALUATION OVERVIEW

In order to understand the full impact of Measure KK investments on social equity and anti displacement, impacts should be measured at three intervals: short, medium, and long term. The short term evaluation will assess if project distribution across the City is equitably distributed, while the medium and long term evaluations will assess if, and how, these projects have measurably increased social equity or caused any adverse impacts to low-income communities of color.


Because medium term impacts should be measured several years after projects have been completed and long term impacts should be measured a decade or more after projects have been completed, this evaluation will be focused solely on short term outcomes. However, there are recommendations at the end of this evaluation that will outline critical components of future evaluations. The framework for the medium-term evaluation will offer strategies to evaluate if there have been measurable impacts of investments in neighborhoods/among residents. And, the framework for the long-term evaluation will offer strategies to evaluate if there have been measurable increases in social equity and any adverse impacts to low-income communities of color from Measure KK funding.

The main questions to be answered by the short-term evaluation are: (1) how are the investments spatially distributed; (2) who is impacted by these investments; and (3) how well have the new criteria for identifying capital improvements/street projects worked?

**This evaluation is divided into the following sections:**

- (1) Report Methods and Limitations
- (2) Oakland Public Works
- (3) Department of Transportation
- (4) Housing and Community Development
- (5) Summary
- (6) Future Evaluations


Map 9: OPW Projects by Phase on Census Tract Geographies



Across the two phases, 48 public works projects received funding allocations in the amount of \$63,423,800. Projects in Phase I were selected using the Oakland Equity Index (OEI) from OakDOT's Equity Toolbox, while projects in Phase II were selected using the CIP prioritization process. For orientation, Map 9 shows the distribution of public works projects across Oakland's census tracts by phase, while Map 10 shows the same distribution across Oakland's Council Districts by phase. Most data in this section, including maps, tables, and other calculations are based on projects that could be geolocated (had an address or approximate location).

Maps 9 and 10 highlight that funding for OPW projects occurred throughout the city across both phases, except Council District 5 in Phase II, which did not receive funding. While all council districts


Map 10: OPW Projects by Phase on City Council District Geographies



received funding for projects in at least one phase, there are clear concentrations of investment, particularly in the Flatlands. These maps show that there was a noticeable shift in where funding was allocated during each phase. In Phase I, the majority of projects were primarily located in West and Central Oakland, with additional projects peppered throughout the Hills. There were very few projects located in East Oakland in Phase I. However, during Phase II, there were many more projects funded in East Oakland, not as many funded in Central Oakland, and a similar amount funded in West Oakland and the Hills.

Maps 11 and 12 display the amount of funding in different census tracts across Phase I and Phase II. Census tracts that do not have any coloring did not receive any investment during that phase.


Map 11: Phase One OPW Investments on Census Tract Geographies (Measure KK Funds)



Map 11 highlights that there is a difference between the number of projects in an area and the amount of investment that area received. For instance, in Phase I, there is a substantial amount of funding going into East Oakland, despite the fact that there were only a few projects that were slated to receive funding. This suggests that the projects that were funded were more costly and/or dependent on Measure KK funding than some of the projects that happened in West and Central Oakland, where there were more projects and less funding.

Map 12 shows that in Phase II there was a similar pattern of funding, with a concentration of deep investment in East Oakland and West Oakland, though not as much funding was allocated to Central Oakland. Census tracts in the Hills received more concentrated funding in Phase II, though the Hills received a small amount of funding relative to the other areas in the city, similar to Phase I. The similarities between Phase I and Phase II funding patterns demonstrate the depth and intention of investment in specific areas of the city.

Map 12: Phase Two OPW Investment on Census Tract Geographies (Measure KK Funds)



Map 13 illustrates how Measure KK funded OPW projects were distributed among OEI's priority neighborhoods, and Table 3 provides more detail about how the projects and funding were distributed amongst those neighborhoods. Using OEI's priority neighborhoods index, we see that over 50% (53%) of the projects are located in the highest or high priority neighborhoods and approximately 58% of Measure KK funds were used in highest and high priority neighborhoods. This amounted to \$35.1M in Measure KK funding. Low and lowest priority neighborhoods had 21 projects and \$10.6M in Measure KK funding; however, these projects seemed to be able to leverage more additional funding than highest and high priority neighborhoods, with Measure KK funding only providing 38.5% of total project cost in lowest priority neighborhoods.

Map 14 presents how Measure KK funded OPW projects were distributed among the composite score priority neighborhoods, and Table 4 provides more detail about how the projects and funding were distributed among the composite score's priority

Map 13: All OPW Projects on OEI Priority Neighborhoods  
Map




Table 3: Summary of OPW Projects by OEI Priority Neighborhood Designation

Priority Neighborhood	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects	Measure KK Funding	Total Cost of Projects Receiving Measure KK Funding	% Project Cost Funded by Measure KK	Avg Amount of Measure KK Funding/Project
Highest	20	27.8%	\$21,873,250	\$31,624,038	69.2%	\$1,093,663
High	18	25.0%	\$13,180,125	\$14,950,975	88.2%	\$732,229
Medium	13	18.1%	\$14,551,625	\$14,944,125	97.4%	\$1,119,356
Low	8	11.1%	\$3,551,500	\$4,201,500	84.5%	\$443,938
Lowest	13	18.1%	\$7,097,300	\$18,422,402	38.5%	\$545,946
Total	72	100.0%	\$60,253,800	\$84,143,040	71.6%	\$836,858

\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses

neighborhoods. We see that again, over 50% (54%) of the projects were located in the highest or high priority neighborhoods, and approximately 70% of Measure KK funds were used in highest and high priority neighborhoods. This amounted to \$42.4M in Measure KK funding. Low and lowest priority neighborhoods had 24 projects and \$14.6M in Measure KK funding; however, these projects, again, seemed to be able to leverage more additional funding than high and highest priority neighborhoods, with Measure KK funding providing only 52.5% of total project cost in low priority neighborhoods.

Map 15 displays how Measure KK funded OPW projects were distributed among Urban Displacement Project categories, and Table 5 provides more detail about how the projects and funding were distributed among the categories. **The largest number of projects were located in the low income/susceptible to displacement category (25 projects) and the at risk of gentrification category (20 projects).** These two categories also received over 70% of the Measure KK funds (\$44.6M). These two categories have not yet experienced gentrification, but are at risk of gentrification in varying degrees. **Map 15 highlights that Measure KK funds are going to vulnerable areas that will likely need protections from gentrification in the near future.**

In the second phase of funding, OPW switched to the CIP prioritization process to identify new capital projects for funding. The switch to the CIP prioritization process seems to have increased the number of projects in East Oakland, while maintaining the high number of projects in West Oakland. Earlier OPW project selection did a good job of ensuring that priority neighborhoods were prioritized for funding. The highest priority neighborhoods received the most amount of Measure KK funding (\$8.2M) in Phase I; however, there were a lower number of projects in highest priority neighborhoods in East Oakland than highest priority neighborhoods in other parts of the city. Though, it should be noted that the limited projects in East Oakland neighborhoods received a relatively large amount of funding. Map 16 and Table 6 suggest that

in Phase II, projects were distributed much more equitably among highest priority neighborhoods in both East and West Oakland.

The CIP prioritization supported the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way, which may have been missing in the previous OEI process. Additionally, Phase II investments in highest priority neighborhoods were fully funded by Measure KK dollars, which is important because it suggests that need was the driver for selection, as opposed to leverage. The CIP prioritization process seems to have supported the geographical equitable distribution of OPW projects among priority neighborhoods and supported the funding of projects with less leverage in highest priority neighborhoods.

Analysis using OEI's priority neighborhoods, the composite score priority neighborhoods, and the Urban Displacement Project's categories suggest that an equitable amount of investment is going towards highest and high priority neighborhoods and areas that are at risk of gentrification. **These maps and tables highlight that the most vulnerable neighborhoods in Oakland are receiving the most OPW investment, which is in line with an equitable distribution of investment.** Highest and high priority neighborhoods received the most number of projects and the most funding for projects, and categories that are susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification received the highest number of projects and the most funding for projects. However, the ongoing displacement category had zero OPW investment, which might be worth investigating. Overall, OPW supported the funding of vulnerable neighborhoods, which include a high number of people of color, children in poverty, and a high proportion of renters.

Map 14: All OPW Projects on Composite Score Priority Neighborhoods Map




Table 4: Summary of OPW Projects by Composite Score Priority Neighborhood Designation

Priority Neighborhood	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects	Measure KK Funding	Total Cost of Projects Receiving Measure KK Funding	% Project Cost Funded by Measure KK	Avg Amount of Measure KK Funding/Project
Highest	22	30.6%	\$26,705,375	\$37,342,013	71.5%	\$1,213,881
High	17	23.6%	\$15,743,750	\$16,418,750	95.9%	\$926,103
Medium	9	12.5%	\$3,219,625	\$3,822,125	84.2%	\$357,736
Low	11	15.3%	\$10,907,750	\$20,782,152	52.5%	\$991,614
Lowest	13	18.1%	\$3,677,300	\$5,778,000	63.6%	\$282,869
Total	72	100.0%	\$60,253,800	\$84,143,040	71.6%	\$836,858


\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses

Table 5: Summary of OPW Projects by Urban Displacement Project Category

Urban Displacement Category	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects	Measure KK Funding	Total Cost of Projects Receiving Measure KK Funding	% Project Cost Funded by Measure KK	Avg Amount of Measure KK Funding/Project
Low Income/Susceptible to Displacement	25	34.7%	\$25,778,875	\$27,989,375	92.1%	\$1,031,155
Ongoing Displacement	0	0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
At Risk of Gentrification	20	27.8%	\$18,821,875	\$28,440,513	66.2%	\$941,094
Early/Ongoing Gentrification	6	8.3%	\$5,040,375	\$5,382,875	93.6%	\$840,063
Advanced Gentrification	6	8.3%	\$6,538,875	\$16,455,777	39.7%	\$1,089,813
Stable Moderate/Mixed Income	2	2.9%	\$620,000	\$620,000	100.0%	\$77,500
At Risk of Becoming Exclusive	1	1.4%	\$200,000	\$200,000	100.0%	\$200,000
Becoming Exclusive	2	2.8%	\$950,000	\$1,125,000	84.4%	\$475,000
Stable/Advanced Exclusion	8	11.1%	\$2,077,300	\$3,703,000	56.1%	\$259,663
Total	70	97.3%	\$60,027,300	\$83,916,540	71.6%	\$836,858

\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses. Excludes High Student Population and Unavailable or Unreliable Data Categories.

Map 15: All OPW Projects on Urban Displacement Categories



Map 16: OPW Projects by Phase on OEI Priority Neighborhoods Map






Table 5: OPW Project Funds by Phase on by OEI Priority Neighborhood Designations

Priority Neighborhood	Phase 1 Measure KK Allocation	Phase 1 Total Project Cost	Phase 2 Measure KK Allocation	Phase 2 Total Project Cost
Highest	\$8,198,250	\$17,949,038	\$13,675,000	\$13,675,000
High	\$4,067,625	\$4,710,125	\$9,112,500	\$10,240,850
Medium	\$4,851,625	\$5,244,125	\$9,700,000	\$9,700,000
Low	\$2,376,500	\$3,026,500	\$1,175,000	\$1,175,000
Lowest	\$1,721,000	\$2,396,000	\$5,376,300	\$16,026,402
Total	\$21,215,000	\$33,325,788	\$39,038,800	\$50,817,252


Map X17. OPW Investments/ %  
Population Black




Map 18. OPW Investments/ %  
Population Hispanic or Latino



Map 19. OPW Investments/ %  
Population API or NHOPI



Map 20. OPW Investments/ %  
Population BIPOC




### Racial Equity


Maps 17-20 show where OPW investments were sited, in relationship to the concentration of BIPOC populations. Map 20 highlights that OPW sited Measure KK funded investments in areas that had a high proportion of BIPOC residents, and Maps 17-19 show investments in relationship to where there are concentrations of Black, Hispanic or Latino, or Asian or NHOPI residents. Map 17 shows that while there are a number of Measure KK funded OPW investments in West Oakland, where there are high concentrations of Black residents, there are few to no investments in areas with high concentrations of Black residents in East Oakland. Map 18 shows that there are a number of Measure KK funded OPW investments in East Oakland, where there's a high concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents, but there are a couple of census tracts in Central/East Oakland where there are no Measure KK funded investments and a high concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents. And, Map 19 shows, again, that while there is Measure KK funded investment in a number of areas with high concentrations of Asian or NHOPI residents, there are some census tracts in Central Oakland where there are no Measure KK funded investments and a high concentration of Asian or NHOPI residents. **This mapping suggests that while OPW is supporting equitable distribution of Measure KK funded projects, there are communities with high concentrations of BIPOC residents that are not receiving Measure KK investments. However, this is likely due to the influence of other indicators that were utilized in funding and siting decisions.**

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (OAKDOT)

Map 21: Number of DOT Projects by Council District (for projects with a specific council district)



Map 22: DOT Project Funding by Council District (for projects with a specific council district)



\$97,730,000 has been allocated for OakDOT projects across the following five programs: paving and bike paving; complete streets capital; ADA curb ramps; neighborhood traffic calming/safe routes to schools; and sidewalk repairs. OakDOT's three year paving policy was adopted in 2019 in order to distribute a tranche of funding for FY2019-FY21. And, the scoring criteria were amended to distribute FY21-FY23 funds.

Note: Because of the nature of transportation improvements, which often stretch across census tracts, the analysis for OakDOT's projects were done at the Council District level. Projects included in the analysis had a designated council district in the data set. If they had more than one council district, the data was evenly distributed amongst the districts. (E.g. if one project received \$500K from Measure KK funds and was located in two districts, it would

count as a single project for each district, receiving \$250K.) And, paving analysis was based on materials from OakDOT's website (<https://www.oaklandca.gov/departments/transportation>). Paving & bike paving; complete streets capital; ADA curb ramps; sidewalk repair, and safe routes to school occurred across the city and were not able to be disaggregated. Therefore those investments, though large (\$40.6M in Phase I and \$97.7M in Phase II), are not analyzed in detail. The OakDOT paving map will help to identify where some street improvements were made, but in a limited way. Because of extensive detail in the reporting sheets, funding buckets were not able to be disaggregated at this time.

Map 21 shows the number of DOT projects in each council district over the two phases, and Map 22 shows the amount of Measure KK funding allocated to each district for DOT projects over the

Table 7: Summary of DOT Projects by Council District

Council District	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects	Measure KK Funding	Total Cost of Projects Receiving Measure KK Funding	% Project Cost Funded by Measure KK	Avg Amount of Measure KK Funding/Project
1	2	4.8%	\$753,050	\$2,721,650	27.67%	\$376,525
2	5	11.9%	\$568,070	\$7,226,388	7.86%	\$113,614
3	13	31.0%	\$4,883,938	\$66,386,576	7.36%	\$375,688
4	4	9.5%	\$899,007	\$6,093,719	14.75%	\$224,752
5	8	19.0%	\$1,252,110	\$14,082,925	8.89%	\$156,514
6	6	14.3%	\$1,063,739	\$10,302,052	10.33%	\$177,290
7	4	9.5%	\$415,731	\$6,248,800	6.65%	\$103,933

\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses

Figure 1: 2019 3-Year Paving Plan Final Streets by OakDOT (<https://www.oaklandca.gov/departments/transportation>)



Table 8: Summary of DOT Projects by Phase by City Council District

City Council Districts	Round One			Round Two		
	Round 1 # of Projects	Round 1 Measure KK Funds	Round 1 Total Project Costs	Round 2 # Projects	Round 2 Measure KK Funds	Total Project Costs
1	1	\$75,823	\$1,360,825	1	\$677,228	\$1,360,825
2	4	\$288,071	\$3,046,388	1	\$280,000	\$4,180,000
3	7	\$1,826,409	\$30,210,357	6	\$3,057,530	\$36,176,219
4	1	\$42,008	\$492,602	3	\$857,000	\$5,601,117
5	5	\$554,825	\$8,998,850	3	\$697,286	\$5,084,075
6	3	\$159,381	\$4,790,452	3	\$904,359	\$5,511,600
7	2	\$117,373	\$4,297,850	2	\$298,359	\$1,950,950


two phases. Again, these are projects that specify a council district and do not include large buckets of funding, like paving, sidewalk repairs, and ADA curb ramps. The maps suggest that the most Measure KK investment went into Council District 3 (West Oakland). Council District 3 had both the highest number of projects (13) and the largest amount of Measure KK funding (\$4.8M). Council District 1 (North Oakland) had the lowest number of projects (2), and Council District 7 (deep East Oakland) had the lowest amount of funding (\$416K).

Table 7 provides more detail about how the projects and funding were distributed among Council Districts. Table 7 suggests that despite having the lowest amount of funding, projects in Council District 7 were able to leverage the most money per project, with Measure KK funding only 6.7% of project costs. On the other hand projects in Council District 1 leveraged the least amount of money

per project, with Measure KK funding 27.7% of project costs, and it had the highest amount of Measure KK funding per project. District 3 had the highest number of projects (31% of projects), the highest amount of Measure KK funding, and the highest total cost of projects receiving Measure KK funding.

The 2019 3-Year Paving Plan Final Streets Map from OakDOT’s website (Figure 1) displays the location of paved streets across the city for the three year plan. This map clearly indicates that there were extensive paving efforts done in the flatlands, across West, Central, and East Oakland. Importantly, OakDOT focused on paving major streets to ensure that high injury corridors were getting critical safety improvements. **The paving map highlights that there is a concentration of major street improvements in West Oakland and, to a lesser extent, East Oakland. However, these areas are some of the most impacted by traffic violence and focused paving**

Figure 2: OakDOT's Public Request Maps FY19-21 vs. FY21-23



From OakDOT's Capital Improvement Program FY21-23, <https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/FY-21-23-CIP-Book-Revised-5.13.21.pdf>

investment in these areas is critical to ensuring equity.

Table 8 shows the number of projects and amount of Measure KK funding in both round one and two. In both rounds, Council District 3 (West Oakland) had the highest amount of Measure KK funding, \$1.8M and \$3.1M respectively. In round one Council District 5 (Central Oakland) had the second most projects and funding (5 projects for \$555K), while in round two District 6 (East Oakland) was tied for the second most projects (3) and had the second most funding (\$904K). Noticeably, District 7 received a relatively low number of projects and a low amount of funding (2 in each round, \$117K in round one, and \$298K in round 2).


Similar to OPW, funding in round two, after the adoption of their own new equity analysis, seemed to have increased the amount of funding and projects in East Oakland, while maintaining the high number of funding and projects in West Oakland. To view an interactive map of the Complete Streets project locations, including OakDOT's Geographic Equity Tool demographics and score by project, go to: <http://oakgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=c9353519c32644d5b362eea1794686f0>.

Figure 2 shows the difference in public requests between the


two funding cycles, where the city made an effort to address the previous gaps. Importantly, the new equity analysis seems to be addressing geographical equity (as demonstrated by the increase in funding for District 6 in Phase II).

Clearly, West Oakland is a key priority for transportation projects, with a high number of projects and Measure KK funding. West, Central, and East Oakland also seem to be priority areas for street paving projects, as evidenced by the 3-Year Paving Plan Map, and East Oakland seems to be receiving increased attention with OakDOT's new equity analysis. And, during both phases, the Flatlands received considerably more projects and funding than the Hills, in both street paving projects and other transportation projects. OakDOT has intentionally supported equitable distribution of Measure KK funds by utilizing data and equity analysis. This has resulted in: 1) prioritizing of paving of major streets, corridors, and other projects in vulnerable areas, particularly East and West Oakland and 2) ensuring that Measure KK transportation dollars were equitably distributed between the Flatlands and Hills, with more far more funding going towards the Flatlands than the Hills (the top three funded Council Districts represented West, Central, and East Oakland).


Map 23. OPW Investments / % Population Black




Map 24. OPW Investments / % Population Hispanic or Latino



Map 25. OPW Investments / % Population API or NHOPI



Map 26. OPW Investments / % Population BIPOC




### Racial Equity


Maps 23-26 show the City of Oakland's City Council District boundaries in relationship to concentrations of different BIPOC populations. These maps, paired with Maps 21 and 22 and Table 8, show how different races/ethnicities benefited from some of OakDOT's Measure KK funded investments. For instance, Map 23 highlights that West Oakland has a major concentration of the City's Black residents, and Table 8 shows that West Oakland received the highest number of OakDOT projects and funding. However, District 7, in East Oakland, which has large concentrations of Black and Hispanic or Latino residents, received the lowest amount of funding. Map 26 also suggests that Council Districts 6 and 7 have very large concentrations of BIPOC residents, and Council District 6 received high amounts of projects and funding, while District 7 did not. This suggests that additional indicators in OakDOT's equity analysis were critical in deciding where to site projects.

# HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (HCD)

Map 27: HCD Projects by Phase on Census Tract Geographies



Map 28: HCD Projects by Phase on City Council District Geographies



Measure KK funds, in the amount of \$100M, were allocated to Oakland HCD to fund affordable housing projects and programs in new construction, preservation, and rehabilitation and acquisition of affordable housing. As of early 2021, 88% of the funds had been committed to projects, and there was \$11.7M left for distribution. \$88.3M was allocated in the following ways:

- \$24.1M for acquisition and conversion to affordable housing
- \$20.3M for housing rehabilitation and preservation
- \$6.3M for new construction
- \$15M for acquisition of transitional housing facilities
- \$15.6M for site acquisition
- \$1.5M for 1-4 Unit Housing Program
- \$500K for ADUs
- \$5M for administration

Note: This evaluation uses an earlier source of data, where approximately 80% of funds had been expended.

Map 27 shows HCD project distribution by type (acquisition, new construction, and rehabilitation) across census tract geographies, while Map 28 shows HCD project distribution by type across city council districts. **These maps indicate that housing investment is concentrated most densely in West and Central Oakland.** East Oakland has several acquisition projects and a new construction project, though its projects are less densely situated and more diffuse. And, the Oakland Hills did not have any projects that received Measure KK funding. Acquisition projects occurred throughout the Flatlands, while new construction and rehabilitation efforts were mostly confined to West and Central Oakland.

Table 9: Summary of HCD Project Type by Council District

Council District	New Construction	Acquisition	Rehabilitation	Total Number of Projects
1	2	3		5
2	1	6	2	9
3	3	3	3	9
5	2	2	1	5
6		3		3
7	1	3		4
<b>Total</b>	9	20	6	35

Table 10: Summary of HCD Project Funding by Phase, by Council District

Council District	Measure KK Funding (Round 1)	Total Project Budget (Round 1)	Measure KK Funding (Round 2)	Total Project Budget (Round 2)	Measure KK Funding (Rounds 1+2)	Total Project Budget (Rounds 1+2)	% of Total Measure KK Funding	% Total Project Budget
1	\$8,291,667	\$122,409,671					9.8%	13.4%
2	\$23,777,981	\$245,925,724			\$2,500,000	\$7,000,000	31.1%	27.7%
3	\$17,773,645	\$248,872,119	\$9,820,000	\$44,884,202			32.7%	32.2%
5	\$13,900,000	\$179,712,802					16.5%	19.7%
6	\$2,550,000	\$549,358	\$390,606	\$708,409			3.5%	0.1%
7	\$2,899,616	\$57,512,368	\$2,550,000	\$4,118,591			6.5%	6.8%
<b>Total</b>	\$69,192,909	\$854,982,042	\$12,760,606	\$49,711,202	\$2,500,000	\$7,000,000	100.0%	100%

Map 29: HCD Projects by OEI Priority Neighborhoods




Table 11: Project Type by OEI Priority Neighborhoods

Priority Neighborhood	New Construction Projects	Preservation-Acquisition	Preservation-Rehabilitation
Highest	2	3	4
High	1	4	1
Medium	6	8	1
Low	0	3	0
Lowest	0	2	0
Total	9	20	6

Map 30: HCD Projects by Composite Score Priority Neighborhoods




Table 12: Project Type by Composite Score Priority Neighborhoods

Priority Neighborhood	New Construction Projects	Preservation-Acquisition	Preservation-Rehabilitation
Highest	1	2	3
High	4	8	2
Medium	4	5	1
Low	0	2	0
Lowest	0	3	0
Total	9	20	6

\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses

Table 9 displays the number and type of projects distributed across the seven council districts, and Table 10 shows how Measure KK funding and total project budgets were distributed across the seven council districts. Council Districts 2 and 3 had the highest total number of projects (9). District 3 had the highest number of new construction projects (3) and rehabilitation projects (3), while District 2 had the highest number of acquisition projects (6). District 6 had the lowest number of total projects (3), aside from District 4, and had zero new construction projects.

District 3 received the most Measure KK funding, \$27.6M, which is approximately 33% of the Measure KK funds that were awarded to all projects. District 3 had the highest total project budget amount, with projects totaling \$293.8M in total project budget. District 2 received the second highest amount of Measure KK funding, \$26.3M, which is approximately 28% of the Measure KK funds that were awarded to all projects. District 6 received the least amount of Measure KK funding (\$2.9M), while District 7 received the second least amount of Measure KK funding (\$5.5M). Districts 6 and 7 also had the least amount in total project budget.

Map 29 shows how Measure KK funded projects were distributed across OEI priority neighborhoods, and Table 11 breaks out the types of projects in each priority neighborhood. Medium priority neighborhoods had the highest amount of new construction (6) and acquisition projects (8), while high and highest priority neighborhoods received a fair amount of new construction (3), preservation projects (7), and rehabilitation projects (5). Low and lowest priority neighborhoods had only 5 acquisition projects.

Map 30 shows how Measure KK funded projects were distributed across composite score priority neighborhoods, and Table 12 breaks out the types of projects in each priority neighborhood. In this iteration, high and medium priority neighborhoods had an equal amount of new construction projects (4 each), and high priority neighborhoods had the highest number of acquisition projects (8). Highest priority neighborhoods had the highest amount of rehabilitation projects (3), and low and lowest priority neighborhoods again had the least number of projects, with only 5 acquisition projects.

Map 31 displays how Measure KK funded projects were distributed across Urban Displacement Project categories, and Table 13 provides more information about the types of projects in each category. The highest number of new construction projects (4) were located in early/ongoing gentrification categories, and the second highest number of new construction projects (2) were located in low income/susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification categories. **The highest number of acquisition projects were located in at risk of gentrification categories, and the second highest number of acquisition projects were located in low income/susceptible to displacement categories. The only category with Measure KK funded rehabilitation projects was the at risk of gentrification category.**

In total, there was \$84,453,515 in Measure KK funds awarded to projects across the city. Table 14 shows funding details for new construction, acquisition, and preservation projects. The average amount of Measure KK funding per project was: \$1.4M for new construction; \$2.3M for acquisition, and \$4.2M for rehabilitation. Measure KK funded \$20K per unit for new construction; \$108K per unit for acquisition, and \$64K per unit for rehabilitation. The average city contribution was highest for new construction (\$411K per unit), but lowest for acquisition (\$138K/unit). New construction projects had the highest average total project budget at \$60.7M, and acquisition had the lowest average project budget at \$3.8M.

Table 15 highlights the area median incomes (AMI) for units of Measure KK funded affordable housing projects. **Importantly, over 99% of units were designated as extremely low (less than 30% AMI), very low (31-50% AMI), or low (51-80% AMI) income units.** New construction had the most extremely low income units (304), which is important because the majority of those projects were in areas that were susceptible, at risk, or experiencing ongoing gentrification. Having these low AMI units will help to allow residents to stay in their neighborhoods.

Map 31: HCD Projects on Urban Displacement Project Categories




Table 13: Summary of HCD Projects by Urban Displacement Project Categories

Urban Displacement Category	New Construction Projects	Preservation-Acquisition	Preservation-Rehabilitation
Low Income/Susceptible to Displacement	2	5	0
Ongoing Displacement	0	0	0
At Risk of Gentrification	2	6	6
Early/Ongoing Gentrification	4	4	0
Advanced Gentrification	1	4	0
Stable Moderate/Mixed Income	0	1	0
At Risk of Becoming Exclusive	0	0	0
Becoming Exclusive	0	0	0
Stable/Advanced Exclusion	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 14: Summary of HCD Project Funding by Type

	Total Amount of Measure KK Funding	Total Number of Projects	Total Number of Units	Average \$ of Measure KK Funding/Project	Average \$ of Measure KK Funding/Unit	Average \$ City Contribution/Unit	Average Total Project Budget
New Construction	\$12,994,900	9	659	\$1,443,878	\$19,719	\$411,966	\$60,753,220
Preservation-Acquisition	\$46,012,615	20	426	\$2,300,631	\$108,011	\$137,899	\$3,786,095
Preservation-Rehabilitation*	\$25,446,000	6	399	\$4,241,000	\$63,774	\$224,889	\$48,198,729




Table 15: Summary of Unit AMIs, by Type

	Extremely Low-Income @ <20% AMI	Extremely Low-Income @ 21-30% AMI	Very Low-Income @ 31-50% AMI	Low-Income @ 51-80% AMI	Moderate-Income @ 81-120% AMI
New Construction	197	107	166	185	2
Acquisition	0	142	20	257	0
Rehabilitation	25	79	170	123	0
Total	222	328	356	565	2
Total % of Units (n=1484)	15.0%	22.1%	24.0%	38.1%	0.1%

Figure 3: Self Reported Demographics





Figure 3 shows self-reported demographics for residents living in new construction units, acquisition units, and rehabilitation units. According to this date, which is limited, Black households make up the majority of households living in both new construction units and rehabilitation units, at 50% and 62% respectively. Latinx households make up 32% of households in acquisition units, and Black residents make up 23% of households living in acquisition units. Asian households make up over a quarter (28%) of households in new construction units, but make up very little of the households in acquisition units (2%) and rehabilitation units (3%). Many residents declined to state their race/ethnicity: 21% in acquisition units, 10% in rehabilitation units, and 3% in new construction units.


Acquisition projects had the highest number of properties where tenants were at risk of displacement. 70% of acquisition projects had tenants that were at high risk of displacement, and 20% of rehabilitation projects had tenants that were at risk of displacement. Zero new construction projects had any tenants that were at high risk of displacement. The higher number of acquisition and rehabilitation properties that had tenants at high risk of displacement is likely attributable to HCD's 2019 NOFA for Acquisition and Conversion to Affordable Housing (ACAH), which prioritized properties with tenants that were at risk of displacement, as evidenced by: landlord harassment, three day notices and no-fault evictions, rent burdened households, households with a greater than 10% rent increase in the last 12 months, and property owner in violation of/has multiple complaints related to Oakland rental housing laws.

These maps and figures highlight that HCD equitably supported vulnerable residents through their affordable housing programs and projects, though there were concentrations of investment in West and Central Oakland and more diffuse investment in East Oakland. HCD: 1) constructed, acquired, and rehabbed a high number of low and extremely-low income units, 2) supported high proportions of people of color; 3) helped stabilize neighborhoods classified as high and highest priority (by both indexes) by performing a high number of acquisitions and rehabs in those neighborhoods; and 4) made a large push to increase housing stock in neighborhoods that were classified as early/ongoing gentrification, low income/susceptible to displacement, and at risk of gentrification categories. The efforts of HCD should support residents to stay in place, with the addition of new housing units, as well as preservation of existing units.


Map 32. OPW Investments/ %  
Population Black




Map 35. OPW Investments/ %  
Population BIPOC



Map 33 OPW Investments/ %  
Population Hispanic or Latino



Map 34. HCD Investments/ %  
Population API or NHOPI



### Racial Equity

Maps 32-35 show where HCD investments were sited, in relationship to the concentration of BIPOC populations. Map 35 highlights that HCD generally sited Measure KK funded investments in areas that had a medium to high proportion of BIPOC residents, and Maps 32-34 show investments in relationship to where there are concentrations of Black, Hispanic or Latino, or Asian or NHOPI residents. Map 32 shows that while there are a number of Measure KK funded HCD investments in West Oakland, where there are high concentrations of Black residents, there are several tracts in areas with high concentrations of Black residents in parts of West and East Oakland that did not receive investment. Map 33 shows that there are several Measure KK funded HCD investments in East Oakland, where there's a high concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents, but there are a couple of census tracts in Central/East Oakland where there are no Measure KK funded investments and a high concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents. And, Map 34 shows, again, that while there is Measure KK funded investment in a number of areas with high concentrations of Asian or NHOPI residents, there are some census tracts in Central Oakland where there are no Measure KK funded investments and a high concentration of Asian or NHOPI residents. This mapping suggests that while HCD is supporting equitable distribution of Measure KK funded projects, there are communities with high concentrations of BIPOC residents that are not receiving Measure KK investments. However, this is likely due to the influence of other indicators that were utilized in funding and siting decisions.

# SUMMARY

Measure KK dollars distributed by OPW, OakDOT, and HCD overwhelmingly went to vulnerable neighborhoods, defined as highest/high priority neighborhoods and/or census tract categories that suggest future or imminent displacement of residents.

Below are a few key points from each section:

## Office of Public Works

- Highest and high priority neighborhoods received the most number of projects and the most funding for projects
- Categories that are susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification received the highest number of projects and the most funding for projects
- CIP prioritization process supported 1) the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way and 2) funding need over funding leverage
- Mapping suggests that OPW Measure KK funded investments were equitably sited in areas with high concentrations of BIPOC residents; however, there were census tracts with high proportions of Black, Hispanic or Latino, and/or Asian or NHOPI residents that did not receive investment.

## Department of Transportation

- Prioritized the paving of major streets and other corridors in vulnerable areas, particularly East and West Oakland
- Ensured that Measure KK transportation dollars were equitably distributed between the Flatlands and Hills, with far more funding going towards the Flatlands than the Hills (the top

three funded Council Districts represented West, Central, and East Oakland)

- New equity analysis supported the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way.

## Housing and Community Development

- Constructed, acquired, and rehabbed a high number of low and extremely-low income units
- Supported high proportions of BIPOC populations
- Helped stabilize neighborhoods classified as high and highest priority by performing a high number of acquisitions and rehabs in those neighborhoods
- Made a large push to increase housing stock in neighborhoods that were classified as early/ongoing gentrification, low income/susceptible to displacement, and at risk of gentrification categories
- Mapping suggests that HCD Measure KK funded investments were generally sited in areas with medium to high concentrations of BIPOC residents, and there were census tracts with high proportions of Black, Hispanic or Latino, and/or Asian or NHOPI residents that did not receive investment.

# FUTURE EVALUATIONS

Future evaluations should be conducted to determine the medium and long term impacts of the project, as well as contextualize Measure KK. Suggestions for these evaluations are listed below:

## Process Evaluation:

- *Contextualize how Measure KK came to be and document how it was implemented*
  - Critical for understanding the decisions that were made and why they were made.
  - Will help to contextualize Measure KK within other department and City plans.

## Medium Term Evaluation:

*Are there measurable impacts in neighborhoods/among stakeholders?*

*What types of affordable housing investments are being made, how are they distributed and how do they interact with capital/street improvements?*

- How have the investments impacted lower income neighborhoods and their residents?
  - Are the originally targeted residents benefiting from the improvements?
    - What do area demographics tell us about neighborhood stability?
      - Are the same residents still there?
      - How have the demographics shifted from five years ago?
  - What is the usage rate (pre and post) for facilities funded by KK funds?
    - How much are facilities being used (increased usage)?
    - Who is using the facilities (pre and post)?
- Disaggregate and analyze data by investment type and use (particularly for OPW and OakDOT projects)
- Incorporate qualitative data
  - Interviews
  - Focus Groups
  - Photovoice- particularly among younger demographic
- Investigate neighborhoods with the highest amounts of Measure KK funding (priority neighborhoods)
  - Is there a distinction between the neighborhoods now and when Measure KK funds were implemented?
  - Have there been any demographic changes in these neighborhoods or is the population relatively stable?
- Economic impacts
  - Additional revenue generated in the neighborhood?
  - Are there additional neighborhood investments/growth correlated with Measure KK projects?
- How do new/rehabbed housing units interact with other anti-displacement and affordable housing initiatives?
  - Evaluation of effectiveness of investing in new affordable housing development vs rehabbing housing

## Long-Term Evaluation of Social Equity Impacts

*Have there been measurable increases in social equity and any adverse impacts to low-income communities of color from Measure KK funded projects?*

- Perceptions of investments
    - Survey that measures impact and use
  - Have investments been connected with other investments and other infrastructure/transportation/economic development projects?  
Were these standalone one-off projects or were they connected to a larger goal?
    - Were neighborhoods with projects that emphasized “connection” to other goals create larger neighborhood impacts? If so, were these “good” impacts or “bad” impacts (i.e. displacement)?
  - How to understand why investments were foundational in neighborhood change?
    - Qualitative data collected from neighborhood residents and city staff
    - Studying pre and post intervention statistics around crime, economy, individual outcomes
  - Have the investments contributed to increasing social equity?
    - Have equity gaps among residents in vulnerable neighborhoods improved?
    - Educational attainment
    - Poverty
    - Income
    - Health
    - Economic development (revenue generation)
    - Access to social infrastructure and facilities
    - Access to neighborhood amenities
    - Access to park and open space
    - Feelings and perceptions of safety
    - Violent crime density analysis
  - Is there a lower rental housing cost burden?
  - Is there a narrowing of the racial wealth gap?
  - Is there a narrowing of the unemployment rate?
  - How have investments worked in concert with other funding and programs to contribute to increasing social equity?
  - How have the investments impacted the displacement of low-income communities and communities of color?
    - How have neighborhood demographics changed (descriptive statistics)?
    - American Community Survey data
    - Change in cost of rents
    - Change in home values
    - Anecdotal/qualitative data
  - Spatial mapping of demographics and change over time
  - Gentrification mapping analysis
- 34 • Urban Displacement Project

# EXHIBIT D

## Measure KK Annual Reporting Proposal



CITY OF  
**OAKLAND**



### Contents

Measure KK Tranches 1 and 2 Impact .....	1
Funding and Expenditures Summary by Program.....	2
Leveraged Funding .....	3
Examples of Measure KK-funded Projects .....	4
Supplemental Project Information – Scopes, Schedules, Budgets .....	5
Maps of Capital Projects .....	7
Questionnaire (specific questions as requested from Measure KK committee) .....	8



## Measure KK Tranches 1 and 2 Impact

[Placeholder for narrative/text, highlighting total # of Measure KK funded projects and other key statistics]



## Funding and Expenditures Summary by Program

[Placeholder for narrative/text]

PROGRAM	FUNDING ALLOCATED (5330 + 5332)	Total Spent to Date (5330 + 5332)	FY 20-21 Encumbered	FY 21-22 Encumbered
Paving Program	\$ 125,865,300	\$ 94,903,442	\$ 31,056,514	\$ 6,018,296
Complete Streets Capital	\$ 18,230,000	\$ 7,285,851	\$ 4,117,932	\$ 708,639
ADA Curb Ramps	\$ 7,600,000	\$ 5,910,171	\$ 643,302	\$ 151,774
Sidewalk Repairs	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,253,298	\$ 530,170	\$ -
Neighborhood Traffic Safety/Safe Routes To School	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,669,904	\$ 1,339,037	\$ 1,180,171
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 159,195,300</b>	<b>\$ 114,022,666</b>	<b>\$ 37,686,955</b>	<b>\$ 8,058,879</b>


  

PROGRAM	FUNDING ALLOCATED (5330 + 5332)	Total Spent to Date (5330 + 5332)	FY 20-21 Encumbered	FY 21-22 Encumbered
Paving Program	\$ 125,865,300	\$ 94,903,442	\$ 31,056,514	\$ 6,018,296
Complete Streets Capital	\$ 18,230,000	\$ 7,285,851	\$ 4,117,932	\$ 708,639
ADA Curb Ramps	\$ 7,600,000	\$ 5,910,171	\$ 643,302	\$ 151,774
Sidewalk Repairs	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,253,298	\$ 530,170	\$ -
Neighborhood Traffic Safety/Safe Routes To School	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,669,904	\$ 1,339,037	\$ 1,180,171
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 159,195,300</b>	<b>\$ 114,022,666</b>	<b>\$ 37,686,955</b>	<b>\$ 8,058,879</b>



## Leveraged Funding

[Placeholder for narrative/text]



## Examples of Measure KK-funded Projects

High scoring CIP projects with grant funding and matching KK funding

### Bancroft Avenue Trail


#### Outreach to-date

- August 8, 2019 - CBO Deep Dive/Listening Session
- August 16, 2019 - CBO Deep Dive/Listening Session
- October 24, 2019 - CBO Deep Dive/Listening Session
- December 19, 2019 - CBO Deep Dive/Listening Session
- February 29, 2020 - Bancroft Ave Mobile Pop-up @ 78th Ave
- June 2020 - 1:1 meetings (CBO facilitated)
- July 25, 2020 - Residential focus group

#### Next steps

- Continued outreach and design through East Oakland Mobility Action Plan (EOMAP)

<https://www.oaklandca.gov/projects/eastoakmap>



### 73rd Avenue Active Routes to Transit

#### Outreach to-date

- Fall 2019 - four CBO Deep Dive/Listening Sessions
- July 18, 2020 - 73rd Ave Mobile Pop-up @ Eastmont Transit Center
- June 2020 - 1:1 meetings (CBO facilitated)
- July 25, 2020 - Residential focus group
- July 17, 2020 - present - Online engagement via website and social media promoting 73rd Ave. survey (~240 responses to-date)

#### Next steps

- Continued outreach and design through East Oakland Mobility Action Plan (EOMAP) to gather input on lived experience and community needs

<https://www.oaklandca.gov/projects/73rd-avenue-active-routes-to-transit>



City of  
Oakland

## Supplemental Project Information – Scopes, Schedules, Budgets (OakDOT)

OakDOT - Major Capital Projects Database									
Includes Complete Streets Capital, Bridge Safety, Safe Routes to School, Named Planning Projects. Does not capture paving, neighborhood traffic safety.									
PROJECT	CIP PROGRAM	CIP Score	Phase	Total Funding	FUNDTYPE	DESC_	Construction Start	Completion Date	
East Oakland Mobility Action Plan	Community Transportation	94.00	Plan	\$ 350,000	ACTC CIP (regional), B/BB (local)	Conduct community engagement to identify priorities and create concept designs for improvements that can provide safe mobility through East Oakland	N/A	Winter 2021	
Lower Park Blvd Complete Streets	Paving	89.50	Construction	TBD	KK (local)	Pave portions of Park Blvd, E 18th St, and 3rd Ave and change the roadway striping to improve traffic safety, access, and mobility for people walking, biking, riding the bus, and driving	Spring 2020	Spring 2021	
ATP 14th St Safety Project	Complete Streets Capital	89.25	Design	\$ 18,837,000	ATP (state), KK (local)	14th St between Brush St and Oak St, project will reduce lanes from 4 to 2, add Class IV bike lanes separated from traffic; install bus boarding islands, pedestrian refuges, and green stormwater infrastructure; improve signals and pedestrian crossings.14t	Spring 2023	Fall 2025	
East Oakland Sustainable Access to MLK Jr Shoreline	Community Transportation	89.00	Plan	\$ 184,754	STEP (state)	Planning study of clean air mobility options that will enhance access to the Martin Luther King Jr. Shoreline as identified in the East Oakland Neighborhoods Initiative, Resilient by Design Estuary Common Plan, and East Oakland Mobility Action Plan.	N/A	TBD	
HSIP7 MARKET ST AND SAN PABLO AVE (VARIOUS LOCATIONS)	Complete Streets Capital	88.50	Construction	\$ 1,584,300	HSIP (state), B (local), KK (local)	On Market St (4th-7th St, 18th-19th St). Intersections at 14th, 16th, 21st, 34th, Brockhurst St, and San Pablo Av (at 32nd St). Install uncontrolled crosswalk enhancements-RRFBs, ladder striping, raised bulb-outs, raised median refuges. HSIP7-04-015.	Winter 2020	Winter 2022	
LAMMPS PHASE 1 (LAUREL ACCESS TO MILLS MAXWELL PARK SEMINARY)	Complete Streets Capital	86.00	Completed	\$ 9,239,000	ATP, ACTC, KK	Multi-use path between High St & Richards Rd.	N/A	3/22/2021	
Bancroft Greenway	Complete Streets Capital	85.50	N/A	TBD (pending ATP)	TBD (pending ATP augmentation)	Reactivate the central median on Bancroft Ave from 73rd St to 106th St, including potentially widening the median and re-landscaping it to accommodate a multi-use bicycle and pedestrian path, while also providing accessible open green space	N/A	TBD	
East Oakland Neighborhood Initiative (EONI) Transportation Improvements	Community Transportation	84.25	Plan	\$ 50,000	N/A	Planning and design of transportation projects recommended in the East Oakland Neighborhoods Initiative, a partnership between the Oakland's Planning Bureau and 12 community-based organizations focused on equity-based planning for Deep East Oakland.	N/A	TBD	
HSIP8 BANCROFT AVE	Complete Streets Capital	84.00	Construction	\$ 4,770,709	HSIP (state), B/BB (local), KK (local)	Install crosswalk enhancements, pedestrian countdowns, HAWKs, RRFBs, signal upgrades and modifications, landscape median, signing, striping, markings. H8-04-013	Summer 2021	Winter 2023	
Grand Avenue Mobility Plan Implementation	Complete Streets Capital	83.70	Plan	\$ 642,650	Caltrans Sustainable Communities (st	The Grand Ave corridor is undergoing robust engagement to envision the future of the corridor and address transportation challenges. The implementation plan will make improvements to transit, walking, and biking without impeding goods movement.	N/A	TBD	
West Oakland Industrial Streets (rail removal)	Complete Streets Capital	82.75	Plan	\$ 150,000	KK (local)	Upgrade streets in West Oakland to complete streets, consistent with the West Oakland Specific Plan, including the removal of inactive railroad tracks, road diets, repaving, street lighting, landscaping, pedestrian and bike improvements.	TBD	TBD	



## Supplemental Project Information – Scopes, Schedules, Budgets (OPW – placeholder)

*[Placeholder for OPW]*




# Maps of Capital Projects


[OakDOT Major Projects Online Map](#)

[OPW Public Dashboard Map](#)

[CIP Information and Maps](#)



<https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=d17d586b9a5a4c529d3951a5d239e47f&extent=-122.4014,37.7246,-122.0818,37.8467>



City of  
Oakland

**Questionnaire (specific questions as requested from Measure KK committee)**



# ATTACHMENT C

**A COMMITTEE MEETING** of the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond (I-Bond) Public Oversight Committee (the “I-Bond Committee”) was held on September 12, 2022 via Tele-Conference.

## I. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

### Committee Members

**Present:**

- Ellen Wu, Chairperson
- Daniel Swafford, Vice Chairperson
- Christopher Johnson, Member
- Gloria Bailey-Ray, Member
- Anne Griffith, Member

### Committee Members

**Absent:**

- Danielle J. Harris, Member (Excused)
- Tia Hicks, Member (Excused)
- Baldomero Gonzalez, Member
- Gary Jimenez, Member

### Additional Attendees:

- David Jones, Secretary to the Committee
- Dawn Hort, Staff to Committee

The meeting was called to order at 5:22 pm by David Jones.

## II. ADOPT A CONTINUING RESOLUTION as per AB 361 establishing findings justifying the ongoing need for virtual meetings (**Exhibit A**)

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Griffith.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ GRIFFITH-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 5 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

## III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments

**IV. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES** with modifications to the minutes from previous SPECIAL meeting of **June 6, 2022**, referencing reports as presented by the public speaker **(Exhibit B)**

This item was pulled and moved to the next meeting as quorum of previous meeting's members has not been achieved.

**V. Approval of Measure KK Investments Report – Amanda Fukutome (Exhibit C)**

Ms. Amanda Fukutome could not attend, this report will replace the Committee's Annual Report to City Council including a cover memorandum outlining the information will be added to the final report.

**MOTION:** Member Anne Griffith made a motion to approve; seconded by Vice Chairperson Daniel Swafford.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ GRIFFITH-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 5 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

**VI. Discuss Ad Hoc Committee's Recommendation for Annual Report Format**

Ad Hoc Sub-Committee was comprised of Chairperson Wu, Member Hicks, Member Bailey-Ray and Member Johnson reporting back with recommendations. Department of Transportation and Public Works Department demonstrated an interactive website with map highlighting and detailing Measure KK projects geographically will be added. Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) does not yet have an interactive website, but can explore the option.

**VII. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS**

- a. Identify Future Agenda Items
  - Explore the full public interactive website map of Measure KK projects
  - Update with HCD on mapping Measure KK projects
- b. Confirm next meeting
  - Monday, December 12, 2022 at 5:00PM-7:00PM

**VIII. OPEN FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comments

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Gloria Bailey-Ray. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 6:07 pm.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ GRIFFITH-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 5 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

---

DAVID JONES, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

December 12, 2022

---

DATE

## Exhibit A

# OAKLAND AFFORDABLE HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PUBLIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

---

**ADOPT A RESOLUTION DETERMINING THAT CONDUCTING IN-PERSON MEETINGS OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PUBLIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND ITS COMMITTEES WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO ATTENDEES' HEALTH, AND ELECTING TO CONTINUE CONDUCTING MEETINGS USING TELECONFERENCING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e), A PROVISION OF AB-361.**

**WHEREAS**, on March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency related to COVID-19, pursuant to Government Code Section 8625, and such declaration has not been lifted or rescinded. See <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/3.4.20-Coronavirus-SOE-Proclamation.pdf>; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 9, 2020, the City Administrator in their capacity as the Director of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), issued a proclamation of local emergency due to the spread of COVID-19 in Oakland, and on March 12, 2020, the City Council passed Resolution No. 88075 C.M.S. ratifying the proclamation of local emergency pursuant to Oakland Municipal Code (O.M.C.) section 8.50.050(C); and

**WHEREAS**, City Council Resolution No. 88075 remains in full force and effect to date; and

**WHEREAS**, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommends physical distancing of at least six (6) feet whenever possible, avoiding crowds, and avoiding spaces that do not offer fresh air from the outdoors, particularly for people who are not fully vaccinated or who are at higher risk of getting very sick from COVID-19. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC recommends that people who live with unvaccinated people avoid activities that make physical distancing hard. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/about-covid-19/caring-for-children/families.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC recommends that older adults limit in-person interactions as much as possible, particularly when indoors. See <https://www.cdc.gov/aging/covid19/covid19-older-adults.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the CDC, the California Department of Public Health, and the Alameda County Public Health Department all recommend that people experiencing COVID-19 symptoms stay home. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, persons without symptoms may be able to spread the COVID-19 virus. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, fully vaccinated persons who become infected with the COVID-19 Delta variant can spread the virus to others. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/fully-vaccinated.html>; and

**WHEREAS**, the City's public-meeting facilities are indoor facilities that do not ensure circulation of fresh / outdoor air, particularly during periods of cold and/or rainy weather, and were not designed to ensure that attendees can remain six (6) feet apart; and

**WHEREAS**, holding in-person meetings would encourage community members to come to City facilities to participate in local government, and some of them would be at high risk of getting very sick from COVID-19 and/or would live with someone who is at high risk; and

**WHEREAS**, in-person meetings would tempt community members who are experiencing COVID-19 symptoms to leave their homes in order to come to City facilities and participate in local government; and

**WHEREAS**, attendees would use ride-share services and/or public transit to travel to in-person meetings, thereby putting them in close and prolonged contact with additional people outside of their households; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 14, 2022 the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee adopted a resolution determining that conducting in-person meetings would present imminent risks to attendees' health, and electing to continue conducting meetings using teleconferencing in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; now therefore be it:

**RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and hereby adopts and incorporates them into this resolution; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that, based on these determinations and consistent with federal, state and local health guidance, the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee renews its determination that conducting in-person meetings would pose imminent risks to the health of attendees; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee firmly believes that the community's health and safety and the community's right to participate in local government, are both critically important, and is committed to balancing the two by continuing to use teleconferencing to conduct public meetings, in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** that the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee will renew these (or similar) findings at least every thirty (30) days in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e) until the state of emergency related to COVID-19 has been lifted, or the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond Public Oversight Committee finds that in-person meetings no longer pose imminent risks to the health of attendees, whichever occurs first.

**A SPECIAL COMMITTEE MEETING** of the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Bond (I-Bond) Public Oversight Committee (the “I-Bond Committee”) was held on June 6, 2022 via Tele-Conference.

**I. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Committee Members

**Present:**

- Ellen Wu, Chairperson
- Daniel Swafford, Vice Chairperson
- Danielle J. Harris, Member
- Tia Hicks, Member
- Christopher Johnson, Member
- Gloria Bailey-Ray, Member

Committee Members

**Absent:**

- Gary Jimenez, Member (Excused)
- Anne Griffith, Member
- Baldomero Gonzalez, Member

Additional Attendees:

- David Jones, Secretary to the Committee
- Dawn Hort, Staff to Committee

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 pm by David Jones.

**II. ADOPT A CONTINUING RESOLUTION as per AB 361** establishing findings justifying the ongoing need for virtual meeting (Exhibit A)

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Gloria Bailey-Ray.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 6 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

**III. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- IV. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES** with modifications to the minutes from previous SPECIAL meeting of **May 2, 2022**, referencing reports as presented by the public speaker (Exhibit B)

**MOTION:** Member Danielle Harris made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Christopher Johnson.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]

(AYES: 6 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

- V. Finalize Measure KK Investments Report – Amanda Fukutome (Exhibit C)**

Ms. Amanda Fukutome presented a revised report based on comments received from the commissioners, which now includes a departmental section looking at investments in relation to the concentration of different ethnicities. This is to show relationships of geographic indexes and racial equity since all geographic indexes use race and ethnicity as their primary indicators. Also, Ms. Fukutome added an executive summary section highlighting a need for more formal processes of evaluation.

- VI. Finalize Committee’s Annual Report (Exhibit D)**

Chairperson Wu provided three options for the annual report structure:

- 1) Use the department’s proposed structure and work with the departments.
- 2) Step back and identify the context and information the Committee wants to communicate about Measure KK funds to Council and the public.
- 3) Continue the same process but pare down unnecessary information.

**APPROVAL OF THE FORMATION OF AN AD-HOC COMMITTEE** to address reporting and structure issues of the Oversight Committee’s board consisting of Member Tia Hicks, Member Christopher Johnson, Member Gloria Bailey-Ray, and Chairperson Ellen Wu.

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Gloria Bailey-Ray.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]

(AYES: 6 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

**VII. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS**

- a. Identify Future Agenda Items
  - Finalize and vote on the Measure KK Investments Report
  - Discuss the Ad-Hoc Committee’s recommendations for the Annual Report
- b. Confirm next meeting
  - Monday, September 12, 2022 at 5:00PM-7:00PM
  - Monday, December 12, 2022 at 5:00PM-7:00PM

**VIII. OPEN FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Member Christopher Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Tia Hicks. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

[BAILEY-RAY-Y/ HARRIS-Y/ HICKS-Y/ JOHNSON-Y/ SWAFFORD-Y/ WU-Y]  
(AYES: 6 / NOES: 0 / ABSTAIN: 0)

---

DAVID JONES, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

September 12, 2022  
DATE

# Exhibit C

# Measure KK Evaluation

## Summer 2022

Amanda Fukutome, MCP

# BACKGROUND

Measure KK was approved on November 8, 2016. This Measure authorized the City to issue \$600M in general bonds to “improve public safety and invest in neighborhoods throughout Oakland.” In the years that followed, three city departments, Oakland Public Works Department, Oakland Department of Transportation, and Oakland Department of Housing and Community Development, funded projects with Measure KK bonds to improve neighborhoods throughout the city.

In line with the City’s priorities of social and racial equity, the Departments utilized different criteria to promote project investment and siting in a way that advances social equity. Measure KK’s Oversight Committee is tasked with evaluating whether or not Measure KK funds supported the advancement of social equity and anti-displacement efforts. This evaluation is intended to be the beginning of that exploration. This report evaluated the short-term impacts of Measure KK funding, while providing suggestions for a medium and long-term evaluation.

Some key findings from the report are below:

## **Office of Public Works**

- Highest and high priority neighborhoods received the most number of projects and the most funding for project, and susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification categories received the highest number of projects and the most funding for projects
- CIP prioritization process supported 1) the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way and 2) funding need over funding leverage

## **Department of Transportation**

- Ensured that Measure KK transportation dollars were equitably distributed, with more funding going towards the Flatlands.
- New equity analysis supported the identification of projects in a geographically, and demographically equitable way.

## **Housing and Community Development**

- Constructed, acquired, and rehabbed a high number of low and extremely-low income units, and helped stabilize neighborhoods classified as high and highest priority by performing a high number of acquisitions and rehabs in those neighborhoods

This report found that Measure KK funding was equitably distributed throughout the City of Oakland, and new prioritization processes are helping to ensure that Oakland’s most vulnerable residents are receiving a majority of Measure KK investment. However, there are a few outliers, which are identified in the report, and future prioritization processes should look for ways to ensure these outliers receive funding and prioritization in the future.

# BACKGROUND

## **Measure KK**

On November 8, 2016, voters from Oakland, CA approved Measure KK, which authorized the City to issue \$600M in general bonds to “improve public safety and invest in neighborhoods throughout Oakland by re-paving streets, which included to remove potholes, rebuilding cracked and deteriorating sidewalks, funding bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements, funding affordable housing for Oaklanders, and providing funds for facility improvements, such as, neighborhood recreation centers, playgrounds and libraries” (City of Oakland, 2021).

**Projects being supported by Measure KK funds, include the following:**

### **Streets and Roads Projects in the amount of \$350 million**

- Street paving and reconstruction
- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements; bikeways, sidewalks, paths, stairs, streetscape, curb ramps
- Traffic calming improvements

### **2. Facilities Projects in the amount of \$150 million**

- Fire Facilities (\$40 million)
- Police Facility (\$40 million)
- Libraries (\$15 million)
- Parks, Recreation and Senior Facilities (\$35 million)
- Water, energy and seismic improvements consistent with the City’s Energy and Climate Action Plan (\$20 million)

### **3. Anti-Displacement and Affordable Housing Preservation Projects in the amount of \$100 million**

- Funds may be spent on the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of affordable housing as set forth in the Affordable Bond Law Ordinance.

“On December 12, 2017, the Mayor appointed nine (9) members to serve on the Affordable Housing & Infrastructure Public Oversight Committee (the “Public Oversight Committee”) and the appointments were confirmed by City Council on December 18, 2017” (City of Oakland, 2021).

“Measure KK requires the creation of the Public Oversight Committee to review financial and operational reports related to the expenditure of bond proceeds to confirm that the funds were used in a manner permitted under Measure KK and to evaluate the impacts and outcomes of the bond expenditures on Measure KK’s stated goals, including social equity, anti-displacement, and affordable housing. The Public Oversight Committee reports to the City Council” (City of Oakland, 2021).

“One of the outcomes the Public Oversight Committee is charged to evaluate, related to the expenditures of the bond proceeds, is social equity and anti-displacement.” (City of Oakland, 2021). This report is intended to respond to the charge of evaluating expenditures as they pertain to social equity and anti-displacement. It seeks to understand if Measure KK funded investments were distributed in an equitable way, and offers suggestions for future evaluations to understand if these investments will support anti-displacement efforts.

For more information on Measure KK and the Public Oversight Committee, please visit: <https://oakland.granicus.com/boards/w/8552f8c4c0e15460/boards/17813>

# REPORT METHODS AND SOURCES

## *Report Methods*

### *Defining Areas of Priority*

In order to determine if projects funded by Measure KK are advancing social equity, areas of priority need to be established using an index or multiple indexes. (To determine if social equity is being advanced, distribution assumes that a higher proportion of projects and funding will be located in areas with more priority and experiencing higher need. In this evaluation, equitable distribution implies distribution that will advance social equity.)

This evaluation uses two primary indexes to evaluate if projects were equitably distributed across the city: (1) the designated 'Priority Neighborhoods' from the Oakland Equity Index (OEI) in OakDOT's Equity Toolkit and (2) a composite index derived from three sources: the 'Priority Neighborhoods' layer from OakDOT, the Social Vulnerability Index from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and CalEnviroScreen from the CA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. Both of these indexes heavily weigh demographic indicators, like race/ethnicity, income, educational attainment, and linguistic isolation. The composite index was created by creating quintile scores for each index, ranging from one to five. One indicated the lowest priority/lowest vulnerability/lowest environmental burden and five indicated the highest priority/highest vulnerability/highest need. Scores for each index were summed, creating a composite index. Both of these indexes utilize census tract geographies.

Areas of priority are defined as:

High or highest priority neighborhoods (tracts), as defined by the 'Priority Neighborhoods' layer from the Oakland Equity Toolkit, or Census tracts with a composite score of 11 - 13 (high priority) or 13 - 15 (highest priority).

Categories developed by the Urban Displacement Project ([urbandisplacement.org](http://urbandisplacement.org)) are also used to look at project distribution.

## *Sources*

### *Internal Data*

Internal data sources include quantitative and qualitative data from the Oakland Public Works Department, Oakland's Department of Transportation, and Oakland's Department of Housing and Community Development. Quantitative data was gathered using a spreadsheet developed by the Oversight Committee and the Departments for reporting purposes, and qualitative data was gathered from questionnaires and conversations with City staff.

### *Public Data*

Public data sources include the Oakland Equity Toolkit, the Social Vulnerability Index, CalEnviroScreen, the Urban Displacement Project, American Community Survey data (2019 and 2020 data), spatial data from the City of Oakland and the United States Census Bureau.


### *Limitations*

A major limitation of this evaluation is that distribution of all Measure KK funding has not been completed. This means that future investments may change the results described in this report. It would be important to revise this report when all of the funding is spent. Another limitation is that this report relies primarily on spatial analysis; however, it was not possible to get addresses/coordinates for all Measure KK funded projects and multiple projects had either no location or locations across multiple sites. Therefore, there were some estimations that had to be done. For instance, if there was a project that had two sites listed, funding amounts were approximated to be equally split, though that might not be completely accurate. And, if a project crossed boundaries (like in OakDOT projects), the project was counted as a project in both districts, with the funding equally split between both districts, which again might not be completely accurate. Projects without an address had to be excluded from the analysis.


# REFERENCE MAPS AND DEMOGRAPHICS

The following reference maps are larger versions of the base maps used throughout the report. The OEI Priority Neighborhoods and the Composite Index maps also include select demographic information for reference.

Map 1: Council District Map



Map 2: Urban Displacement Categories



District 1	Dan Kalb
District 2	Nikki Fortunato Bas
District 3	Carroll Fife
District 4	Sheng Thao
District 5	Noel Gallo
District 6	Loren Taylor
District 7	Treva Reid

- Low Income/Susceptible to Displacement
- Ongoing Displacement
- At Risk of Gentrification
- Early/Ongoing Gentrification
- Advanced Gentrification
- Stable Moderate/Mixed Income
- At Risk of Becoming Exclusive
- Becoming Exclusive
- Stable/Advanced Exclusion
- High Student Population

Map 3: OEI Priority Neighborhoods Map




Table 1: Select Demographics by OEI Priority Neighborhood

	% API	% Black	% Hispanic	% White	% Children Living in Poverty	% Under 25	% Renters	% Bachelor's Degree or Higher
<b>Highest</b>	13.9%	27.3%	47.0%	8.0%	38.3%	35.8%	72.9%	19.3%
<b>High</b>	15.8%	29.2%	38.3%	12.0%	28.4%	32.5%	64.9%	24.9%
<b>Medium</b>	20.7%	27.1%	22.8%	23.9%	29.7%	24.2%	69.2%	40.5%
<b>Low</b>	15.1%	22.0%	14.6%	40.9%	9.8%	21.0%	55.4%	58.2%
<b>Lowest</b>	13.7%	9.0%	8.2%	62.0%	2.3%	21.8%	37.4%	75.2%

Map 4: Composite Index  
Priority Neighborhoods Map




Table 2: Select Demographics by  
Composite Index Priority Neighborhood

	% API	% Black	% Hispanic	% White	% Children Living in Poverty	% Under 25	% Renters	% Bachelor's Degree or Higher
<b>Highest</b>	15.4%	24.4%	49.5%	7.0%	39.7%	36.5%	68.2%	17.3%
<b>High</b>	20.5%	27.7%	31.9%	15.5%	27.0%	29.1%	70.6%	30.1%
<b>Medium</b>	12.1%	30.2%	26.8%	24.8%	25.3%	26.8%	64.2%	39.7%
<b>Low</b>	17.6%	20.0%	10.8%	44.7%	9.7%	20.8%	54.7%	63.2%
<b>Lowest</b>	13.8%	13.3%	11.3%	54.4%	5.1%	22.1%	42.5%	67.8%


# SELECT CITY OF OAKLAND DEMOGRAPHICS

46.1% of residents have Bachelor's Degree or higher

Median household income for residents is **\$80,143**

21% of children are living in poverty and 13% of adults (18-64) are living in poverty

59.2% renter occupied households



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020

Asian & NHOPI **16%**

Black **22%**

Hispanic **27%**

White **28.5%**

**.51**  
GINI Index of Inequality

(GINI measures income inequality on a scale of 0 to 1. 0 is perfect equality and 1 is perfect inequality)

**422,575**  
residents


**6%**  
unemployed  
(note: 2020)

# RACIAL EQUITY


Advancing racial equity is a core goal for the City of Oakland. In addition to providing needed improvements, Measure KK funding seeks to promote social equity through project prioritization processes, like the new Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Prioritization Criteria and OakDOT's equity analysis. A critical component of social equity is racial equity and ensuring that Oakland's Black and Brown communities are being equitably served.

The evaluation focuses on geographic equity; however, race/ethnicity is a core component of each one of the indexes that were used and is deeply integrated into the identification of vulnerable communities. Maps 5-8 show how Oakland's BIPOC residents are distributed throughout the City, and these maps are used in a racial equity section at the end of each departmental section.


Map 7. Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2019)




Map 5. Percent Population BIPOC (2019)



Map 6. Percent Population Black (2019)



Map 8. Percent Population Asian or NHOPI (2019)



# EVALUATION OVERVIEW

In order to understand the full impact of Measure KK investments on social equity and anti-displacement, impacts should be measured at three intervals: short, medium, and long term. The short term evaluation will assess if project distribution across the City is equitably distributed, while the medium and long term evaluations will assess if, and how, these projects have measurably increased social equity or caused any adverse impacts to low-income communities of color.

Because medium-term impacts should be measured several years after projects have been completed and long term impacts should be measured a decade or more after projects have been completed, this evaluation will be focused solely on short term outcomes. However, there are recommendations at the end of this evaluation that will outline critical components of future evaluations. The framework for the medium-term evaluation will offer strategies to evaluate if there have been measurable impacts of investments in neighborhoods/among residents. And, the framework for the long-term evaluation will offer strategies to evaluate if there have been measurable increases in social equity and any adverse impacts to low-income communities of color from Measure KK funding.


The main questions to be answered by the short-term evaluation are: (1) how are the investments spatially distributed; (2) who is impacted by these investments; and (3) how well have the new criteria for identifying capital improvements/street projects worked?

## **This evaluation is divided into the following sections:**

- (1) Report Methods and Limitations
- (2) Oakland Public Works
- (3) Department of Transportation
- (4) Housing and Community Development
- (5) Summary
- (6) Future Evaluations

# OAKLAND PUBLIC WORKS (OPW) DEPARTMENT


Map 9: OPW Projects by Phase on Census Tract Geographies



Across the two phases, 48 public works projects received funding allocations in the amount of \$63,423,800. Projects in Phase I were selected using the Oakland Equity Index (OEI) from OakDOT's Equity Toolbox, while projects in Phase II were selected using the CIP prioritization process. For orientation, Map 9 shows the distribution of public works projects across Oakland's census tracts by phase, while Map 10 shows the same distribution across Oakland's Council Districts by phase. Most data in this section, including maps, tables, and other calculations, are based on projects that could be geolocated (had an address or approximate location).

Maps 9 and 10 highlight that funding for OPW projects occurred throughout the city across both phases, except Council District 5 in Phase II, which did not receive funding. While all council districts


Map 10: OPW Projects by Phase on City Council District Geographies



received funding for projects in at least one phase, there are clear concentrations of investment, particularly in the Flatlands. These maps show that there was a noticeable shift in where funding was allocated during each phase. In Phase I, the majority of projects were primarily located in West and Central Oakland, with additional projects peppered throughout the Hills. There were very few projects located in East Oakland in Phase I. However, during Phase II, there were many more projects funded in East Oakland, not as many funded in Central Oakland, and a similar amount funded in West Oakland and the Hills.

Maps 11 and 12 display the amount of funding in different census tracts across Phase I and Phase II. Census tracts that do not have any coloring did not receive any investment during that phase.


Map 11: Phase One OPW Investments on Census Tract Geographies (Measure KK Funds)



Map 11 highlights that there is a difference between the number of projects in an area and the amount of investment that area received. For instance, in Phase I, there is a substantial amount of funding going into East Oakland, despite the fact that there were only a few projects that were slated to receive funding. This suggests that the projects that were funded were more costly and/or dependent on Measure KK funding than some of the projects that happened in West and Central Oakland, where there were more projects and less funding.

Map 12 shows that in Phase II there was a similar pattern of funding, with a concentration of deep investment in East Oakland and West Oakland, though not as much funding was allocated to Central Oakland. Census tracts in the Hills received more concentrated funding in Phase II, though the Hills received a small amount of funding relative to the other areas in the city, similar to Phase I. The similarities between Phase I and Phase II funding patterns demonstrate the depth and intention of investment in specific areas of the city.

Map 12: Phase Two OPW Investment on Census Tract Geographies (Measure KK Funds)



Map 13 illustrates how Measure KK funded OPW projects were distributed among OEI's priority neighborhoods, and Table 3 provides more detail about how the projects and funding were distributed amongst those neighborhoods. Using OEI's priority neighborhoods index, we see that over half (53%) of the projects are located in the highest or high priority neighborhoods and approximately 58% of Measure KK funds were used in highest and high priority neighborhoods. This amounted to \$35.1M in Measure KK funding. Low and lowest priority neighborhoods had 21 projects and \$10.6M in Measure KK funding; however, these projects seemed to be able to leverage more additional funding than highest and high priority neighborhoods, with Measure KK funding only providing 38.5% of total project cost in lowest priority neighborhoods.

Map 13: All OPW Projects on OEI Priority Neighborhoods  
Map




Table 3: Summary of OPW Projects by OEI Priority Neighborhood Designation

Priority Neighborhood	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects	Measure KK Funding	Total Cost of Projects Receiving Measure KK Funding	% Project Cost Funded by Measure KK	Avg Amount of Measure KK Funding/Project
Highest	20	27.8%	\$21,873,250	\$31,624,038	69.2%	\$1,093,663
High	18	25.0%	\$13,180,125	\$14,950,975	88.2%	\$732,229
Medium	13	18.1%	\$14,551,625	\$14,944,125	97.4%	\$1,119,356
Low	8	11.1%	\$3,551,500	\$4,201,500	84.5%	\$443,938
Lowest	13	18.1%	\$7,097,300	\$18,422,402	38.5%	\$545,946
Total	72	100.0%	\$60,253,800	\$84,143,040	71.6%	\$836,858

\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses

Map 14 presents how Measure KK funded OPW projects were distributed among the composite score priority neighborhoods, and Table 4 provides more detail about how the projects and funding were distributed among the composite score's priority neighborhoods. We see that again, over half (54%) of the projects were located in the highest or high priority neighborhoods, and approximately 70% of Measure KK funds were used in highest and high priority neighborhoods. This amounted to \$42.4M in Measure KK funding. Low and lowest priority neighborhoods had 24 projects and \$14.6M in Measure KK funding; however, these projects, again, seemed to be able to leverage more additional funding than high and highest priority neighborhoods, with Measure KK funding providing only 52.5% of total project cost in low priority neighborhoods.

Map 15 displays how Measure KK funded OPW projects were distributed among Urban Displacement Project categories, and Table 5 provides more detail about how the projects and funding were distributed among the categories. **The largest number of projects were located in the low income/susceptible to displacement category (25 projects) and the at risk of gentrification category (20 projects).** Neighborhoods in these two categories also received over 70% of the Measure KK funds (\$44.6M). These two categories have not yet experienced gentrification, but are at risk of gentrification in varying degrees. **Map 15 highlights that Measure KK funds are going to vulnerable areas that will likely need protections from gentrification in the near future.**

In the second phase of funding, OPW used to the CIP prioritization process to identify new capital projects for funding. The switch to the CIP prioritization process seems to have increased the number of projects in East Oakland, while maintaining the high number of projects in West Oakland. Earlier OPW project selection did a good job of ensuring that priority neighborhoods were prioritized for funding. The highest priority neighborhoods received the most amount of Measure KK funding (\$8.2M) in Phase I; however, there were a lower number of projects in highest priority neighborhoods

in East Oakland than highest priority neighborhoods in other parts of the city. Though, it should be noted that the limited projects in East Oakland neighborhoods received a relatively large amount of funding. Map 16 and Table 6 suggest that in **Phase II, projects were distributed much more equitably among highest priority neighborhoods in both East and West Oakland.**

**The CIP prioritization supported the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way, which may have been missing in the previous OEI process.** Additionally, Phase II investments in highest priority neighborhoods were fully funded by Measure KK dollars, which is important because it suggests that need was the driver for selection, as opposed to leverage. The CIP prioritization process seems to have supported the geographical equitable distribution of OPW projects among priority neighborhoods and supported the funding of projects with less leverage in highest priority neighborhoods.

Analysis using OEI's priority neighborhoods, the composite score priority neighborhoods, and the Urban Displacement Project's categories suggest that an equitable amount of investment is going towards highest and high priority neighborhoods and areas that are at risk of gentrification. **These maps and tables highlight that the most vulnerable neighborhoods in Oakland are receiving the most OPW investment, which is in line with an equitable distribution of investment.** Highest and high priority neighborhoods received the most number of projects and the most funding for projects, and neighborhoods that are susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification received the highest number of projects and the most funding for projects. However, the ongoing displacement category had zero OPW investment, which might be worth investigating. Overall, OPW supported the funding of vulnerable neighborhoods, which include a high number of people of color, children in poverty, and a high proportion of renters.

Map 14: All OPW Projects on Composite Score Priority Neighborhoods Map




Table 4: Summary of OPW Projects by Composite Score Priority Neighborhood Designation

Priority Neighborhood	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects	Measure KK Funding	Total Cost of Projects Receiving Measure KK Funding	% Project Cost Funded by Measure KK	Avg Amount of Measure KK Funding/Project
Highest	22	30.6%	\$26,705,375	\$37,342,013	71.5%	\$1,213,881
High	17	23.6%	\$15,743,750	\$16,418,750	95.9%	\$926,103
Medium	9	12.5%	\$3,219,625	\$3,822,125	84.2%	\$357,736
Low	11	15.3%	\$10,907,750	\$20,782,152	52.5%	\$991,614
Lowest	13	18.1%	\$3,677,300	\$5,778,000	63.6%	\$282,869
Total	72	100.0%	\$60,253,800	\$84,143,040	71.6%	\$836,858


\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses

Table 5: Summary of OPW Projects by Urban Displacement Project Category

<b>Urban Displacement Category</b>	<b>Number of Projects</b>	<b>Percent of Projects</b>	<b>Measure KK Funding</b>	<b>Total Cost of Projects Receiving Measure KK Funding</b>	<b>% Project Cost Funded by Measure KK</b>	<b>Avg Amount of Measure KK Funding/Project</b>
Low Income/Susceptible to Displacement	25	34.7%	\$25,778,875	\$27,989,375	92.1%	\$1,031,155
Ongoing Displacement	0	0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
At Risk of Gentrification	20	27.8%	\$18,821,875	\$28,440,513	66.2%	\$941,094
Early/Ongoing Gentrification	6	8.3%	\$5,040,375	\$5,382,875	93.6%	\$840,063
Advanced Gentrification	6	8.3%	\$6,538,875	\$16,455,777	39.7%	\$1,089,813
Stable Moderate/Mixed Income	2	2.9%	\$620,000	\$620,000	100.0%	\$77,500
At Risk of Becoming Exclusive	1	1.4%	\$200,000	\$200,000	100.0%	\$200,000
Becoming Exclusive	2	2.8%	\$950,000	\$1,125,000	84.4%	\$475,000
Stable/Advanced Exclusion	8	11.1%	\$2,077,300	\$3,703,000	56.1%	\$259,663
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>97.3%</b>	<b>\$60,027,300</b>	<b>\$83,916,540</b>	<b>71.6%</b>	<b>\$836,858</b>

\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses. Excludes High Student Population and Unavailable or Unreliable Data Categories.

Map 15: All OPW Projects on Urban Displacement Categories



Map 16: OPW Projects by Phase on OEI Priority Neighborhoods Map






Table 5: OPW Project Funds by Phase on by OEI Priority Neighborhood Designations

Priority Neighborhood	Phase 1 Measure KK Allocation	Phase 1 Total Project Cost	Phase 2 Measure KK Allocation	Phase 2 Total Project Cost
Highest	\$8,198,250	\$17,949,038	\$13,675,000	\$13,675,000
High	\$4,067,625	\$4,710,125	\$9,112,500	\$10,240,850
Medium	\$4,851,625	\$5,244,125	\$9,700,000	\$9,700,000
Low	\$2,376,500	\$3,026,500	\$1,175,000	\$1,175,000
Lowest	\$1,721,000	\$2,396,000	\$5,376,300	\$16,026,402
Total	\$21,215,000	\$33,325,788	\$39,038,800	\$50,817,252


Map X17. OPW Investments/ %  
Population Black




Map 18. OPW Investments/ %  
Population Hispanic or Latino



Map 19. OPW Investments/ %  
Population API or NHOPI



Map 20. OPW Investments/ %  
Population BIPOC




### Racial Equity

Maps 17-20 show where OPW investments were sited, in relationship to the concentration of Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) populations. Map 20 highlights that OPW sited Measure KK funded investments in areas that had a high proportion of BIPOC residents, and Maps 17-19 show investments in relationship to where there are concentrations of Black, Hispanic or Latino, or Asian or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (NHOPI) residents. Map 17 shows that while there are a number of Measure KK funded OPW investments in West Oakland, where there are high concentrations of Black residents, there are few to no investments in areas with high concentrations of Black residents in East Oakland. While Map 18 shows that there are a number of Measure KK funded OPW investments in East Oakland where there's a high concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents, there are also a couple of census tracts in Central/East Oakland with a high concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents that received no Measure KK investments. And, Map 19 shows, again, that while there is Measure KK funded investment in a number of areas with high concentrations of Asian or NHOPI residents, there are some census tracts in Central Oakland where there are no Measure KK funded investments and a high concentration of Asian or NHOPI residents. This mapping suggests that while OPW is supporting equitable distribution of Measure KK funded projects, there are communities with high concentrations of BIPOC residents that are not receiving Measure KK investments. This is likely due to the influence of other indicators that were utilized in funding and siting decisions.

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (OAKDOT)


Map 21: Number of DOT Projects by Council District (for projects with a specific council district)



\$97,730,000 has been allocated for OakDOT projects across the following five programs: paving and bike paving; complete streets capital; ADA curb ramps; neighborhood traffic calming/safe routes to schools; and sidewalk repairs. OakDOT's three year paving policy was adopted in 2019 in order to distribute a tranche of funding for FY2019-FY21. The scoring criteria were amended to distribute FY21-FY23 funds.

Note: Because of the nature of transportation improvements, which often stretch across census tracts, the analysis for OakDOT's projects were done at the Council District level. Projects included in the analysis had a designated council district in the data set. If they had more than one council district, the data was evenly distributed amongst the districts. (E.g. if one project received \$500K from Measure KK funds and was located in two districts, it

Map 22: DOT Project Funding by Council District (for projects with a specific council district)



would count as a single project for each district, receiving \$250K.) Paving analysis was based on materials from OakDOT's website (<https://www.oaklandca.gov/departments/transportation>). Paving & bike paving; complete streets capital; ADA curb ramps; sidewalk repair, and safe routes to school occurred across the city and were not able to be disaggregated. Therefore those investments, though large (\$40.6M in Phase I and \$97.7M in Phase II), are not analyzed in detail. The OakDOT paving map will help to identify where some street improvements were made, but in a limited way. Because of reporting format, funding buckets were not able to be disaggregated at this time.

Map 21 shows the number of DOT projects in each council district over the two phases, and Map 22 shows the amount of Measure KK funding allocated to each district for DOT projects over the

Table 7: Summary of DOT Projects by Council District

Council District	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects	Measure KK Funding	Total Cost of Projects Receiving Measure KK Funding	% Project Cost Funded by Measure KK	Avg Amount of Measure KK Funding/Project
1	2	4.8%	\$753,050	\$2,721,650	27.67%	\$376,525
2	5	11.9%	\$568,070	\$7,226,388	7.86%	\$113,614
3	13	31.0%	\$4,883,938	\$66,386,576	7.36%	\$375,688
4	4	9.5%	\$899,007	\$6,093,719	14.75%	\$224,752
5	8	19.0%	\$1,252,110	\$14,082,925	8.89%	\$156,514
6	6	14.3%	\$1,063,739	\$10,302,052	10.33%	\$177,290
7	4	9.5%	\$415,731	\$6,248,800	6.65%	\$103,933

\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses

Figure 1: 2019 3-Year Paving Plan Final Streets by OakDOT (<https://www.oaklandca.gov/departments/transportation>)




Table 8: Summary of DOT Projects by Phase by City Council District

City Council Districts	Round One			Round Two		
	Round 1 # of Projects	Round 1 Measure KK Funds	Round 1 Total Project Costs	Round 2 # Projects	Round 2 Measure KK Funds	Total Project Costs
1	1	\$75,823	\$1,360,825	1	\$677,228	\$1,360,825
2	4	\$288,071	\$3,046,388	1	\$280,000	\$4,180,000
3	7	\$1,826,409	\$30,210,357	6	\$3,057,530	\$36,176,219
4	1	\$42,008	\$492,602	3	\$857,000	\$5,601,117
5	5	\$554,825	\$8,998,850	3	\$697,286	\$5,084,075
6	3	\$159,381	\$4,790,452	3	\$904,359	\$5,511,600
7	2	\$117,373	\$4,297,850	2	\$298,359	\$1,950,950

two phases. Again, these are projects that specify a council district and do not include large buckets of funding, like paving, sidewalk repairs, and ADA curb ramps. The maps suggest that the most Measure KK investment went into Council District 3 (West Oakland). Council District 3 had both the highest number of projects (13) and the largest amount of Measure KK funding (\$4.8M). Council District 1 (North Oakland) had the lowest number of projects (2), and Council District 7 (deep East Oakland) had the lowest amount of funding (\$416K).

Table 7 provides more detail about how the projects and funding were distributed among Council Districts. Table 7 suggests that despite having the lowest amount of funding, projects in Council District 7 were able to leverage the most money per project, with Measure KK funding only 6.7% of project costs. On the other hand projects in Council District 1 leveraged the least amount of money

per project, with Measure KK funding 27.7% of project costs, and it had the highest amount of Measure KK funding per project. District 3 had the highest number of projects (31% of projects), the highest amount of Measure KK funding, and the highest total cost of projects receiving Measure KK funding.

The 2019 3-Year Paving Plan Final Streets Map from OakDOT’s website (Figure 1) displays the location of paved streets across the city for the three year plan. This map clearly indicates that there were extensive paving efforts done in the flatlands, across West, Central, and East Oakland. Importantly, OakDOT focused on paving major streets to ensure that high injury corridors were getting critical safety improvements. **The paving map highlights that there is a concentration of major street improvements in West Oakland and, to a lesser extent, East Oakland. These areas are some of the most impacted by traffic violence and focused paving investment in**

Figure 2: OakDOT's Public Request Maps FY19-21 vs. FY21-23



From OakDOT'S Capital Improvement Program FY21-23, <https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/FY-21-23-CIP-Book-Revised-5.13.21.pdf>

these areas is critical to ensuring equity.


Table 8 shows the number of projects and amount of Measure KK funding in both round one and two. In both rounds, Council District 3 (West Oakland) had the highest amount of Measure KK funding, \$1.8M and \$3.1M respectively. In round one Council District 5 (Central Oakland) had the second most projects and funding (5 projects for \$555K), while in round two District 6 (East Oakland) was tied with Districts 4 and 5 for the second most projects (3) and had the second most funding (\$904K). Noticeably, District 7 received a relatively low number of projects and a low amount of funding (2 in each round, \$117K in round one, and \$298K in round 2).

Similar to OPW, funding in round two, after the adoption of their own new equity analysis, seemed to have increased the amount of funding and projects in East Oakland, while maintaining the high number of funding and projects in West Oakland. To view an interactive map of the Complete Streets project locations, including OakDOT's Geographic Equity Tool demographics and score by project, go to: <http://oakgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=c9353519c32644d5b362eea1794686f0>.


Figure 2 shows the difference in public requests between the two funding cycles, where the city made an effort to address the previous gaps. Importantly, the new equity analysis seems to be addressing geographical equity (as demonstrated by the increase in funding for District 6 in Phase II).

Clearly, West Oakland is a key priority for transportation projects, with a high number of projects and Measure KK funding. West, Central, and East Oakland also seem to be priority areas for street paving projects, as evidenced by the 3-Year Paving Plan Map, and East Oakland seems to be receiving increased attention with OakDOT's new equity analysis. And, during both phases, the Flatlands received considerably more projects and funding than the Hills, in both street paving projects and other transportation projects. OakDOT has intentionally supported equitable distribution of Measure KK funds by utilizing data and equity analysis. This has resulted in: 1) prioritizing of paving of major streets, corridors, and other projects in vulnerable areas, particularly East and West Oakland and 2) ensuring that Measure KK transportation dollars were equitably distributed between the Flatlands and Hills, with more far more funding going towards the Flatlands than the Hills (the top three funded Council Districts represented West, Central, and East Oakland).


Map 23. OPW Investments/ %  
Population Black




Map 24. OPW Investments/ %  
Population Hispanic or Latino



Map 25. OPW Investments/ %  
Population API or NHOPI



Map 26. OPW Investments/ %  
Population BIPOC




### Racial Equity


Maps 23-26 show the City of Oakland’s City Council District boundaries in relationship to concentrations of different BIPOC populations. These maps, paired with Maps 21 and 22 and Table 8, show how different races/ethnicities benefited from some of OakDOT’s Measure KK funded investments. For instance, Map 23 highlights that West Oakland has a major concentration of the City’s Black residents, and Table 8 shows that West Oakland received the highest number of OakDOT projects and funding. However, District 7, in East Oakland, which has large concentrations of Black and Hispanic or Latino residents, received the lowest amount of funding. Map 26 also suggests that Council Districts 6 and 7 have very large concentrations of BIPOC residents, and Council District 6 received high amounts of projects and funding, while District 7 did not. This suggests that additional indicators in OakDOT’s equity analysis were critical in deciding where to site projects.

# HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (HCD)

Map 27: HCD Projects by Phase on Census Tract Geographies



Map 28: HCD Projects by Phase on City Council District Geographies



Measure KK funds, in the amount of \$100M, were allocated to Oakland HCD to fund affordable housing projects and programs in new construction, preservation, and rehabilitation and acquisition of affordable housing. As of early 2021, 88% of the funds had been committed to projects, and there was \$11.7M left for distribution. \$88.3M was allocated in the following ways:

- \$24.1M for acquisition and conversion to affordable housing
- \$20.3M for housing rehabilitation and preservation
- \$6.3M for new construction
- \$15M for acquisition of transitional housing facilities
- \$15.6M for site acquisition
- \$1.5M for 1-4 Unit Housing Program
- \$500K for ADUs
- \$5M for administration

Note: This evaluation uses an earlier source of data, where approximately 80% of funds had been expended.

Map 27 shows HCD project distribution by type (acquisition, new construction, and rehabilitation) across census tract geographies, while Map 28 shows HCD project distribution by type across city council districts. **These maps indicate that housing investment is concentrated most densely in West and Central Oakland.** East Oakland has several acquisition projects and a new construction project, though its projects are less densely situated and more diffuse. And, the Oakland Hills did not have any projects that received Measure KK funding. Acquisition projects occurred throughout the Flatlands, while new construction and rehabilitation efforts were mostly confined to West and Central Oakland.

Table 9: Summary of HCD Project Type by Council District

Council District	New Construction	Acquisition	Rehabilitation	Total Number of Projects
1	2	3		5
2	1	6	2	9
3	3	3	3	9
5	2	2	1	5
6		3		3
7	1	3		4
<b>Total</b>	9	20	6	35

Table 10: Summary of HCD Project Funding by Phase, by Council District

Council District	Measure KK Funding (Round 1)	Total Project Budget (Round 1)	Measure KK Funding (Round 2)	Total Project Budget (Round 2)	Measure KK Funding (Rounds 1+2)	Total Project Budget (Rounds 1+2)	% of Total Measure KK Funding	% Total Project Budget
1	\$8,291,667	\$122,409,671					9.8%	13.4%
2	\$23,777,981	\$245,925,724			\$2,500,000	\$7,000,000	31.1%	27.7%
3	\$17,773,645	\$248,872,119	\$9,820,000	\$44,884,202			32.7%	32.2%
5	\$13,900,000	\$179,712,802					16.5%	19.7%
6	\$2,550,000	\$549,358	\$390,606	\$708,409			3.5%	0.1%
7	\$2,899,616	\$57,512,368	\$2,550,000	\$4,118,591			6.5%	6.8%
<b>Total</b>	\$69,192,909	\$854,982,042	\$12,760,606	\$49,711,202	\$2,500,000	\$7,000,000	100.0%	100%

Table 9 displays the number and type of projects distributed across the seven council districts, and Table 10 shows how Measure KK funding and total project budgets were distributed across the seven council districts. Council Districts 2 and 3 had the highest total number of projects (9). District 3 had the highest number of new construction projects (3) and rehabilitation projects (3), while District 2 had the highest number of acquisition projects (6). District 6 had the lowest number of total projects (3), aside from District 4, and had zero new construction projects.

District 3 received the most Measure KK funding, \$27.6M, which is approximately 33% of the Measure KK funds that were awarded to all projects. District 3 had the highest total project budget amount, with projects totaling \$293.8M in total project budget. District 2 received the second highest amount of Measure KK funding, \$26.3M, which is approximately 28% of the Measure KK funds that were awarded to all projects. District 6 received the least amount of Measure KK funding (\$2.9M), while District 7 received the second least amount of Measure KK funding (\$5.5M). Districts 6 and 7 also had the least amount in total project budget.

Map 29 shows how Measure KK funded projects were distributed across OEI priority neighborhoods, and Table 11 breaks out the types of projects in each priority neighborhood. Medium priority neighborhoods had the highest amount of new construction (6) and acquisition projects (8), while high and highest priority neighborhoods received a fair amount of new construction (3), preservation projects (7), and rehabilitation projects (5). Low and lowest priority neighborhoods had only 5 acquisition projects.

Map 30 shows how Measure KK funded projects were distributed across composite score priority neighborhoods, and Table 12 breaks out the types of projects in each priority neighborhood. In this iteration, high and medium priority neighborhoods had an equal amount of new construction projects (4 each), and high priority neighborhoods had the highest number of acquisition projects (8). Highest priority neighborhoods had the highest amount of rehabilitation projects (3), and low and lowest priority neighborhoods again had the least number of projects, with only 5 acquisition projects.

Map 31 displays how Measure KK funded projects were distributed across Urban Displacement Project categories, and Table 13 provides more information about the types of projects in each category. The highest number of new construction projects (4) were located in early/ongoing gentrification categories, and the second highest number of new construction projects (2) were located in low income/susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification categories. **The highest number of acquisition projects were located in at risk of gentrification categories, and the second highest number of acquisition projects were located in low income/susceptible to displacement categories. The only category with Measure KK funded rehabilitation projects was the at risk of gentrification category.**

In total, there was \$84,453,515 in Measure KK funds awarded to projects across the city. Table 14 shows funding details for new construction, acquisition, and preservation projects. The average amount of Measure KK funding per project was: \$1.4M for new construction; \$2.3M for acquisition, and \$4.2M for rehabilitation. Measure KK funded \$20K per unit for new construction; \$108K per unit for acquisition, and \$64K per unit for rehabilitation. The average total city contribution (including, but not limited to, Measure KK funds) was highest for new construction (\$411K per unit), and lowest for acquisition (\$138K/unit). New construction projects had the highest average total project budget at \$60.7M, and acquisition had the lowest average project budget at \$3.8M.

Table 15 highlights the area median incomes (AMI) for units of Measure KK funded affordable housing projects. **Importantly, over 99% of units were designated as extremely low (less than 30% AMI), very low (31-50% AMI), or low (51-80% AMI) income units.** New construction had the most extremely low income units (304), which is important because the majority of those projects were in areas that were susceptible, at risk, or experiencing ongoing gentrification. Having these low AMI units will help to allow residents to stay in their neighborhoods.

Map 29: HCD Projects by OEI Priority Neighborhoods




Table 11: Project Type by OEI Priority Neighborhoods

Priority Neighborhood	New Construction Projects	Preservation-Acquisition	Preservation-Rehabilitation
Highest	2	3	4
High	1	4	1
Medium	6	8	1
Low	0	3	0
Lowest	0	2	0
Total	9	20	6

\*Note: Excludes projects without addresses

Map 30: HCD Projects by Composite Score Priority Neighborhoods




Table 12: Project Type by Composite Score Priority Neighborhoods

Priority Neighborhood	New Construction Projects	Preservation-Acquisition	Preservation-Rehabilitation
Highest	1	2	3
High	4	8	2
Medium	4	5	1
Low	0	2	0
Lowest	0	3	0
Total	9	20	6

Map 31: HCD Projects on Urban Displacement Project Categories




Table 13: Summary of HCD Projects by Urban Displacement Project Categories

Urban Displacement Category	New Construction Projects	Preservation-Acquisition	Preservation-Rehabilitation
Low Income/Susceptible to Displacement	2	5	0
Ongoing Displacement	0	0	0
At Risk of Gentrification	2	6	6
Early/Ongoing Gentrification	4	4	0
Advanced Gentrification	1	4	0
Stable Moderate/Mixed Income	0	1	0
At Risk of Becoming Exclusive	0	0	0
Becoming Exclusive	0	0	0
Stable/Advanced Exclusion	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 14: Summary of HCD Project Funding by Type

	Total Amount of Measure KK Funding	Total Number of Projects	Total Number of Units	Average \$ of Measure KK Funding/Project	Average \$ of Measure KK Funding/Unit	Average \$ City Contribution/Unit	Average Total Project Budget
New Construction	\$12,994,900	9	659	\$1,443,878	\$19,719	\$411,966	\$60,753,220
Preservation-Acquisition	\$46,012,615	20	426	\$2,300,631	\$108,011	\$137,899	\$3,786,095
Preservation-Rehabilitation*	\$25,446,000	6	399	\$4,241,000	\$63,774	\$224,889	\$48,198,729

AVERAGE AMI FOR ALL MEASURE KK FUNDED PROJECTS



Percent of Projects Where Tenants Were at High Risk of Displacement




Table 15: Summary of Unit AMIs, by Type

	Extremely Low-Income @ <20% AMI	Extremely Low-Income @ 21-30% AMI	Very Low-Income @ 31-50% AMI	Low-Income @ 51-80% AMI	Moderate-Income @ 81-120% AMI
New Construction	197	107	166	185	2
Acquisition	0	142	20	257	0
Rehabilitation	25	79	170	123	0
Total	222	328	356	565	2
Total % of Units (n=1484)	15.0%	22.1%	24.0%	38.1%	0.1%

Figure 3: Self Reported Demographics





Figure 3 shows self-reported demographics for residents living in new construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation units. According to this data, which is limited, Black households make up the majority of households living in both new construction units and rehabilitation units, at 50% and 62% respectively. Latinx households make up 32% of households in acquisition units, and Black residents make up 23% of households living in acquisition units. Asian households make up over a quarter (28%) of households in new construction units, but make up very little of the households in acquisition units (2%) and rehabilitation units (3%). Many residents declined to state their race/ethnicity: 21% in acquisition units, 10% in rehabilitation units, and 3% in new construction units.


Acquisition projects had the highest number of properties where tenants were at risk of displacement. 70% of acquisition projects had tenants that were at high risk of displacement, and 20% of rehabilitation projects had tenants that were at risk of displacement. The higher number of acquisition and rehabilitation properties that had tenants at high risk of displacement is likely attributable to HCD's 2019 NOFA for Acquisition and Conversion to Affordable Housing (ACAH), which prioritized properties with tenants that were at risk of displacement, as evidenced by: landlord harassment, three day notices and no-fault evictions, rent burdened households, households with a greater than 10% rent increase in the last 12 months, and property owner in violation of/has multiple complaints related to Oakland rental housing laws.

These maps and figures highlight that HCD equitably supported vulnerable residents through their affordable housing programs and projects, though there were concentrations of investment in West and Central Oakland and more diffuse investment in East Oakland. HCD: 1) constructed, acquired, and rehabbed a high number of low and extremely-low income units, 2) supported high proportions of people of color; 3) helped stabilize neighborhoods classified as high and highest priority (by both indexes) by performing a high number of acquisitions and rehabs in those neighborhoods; and 4) made a large push to increase housing stock in neighborhoods that were classified as early/ongoing gentrification, low income/susceptible to displacement, and at risk of gentrification categories. The efforts of HCD should support residents to stay in place, with the addition of new housing units, as well as preservation of existing units.


Map 32. OPW Investments/ %  
Population Black




Map 33 OPW Investments/ %  
Population Hispanic or Latino



Map 34. HCD Investments/ %  
Population API or NHOPI



Map 35. OPW Investments/ %  
Population BIPOC



### Racial Equity

Maps 32-35 show where HCD investments were sited in relationship to the concentration of BIPOC populations. Map 35 highlights that HCD generally sited Measure KK funded investments in areas that had a medium to high proportion of BIPOC residents, and Maps 32-34 show investments in relationship to where there are concentrations of Black, Hispanic or Latino, or Asian or NHOPI residents. Map 32 shows that while there are a number of Measure KK funded HCD investments in West Oakland, where there are high concentrations of Black residents, there are several tracts in areas with high concentrations of Black residents in parts of West and East Oakland that did not receive Measure KK funding. Map 33 shows that there are several Measure KK funded HCD investments in East Oakland, where there's a high concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents, but there are a couple of census tracts in Central/East Oakland, where there is a high concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents but no Measure KK funded investments. Map 34 shows, again, that while there is Measure KK funded investment in a number of areas with high concentrations of Asian or NHOPI residents, there are some census tracts in Central Oakland where there are no Measure KK funded investments and a high concentration of Asian or NHOPI residents. These maps suggest that while HCD is supporting equitable distribution of Measure KK funded projects, there are communities with high concentrations of BIPOC residents that are not receiving Measure KK investments. However, this is likely due to the influence of other indicators that were utilized in funding and siting decisions.

# SUMMARY

Measure KK dollars distributed by OPW, OakDOT, and HCD overwhelmingly went to vulnerable neighborhoods, defined as highest/high priority neighborhoods and/or census tract categories that suggest future or imminent displacement of residents.

Below are a few key points from each section:

## Office of Public Works

- Highest and high priority neighborhoods received the most number of projects and the most funding for projects
- Neighborhoods that are susceptible to displacement and at risk of gentrification received the highest number of projects and the most funding for projects
- CIP prioritization process supported 1) the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way and 2) funding need over funding leverage
- Mapping suggests that OPW Measure KK funded investments were equitably sited in areas with high concentrations of BIPOC residents; however, there were census tracts with high proportions of Black, Hispanic or Latino, and/or Asian or NHOPI residents that did not receive investment.

## Department of Transportation

- Prioritized the paving of major streets and other corridors in vulnerable areas, particularly East and West Oakland
- Ensured that Measure KK transportation dollars were equitably distributed, with more funding going towards the Flatlands

- New equity analysis supported the identification of projects in a geographically equitable way.

## Housing and Community Development

- Constructed, acquired, and rehabbed a high number of low- and extremely-low income units
- Supported high proportions of BIPOC populations
- Helped stabilize neighborhoods classified as high and highest priority by performing a high number of acquisitions and rehabs in those neighborhoods
- Prioritized increasing housing stock in neighborhoods that were classified as early/ongoing gentrification, low-income/susceptible to displacement, and at risk of gentrification categories
- Mapping suggests that HCD Measure KK funded investments were generally sited in areas with medium to high concentrations of BIPOC residents, however there were census tracts with high proportions of Black, Hispanic or Latino, and/or Asian or NHOPI residents that did not receive investment.

# FUTURE EVALUATIONS

Future evaluations should be conducted to determine the medium and long term impacts of the project, as well as contextualize Measure KK. Suggestions for these evaluations are listed below:

## Process Evaluation:

- *Contextualize how Measure KK came to be and document how it was implemented*
  - Critical for understanding the decisions that were made and why they were made.
  - Will help to contextualize Measure KK within other department and City plans.

## Medium Term Evaluation:

*Are there measurable impacts in neighborhoods/among stakeholders?*

*What types of affordable housing investments are being made, how are they distributed and how do they interact with capital/street improvements?*

- How have the investments impacted lower income neighborhoods and their residents?
  - Are the originally targeted residents benefiting from the improvements?
    - What do area demographics tell us about neighborhood stability?
      - Are the same residents still there?
      - How have the demographics shifted from five years ago?
  - What is the usage rate (pre and post) for facilities funded by KK funds?
    - How much are facilities being used (increased usage)?
    - Who is using the facilities (pre and post)?
- Disaggregate and analyze data by investment type and use (particularly for OPW and OakDOT projects)
- Incorporate qualitative data
  - Interviews
  - Focus Groups
  - Photovoice- particularly among younger demographic
- Investigate neighborhoods with the highest amounts of Measure KK funding (priority neighborhoods)
  - Is there a distinction between the neighborhoods now and when Measure KK funds were implemented?
  - Have there been any demographic changes in these neighborhoods or is the population relatively stable?
- Economic impacts
  - Additional revenue generated in the neighborhood?
  - Are there additional neighborhood investments/growth correlated with Measure KK projects?
- How do new/rehabbed housing units interact with other anti-displacement and affordable housing initiatives?
  - Evaluation of effectiveness of investing in new affordable housing development vs rehabbing housing

## Long-Term Evaluation of Social Equity Impacts

*Have there been measurable increases in social equity and any adverse impacts to low-income communities of color from Measure KK funded projects?*

- Perceptions of investments
    - Survey that measures impact and use
  - Have investments been connected with other investments and other infrastructure/transportation/economic development projects?  
Were these standalone one-off projects or were they connected to a larger goal?
    - Were neighborhoods with projects that emphasized “connection” to other goals create larger neighborhood impacts? If so, were these “good” impacts or “bad” impacts (i.e. displacement)?
  - How to understand why investments were foundational in neighborhood change?
    - Qualitative data collected from neighborhood residents and city staff
    - Studying pre and post intervention statistics around crime, economy, individual outcomes
  - Have the investments contributed to increasing social equity?
    - Have equity gaps among residents in vulnerable neighborhoods improved?
    - Educational attainment
    - Poverty
    - Income
    - Health
    - Economic development (revenue generation)
    - Access to social infrastructure and facilities
    - Access to neighborhood amenities
    - Access to park and open space
    - Feelings and perceptions of safety
    - Violent crime density analysis
  - Is there a lower rental housing cost burden?
  - Is there a narrowing of the racial wealth gap?
  - Is there a narrowing of the unemployment rate?
  - How have investments worked in concert with other funding and programs to contribute to increasing social equity?
  - How have the investments impacted the displacement of low-income communities and communities of color?
    - How have neighborhood demographics changed (descriptive statistics)?
    - American Community Survey data
    - Change in cost of rents
    - Change in home values
    - Anecdotal/qualitative data
  - Spatial mapping of demographics and change over time
  - Gentrification mapping analysis
- 34 • Urban Displacement Project