# Bishop, California

## *Indicators Report*

by
The National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

April 20, 2024

Exploring the economics, demographics, and well-being of Bishop and its residents through indicators.

This report was produced by the:

National Economic Education Delegation
271 Arias St.
San Rafael, CA 94903
415-336-5705
www.NEEDEcon.org
Contact: Jon@NEEDEcon.org

# Executive Summary

## *Assessing the City with Indicators*

**About this Report**

This report provides background or summary information for the city of Bishop (the City) in the form of indicators.

**Using this Report**

Indicators are measures of various aspects of a regional economy. They help to provide an indication of the quality of life in a region and progress toward improving conditions in the local economy. This report focuses on indicators for changing demographics, incomes, housing markets, commute patterns, and employment in Bishop. These indicators are compared to Inyo County (the County) as a whole, a broader region where one is well defined, California, and the United Sates.

This report is vital for understanding trends in the underlying economy. It does not provide forecasts, but Rob Eyler and Jon Haveman at Economic Forensics and Analytics are available to provide them if that is of interest.

**Topics Covered:**

- **Demographics:** A detailed snopshot of Bishop demographics is presented. This provides evidence on the size, age and sex, income and poverty status, race and ethnicity, housing status, living arrangements, education, health, and transportation choices of the population. Beyond the current population level, data on trends in local population growth, in comparison with other broader regions is presented, in both tabular and graphical form.
- **Employment Report:** Here, we provide a brief snapshot or employment and unemployment in Bishop and how the City's experience differs from broader regions.
- **Income and Earnings:** Vital to understanding the prosperity of a city relative to its surrounding area is information on income and earnings. We provide a ranking of the City's income relative to all cities in California as well as growth relative to local regions. Inequality and poverty status are also important indicators for the level of equity in the community. We provide evidence of trends in both, not only for all residents, but also for children separately.
- **Housing:** This section provides evidence on the cost and availability of housing. Both median home values and rental costs are included, along with detailed information on home ownership, by age and income, in particular. Further, evidence is provided on the housing burden in the City, again, in comparison with other broader regions. We also provide evidence on the rate at which new buildings and units are permitted along with a broader housing picture. Finally, we provide evidence on the age of the housing stock in Bishop, along with information on how long the City's residents have been in place.
- **Transportation:** Increasingly important, in the wake of the pandemic, is an understanding of the transportation patterns and choices of local residents. We provide detailed evidence on the proprotion of residents who work from home and on the various transportation choices of those who head to the office. This information is also provided for those who work in Bishop, but do not necessarily live in Bishop.
- **Migration:** Population changes comes primarily through organic causes: births and deaths. Migration between regions also plays a significant role in population growth. A final section of the report provides evidence on migration into and out of the City.

Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

# Contents



Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

# Demographics

**Definition:**

Data on the demographics of a city indicate the nature of the population, with a focus on age, gender, race and ethnicity, as well as household compositon.

**Why is it important?**

The characteristics and growth of Bishop's population are fundamental indicators of the city's growth potential.

## *A Demographic Snapshot*

| Statistic | 2022 | 2019 |
|---|---|---|
| **POPULATION** | | |
| Population Estimate (#, 5yr) | 3,802.0 | 3,745.0 |
| Veterans (#, 5yr) | 361.0 | 305.0 |
| Foreign born persons (%, 5yr) | 6.9 | 12.3 |
| Population age 25+ (#, 5yr) | 3,160.0 | 2,916.0 |
| **AGE AND SEX** | | |
| Persons under 5 years (%, 5yr) | 0.4 | 6.3 |
| Persons under 18 years (%, 5yr) | 11.7 | 18.9 |
| Persons 65 years and over (%, 5yr) | 25.2 | 22.1 |
| Female persons (%, 5yr) | 59.0 | 55.0 |
| **INCOME AND POVERTY** | | |
| Median household income ($, 5yr) | 75,451.0 | 62,067.0 |
| Per capita income in past 12 months ($, 5yr) | 47,064.0 | 36,541.0 |
| Persons in poverty (%, 5yr) | 7.3 | 6.6 |
| Children age less than 18 in poverty (#, 5yr) | 0.0 | 29.0 |
| Children age less than 18 in poverty (%, 5yr) | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| **RACE AND ETHNICITY** | | |
| White alone (%, 5yr) | 84.4 | 81.7 |
| African American alone (%, 5yr) | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native alone (%, 5yr) | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Asian alone (%, 5yr) | 2.3 | 5.3 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone (%, 5yr) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Two or More Races (%, 5yr) | 11.9 | 10.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino (%, 5yr) | 17.4 | 23.7 |
| White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (%, 5yr) | 75.0 | 66.4 |
| **HOUSING** | | |
| Housing units (#, 5yr) | 2,269.0 | 2,187.0 |
| Owner-occupied housing units (%, 5yr) | 55.1 | 37.8 |
| Median value of owner-occupied housing units ($, 5yr) | 387,200.0 | 319,000.0 |
| Median selected monthly owner costs-with a mortgage ($, 5yr) | 2,135.0 | 1,928.0 |
| Median selected monthly owner costs-without a mortgage ($, 5yr) | 600.0 | 463.0 |
| Median gross rent ($, 5yr) | 1,295.0 | 977.0 |
| **FAMILIES AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS** | | |
| Households (#, 5yr) | 2,035.0 | 1,993.0 |
| Persons per household (#, 5yr) | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Living in same house 1 year ago, % of persons age 1+ (5yr) | 84.6 | 81.5 |
| **EDUCATION** | | |
| High school graduate or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr) | 97.3 | 92.8 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr) | 33.4 | 38.5 |
| **HEALTH** | | |
| With a disability, under age 65 years (#, 5yr) | 230.0 | 279.0 |
| Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years (%, 5yr) | 7.9 | 5.6 |
| **LABOR FORCE** | | |
| In civilian labor force, persons age 16+ (%, 5yr) | 67.9 | 59.7 |
| In civilian labor force, women age 16+ (%, 5yr) | 68.2 | 57.3 |
| Employed, persons age 16+ (%, 5yr) | 62.7 | 55.4 |
| Self employed (%, 5yr) | 5.3 | 3.0 |
| **TRANSPORTATION** | | |
| Mean travel time to work, workers age 16+ (Mins., 5yr) | 13.7 | 12.1 |
| Using public transportation (%, 5yr) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Drive alone in private vehicle (%, 5yr) | 59.5 | 66.2 |

Source: American Community Survey, Summary Files
Note: Data are from the 1-year files unless indicated by the notation 5yr.

Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## *Current Population*

The data in these two tables and the following two graphs are from the CA Department of Finance (DOF). The DOF produces population estimates for geographies around California twice a year: January and July. As estimates for cities are only available in January, these two tables are based on the January data. The remaining figures are from the American Community Survey (ACS), provided annually by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

**Table 1. Population Change by Region**
(Thousands, January to January)

| Region | 2023 Population | % Change 1 Year | % Change 3 Year | % Change 5 Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **City** | | | | |
| Bishop | 3,872 | −0.15 | −0.97 | −0.72 |
| **County and Broader Regions** | | | | |
| Inyo County | 18,896 | −0.13 | 1.68 | 1.60 |
| Eastern Sierra | 188,304 | −0.18 | 0.31 | 0.04 |
| California | 38,940,231 | −0.35 | −1.79 | −2.01 |

Source: CA DOF; Calculations by National Economic Education Delegation

**Table 2. County Population Change by City**
(Thousands, January to January)

| City | 2022 | 2023 | % Change Local | % Change Eastern Sierra | % Change California |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inyo County | 18.9 | 18.9 | −0.13 | −0.18 | −0.35 |
| Bishop | 3.9 | 3.9 | −0.15 | | |

Source: CA DOF; Calculations by National Economic Education Delegation

Figure 1: Population Growth (1)




Figure 2: Population Growth (2)




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## Figure 3: Population by Age - Detailed Age Categories







## Figure 4: Population by Age - Broad Age Categories







## Figure 5: Population by Educational Attainment







Jon Haveman, Ph.D. ● National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org ● 415-336-5705

Figure 6: Population by Race/Ethnicity




Figure 7: Population by Race/Ethnicity Over Time




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. ● National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org ● 415-336-5705

# Employment Report

## *Citywide Employment and Unemployment*

**Definition:**

Each month, California's Employment Development Division (EDD) publishes an update on employment in California and in MSAs, counties, and cities all across the state. The report focuses primarily on non-farm employment, providing estimates of changes in employment by industry as well as unemployment in each region. Data for cities is limited to aggregate employment, labor force, and unemployment data. Those are reported below.

**Why is it important?**

Employment growth is a fundamental indicator of the health of an economy.

Table 3. Bishop Summary for March, 2024

| Category | Current Value | Change From: Last Month | 2 Months Ago | Last Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employment | 8,924 | -30 | −53 | -103 |
| Labor Force | 9,644 | 9 | 15 | 96 |
| Number Unemployed | 678 | -4 | 21 | 97 |
| Unemployment Rate | 7.0 | -0.0 | 0.2 | 0.9 |

Source: EDD, National Economic Education Delegation

Figure 8: Historical Employment and Unemployment




Figure 9: Employment and Unemployment - Last 12 Months




Figure 10: Relative Employment Growth Across Regions - since 2010




Figure 11: Relative Employment Growth Across Regions - since 2019




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## *County Employment by Industry*

California's Employment Development Division (EDD) does not regularly produce data on employment by industry for cities. However, we are able to report indsutry-level employment data for Inyo County. The following table provides the latest data for the County.

Table 4. Employment Growth by Industry in Inyo County for March, 2024

| Industry | Employment | Share | Empl Growth | % Growth - Annualized Rate | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Month | Qtr | 6mo | 1yr | 3yr | 5yr |
| Mining, Logging and Construction | 305 | 76.2 | 7.2 | 33.1 | 16.7 | 13.0 | 24.8 | 11.9 | 5.6 |
| Mining and Logging | 50 | 12.5 | 10.0 | 1,355.2 | 144.1 | 56.2 | 25.0 | 133.3 | 80.0 |
| Durable Goods | 60 | 15.0 | 10.0 | 791.6 | 107.4 | 44.0 | 20.0 | 16.7 | 20.0 |
| Information | 50 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.2 | 25.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
| State | 400 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 4.8 | 2.2 |

Source: EDD, National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

## *Some Employee Detail*

### Employed in Bishop

Figure 12: Employment by Occupation




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 13: Employment by Industry




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 14: Language Spoken at Home




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 15: Citizenship




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

**Employed Residents of Bishop**

Figure 16: Employment by Occupation




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 17: Employment by Industry




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 18: Language Spoken at Home




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 19: Citizenship




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

**Employed Residents vs Workers in Bishop**

Figure 20: Employment by Occupation




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 21: Employment by Industry




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 22: Language Spoken at Home




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 23: Citizenship




Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

# Income and Earnings

## *Per Capita Income Growth*

**Definition:**

Per capita income is the average income per person in Bishop. Personal income is the income received by, or on behalf of, all persons from all sources: from participation as laborers in production, from owning a home or unincorporated business, from the ownership of financial assets, and from government and business in the form of transfer receipts. Noncash government benefits are not included.

**Why is it important?**

Income is the money that is available to persons for consumption expenditures, taxes, interest payments, transfer payments to governments and the rest of the world, or for saving. As such, it is an important indicator of economic well-being in a community.

Figure 24: Real Per Capita Income Ranking Among California Cities




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

Figure 25: Regional Comparison of Growth over Time




## Real Per Capita Income Ranking Among California Cities - w/Comparable Populations

Figure 26: Income Levels




Figure 27: Growth over Time




## Real Per Capita Income Ranking Among Cities in Inyo County

Figure 28: Income Levels

N/A

Figure 29: Growth over Time

N/A

Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

Figure 30: Comparison with All Cities Nationwide




Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 5-yr American Community Survey
The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 19,695 geographies.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

## *Poverty and Inequality*

**Definition:**

The local poverty rate provides an indication of the well-being of those at the bottom of the income distribution. The federal poverty rate measures the proportion of households in the region that are classified as living in poverty. Also included are measures of the extent to which the City's children are impoverished. Measures of the income distribution provide further evidence on disparities in income in the region and how those disparities have changed over time.

**Why is it important?**

It is important to track measures of poverty and inequality to assess the extent of income disparities in the region, with an eye toward understanding how well the local economy is performing for all of its citizens.




Figure 31: Inequality



Figure 32: Shares Across the Income Distribution




Source: American Community Survey, 5-yr Summary Files
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Figure 33: Means Across the Income Distribution




Source: American Community Survey, 5-yr Summary Files
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

# Housing

## *Housing Costs and Affordability*

**Definition:**

Housing costs are measured in several different ways. First, we provide evidence on the evolution of median home prices, median rental price, and finally through evidence on the housing burden in the city and comparison regions. Housing burden is defined as a household needing to commit more than 30% of their household income toward housing costs. The median value is the amount in the middle. Fifty percent of units are above the median and 50 percent are below.

**Why is it important?**

Housing is one of three fundamental necessities, along with food and clothing. A measure of the cost of housing is an integral part of the measurement of the cost of living in a specific community. This is particularly true in cities and regions throughout the Bay Area, where housing costs are high relative to income.

**Cost of Housing in Bishop and Broader Regions**

Figure 34: Median Home Prices




Figure 35: Median Rents

N/A

Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## Housing Ownership in Bishop and Broader Regions

Figure 36: Home Ownership Rates




Figure 37: Home Ownership by Age




Figure 38: Income by Tenure




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

Figure 39: Income Distribution by Tenure




Figure 40: Income Distribution of Home Owners




Figure 41: Income Distribution of Renters



## Housing Burden in Bishop and Broader Regions

Figure 42: Home Owners w/ A Mortgage




Figure 43: Home Owners w/o A Mortgage




Figure 44: Renters




Figure 45: Homeowner Housing Burden by Age




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## *Housing Picture*

**Definition:**

Housing costs are measured in several different ways. First, we provide evidence on the evolution of median home prices, median rental price, and finally through evidence on the housing burden in the city and comparison regions. The median value is the amount in the middle. Fifty percent of units are above the median and 50 percent are below.

**Why is it important?**

In areas where the rate of population growth exceeds the rate of housing growth, this is likely to reflect a tightening housing market. A tightening housing market will also likely be reflected in lower vacancy rates and higher occupancy rates. It may also be reflected in higher numbers of people per household.

**Table 5. Housing Market Indicators**

| Indicator | 2023 | 2019 | 2010 | % Change from 2019 | % Change from 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Population | 3,872.0 | 3,815.0 | 3,879.0 | 1.5 | -0.2 |
| Total # of Homes | 1,958.0 | 1,933.0 | 1,926.0 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| # Occupied Units | 1,767.0 | 1,744.0 | 1,748.0 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Persons per Household | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.2 | -1.3 | -2.8 |
| Vacancy Rate (%) | 9.8 | 9.8 | 9.2 | -0.2 | 5.5 |

Source: CA DOF; Calculations by the National Economic Education Delegation

Figure 46: Housing Growth




Figure 47: Persons per Household




Figure 48: Vacancy Rates




Figure 49: Number of Occupanied Units




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## Trends in the Growth of Housing by Housing Type

Figure 50: Single Detached Homes




Figure 51: Single Attached Homes




Figure 52: Housing in Buildings with Two to Four Units




Figure 53: Housing in Buildings with Five or More Units




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. ● National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org ● 415-336-5705

## *Vintage of Residential Housing*

**Why is it important?**

This section provides evidence on the year in which residential housing in Bishop was built. We break it down into owned versus rented residences and provide a comparison across Inyo County and broader regions. A sense of the age of housing in a region provides an indication of the urgency with which a region might pursue additional housing. As the housing stock ages, an urgency with which renovations and rebuilds are permitted might result. All things equal, more recently constructed housing will be more likely to meet current codes and standards. Remodeling of existing units will be more desirable when existing units are, on average, older.

Figure 54: Distribution of Housing Construction



Figure 55: Housing Vintage across Regions




Figure 56: Housing Vintage by Tenure




Figure 57: Vintage of Owned Residences




Figure 58: Vintage of Rented Residences




Figure 59: Vintage of All Residences




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## *Occupation of Residential Housing*

### Why is it important?

The duration of residence in a city is important for developing future policies regarding growing the local population. If a region is highly mobile, evidenced by most residences having been recently occupied, a city might propose policies to reduce that mobility, or ask why the mobility happens. Policies could be put in place to either reduce or increase migration.

Figure 60: Year Current Occupant Moved In




Figure 61: Year Occupied by Current Residents across Regions




Figure 62: Year Occupied by Current Residents by Tenure



Figure 63: Year Occupied by Current Residents for Owned Housing




Figure 64: Year Occupied by Current Residents for Rented Housing




Figure 65: Year Occupied by Current Residents for All Housing



## *Residential Permitting*

**Definition:**

This indicator provides evidence on the number of residential buildings that are permitted for construction each year. Permit data for Bishop is compared with data from Inyo County as a whole and broader regions. The statistic provided scales the number of permits by population. This is done to facilitate comparisons across regions.

**Why is it important?**

Building permits are the best indicator available of new units coming on the market. In order for a region's population to grow and flourish, new residential properties must be added to the existing stock. Building, both in the City and in the County more generally, is an indication of the extent to which new residences accommodate new residents or are affecting prices through increased supply.

**Bishop - Ranking Among Comparables**

Figure 66: Number of Units Permitted - Nationwide Comparables (Rank)




Source: U.S. Census Bureau
The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 14338 geographies.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Figure 67: Number of Units Permitted - California Comparables (Rank)




Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 515 geographies.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Figure 68: Number of Units Permitted - Cities in Inyo County (Rank)




Source: U.S. Census Bureau,
The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 1 geographies.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

## Bishop - Permitting Activity

### Annual Units Permitted - Per Capita in Bishop

Figure 69: Units Permitted Each Year




Figure 70: Average Annual Growth in Units Permitted




### Annual Number of Buildings Permitted - Per Capita in Bishop

Figure 71: Units Permitted Each Year




Figure 72: Average Annual Growth in Buildings Permitted




### Annual Value of Property Permitted - Per Capita in Bishop

Figure 73: Value Permitted Each Year




Figure 74: Average Annual Growth in Value Permitted



# Commute Patterns

During the recovery from the Great Recession, the period from 2010 to 2019, the Bay Area economy, and Silicon Valley in particular, has been growing at a pace roughly double that of the state as a whole and triple that of the nation. This growth has precipitated a tight housing market and also brought about some significant changes in commute patterns, many of which have been reversed by the pandemic. Recent years have seen significant changes in both the mode of transportation and commute times.

## *Mode of Transportation*

Figure 75: Percent of Workers Commuting by Car Alone




Figure 76: Percent of Workers Commuting by Carpool




Figure 77: Percent of Workers using Public Transportation




Figure 78: Percent of Workers Who Work From Home



The first table on this page presents data for those who LIVE in Bishop. The second provides data on those who work, but do not necessarily live in Bishop. The final two columns provide for a comparison of commute mode choices of people locally with those in California more broadly.

**Table 6. SEX OF WORKERS BY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK**

| | Male | | Female | | All Workers | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mode of Transit | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Car, Truck, or Van: | 786 | 81.1 | 709 | 55.3 | 1,495 | 68.2 | 78.0 |
| Drove Alone | 640 | 66.0 | 614 | 47.9 | 1,254 | 57.2 | 68.4 |
| Carpooled: | 146 | 15.1 | 95 | 7.4 | 241 | 11.0 | 9.5 |
| In 2-person carpool | 122 | 12.6 | 95 | 7.4 | 217 | 9.9 | 6.9 |
| In 3-person carpool | 15 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 0.7 | 1.5 |
| In 4-or-more-person carpool | 9 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 0.4 | 1.1 |
| Public Transportation (excl Taxi): | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
| Bus or Trolley Bus | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
| Streetcar or Trolley Car | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Subway or Elevated | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Railroad | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Ferryboat | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Bicycle | 51 | 5.3 | 172 | 13.4 | 223 | 10.2 | 0.7 |
| Walked | 34 | 3.5 | 223 | 17.4 | 257 | 11.7 | 2.4 |
| Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other | 0 | 0.0 | 30 | 2.3 | 30 | 1.4 | 1.7 |
| Worked at Home | 40 | 4.1 | 147 | 11.5 | 187 | 8.5 | 13.6 |
| **Total:** | 911 | 94.0 | 1,281 | 100.0 | 2,192 | 100.0 | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

**Table 7. SEX OF WORKERS BY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK FOR WORKPLACE GEOGRAPHY**

| | Male | | Female | | All Workers | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mode of Transit | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Car, Truck, or Van: | 1,635 | 66.0 | 1,765 | 66.8 | 3,400 | 66.4 | 78.0 |
| Drove Alone | 1,360 | 54.9 | 1,459 | 55.2 | 2,819 | 55.0 | 68.5 |
| Carpooled: | 275 | 11.1 | 306 | 11.6 | 581 | 11.3 | 9.5 |
| In 2-person carpool | 108 | 4.4 | 208 | 7.9 | 316 | 6.2 | 6.9 |
| In 3-person carpool | 114 | 4.6 | 80 | 3.0 | 194 | 3.8 | 1.5 |
| In 4-or-more-person carpool | 53 | 2.1 | 18 | 0.7 | 71 | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| Public Transportation (excl Taxi): | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0.5 | 12 | 0.2 | 3.6 |
| Bus or Trolley Bus | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0.5 | 12 | 0.2 | 2.3 |
| Streetcar or Trolley Car | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Subway or Elevated | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Railroad | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Ferryboat | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Bicycle | 59 | 2.4 | 165 | 6.2 | 224 | 4.4 | 0.7 |
| Walked | 59 | 2.4 | 206 | 7.8 | 265 | 5.2 | 2.4 |
| Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other | 25 | 1.0 | 61 | 2.3 | 86 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Worked at Home | 40 | 1.6 | 147 | 5.6 | 187 | 3.7 | 13.6 |
| **Total:** | 1,818 | 73.4 | 2,356 | 89.1 | 4,174 | 81.5 | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File
The results in this table are for those who work in the region, regardless of the location of their residence.

## *Commute Times for Employed Residents*

**Table 8. SEX OF WORKERS BY TRAVEL TIME TO WORK**

| | Male | | Female | | All Workers | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mode of Transit | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Less than 5 minutes | 197 | 21.0 | 116 | 10.2 | 313 | 15.6 | 2.0 |
| 5 to 9 minutes | 335 | 35.8 | 370 | 32.6 | 705 | 35.2 | 7.5 |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 188 | 20.1 | 157 | 13.8 | 345 | 17.2 | 12.2 |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 3 | 0.3 | 200 | 17.6 | 203 | 10.1 | 15.0 |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 27 | 2.9 | 53 | 4.7 | 80 | 4.0 | 14.3 |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6.3 |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 15.0 |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 0 | 0.0 | 68 | 6.0 | 68 | 3.4 | 4.3 |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 106 | 11.3 | 170 | 15.0 | 276 | 13.8 | 8.6 |
| 60 to 89 minutes | 15 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 0.7 | 7.9 |
| 90 or more minutes | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| **Total:** | 871 | 93.0 | 1,134 | 100.0 | 2,005 | 100.0 | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

Figure 79: Percent of Employed Population With Commutes of More than 30 Minutes




Figure 80: Percent of Employed Population With Commutes of More than 90 Minutes




Figure 81: Rank: Share of MegaCommuters Across Similar Geographies




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## *Commute Times for Those Employed in the City*

**Table 9. SEX OF WORKERS BY TRAVEL TIME TO WORK FOR WORKPLACE GEOGRAPHY**

| | Male | | Female | | All Workers | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mode of Transit | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Less than 5 minutes | 235 | 9.6 | 180 | 7.0 | 415 | 8.2 | 2.0 |
| 5 to 9 minutes | 572 | 23.4 | 835 | 32.3 | 1,407 | 27.9 | 7.5 |
| 10 to 14 minutes | 353 | 14.4 | 513 | 19.8 | 866 | 17.2 | 12.2 |
| 15 to 19 minutes | 212 | 8.7 | 313 | 12.1 | 525 | 10.4 | 15.0 |
| 20 to 24 minutes | 165 | 6.7 | 232 | 9.0 | 397 | 7.9 | 14.3 |
| 25 to 29 minutes | 12 | 0.5 | 28 | 1.1 | 40 | 0.8 | 6.3 |
| 30 to 34 minutes | 35 | 1.4 | 40 | 1.5 | 75 | 1.5 | 15.0 |
| 35 to 39 minutes | 18 | 0.7 | 8 | 0.3 | 26 | 0.5 | 2.9 |
| 40 to 44 minutes | 3 | 0.1 | 9 | 0.3 | 12 | 0.2 | 4.3 |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 41 | 1.7 | 29 | 1.1 | 70 | 1.4 | 8.6 |
| 60 to 89 minutes | 117 | 4.8 | 15 | 0.6 | 132 | 2.6 | 7.9 |
| 90 or more minutes | 15 | 0.6 | 7 | 0.3 | 22 | 0.4 | 4.0 |
| **Total:** | 1,778 | 72.7 | 2,209 | 85.4 | 3,987 | 79.2 | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File
The results in this table are for those who work in the region, regardless of the location of their residence.

Figure 82: Percent of Local Employees With Commutes of More than 30 Minutes




Figure 83: Percent of Local Employees With Commutes of More than 90 Minutes




Figure 84: Rank: Share of MegaCommuters Across Similar Geographies



## *Place of Work*

This section provides evidence on where workers living in Bishop work. As evidenced in the first table, some of Bishop's employed workers work in the City, but many do not. The first table and graph pair provide evidence at the county level while the second provide evidence with regard to working outside of the Bishop city boundary.

**Table 10. SEX OF WORKERS BY PLACE OF WORK–STATE AND COUNTY LEVEL**

| | Male | | Female | | All Workers | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Place of Work | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Worked in state of residence: | 911 | 94.0 | 1,281 | 100.0 | 2,192 | 100.0 | 99.6 |
| Worked in county of residence | 781 | 80.6 | 1,195 | 93.3 | 1,976 | 90.1 | 84.1 |
| worked outside of county of residence | 130 | 13.4 | 86 | 6.7 | 216 | 9.9 | 15.4 |
| Worked outside state of residence | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| **Total:** | 911 | 94.0 | 1,281 | 100.0 | 2,192 | 100.0 | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

Figure 85: Percent of Workers Employed Outside of Their County of Residence



**Table 11. SEX OF WORKERS BY PLACE OF WORK–PLACE LEVEL**

| | Male | | Female | | All Workers | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Place of Work | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Living in a place: | 911 | 94.0 | 1,281 | 100.0 | 2,192 | 100.0 | 95.9 |
| Worked in place of residence | 632 | 65.2 | 913 | 71.3 | 1,545 | 70.5 | 39.5 |
| Worked outside place of residence | 279 | 28.8 | 368 | 28.7 | 647 | 29.5 | 56.4 |
| Not living in a place | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| **Total:** | 911 | 94.0 | 1,281 | 100.0 | 2,192 | 100.0 | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

Figure 86: Percent of Workers Employed Outside of Their Place of Residence



## *Commute Mode by Income*

**Table 12. MEDIAN EARNINGS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS BY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK**

| | City | California | | United States | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Median* | *Median* | *Ratio* | *Median* | *Ratio* |
| Car, truck, or van - drove alone | 73,634 | 48,566 | 119.9 | 46,171 | 119.3 |
| Car, truck, or van - carpooled | 20,532 | 36,463 | 44.5 | 34,487 | 44.5 |
| Public transportation (excluding taxicab) | | 40,179 | | 45,100 | |
| Walked | | 29,366 | | 27,142 | |
| Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other means | 34,018 | 40,433 | 66.5 | 36,140 | 70.4 |
| Worked from home | | 75,153 | | 67,180 | |
| **Total:** | 61,641 | 48,747 | 126.5 | 46,099 | 133.7 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

Notes: 1) Ratio = the ratio of the regional median to either the CA or US median, relative to the Total ratio.
Values above 100 imply a high local median. Values below 100 imply a low local median.
For example, a value of 200 means that the local mean is 2x higher than would be expected.
For "Total:", ratio is simply the ratio of the medians.
2) For regions with more than one geography, the medians are averages weighted by working population.

**Table 13. MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK BY WORKERS' EARNINGS**

| | < $25,000 | | $25,000-$74,999 | | $75,000+ | | All | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mode of Transit | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone | 94 | 9.0 | 579 | 63.3 | 533 | 75.1 | 1,254 | 57.2 | 68.4 |
| Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled | 223 | 21.4 | 3 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 241 | 11.0 | 9.5 |
| Public Transportation (excl Taxi) | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
| Walked | 142 | 13.6 | 51 | 5.6 | 61 | 8.6 | 257 | 11.7 | 2.4 |
| Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other | 68 | 6.5 | 47 | 5.1 | 52 | 7.3 | 253 | 11.5 | 2.4 |
| Worked at Home | 11 | 1.1 | 112 | 12.3 | 64 | 9.0 | 187 | 8.5 | 13.6 |
| **Total:** | 538 | 51.7 | 792 | 86.7 | 710 | | 2,192 | | 100.0 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

**Table 14. MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK BY WORKERS' EARNINGS FOR WORKPLACE GEOGRAPHY**

| | < $25,000 | | $25,000-$74,999 | | $75,000+ | | All | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mode of Transit | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone | 610 | 26.7 | 1,181 | 66.1 | 841 | 72.4 | 2,819 | 55.0 | 68.5 |
| Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled | 336 | 14.7 | 116 | 6.5 | 127 | 10.9 | 581 | 11.3 | 9.5 |
| Public Transportation (excl Taxi) | 12 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0.2 | 3.6 |
| Walked | 125 | 5.5 | 51 | 2.9 | 61 | 5.2 | 265 | 5.2 | 2.4 |
| Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other | 124 | 5.4 | 47 | 2.6 | 69 | 5.9 | 310 | 6.1 | 2.4 |
| Worked at Home | 11 | 0.5 | 112 | 6.3 | 64 | 5.5 | 187 | 3.7 | 13.6 |
| **Total:** | 1,218 | 53.4 | 1,507 | 84.3 | 1,162 | | 4,174 | 81.5 | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

The results in this table are for those who work in the region, regardless of the location of their residence.

## *Commute Mode by Poverty Status*

**Table 15. MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK BY POVERTY STATUS**

| | In Poverty | | 100-149% of Pov | | >150% of Pov | | All | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mode of Transit | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone | 87 | 54.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1,167 | 60.1 | 1,254 | 57.2 | 68.7 |
| Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled | 6 | 3.8 | 87 | 34.7 | 148 | 7.6 | 241 | 11.0 | 9.5 |
| Public Transportation (excl Taxi) | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
| Walked | 4 | 2.5 | 14 | 5.6 | 239 | 12.3 | 257 | 11.7 | 2.1 |
| Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other | 44 | 27.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 209 | 10.8 | 253 | 11.5 | 2.4 |
| Worked at Home | 4 | 2.5 | 4 | 1.6 | 179 | 9.2 | 187 | 8.5 | 13.6 |
| **Total:** | 145 | 91.2 | 105 | 41.8 | 1,942 | | 2,192 | | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

**Table 16. MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK BY POVERTY STATUS FOR WORKPLACE GEOGRAPHY**

| | In Poverty | | 100-149% of Pov | | >150% of Pov | | All | | All of CA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mode of Transit | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | # | (%) | (%) |
| Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone | 193 | 58.1 | 99 | 29.0 | 2,527 | 55.7 | 2,819 | 55.0 | 68.7 |
| Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled | 42 | 12.7 | 9 | 2.6 | 530 | 11.7 | 581 | 11.3 | 9.5 |
| Public Transportation (excl Taxi) | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 3.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0.2 | 3.6 |
| Walked | 4 | 1.2 | 14 | 4.1 | 247 | 5.4 | 265 | 5.2 | 2.1 |
| Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other | 69 | 20.8 | 9 | 2.6 | 232 | 5.1 | 310 | 6.1 | 2.4 |
| Worked at Home | 4 | 1.2 | 4 | 1.2 | 179 | 3.9 | 187 | 3.7 | 13.6 |
| **Total:** | 312 | 94.0 | 147 | 43.1 | 3,715 | 81.8 | 4,174 | 81.5 | |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File
The results in this table are for those who work in the region, regardless of the location of their residence.

# Migration

## *Overall Migration Flows*

**Definition:**

The United States is a country with an increasingly mobile population. People move, migrate, from one place to another with increasing frequency.

**Why is it important?**

Having a handle on whether or not Bishop is a net recipient (migration inflows) or donor (migration outflows) of population is very important for understanding trends in the City's development. This section outlines migration patterns by age, education, income, marital status, and housing tenure. Understanding recent trends is very important for making policy, investment, and other decisions about the future. Also, understanding the extent to which the population is stable, or experiences significant turnover each year is helpful for planning purposes.

Figure 87: Overall Movements of Residents




**Table 17: Migration by Income**

| | | Net Inflows | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Same State | | | |
| Category | Population | All Migration | W/in County | Between Counties | Across States | From Abroad |
| No income | 176 | −110 | −15 | −87 | −8 | 0 |
| With income | 3,212 | −38 | −239 | 88 | 113 | 0 |
| $1 to $9,999 or loss | 354 | 84 | −13 | 21 | 76 | 0 |
| $10,000 to $14,999 | 191 | −19 | −3 | −6 | −10 | 0 |
| $15,000 to $24,999 | 470 | 89 | −26 | 4 | 111 | 0 |
| $25,000 to $34,999 | 305 | 21 | −25 | 49 | −3 | 0 |
| $35,000 to $49,999 | 331 | −111 | −31 | −59 | −21 | 0 |
| $50,000 to $64,999 | 367 | −121 | −107 | 23 | −37 | 0 |
| $65,000 to $74,999 | 279 | 56 | −9 | 68 | −3 | 0 |
| $75,000 or more | 915 | −37 | −25 | −12 | 0 | 0 |
| **All:** | 3,388 | −148 | −254 | 1 | 105 | 0 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File
Note: The data in this and other tables in this section are limited in that there is no information on the City's population that has moved abroad.
The "From Abroad" column is gross movements into the City from abroad.

Figure 88: Overall Movements of Low Income Residents




Figure 89: Overall Movements of Middle Income Residents




Figure 90: Overall Movements of High Income Residents




Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705

## *Demographics of Migration Flows*

**Table 18: Migration by Marital Status**

| Category | Population | Net Inflows | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Same State | | | |
| | | All Migration | W/in County | Between Counties | Across States | From Abroad |
| Never married | 860 | −110 | −173 | 146 | −83 | 0 |
| Now married, except separated | 1,541 | −17 | −53 | −141 | 177 | 0 |
| Divorced | 498 | 5 | −23 | 17 | 11 | 0 |
| Separated | 159 | −35 | 0 | −35 | 0 | 0 |
| Widowed | 330 | 9 | −5 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total:** | 3,388 | −148 | −254 | 1 | 105 | 0 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

**Table 19: Migration by Tenure**

| Category | Population | Net Inflows | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Same State | | | |
| | | All Migration | W/in County | Between Counties | Across States | From Abroad |
| Householder lived in owner-occupied housing units | 2,400 | −3 | −65 | −3 | 65 | 0 |
| Householder lived in renter-occupied housing units | 1,286 | −86 | −182 | 56 | 40 | 0 |
| **Total:** | 3,686 | −89 | −247 | 53 | 105 | 0 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

Figure 91: Domestic Movements of Residents by Tenure



**Table 20: Migration by Age**

| | | Net Inflows | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Same State | | | |
| Category | Population | All Migration | W/in County | Between Counties | Across States | From Abroad |
| 1 to 4 years | 14 | −32 | −8 | −16 | −8 | 0 |
| 5 to 17 years | 429 | −14 | −14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 and 19 years | 34 | −35 | −10 | 0 | −25 | 0 |
| 20 to 24 years | 165 | −56 | −31 | 20 | −45 | 0 |
| 25 to 29 years | 232 | −17 | −10 | −111 | 104 | 0 |
| 30 to 34 years | 323 | 52 | −41 | 79 | 14 | 0 |
| 35 to 39 years | 218 | −148 | −103 | −13 | −32 | 0 |
| 40 to 44 years | 236 | −79 | −41 | −38 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 to 49 years | 279 | −7 | −7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 50 to 54 years | 235 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 |
| 55 to 59 years | 251 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| 60 to 64 years | 427 | −10 | 0 | −7 | −3 | 0 |
| 65 to 69 years | 231 | 37 | 0 | −9 | 46 | 0 |
| 70 to 74 years | 202 | 7 | −3 | 14 | −4 | 0 |
| 75 years and over | 526 | 53 | −8 | 11 | 50 | 0 |
| **Total Population:** | 3,802 | −194 | −276 | −15 | 97 | 0 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

**Table 21: Migration by Educational Attainment**

| | | Net Inflows | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Same State | | | |
| Category | Population | All Migration | W/in County | Between Counties | Across States | From Abroad |
| Less than high school graduate | 85 | −32 | −8 | −40 | 16 | 0 |
| High school graduate (includes equiv) | 723 | 20 | −15 | −18 | 53 | 0 |
| Some college or assoc. degree | 1,297 | 42 | −67 | −29 | 138 | 0 |
| Bachelor's degree | 474 | −136 | −123 | 19 | −32 | 0 |
| Graduate or professional degree | 581 | 49 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total:** | 3,160 | −57 | −213 | −19 | 175 | 0 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

**Table 22: Median Income of Migration Flows**

| Flow | In-Migration | Out-Migration |
|---|---|---|
| Same House 1 Year Ago | 58,930 | 58,930 |
| Moved Within Same County | 47,739 | 48,883 |
| Moved to Different County, Same State | 57,679 | 47,167 |
| **Total Population:** | 48,060 | 57,424 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

**Table 23: Median Age of Migration Flows**

| Flow | In-Migration | Out-Migration |
|---|---|---|
| Same House 1 Year Ago | 51.1 | 51.1 |
| Moved Within Same County | 34.8 | 35.2 |
| Moved to Different County, Same State | 31.8 | 29.0 |
| Moved Between States | 31.3 | 24.3 |
| **Total Population:** | 48.6 | 46.1 |

Source: 2022 5-year American Community Survey, Summary File

# References and Sources

The majority of the data presented in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS). For larger geographies, the 1-year Summary Files provide the data. For smaller communities, roughly those with less than 65,000 in population in 2021, the 5-year Summary Files provide the data.

The ACS data are supplemented by building permit data from the U.S. Census Bureau, population and housing data from the California Department of Finance, and home price and rental rates from Zillow.

U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey 1-year and 5-year Summary Files. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data/data-via-ftp.html. The 1-year data are released in September each year and the 5-year data are relased in January.

Zillow Research Data https://www.zillow.com/research/data/

U.S. Census Bureau. Building Permits Data, updated annually in February. https://www.census.gov/construction/bps/current.html

State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State — January 1. Sacramento, California, May. https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates/

State of California, Department of Finance, E-2. California County Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year, July 1, 2010-2021. Sacramento, California, December. https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/

State of California, Department of Finance, E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change — January 1. Sacramento, California, May. https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/

Jon Haveman, Ph.D. • National Economic Education Delegation
Jon@NEEDEcon.org • 415-336-5705