HOUSING OAKLAND’S UNHOUSED
COMMUNITY-BASED SOLUTIONS TO HOUSE ALL OF OAKLAND’S UNHOUSED NOW

THE HOUSING & DIGNITY PROJECT: THE VILLAGE, THE EAST OAKLAND COLLECTIVE,
DELLUMS INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE/JUST CITIES

“Attempting to discourage residents from remaining in informal settlements or encampments
by denying access to water, sanitation and health services and other basic necessities,
as has been witnessed by the Special Rapporteur in Oakland, CA, constitutes
cruel and inhuman treatment and is a violation of multiple human rights...Such
punitive policies must be prohibited in law and immediately ceased.”

UN Report of the Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing, 18 Sept 2018
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INTRODUCTION:
As the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Housing, Leilani Farha said about her recent visit to Oakland’s homeless encampments:

“I find there to be a real cruelty in how people are being dealt with here.”

In response to Oakland’s escalating homelessness, the Dellums Institute for Social Justice/Just Cities, The Village, and The East Oakland Collective formed the Housing & Dignity Project to advance community solutions. The Project commissioned UC Berkeley Goldman School of Public Policy assistance to assess current government and community efforts underway and research comparative efforts occurring in other communities. The Project also facilitated policy solution design meetings with unhoused residents and community advocates. The following summarizes the Goldman Analysis’ main findings and community-based immediate and long-term solutions.

COMMUNITY LISTENING SESSIONS
Community listening sessions were held during monthly meetings with the Housing and Dignity Project. The unhoused individuals in attendance represented people residing in unsanctioned encampments, people residing in the Two Three Hunid Ohlone Village sanctioned encampment, and newly homeless individuals.

Based on these listening sessions, we identified the following priorities for the unhoused population in relation to: housing (Table 3), supportive services for those that need it (Table 4), and the way that services and outreach is conducted (Table 5). The priorities identified by the unhoused community serve the purpose of maintaining household financial and personal wellbeing and stability and preventing further risk of displacement.

Table 3: Shelter Criteria Identified by Unhoused Community

| Access to Utility & Sewage Hook-Ups | No Noise Pollution | No Environmental Pollution |
| Located on an Empty Lot | Access to Public Transportation | Access to Grocery Stores |

Table 4: Service Needs Identified by Unhoused Community

| Financial Literacy Training | Vocational Job Training | Access to Stable Employment |
| Healing, Wellness & Recovery | Mentorship Programming | Life Skills Training |

Table 5: Additional Priorities Identified by Unhoused Community

| Staying Connected to Service Providers | Legal Representation | Timely Access to Services |
WHO ARE THE UNHOUSED?
They are...

People asserting their human right to housing.
Per the United Nations, people living in Oakland’s 329 encampments are “affirming their humanity in the most inhumane conditions.”

Our neighbors.

The working poor.
Oakland renters making the median income would pay almost 75% towards new rents.

Undercounted.
There are over 9,000 Oakland people unhoused, not 2,761.

Where do Unhoused People in Oakland Come From?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>From Alameda County</th>
<th>Outside Alameda County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>9,297</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities</td>
<td>5,588</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Renter Median Income Going Towards Median Housing Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sustainable Rent Burden</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT STRATEGIES
Violate UN Mandates

Criminalize the Homeless.⁸

The law criminalizes the homeless, “sometimes even for sleeping and eating.”⁹

In Oakland, there are 14 anti-homeless laws.¹⁰

Exclude newly unhoused from homeless services.¹¹

“A State is in violation of international human rights law if any significant portion of the population is deprived of access to basic shelter or housing.”¹²

68% of newly homeless are not deemed eligible by HUD.¹³

Fail to provide enough beds to meet the demand.¹⁴

Oakland must implement the right to housing for the unhoused within “the shortest possible time, by all appropriate means, using the maximum of available resources.”¹⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of people served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Shelter &amp; Traditional Beds</td>
<td>1,299 – 1,369¹⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Temporary Tuff Sheds &amp; Transitional Beds</td>
<td>120¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Oakland Beds</td>
<td>1,419 – 1,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oakland Unhoused Point-in-Time Count</td>
<td>2,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oakland Unhoused estimated by Alameda County</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fail to build housing for Oakland residents.¹⁸

“No urban development should be approved if they fail to include housing for those already living in the area. Any development must provide existing residents with housing that fully meets their needs.”¹⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate</td>
<td>20,543 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to Low Income</td>
<td>1,151²⁰ (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low to No Income</td>
<td>287²¹ (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units in Pipeline</td>
<td>21,981²²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY-BASED SOLUTIONS  The following Solutions models applied a goal of providing immediate and long-term housing for 2,000 people. The models can be modified to accommodate housing for more or fewer people.

SHORT TERM EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS: Implementable Within 6 to 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>People Housed</th>
<th>Per Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiny Home Villages on Public or Ally Land</td>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Up to $7,500</td>
<td>$9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes on Public or Ally Land</td>
<td>10 Years</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Up to $35,000</td>
<td>$14 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3-10 Years</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Up to $7,500 - $35,000 Each</td>
<td>$23 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVAILABLE RESOURCES for Short Term Housing Solutions

⇒ $8.7 Million of new State funds for Oakland homeless housing
⇒ $5 Million of new County funds for homeless housing
⇒ $8 Million of new State funds for Alameda County homeless housing
⇒ 50 public land parcels suitable for building 7,300 new housing units

LONG TERM EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS: Permanent Housing for Extremely Low to No Income People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>People Housed</th>
<th>Per Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Multifamily</td>
<td>Forever</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$240 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Models: Container, Modular, Prefab</td>
<td>Forever</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>~ $13,500 - $125,000</td>
<td>$22 - $200 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVAILABLE RESOURCES for Long Term Housing Solutions

⇒ $30 Million of County Measure A1 for Oakland homeless housing
⇒ $10-$14 Million Annually from New Prosperity Tax
⇒ ~ $10 Million Annually from existing County funds (e.g., Prop 47, Measure A)
⇒ $10 Million Annually from corporate and foundation donors
⇒ 50 public land parcels suitable for building 7,300 new housing units
A 2015 analysis from a UC Berkeley Department of City and Regional Planning, Master of City Planning graduate student, Carline Au, identified that there were 50 parcels of publicly owned vacant land that were included in the City of Oakland’s Housing Element as available opportunity sites for building housing. See link to interactive map of the parcels: cdb.io/1NWVTLb

The City of Oakland’s Housing Element identified that an estimated 7,300 new housing units could be developed on these 50 public land parcels.

The City of Oakland owned 36 of these 50 public land parcels, which could have developed 3,600 housing units, per the City’s Housing Element.

Other cities are utilizing public land to provide immediate housing solutions for unhoused and housing insecure residents.
SHARING THE PROSPERITY NEW REVENUE STREAM

Very few “affordable housing” units are actually affordable to people who are homeless or on the verge of homelessness. To address this structural problem, we need a new ongoing revenue that would be dedicated solely to building housing affordable to the unhoused that would not tax lower income homeowners already housing insecure. The Housing & Dignity Project asked Dan Lindheim, former Oakland City Administrator and current Goldman School of Public Policy professor, to analyze revenues that could be generated from increasing the real estate transfer tax for properties selling over $1 or $2 million.33 The below reflects the analysis using the example of Oakland’s 2017 transfer tax revenues. Around this same time, Councilmember Dan Kalb proposed a ballot measure to increase the real estate transfer tax for properties selling over $2 million for the City’s general fund.

We recommend the following:

1. Should Councilmember Kalb’s ballot measure, X, pass, that the Council dedicate new general fund monies for building housing affordable to unhoused Oakland residents.
2. Should Measure X not pass, that City officials work with the Housing & Dignity Project on a new measure that would specifically dedicate new revenues to building housing for the unhoused.

### 2017 Transfer Tax – Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Value</th>
<th>% of Total Properties Sold</th>
<th>Total Transfer Value</th>
<th>Transfer Tax</th>
<th>% Increase Revenue (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$1M</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$1.9 billion</td>
<td>$29.2M</td>
<td>$9.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$1M</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$1.75 billion</td>
<td>$26.4M</td>
<td>$8.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$2M</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$704M</td>
<td>$10.5M</td>
<td>$3.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$5M</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$413M</td>
<td>$6.2M</td>
<td>$2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$10M</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$226M</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2017 Transfer Tax – Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Value</th>
<th>% of Total Properties Sold</th>
<th>Total Transfer Value</th>
<th>Transfer Tax Revenue</th>
<th>% Increase Revenue (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$1M</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$46.9M</td>
<td>$703,043</td>
<td>$234,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$1M</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>$891M</td>
<td>$13.4M</td>
<td>$4.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$2M</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$850M</td>
<td>$12.7M</td>
<td>$4.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$5M</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>$750M</td>
<td>$11.3M</td>
<td>$3.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONNECTING THE DOTS: FROM CITY OF OAKLAND’S RACIST HOUSING COVENANTS TO TODAY’S HOMELESSNESS

The Racial Disparity of the Homelessness Crisis

- African Americans are 28% of Oaklanders, but 68% of the unhoused.34
- African Americans are disproportionately represented in the prison to homeless cycle.36
- African American older adults are 2x more at risk of losing their housing than other ethnicities.37
- African American families with children are the fastest growing homeless population.38

What the Maps Tell Us: Racial Targeting for Housing Discrimination & Exploitation

⇒ Beginning in the late 1930s, African Americans and other people of color were excluded from certain neighborhoods via racial housing covenants designed by the City of Oakland and real estate industry.39
⇒ The neighborhoods inhabited by people of color, predominately in West and parts of lower East Oakland, were then redlined by the federal government and banks for access to capital.40
⇒ Beginning 2006, African American and other homeowners of color were targeted by banks for subprime loans,41 which led to default/foreclosure of over 11,000 homes, predominately in West and East Oakland.42 Oakland lost 27% of its African American population from 2000-2010.43
⇒ Outside speculators purchased over 90% of the defaulted/foreclosed properties in West and East Oakland.44 Because of State Costa Hawkins law, single-family homes are not protected by rent control; overnight, many homeowners and renters lost their homes.
⇒ The neighborhoods in West and East Oakland once targeted for subprime loans are now in advanced or at risk stages of gentrification and displacement.45
⇒ E.g., Clawson/West Oakland renter households make median income of $40,625 - $75,439 while median rents in their neighborhood are now ~$3,084,46 requiring them to pay 91% to 49% of their monthly income for housing.
⇒ Community advocacy data shows that many people living in Oakland homeless encampments once resided in West or East Oakland.47
⇒ The Anti-Eviction Mapping Project, using City Public Works data, has identified 316 neighborhoods in Oakland with homeless encampments, from only a handful of neighborhoods a few years ago.48
CHANGING THE NARRATIVE: PROFILES OF “AFFIRMING HUMANITY”

Ms. Elizabeth Easton
Ms. Elizabeth was living in Beaumont Texas when Hurricane Harvey hit. Displaced after the storm, Ms. Elizabeth left for Oakland, where her daughter and son lived. Initially, she moved in with her daughter, who was living with her family in section 8 housing. “I couldn’t stay there,” she said, explaining that Oakland HUD gave her a notice requiring her to vacate the home. Not able to live with her son either, Ms. Elizabeth took up residence in a warehouse near the Coliseum. The building owners provided her with wood, pallets, and other materials to begin building her own home, while her daughter and her daughter’s father bought other items to help her with construction. Ms. Elizabeth had tried other housing options in the past, such as section 8, but said that it was ‘too stressful and too slow. Having come from a family of homesteaders in Texas, Ms. Elizabeth knew how to build and finds this option as preferable. She doesn’t see her tiny house as a temporary structure, but as a home to work on and decorate with flowers and her original paintings. She hopes to get a trailer and to transport her home to a plot of land she can rent. In the meantime, her number one recommendation to the city: time to talk. ‘Get an organization that can sit and talk with us about our needs.’ Due to safety concerns, Ms. Elizabeth said that she usually keeps to herself and that it can be lonely without someone to ‘just vent to’ or sit with. Without this essential human connection, she fears that homeless people are ‘out of sight, out of mind.’ Ms. Elizabeth also requested basic amenities, like access to water, portable toilets, and for the city to send dump trucks to the encampments so that they can clean out the trash and help to clean up their image. ‘It’s not our trash...a lot of the negativity comes from that.’

Kaleeo Acatar
Before the 2008 recession, life for Kaleeo Acatar and his mother was “good for a while.” They had a house (in Oakland) with a pool and Jacuzzi. His mom—’a good salesperson’—was remodeling cars from auction and selling them for a profit and Kaleeo was working in construction. Once the recession hit, they lost the house and, due to the decline in building, Kaleeo’s construction company cut his job. This resulted in their first experience with homelessness. After losing the house, Kaleeo, living out of a truck at the time, began working at a fast food restaurant. The owner of a nearby apartment complex had noticed Kaleeo leaving for work everyday from the truck and offered him and his mother a deal: he could manage the complex and in return she would give him a deal on any apartment in the building. He and his mother lived comfortable there until the landlady sold the apartment to a new owner who was eager to evict tenants for remodeling. Around the same time, Kaleeo says he was approached by someone from East Bay Organizing Community to advocate for affordable housing and a living wage. Once Kaleeo got involved and started speaking out against injustices in housing and employment in the city, he says that’s when the retaliation began. “I got caught between retaliation with my landlord, and then retaliation with my employer and my hours [got] cut, and I couldn’t make up the rent,” which was all his landlord needed to evict him and his mother. They tried to get by for a while by fixing up cars, but without a permanent place to park the vehicles, the police ended up towing and repossessing them. Kaleeo took up an organizing job but shortly thereafter, he got into a wreck and couldn’t make
necessary repairs to his car. He tried to continue working but said it was difficult to do organizing work without a car. At that point, he and his mom were homeless again, sometimes staying with friends, in a car or in encampments on the street.

Currently, Kaleeo works as a dishwasher with Pixar Animation Studios. He is living out of his car and trying to support his mother, who is in residence at a rehabilitation center out of state. It’s helpful, he says, to have an understanding boss, who even advertises Kaleeo’s music and spoken word performances. But what would be most useful in his situation would be finding affordable housing in Oakland—close to his work and family. He hopes to be able to find a place in time to host his mom when she gets out of rehab within the next few months, and to be able to have his young daughter stay with him more often. Kaleeo, born and raised in Oakland, remembers “the potential the city had back in the day,” recommends that the city put funds toward affordable housing projects (rather than public housing, which Kaleeo thinks has too many restrictions to be feasible for people with jobs and families). “There is a homelessness crisis here...in the whole Bay Area. It just doesn’t make sense that the richest state in the country, richest city in the state, in the richest country itself can’t offer something.” Kaleeo also reminds us that the homeless today have worked, “they have families, they have dreams, they have goals that they wish they could reach just like you, like me and regular folks in Oakland. The homeless, they’re not just old folks [or] drug addicts. Some are students...teachers. Homeless folks, at the end of it all, they’re regular people, they’re human beings, that need an option.” Kaleeo’s biggest hope, however, is that he be able to practice his music and raise his daughter to share his passion for music, language and justice.

John Jones III

John Jones III is a third generation East Oakland resident. With relatives in the Nation of Islam as well as the Black Panther Party, John was raised understanding the importance of community empowerment for people of color. Born in 1974, John grew up in an Oakland deeply impacted by the legacy of the Black Panther Party, COINTELPRO, and the systemic and economic divestment in East Oakland. All of these forces culminated with the crack cocaine epidemic and resulting violence of the 1980s, devastating the community of his youth. After experiencing incidences of police brutality and being targeted in a shooting, John dropped out of junior high school and began selling drugs, resulting in his incarceration. After being paroled in 2012, John was homeless and unemployed for eighteen months. After being incarcerated for one-third of his life, John was unable to land a job due to his criminal history, despite being an FAA licensed Airframe and Powerplant mechanic.

Without stable employment, he soon became homeless because policies restricted formerly incarcerated people from living in subsidized Section 8 housing. John spent nights “couchsurfing”, sleeping in cars, and an extended amount of time sleeping on the couch in an overcrowded one-bedroom shack with ten other adult males and no running water. It was at this point that he joined the Center Street Missionary Baptist Church in West Oakland and the OCO walks for peace. It represented a turning point for John as he started to get more involved in social justice work, fighting successfully for a higher minimum wage, criminal justice reform (Prop 47) and public safety and police accountability. John is currently on staff for the Dellums institute for Social Justice, a member of Our Beloved Community Action Network (BCAN) and was part of a successful process of securing millions of dollars for Anti-Displacement efforts which will assist in keeping low-income tenants and property owners in their place of residence. Also as a member of the Board of State and Community Corrections, Prop 47 Executive Steering Committee, John played a role in directing $103 million in statewide funding to assist formerly incarcerated people suffering from mental health and substance abuse issues with employment, housing, and other vital services.
Mavin Carter-Griffin

Mavin Griffin’s home is comprised of a small trailer that conceals a sprawling, currently exposed and incompleted set of rooms, all defended by a low fence of tarp and other building materials. Just a foot beyond her front entrance, cars whizz by with alarming audacity. When Mavin sees one of these cars coming, she’ll walk out toward the middle of the street and wave her arms wide, asking them if they could please slow down. “I used to have signs up,” she explains, and says that she had also tried painting in a crosswalk.

Mavin has a lot of creative ideas for how to improve quality of life for people living on the street. As a member of the Original Nexus of Burning Man, she developed a “10 principles” street version of a theme camp for curbside situations that has gotten positive attention and support from the city. Another principle guiding her situation as a private person living publicly is Leave no Trace, but it has been challenging due to a lack of a system to support cleanup efforts.

She is an advocate for alternative living spaces like this, stating that policy-makers and Oakland residents need to start rethinking the urban landscape. Rather than stigmatizing curbside shelters, she thinks of the curb as ‘unexplored territory’ for real estate and says that most of us take it for granted that our architecture is stationary. Above all, however, Mavin wants people to stop calling this issue “homelessness” and identify the problem for what it is: a housing crisis. With this framing, the unhoused would not be prejudiced as she has been periodically harassed by law enforcement and exposed to other harms and abuses.

Mavin has been embroiled in legal issues with her family since the fraudulent seizure of her home which is the main reason she lives on the street. She and her children owned a house for 6 years in the Bay Area after receiving a nest egg from her grandmother. They had an idyllic life for a while in a single-family home with a view of the bay until her husband left. She moved around between Contra Costa county, El Dorado, and other places until settling in Oakland because of its reputation for providing plentiful public services. Mavin said she made herself vulnerable in asking for help, expecting warmth and graciousness. She found, instead, that services were largely unavailable, defunct, or she couldn’t get into their schedule.

She has been on the street for 5 years. While she makes best of the situation, she’s eager to find something more safe and stable. “I just want to grow old and be a grandmother,” she says. She has a vision for the currently vacant lot behind her home that borders the train tracks and has a goal of working with city government in resolving some of these issues. For Mavin, change is a two-way street; Oakland residents need to see those suffering the consequences of the housing crisis as people like them, and likewise push city government to offer more basic services. “We just need to be inspired down here.”
ROADMAP TO OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

**ACCESS TO LAND**
**STRATEGY:** Use public & private land for permanent housing

**ACCESS TO INFRASTRUCTURE**
**STRATEGY:** Provide communities access to electricity and water infrastructure

**HUMAN CAPITAL**
**STRATEGY:** Support non-profit and grassroots organizations in serving unhoused community

**OVERCOME N.I.M.B.Y.**
**STRATEGY:** Collaborate with housed neighbors and show how new housing will contribute to broader community

**MONEY TO BUILD**
**STRATEGY:** Seek funding for capital expenses for new housing

**MONEY TO OPERATE**
**STRATEGY:** Seek funding for operational expenses and supportive services in new housing

WHAT IS A HUMAN RIGHTS APPROACH TO HOUSING OAKLAND’S UNHOUSED?

The UN Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing included the following elements:

1) Housing, including informal settlements, is centrally located, livable, and has access to water and sanitation

2) Housing is linked to the economy and supports community economic development

3) People have a right to remain in place

4) Revise laws to recognize settlements, cease evictions and engage with unhoused people to develop housing solutions

5) Only approve housing that includes residents already living in the area, including adopting inclusionary planning/zoning requirements

6) Integrate skills and labor of residents in programs and provide access to serviced land and economical building materials

7) Cease punitive denials to basic services

8) Recognize diverse households and address the needs of marginalized groups

---

vii Based upon case study best practice policy analysis. See Goldman Analysis, p.4

A UN BEST PRACTICE: A Case Study of The Village
This case study is based on interviews with Needa Bee of The Village collective.

The Village/FeedThePeople is a collective of housed and unhoused folks with a mission to provide the basic needs of shelter, food, healing, life & job skills training, support, recreation and dignity. In 2017, The Village transformed vacant land in West Oakland at Marcus Garvey Park, housing 16 people and provided services to 400 others.

In October of 2017, after months of persistent advocacy from members of the Homeless Advocacy Working Group (HAWG) and residents of the first bulldozed Village in West Oakland the city granted The Village to use the open land on 23rd Ave and East 12th street in Oakland to create a second Village to house their vision.

For this case study, The Village will be recognized as a separate entity from the site after government intervention, which will be called Two Three Hunid Tent City. The Village at the 23rd Ave and E 12 Street site started with approximately 10 people on the site before the city intervention, currently, Two Three Hunid Tent City has approximately 85 - 95 people onsite on any given day.

SELF-GOVERNANCE AND EMPOWERMENT

At the original site in West Oakland, The Village was able to provide holistic, customized services as a pathway to get unhoused people into treatment programs or permanent housing without a rigid timetable. When The Village was offered the site in East Oakland, 10 individuals were already living there, The Village formed consensus with everyone on principles of self-governance and designed a program to construct tiny homes on site as a pathway to rehabilitation.

However, the administration did not work in good faith with The Village. Police and public works were instructed to evict six encampments across East & Deep East Oakland and herded them onto The Village site. The Village was not informed of these plans, 40 residents from 5 different rival gangs were herded onto the site. These people were not given a choice to participate in The Village, this inability to choose to relocate to the site and forcing rival gangs onto the location ended the vision of The Village to live on the land. Site control of the land was denied to The Village due to this herding. From then on, the site became known as Two Three Hunid Tent City.

The Village
- Consensus building
- Customized holistic service for people in crisis
- Personalized individual programs and goal setting for each resident
- Self governance in getting all residents to agree on ground rules and vision

Two Three Hunid Tent City
- Zero consultation with people living on site on high impact decisions
- Lack of services for people with substance use and mental health issues
- Overcrowding of site with people who did not choose to live in proximity with each other
- Overcrowding with rival gangs and families with generations deep tensions
**PRISON-LIKE CONDITIONS**

The city of Oakland then rolled out the Tuff Shed program as a response to the deepening homelessness crisis. Without engaging with unhoused people to identify the needs of the population, Tuff Shed sites were barbed-wired, fenced-off camps that were supervised by abusive security that “resembled a prison,” according to one previous Tuff Shed resident. A strict six-month time limit, punitive measures, and controlled movement on and off site criminalized unhoused people.

A total of three Tuff Shed sites with a capacity to serve 120 people were or in the process of being created. These sites were used as a justification to demolish nearby encampments and people who were not transparently rejected trickled into the Two Three Hunid Tent City. Conditions at Two Three Hunid Tent City and other existing encampments worsened. Hard fought concessions from the city to provide water, sanitation, and waste disposal at forty encampments were inconsistent, further exacerbating the problems of overcrowding. Currently there are 65 permanent and 20-30 temporary residents at Two Three Hunid Tent City, and the implementation of the Tuff Shed program has made all but a handful of unhoused people worse off.

The herding has not stopped. In October of this year, residents arrived to the E12th reported that they were picked up by OPD and dropped off at Two Three Hunid Tent City. They were informed if they attempted to leave and establish shelter for themselves elsewhere, they would be arrested.

**The Village**
- Humanistic approach to engaging unhoused people and their needs
- Creation of community and sense of belonging as all unhoused people are welcomed
- Continued advocacy at city hall for unhoused people

**The Tuff Shed Program**
- Six month time limit before transition to housing or expulsion of unhoused person
- No accountability of security guard abuses on Tuff Shed sites
- Format, fencing, and aesthetics of incarceration

**CURRENT UPDATES**

Due to the conditions created by the city administration at the E12th site, not only is it impossible to manifest the vision of The Village, but also the living conditions are completely inhumane. To date, 6 temporary emergency shelters have been built on site that house 11 residents, but construction on any further homes has stopped until we move onto new land as the city will be evicting residents on this site in November. In the meantime, all residents are receiving an upgrade in their tents (larger, more durable tents, tent platforms to avoid rats and flooding), food, clean drinking water are still being provided.

Ongoing advocacy for basic living conditions continue as sanitation, adequate trash service, vector control services committed by the city remain unmet. The Village Collective continues to support residents based on their individual needs, helping with filling out paperwork, rides to the doctor, getting cars back from towing companies, first response after fires, and intervening on violence on site.

**CONCLUSION**

The services provided by The Village sharply contrasts with the way Two Three Hunid Tent City operate. It is important to elevate the customized, holistic, and humane approach of The Village to serve unhoused people in order to truly get them reintegrated into society. The set solutions set forth by the city without community input continues to harm not only those who were displaced by the creation of the Tuff Shed sites, but also existing encampments such as Two Three Hunid Tent City because there are far more unhoused people than there are beds created. We hope the positive examples of The Village will inform future city interventions in alleviating the homelessness crisis.
The Village Site Plan created by community process prior to city of Oakland intervention. The site is now known as Two Three Hunid Tent City and this plan was never executed.
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SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS FROM THE GOLDMAN SCHOOL ADVANCED POLICY ANALYSIS

Rawan Elhalaby, Housing Oakland’s Unhoused: Advanced Policy Analysis conducted for the Dellums Institute for Social Justice, UC Berkeley, Goldman School of Public Policy, Spring 2018

To access the full Analysis:  http://dellumsinstitute.org/community-justice-data/

We found four major findings throughout our work with the Housing and Dignity Project that are important considerations to keep in mind when developing a housing plan and policies that serve the unhoused community.

1. Determined that policymakers have overestimated the size of the chronically homeless and underestimated the size of the working class, newly homeless.

Due to the methodology used in the traditional point-in-time-count and the federal definition of homelessness that often limits homeless service providers to working with individuals experiencing chronic, street homelessness, we do not have an accurate estimate of the number of newly, homeless working class households. By not accounting for this population, we have overestimated the proportion of chronically street homeless in relation to the entire unhoused population and have inefficiently allocated resources and programming.

2. Determined that working class, newly homeless individuals are underserved by traditional homeless service providers.

Due to funding restrictions, the limited scope of their work and the “invisibility” of the newly homeless population, homeless service providers are unable to adequately serve this population.

3. Identified the real needs of the unhoused community.

The unhoused community we worked with made it clear that they need services to support workforce and personal development, rather than just supportive services to overcome mental health problems. Actual community need –not just supportive services for mental health, but a focus on services to support job and personal development and housing that maintains dignity and provides choice; the unhoused community wants the kinds of solutions we’re proposing and want a solution that can be implemented quickly.

4. Identified successful examples of non-traditional housing development for the unhoused.

Other cities have successfully implemented non-traditional housing strategies for the unhoused by overcoming the stigma surrounding innovative housing solutions and advocating for local policies that facilitate the use of funding and land towards these solutions.
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