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The following landscape provides an overview of the Bay Area’s workforce development system, including the North Bay, South Bay, and East Bay. Historic policies and practices and their impact on women, immigrants, and people of color in the region are also highlighted.
POLICY HISTORY

From the Gold Rush to the rise of Silicon Valley, San Francisco Bay Area workers have helped secure the region – and the state of California – unprecedented economic growth. However, more and more Californians are unable to make ends meet, despite working one or more jobs.

- The statewide median hourly wage in 2015 was $19.20, or $39,900 a year. About 60 percent of jobs statewide are low-wage jobs.
- The most common job in the San Francisco metro area is a personal care aide, with a median wage of $11.68.

Over a century of discriminatory policies and practices have worked to diminish the personhood and power of women, immigrants, and people of color. These policies are explored in more detail below.

GOLD RUSH AND LABOR MOVEMENTS BUILD WEALTH, RIGHTS FOR WHITE MEN (1840s-1930s)

Approximately 300,000 people moved to California during the Gold Rush. How much these new Californians benefited from the immense growth of this period depended largely on race and gender: Numerous policies and practices sought to deter people of color from economic success, including the Foreign Miners’ Tax (Black, Latinx, Asian, and Native miners had to pay hefty fees that white miners were exempt from), discriminatory zoning laws, and jurisprudence that reaffirmed a system of white civic and economic power.

1 With the largest state economy nationwide, California’s gross domestic product was over $2.1 trillion in 2014. California Workforce Development Board, Unified State Plan, 19.
4 Anti-Chinese and xenophobic protests against Chinese laborers crowded many Chinese in the Bay Area into less desirable professions including laundry stores; the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed numerous discriminatory zoning ordinances regulating these stores, leading to the geographic segregation of Chinese residents in what is now the city’s Chinatown. Brayden Goyette. "How Racism Created America’s Chinatowns." May 22, 2019. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/11/11/american-chinatowns-history_n_6090692.html
5 See People v. Hall: Following the murder of a Chinese gold miner by a white man, the state Supreme Court ruled that Asians and other “non-whites” could not testify against white people. A 19th century decision written by San Francisco judge Chief Justice Murray declared that people of color were inferior to white people and lacked the right to participate in “the affairs of the government.” See also “Yick Wo: How a Racist Laundry Law in Early San Francisco Helped Civil Rights.” Hoodline. August 2015. https://hoodline.com/2015/08/yick-wo-and-the-san-francisco-laundry-litigation-of-the-late-1800s
As the Bay Area’s workforce grew, so did the collective power of white workers. Some of the earliest trade unions emerged in and around San Francisco, helping white laborers increase pay and shorten their workdays. On the other hand, Black, Latinx, Asian, Native American, and woman workers were crowded into unsafe, arduous, and undesirable jobs (porters, chambermaids, railroad workers, cooks, draymen).

Worker organizing in the Bay Area reflected a national movement where several cornerstone labor policies, including the 1935 National Labor Relations Act, were passed. However, as a compromise to appease Southern state interests, these laws and their worker protections excluded (mostly Black) domestic workers and farm workers. As a result, these workers kept long hours and minimal wages as non-farm professions increased pay and improved job conditions.

THE DEPRESSION AND PUBLIC AGENCIES (1930s-1940s)

During the Great Depression, the Bay Area’s unemployment rate (28 percent) was slightly higher than the nationwide rate (23.6 percent).

Though past and present work narratives suggest that Black people, immigrants, and people of color "deserve" unemployment (and thus, diminished personhood), most unemployed workers receiving benefits in the Bay Area during the Depression were white skilled workers at peak working age. Another dominant narrative is that those who use public benefits are lazy or "gaming the system"; however, Depression-era data suggests that most people expended their savings and waited until they reached a critical period of hardship before applying for government relief.

---

6 The Bay Area has a rich history of union organizing, including the first centralized labor movement in 1863: The San Francisco Trades’ Union advocated for an unprecedented 8-hour work day law, which was eventually passed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1868. Union organizing also served as a means for Irish immigrants to build political and economic power in the area. [https://calaborfed.org/california-history/struggle_for_the_eight_hour_day/](https://calaborfed.org/california-history/struggle_for_the_eight_hour_day/)

7 Ai Jen Poo, Domestic Workers Speak in the United States. [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2IN4rGTopsaZ0VLdmZuYnBuc0U/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2IN4rGTopsaZ0VLdmZuYnBuc0U/view)


9 Ibid. Of all men receiving unemployment benefits in 1932, 16.5 percent were unskilled; the vast majority were skilled and between ages 25 and 44. About 93 percent of those on government aid were white.

In Bay Area cities like Alameda, San Francisco, and Berkeley, individual private agencies contracting with counties initially oversaw Depression-era unemployment relief programs. As unemployment rose, these private entities were replaced by local public agencies in an effort to streamline and centralize aid. This process was an early example of Bay Area local and regional systems coordination, with each locale taking a slightly different approach to standardizing relief.

**WAR AND WORK (1940s-1950s)**

During World War II, the federal government spent over $16 billion on major war production contracts in California. Shipyards and forts lined San Francisco, Marin, Alameda, and Contra Costa counties; the region led the nation in ship-building and naval production. With wartime employers facing a dwindling array of laborers, Black people and women were able to join the Bay Area workforce in new ways (eventually making up 25 percent and 10 percent of the Bay's wartime workforce, respectively), irrevocably changing the region's economic identity.

**WOMEN**

Necessity and war sparked the reversal of societal norms frequently put upon white women: Rather than confinement to the “separate sphere” of household matters, wartime working women were expected to maintain both their families and a job. For the first time in modern history, married working women outnumbered single working women, and more women than men came from the West and South to seek Bay Area wartime jobs. Women (“Rosies”) took substantial roles in ship assembly, crane operation, welding, and riveting. Working women also drove cabs, delivered mail, worked on war bond drives, promoted community health programs, and led a multitude of activities that kept the economy going. Existing Bay Area organizations such as the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) shifted their focus to support these women; the Oakland YWCA chapter, for example, converted its facility to serve as a women’s dormitory for workers.

With four wartime shipyards, Richmond (Contra Costa) produced more ships than any other U.S. shipyard complex and offered more wartime industries (56) than any other similarly-sized city. As the city grew from a population of 24,000 to 100,000 during the war, women emerged to make up nearly 30 percent of Richmond’s shipyard workforce.

**BLACK WARTIME WORKERS**

While some white women took collective action to demand higher wages and better wartime employment, African American workers were often limited to low-wage work in the shipyard, cannery, railroad, and supply factory jobs. Nonetheless, the wartime effort did help some Black women transition out of even lower paying jobs like domestic service. By the war’s end, for example, San Francisco’s MUNI system began enlisting Black women to serve

---

11 Supra note 8. Alameda, San Francisco and Berkeley represented the San Francisco Bay Area surveyed through available census data.
12 Supra note 8. In the Bay Area, Depression relief varied by city and county: Berkeley and Oakland used cash relief; Alameda employed a grocery-order system (households provided with low-cost groceries of their selection on a regular basis); San Francisco used a commissary system (fewer options for individualized selections of food/groceries; food could be home-delivered or picked up at a grocery, in concert with a stipend for fresh produce, meat).
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
as conductors and “motormen.” During this period, Maya Angelou became one of the first black female streetcar conductors in San Francisco.\(^\text{16}\) She did so while attending San Francisco’s California Labor School, a union-supported educational program that taught a diversity of subjects (arts, women’s studies, economics, labor organization).

**HEALTHCARE AND CHILDCARE**

About half of the female wartime workforce had children.\(^\text{17}\) These workers fueled a publicly funded childcare movement: After the federal Lanham Act authorized funding for “public works” in 1940, Bay Area women demanded that childcare be federally funded, prioritized, and available as a “public work.”\(^\text{18}\) After considerable worker protests, Congress allocated $52 million in Lanham funds for childcare, from 1943 to 1946. Prior to this shift, women had to rely on limited community options, like friends and neighbors, for childcare.

Families using Lanham centers got up to 6 days of childcare – regardless of their income and including summers and holidays – at the daily cost of what one would pay $9 to $10 for today. Initially, providers found it difficult to fill childcare slots, largely because of persisting negative stereotypes (e.g., strangers caring for children is dangerous; government services are only for the poor and lazy). These barriers were substantially overcome in California, and by 1945, almost 1 in 4 kids enrolled in Lanham-funded childcare was Californian. In Contra Costa, Richmond’s citywide childcare program maintained 1,400 children at its peak. The service was so well-used that California was the only state to continue Lanham-funding for childcare indefinitely after the war.\(^\text{19}\) It was considered high-quality and affordable, with low student-teacher ratios, and meals, snacks, and supplemental educational activities included.

Many of the Bay Area’s childcare facilities were tied to health centers – particularly Kaiser, which provided both jobs and childcare to working women. Richmond’s Kaiser Center employed over 24,000 women during the war; many of these jobs helped maintain the Bay’s burgeoning childcare system (e.g., teachers, supervisors, educational aides). Established in 1942, the Kaiser Richmond Field Hospital provided health services to shipyard workers through one of the first voluntary pre-paid medical plans (a direct precursor to HMOs).\(^\text{20}\) By 1944, more than 90 percent of all Richmond shipyard employees joined the Kaiser plan, which was later expanded to include workers’ families.

**JAPANESE INTERNMENT**

After Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066 – the internment of coastal Japanese Americans. About 100,000 Japanese Americans living in California were incarcerated in camps until the end of the war, including over 600 from San Francisco.\(^\text{21}\) At San Mateo’s Tanforan Race Track, 8,000 Japanese Americans were detained in horse stables and makeshift barracks. Many Japanese Californians lost homes and businesses permanently, unable to fully regain economic security and property after their release.


\(^{17}\) Supra note 13.


\(^{20}\) Supra Note 13.

\(^{21}\) Supra Note 13.
AFTER THE WAR (1950s-1970s)

A. REVERSAL OF GENDER ATTITUDES, OPPORTUNITIES

After the war, public policy and patriarchal values turned against women working. Women, especially women of color, were the first to be fired from jobs as government contracts ended. Although 1 out of 5 wartime working women were their family breadwinners, most soon were out of a job. A U.S. Department of Labor survey showed that 70 percent of Bay Area women wanted to keep their jobs after the war; on the other hand, a 1943 Gallup Poll showed that only 30 percent of husbands approved of their wives working.

B. GI BILL FURTHERS RACIAL INEQUALITY, INEQUITY

> In concert with the Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill), colleges sprang up as veterans used the GI Bill to attend colleges and universities. In the Bay Area, numerous colleges including Laney College (est. 1953) and Merritt College (est. 1954) were founded in post-war Oakland, and Contra Costa College (est. 1950) was founded in San Pablo.

> In 1961 while enrolled at Merritt College, future Black Panther Party founders Huey Newton and Bobby Seale first met and united to demand that the college offer classes in Black history.22

> By 1946, only 1 out of 5 Black veterans who applied for educational benefits was able to register for college.23 Black vets were less likely to receive bank and mortgage loans compared to whites, making it all the more difficult to achieve educational, housing, and economic stability.

C. SILICON VALLEY INEQUITY

Computer technology, spurred on by a combination of wartime militarization contracts and aggressive innovators, continued to grow in the 1940s and 1950s.24 In Santa Clara County, Stanford University emerged as a hub for tech-

---

24 Some of these “innovators” were not only aggressive but openly racist: William Shockley, one of Silicon Valley’s founding leaders, was a eugenics proponent who advocated for the sterilization of Black people due to their “retrogressive evolution.” Southern Poverty Law Center. “William Shockley.” Accessed March 17, 2020. https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/individual/william-shockley
nological development, encouraging faculty and graduates to pursue tech projects and attracting Hewlett-Packard, Xerox, and Lockheed’s space and missile division to the area. The Cold War further expanded Stanford University’s financial, technological, and research capacity through government defense contracts.

As Santa Clara economically expanded and new workers settled in, suburbs sprawled from what would eventually become the epicenter of Silicon Valley. Discriminatory housing practices, including redlining and blockbusting, placed many families of color outside affluent neighborhoods and, instead, into lower-income neighborhoods with less access to good schools and jobs. This geographic segregation led to many Black and Latinx households not being able to access the same economic, educational, and professional opportunities that white households enjoyed. These policies and practices also laid the foundation for racial economic inequity still experienced in the Bay Area today. For example, Palo Alto and East Palo Alto’s racial segregation informed where to place desirable resources (Stanford’s expanding campus, golf courses) and undesirable utilities (in 1964, East Palo Alto became the location for the Romic waste management facility, which routinely sprayed toxic chemicals into the air).

25 This dates back to the 1890s, when Stanford’s leaders christened themselves leaders of developing the Western U.S. “East Of Palo Alto’s Eden: Race And The Formation Of Silicon Valley.” Tech Crunch, January 2015. https://techcrunch.com/2015/01/10/east-of-palo-altos-eden/
26 Ibid. Stanford’s government military contracts grew from $3 million in 1951 to over $50 million in 1964.
27 Prior to California’s first statewide fair housing law (Prop 14) in 1963, Black activists and allies rallied to get local housing rights laws passed in Santa Clara and across the Bay. Although Prop 14 passed, it was quickly overturned via a ballot initiative championed by then-Governor Ronald Reagan. Nearly five years later, the federal Fair Housing Act was passed in 1968 — leading to new challenges around policy implementation and enforcement. Redlining was not explicitly outlawed until the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977. Online Archive of California. “No On Proposition 14: California Fair Housing Initiative Collection.” Accessed March 17, 2020. http://www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/kt0b69q1bw/
By 1970 – around the same time that articles started using “Silicon Valley” as a nod to the economic prosperity flowing from silicon chips – majority-Black East Palo Alto’s unemployment rate was approximately twice the national average. East Palo Alto residents advocated for better jobs and greater civil rights protections, and Afro-centric, community-based education – including the Nairobi Day School, which combined core subjects and racial justice training – sought to fill educational gaps left by inadequate school funding and resources.

Inequality also played out in the South Bay Area’s higher educational institutions: In 1960, only two of Stanford’s freshmen were Black. Under the leadership of civil rights organizers including Gertrude Wilks and Bob Hoover, East Palo Alto’s Nairobi College opened in 1960 as a “college without walls” – a two-year institution with multiple community-based locations (church basements, private houses) attended by Black, Latinx, and some working-class white students. As a condition of enrollment, students volunteered weekly at local schools, community health centers, and legal aid organizations. Dave Packard, founder and CEO of Hewlett-Packard, helped fund Nairobi’s first class. “By this time in the late 1960s, the civil rights movement had gained so much force that a lot of people in the industry were looking for ways to show that they were good corporate citizens,” Hoover said of Packard. Packard’s support of this grassroots resistance and education movement could be seen as an early display of “philanthrocapitalism” that continues in Silicon Valley today.

D. 1960s BAY AREA CIVIL RIGHTS TIMELINE

- 1966: The Black Panthers were founded in Oakland after the assassination of Malcolm X and the police murder of Matthew Johnson, an unarmed Black teen. The Panthers’ Ten-Point Program advocated for an end to police violence, jobs for African Americans, and land, housing, and justice for all people. The FBI and police sought to undermine the Panthers and their social reform programs (Free Breakfast for Children, community-led health and education).

- 1968: Led by the Black Student Union and the Third World Liberation Front, SF State University Students began the longest campus strike in U.S. history. The strike paved way for ethnic studies programs across the country, and numerous student participants went on to become prominent scholars and social justice leaders (actor Danny Glover, a BSU alum; Ron Dellums, who became mayor of Oakland; and former San Francisco mayor Willie Brown, then a young attorney working to free students arrested in the protests).

- 1969: As part of the Red Power Movement, Native American activists and allies began a two-year occupation of Alcatraz, demanding the restoration and return of tribal lands.

---


31 Nairobi schools and other efforts were regularly met with white hostility, fire-bombings, and threats. Supra note 25.

32 Ibid. Other efforts from Silicon Valley players focused on East Palo Alto include the funding of College Track, a higher education pathway program founded by Laurene Powell Jobs (Steve Jobs’ widow). These efforts have not all been successful and given the historic racial and economic inequities between East Palo Alto and Silicon Valley, brought complications (promotion of missionary mentality, short-sighted investments driven by companies’ PR).


E. IMMIGRATION TRENDS: CONTRAST BETWEEN API AND LATINX COMMUNITIES (1970s-1990s)

Policies such as the federal Chinese Exclusion Act and California’s Page Act restricted non-white immigration for nearly a century. In 1965, the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) removed significant racial barriers from immigration policy and permanently altered the Bay Area’s economic landscape.

Due in part to the INA, Santa Clara County went from 96.8 percent white in 1960 to nearly 40 percent API and 20 percent Latinx in 2018. Droves of Asian immigrants settled in the Bay Area, utilizing the INA’s work visa system and the Bay’s abundance of engineering, tech, and business jobs.

- The INA’s “family reunification” provision allowed many Southeast Asian refugees and their families to relocate to the U.S. (including San Jose, which now has the second highest Vietnamese population in the country) during and after the Vietnam War; the Immigration Act of 1990 brought more high-skilled Asians (the majority of whom were South Asian) to the Bay Area under the H-IB visa program.

---


38 San Jose has one of the highest concentrations of South Asian and Vietnamese immigrants in the country (90,000 and 95,000, respectively). See Elijah Alperin. “Vietnamese Immigrants in the United States.” Migration Policy Institute. September 2018. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/vietnamese-immigrants-united-states-5

39 Supra note 38. By 2003, half of all Silicon Valley startups were started by immigrants of Asian descent (South Asian, Chinese, Taiwanese), and of the 14 Fortune 500 firms located in San Jose, several had immigrant founders.
Latinx immigration, on the other hand, was impacted by in a different way:

- Before the INA, Mexican immigration was largely through the *bracero* program, a temporary work initiative. Activists such as former East San Jose resident Cesar Chavez criticized *bracero* for enabling farmers – many of them white – to subject Latinx and non-white migrant workers to dangerous, harsh working conditions.\(^{40}\)

- The INA imposed numeric caps on immigration from the Western hemisphere that were far below the true economic demand for labor.\(^{41}\) As the undocumented immigrant population increased during the 1970s and 1980s, media and politicians villainized these “new” immigrants, calling for more militarization at the border.\(^{42}\)

**F. RESTRICTING HOUSING EXPANSION, INCREASED POLICING OF COMMUNITIES**

In addition to hostility against Latinx immigrants, policies of the 1980s-2000s effectively criminalized and isolated low-income communities and people of color.

- The 1980s saw massive state and federal cuts to mental health services and public housing that harmed people of color and the poor most of all. In San Francisco, during then-Mayor Dianne Feinstein's term, old MUNI busses had to be used as homeless shelters.\(^{43}\) As the Bay Area diversified, cities passed growth control initiatives, imposing housing caps that impact the region today.\(^{44}\)

- In the 1990s, supporters of California's Three Strikes policy purported [or claimed] the law would put rapists, killers, and child molesters behind bars; in actuality, the policy increased policing of communities of color and led to disproportionate imprisonment of and life sentences for Black men. Prison costs skyrocketed, and by the 2000s, over half of those incarcerated under Three Strikes were in prison for low-level offenses.\(^{45}\)

- In a mid-1990s majority-Black and Latinx East Palo Alto, Bob Hoover and other activists used community-led strategies to fight the city’s media-fueled title of *Murder Capital of the U.S.A.*\(^{46}\)

- Three Strikes law shifted in 2012, but for many, the damage of incarceration continued after release through barriers to jobs and economic security (e.g., continued wealth extraction through probation and parole, licensing restrictions, employer racial bias and stigma).

---


\(^{41}\) For instance, 65,000 Mexicans legally entered the U.S. in 1956, and another 445,000 entered as guest workers; by 1976, legal immigration from Mexico was capped at 20,000 per year and the guest worker program ceased. Supra note 25.


G. RECESSION (2000s-2010s)

California’s Great Recession cost 1.3 million jobs from 2007 to 2010 and a statewide loss of $88 billion in economic activity in just one year (2008 to 2009).

- Though all demographic groups were negatively impacted during the recession, Black and Latinx workers experienced the worst hikes in unemployment (9.8 and 9.2 percentage points, respectively). Asian and white working people experienced the smallest unemployment increases (6.0 and 7.3 percentage points, respectively).47

- Unskilled and less educated workers experienced steeper spikes in unemployment, compared to workers with college degrees and higher skills.

- Construction saw the worst job losses (335,900) followed by trade/transportation/utilities (311,000).

- Although the San Francisco Bay Area lost 251,000 jobs during the recession, it saw the lowest of all regional unemployment rates (5.9 percent). Moreover, the Bay Area experienced the strongest job growth in the state in the years following the recession.

- During and following the Great Recession, workforce development stakeholders sought regional collaboration; for example, in 2011, the East Bay (Oakland, Contra Costa, and Alameda) increased coordination through a shared regional economic analysis and work plan – two practices that continue today.48

47 California Workforce Development Board, Unified State Plan, 22.
II. CONTEMPORARY BAY AREA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT LANDSCAPE

Today, the Bay Area economy continues to boom for a wealthy few. Between 2015 and 2018, the region has had an annual economic growth rate of 4.3 percent. If the Bay Area was a country, its gross domestic project (GDP) would be the 19th largest in the world.49 In contrast, households of all races are worse off on average than they were four years ago, with Black and Latinx households especially at risk for living below the Family Needs Calculator (formerly Self-Sufficiency Standard).50

The following landscape examines Bay Area workforce development efforts, with a focus on how policies and practices are affecting women, immigrants, and people of color. It also explores related issues facing workers, including housing, commuting, and cost of living.


50 An alternative measure to the Federal Poverty Line (FPL), the California Family Needs Calculator (FNC) is a “bare bones” budget that takes into account families of various sizes. It is representative of the actual costs of living, and includes housing, child care, groceries, healthcare, transportation, some miscellaneous items (clothing, shoes, diapers, nonprescription medicines, cleaning products, household items, personal hygiene items, and telephone service) and taxes. It does not include a vacation, take-out food, loan payments, or taking a ride service. The FNC gives an accurate picture of the minimum income needed for over 700 family types by county to meet their most basic needs and is more useful than the FPL. Although groundbreaking when first created close to 50 years ago, the FPL is constrained by using a woefully archaic methodology in measuring poverty. Across California, we see that incomes need to be far above the FPL in order for families to make ends meet. Visit insightced.org/2018-family-needs-calculator/ to explore the California Family Needs Calculator further.
WORKFORCE SYSTEM OVERVIEW

Established in 1998 through the federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA), California’s Workforce Development Board (CWDB) oversees statewide workforce training and education programs. In 2014, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) replaced WIA, creating the foundation of today’s workforce system. Under WIOA, CWDB must coordinate with regional and local workforce development stakeholders to develop and implement programs that serve workforce participants. America’s Job Center of California (AJCC) locations act as a local “one stop” service, training, and education point for workforce participants. In the East Bay, for example, 14 AJCCs serve over 80,000 job seekers and over 2,000 employers annually.

In conjunction with partners including the Departments of Education, Rehabilitation, and Labor, the State Board develops a Unified State Plan to drive policy and program objectives. The Plan lays out strategies for greater regional connections, aligning rising industries and occupations with workforce programs (“demand-driven skills attainment”) and, overall, helping to ensure upward economic mobility for “all Californians, including populations with barriers to employment.” Regional and local Workforce Development Boards must coordinate with other programs to cross-walk and identify shared needs of participants in the workforce development and other systems and programs (e.g. CalFRESH, child support). This coordination includes data sharing, cross-department needs assessments, and efforts to improve collaboration across departments.

52 Local workforce development boards oversee on-the-ground operations of their respective AJCCs. Supra note 2.
53 Supra note 2.
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD EFFORTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, PEOPLE OF COLOR, WOMEN

The movement to connect more women, immigrants, and people of color to sustainable jobs and pathways to economic security has been taken on, at least in part, by the statewide, regional, and local workforce initiatives. These initiatives include Slingshot (sector-driven partnerships where economic development, education, organized labor, and community partners collaborate to shift workers into high-growth industries) and Earn and Learn (approaches that provide participants with education, skills, and knowledge as well as real-life work activities and career opportunities).

In July 2018, additional requirements to serve these populations (or subsets thereof, e.g., refugees, those with limited English proficiency, the reentry population) were released by the state's Employment Development Department and CWDB.54

A. IMMIGRANTS

While some immigrants have found economic stability in the Bay Area, many have struggled to achieve equitable wages and outcomes for themselves and their families.

▶ 1 out of every 4 Californians was born outside the U.S. (about 9.7 million), and half of all children in the state have at least one immigrant parent.55 In the Bay Area, Santa Clara, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Alameda are all counties where over 30 percent of the population was born outside the U.S.

▶ Although immigrants are more likely to be employed compared to U.S.-born people, they are likely to make less money due to systemic barriers like structural racism and economic inequity.56 For example, in Santa Clara County, residents who speak English less than “very well,” and those who speak Spanish at home, are almost three times as likely to live below the Family Needs Calculator compared to fluent English speakers.57

▶ Immigrant workers in California over the age of 25 have lower rates of educational attainment compared to non-immigrant workers of the same age group, making them more likely to work low-wage or seasonal jobs to make ends meet.58

▶ All state licensing boards (e.g., doctors, dentists, security guards) must consider applicants regardless of immigration status, and undocumented immigrants who pass the State Bar exam may practice law in California. California has also extended some rights and benefits to support undocumented students’ education (e.g., access to state financial aid at public universities and community colleges).

55 California Workforce Development Board, Unified State Plan, 49.
56 California Workforce Development Board, Unified State Plan, 47. In 2011, immigrants were 66 percent of the labor force, compared to 62 percent of U.S. born. And yet, immigrants’ median income was over 20 percent lower than U.S.-born households ($48,851 and $61,752, respectively).
57 Insight Family Needs Calculator (FNC) Data: 55 percent of those who speak English “less than very well” live below the FNC; in comparison, 22 percent of those fluent in English live below the FNC.
58 Thirty-seven percent of California’s immigrants age 25 and older had not completed high school, compared to 9 percent of U.S.-born California residents. California Workforce Development Board, Unified State Plan, 41.
> Counties with populations comprising 15 percent or more Limited English Proficient (LEP) speakers are required to “to adequately describe, assess the needs of and plan for serving the LEP population in their jurisdictions.” Using the 2018 Family Needs Calculator, this includes Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Napa (Contra Costa: 14.43 percent “less than very well” English).

> Additional 2018 requirements were created to support more immigrants to find and retain livable wage jobs and careers. Under the additional 2018 requirements, these counties’ local plans must share how they will incorporate delivery strategies, new partnerships, data, and any other relevant updates to better serve the LEP and immigrant and refugee populations. Similar requirements exist for counties with substantial Migrant Seasonal Farmworker populations.

**B. WORKERS AND COMMUNITIES OF COLOR**

> One report estimates that if current trends persist, Oakland’s Black population could decrease by 50 percent over three decades (from 140,000 in 2000 to 70,000 by 2030). In Richmond, one third of Black residents have left over the past 15 years, with the population declining from 35,000 to 23,000. Although reasons for leaving are complex, economic inequality and housing costs are frequently cited as top causes.

> Latinx Californians, including immigrants in essential but low-wage jobs, are the fastest growing racial or ethnic group in many parts of the Bay Area, including Oakland and Richmond.

> Asians make up over 15 percent of the state’s population. On average, APIs are the highest-income racial and ethnic group in the U.S.; however, a 2018 Pew study found that APIs also have the fastest and widest growing economic divide (between higher- and lower-income APIs).

**C. WOMEN**

> California’s women are working more than they did a generation ago, though this growth has slowed in recent decades.

> Though unemployment has been on the decline overall post-Great Recession, men’s unemployment has been decreasing at a greater rate than women.

> Women make up the state’s gender majority (51.1 percent of the population).

> Of the fastest growing industries highlighted in workforce development plans, many have left out women (e.g., construction, tech, manufacturing).

---

59 Requirements include identifying service gaps that English learners, “foreign-born” people, and refugees experience in the work system. Supra note 2.


61 Latinx households make up 40 percent of Richmond’s population, and if present trends hold, they will be Oakland’s biggest racial group by 2030. Ibid.

62 California Workforce Development Board, Unified State Plan, 45.


65 Ibid.

66 California Workforce Development Board, Unified State Plan, 45.
III. WORKFORCE LANDSCAPE (BY COUNTY)

After reviewing Bay Area workforce development documents, Insight identified notable programs and county-specific insights that could be used to prepare for further qualitative or quantitative work.

EAST BAY (CONTRA COSTA, ALAMEDA, OAKLAND)

- This regional partnership ("EASTBAY works") began in 1997. Additional protocols for collaboration began after the Great Recession, when the region lost 10 percent of all jobs. Construction, manufacturing, and retail industry jobs were among those hardest hit – they are also among the industries that East Bay WDB stakeholders have focused on in recent years due to high rates of job growth.

- Decades after it emerged as a massive wartime employer, the Port of Oakland remains a major workforce partner that provides thousands of jobs to East Bay workers.

- Most jobs in the East Bay are through small business: Over 90 percent of the region’s businesses have less than 100 employees and employ a third of the total workforce.\(^67\)

Alameda

- As with other Bay Area counties, Alameda’s management, business, and finance industries are male-dominated, with 54.8 percent men (61,610) to 45.2 percent women (50,845) (EEOC data).

- Per the county’s most recent WDB plan, 28 percent of the county’s population are immigrants and over 16.7 percent speak English “less than very well.” The WDB plan names cultural sensitivity and translation services as two needed components for workforce program and service delivery.\(^68\)

- Alameda male workers nearly triple the number of female science, engineering, and computer professionals [48,860 (74.4 percent men) to 16,825 (25.6 percent women)], while women overwhelmingly make up the healthcare professionals field [16,430 (75 percent female) to 6,100 (27 percent male)].


\(^68\) Ibid.
• Health care, professional, scientific and technical services (PSTS) and construction industries comprise 49 percent of Alameda’s anticipated growth.

> Contra Costa is the third largest county in the Bay Area. Nearly a quarter of the population was born outside the U.S., and 34 percent of the population (over age 5) speaks a language other than English. 69

> In Oakland, though unemployment rates within racial groups have improved (e.g., Black unemployment went from 25 percent in 2013 to 9 percent in 2015), an increasing percentage of workers are not economically secure. 70

**SAN FRANCISCO**

• Of the county’s 6,623 workforce participants, nearly 40 percent are Black, 21 percent are API, and 20 percent are Latinx.

• In 2011, the Board of Supervisors implemented a Local Hire policy for public work and improvement projects over $400,000; Local Hire requires that at least a quarter of all project hours be performed by local residents. (The majority of the county’s workforce participants with job placements are in construction.)

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY: SAN JOSE AND SILICON VALLEY**

• Northern Santa Clara (e.g., Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Palo Alto, Mountain View) belongs to the NOVA Workforce Consortium, a regional cluster that also includes San Mateo.

• Santa Clara County has the largest labor force in the Silicon Valley region (over a million), almost double that of San Francisco (550,300), the next largest. 71

• While only 14 percent of Santa Clara’s WIOA Title I participants are classified by the workforce board as “basic-skills deficient,” the majority of this group (88 percent) do not speak English as a first language — indicative of the county’s large workforce of immigrants with advanced degrees and skills. 72

**SOLANO COUNTY**

• Solano is in the North Bay Regional Planning Unit (RPU) with Lake, Marin, Napa, Mendocino, and Sonoma.

• Solano has 230 adults enrolled in WIOA programs as of July 2018. 73 Although not all industries have recovered fully from the Great Recession, Solano health care and retail jobs are cited as particularly thriving areas.

• Mirroring similar commute trends across the Bay, over half of Solano County residents commute out of county for work (to SF, Alameda, Santa Clara); those who commute into Solano County for work mainly come from Contra Costa, Yolo, Sacramento, and Napa. 74

---

69 All County Summaries, 41.
70 All County Summaries, 38.
71 Supra note 67.
72 All County Summaries, 57. The top three non-English languages spoken at home in Santa Clara are Spanish (19.0 percent), Cantonese/Mandarin Chinese (7.5 percent), and Vietnamese (6.7 percent).
IV. INDUSTRY LANDSCAPE

Health, tech, construction, and transportation are industries that are consistently cited by counties as growing sectors, substantial contributors to local economy, and/or sectors where workforce programs aim to connect more “dislocated workers” to sustainable professional pathways. For instance, in virtually every local and regional plan, the health sector is cited as a top growing industry. (This was even true for the health industry during the Great Recession, when it was one of the few sectors to actually experience growth, as opposed to decline.) Thus, further analysis of what barriers women, immigrants, and people of color face in accessing this and the other key fields is needed.

Similarly, technology is pivotal to the Bay Area economy, especially in Santa Clara County: San Jose Metro has the largest concentration of “high-technology” jobs in the country. Within this industry, Black people, Latinx, and women continue to encounter systemic racial and gender barriers to pay and job equity. Per 2018 research, about half of women in STEM jobs reported that gender discrimination in recruitment, hiring, and promotions is a major reason why women are underrepresented. In 2017, Google’s workforce was 2 percent Black and 3 percent Latinx, while Facebook’s 2014 workforce was 2 percent Black and 4 percent Latinx.

A 2017 Kapor Report further examines why women and workers of color leave the tech sector:

- The report highlights the “high cost of bad culture”: Underrepresented workers (women, Black, and Latinx workers) cite “unfair treatment” as the single biggest reason for turnover. This turnover, the report estimates, costs tech employers an estimated $16 billion per year.

- Among the top revenue-grossing tech companies, many of which are located and/or headquartered in the Bay Area, Black and Latinx employees combined represent only 3 to 5 percent of all employees.

- Almost one third of Black and Latina women reported that they were passed over for promotion — more than any other group.

---

75 Supra note 2. Ensuring upward mobility is a goal of the state, regional, and local WDBs. While construction is identified by WDB strategic plans as a thriving industry, its relationship to the prosperity or downturn of an area – historically, more so than other industries, such as during the Great Recession – makes it a fairly unpredictable long-term prospect for workers.


77 Ibid. Frequently, rather than naming specific groups or people, workforce plans use more ambiguous terms like “dislocated worker” or “disadvantaged communities” when describing targeted participants.

78 A 2011 Contra Costa and Alameda health employer survey cited digital literacy, interpersonal skills, and teamwork as the most desirable entry level skills workers need to join the health workforce. However, historic underfunding of computer technology in majority-Black and Latinx schools, combined with deep racial bias (e.g., research suggests that employers view Black men as having poor interpersonal skills), could turn employers’ desire for said skills into a systemic barrier for Black workers to enter the health field. East Bay Health Workforce Partnership. “A Roadmap for Advancing the Allied Health Workforce in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.” https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56ce6552f8b50b274b847124c4/t/5a5f8173c8302548e71da736/1516208502449/Advancing-the-Allied-Health-Workforce.pdf


V. OTHER CHALLENGES FACING BAY AREA WORKERS

A. POPULATION CHANGES

➤ The Bay Area lags in population growth compared to other comparable big cities (LA, New York, San Diego), suggesting issues in attracting and retaining new workers.

➤ Over the last several years, those leaving the Bay Area (and the state overall) have been concentrated in low-paying job sectors like sales, transportation, and food preparation.83

B. JOB/HOUSING TRENDS

➤ A 2016 report of Bay Area demographic trends reported that poverty is growing fastest in East Bay suburbs, while at the same time, a growing number of renters are moving east into Contra Costa and Solano Counties — risking the furtherance of "an engine for new forms of injustice for people of color, women, and immigrants."84

---


According to October 2016 research, of the nine Bay Area counties, Santa Clara, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Alameda have far more jobs than housing, while Sonoma and Marin have much more housing than jobs. In addition to housing shortage issues, California’s Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act prohibits rent caps on buildings built after 1995, serving as a further burden for those seeking affordable rent.

C. COMMUTING

The San Francisco Bay Area has one of the most comprehensive transit systems in the country. It is a substantial commuter region, both for those leaving for work and those coming in: More than 80,000 workers in the Bay Area commute from the Northern San Joaquin Valley daily; nearly half of San Francisco’s workforce must commute from out of county; and nearly 1 in 4 Contra Costa residents must commute out of county for work.

D. FAMILY LEAVE, CHILD CARE

Though it improves on federal standards, California’s recently expanded Family Leave policy does not cover workers in small businesses with under 20 employees (many of whom are women, parents, caregivers, immigrants, and/or workers of color).

The need for childcare is greater than ever: The percentage of California households with all parents working has doubled between 1970 (25 percent of households with at least one child under 5; 34.2 percent of households with kids under 18) and 2014 (57.3 percent and 49.2 percent, respectively).

---


