

# **Farmersville, California**

## *Indicators Report*

by  
The National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

April 20, 2024

Exploring the economics, demographics, and well-being of Farmersville 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](http://www.NEEDEcon.org)  
Contact: [Jon@NEEDEcon.org](mailto:Jon@NEEDEcon.org)

# Executive Summary

## *Assessing the City with Indicators*

### **About this Report**

This report provides background or summary information for the city of Farmersville (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 Farmersville. These indicators are compared to Tulare County (the County) as a whole, a broader region where one is well defined, California, and the United States.

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 snapshot of Farmersville 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 of employment and unemployment in Farmersville 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 Farmersville, 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 proportion 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 Farmersville, but do not necessarily live in Farmersville.
- **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.

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
Assessing the City with Indicators . . . . .	1
<b>Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
A Demographic Snapshot . . . . .	3
Current Population . . . . .	5
<b>Employment Report</b>	<b>8</b>
Citywide Employment and Unemployment . . . . .	8
County Employment by Industry . . . . .	9
Some Employee Detail . . . . .	10
<b>Income and Earnings</b>	<b>16</b>
Per Capita Personal Income Growth . . . . .	16
Poverty and Inequality . . . . .	19
<b>Housing</b>	<b>21</b>
Housing Costs and Affordability . . . . .	21
Housing Picture . . . . .	25
Vintage of Residential Housing . . . . .	27
Occupation of Residential Housing . . . . .	29
Residential Permitting . . . . .	31
<b>Commute Patterns</b>	<b>34</b>
Mode of Transportation . . . . .	34
Commute Times for Employed Residents . . . . .	36
Commute Times for Those Employed in the City . . . . .	37
Place of Work . . . . .	38
Commute Mode by Income . . . . .	40
Commute Mode by Poverty Status . . . . .	41
<b>Migration</b>	<b>42</b>
Overall Migration Flows . . . . .	42
Demographics of Migration Flows . . . . .	44
<b>References and Sources</b>	<b>46</b>

# 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 composition.

**Why is it important?**

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

***A Demographic Snapshot***



Statistic	2022	2019
<b>POPULATION</b>		
Population Estimate (#, 5yr)	10,393.0	10,716.0
Veterans (#, 5yr)	138.0	188.0
Foreign born persons (% , 5yr)	26.5	31.6
Population age 25+ (#, 5yr)	5,932.0	6,108.0
<b>AGE AND SEX</b>		
Persons under 5 years (% , 5yr)	5.2	9.8
Persons under 18 years (% , 5yr)	28.8	30.2
Persons 65 years and over (% , 5yr)	8.6	8.4
Female persons (% , 5yr)	49.6	51.9
<b>INCOME AND POVERTY</b>		
Median household income (\$, 5yr)	52,714.0	39,720.0
Per capita income in past 12 months (\$, 5yr)	16,635.0	13,983.0
Persons in poverty (% , 5yr)	24.6	28.9
Children age less than 18 in poverty (#, 5yr)	1,137.0	1,227.0
Children age less than 18 in poverty (% , 5yr)	38.4	39.1
<b>RACE AND ETHNICITY</b>		
White alone (% , 5yr)	36.1	68.0
African American alone (% , 5yr)	1.2	0.6
American Indian or Alaska Native alone (% , 5yr)	0.9	0.7
Asian alone (% , 5yr)	0.3	0.5
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone (% , 5yr)	0.1	0.0
Two or More Races (% , 5yr)	24.6	4.2
Hispanic or Latino (% , 5yr)	89.4	88.6
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (% , 5yr)	9.3	9.5
<b>HOUSING</b>		
Housing units (#, 5yr)	2,841.0	2,953.0
Owner-occupied housing units (% , 5yr)	68.0	64.4
Median value of owner-occupied housing units (\$, 5yr)	226,500.0	153,800.0
Median selected monthly owner costs-with a mortgage (\$, 5yr)	1,360.0	1,091.0
Median selected monthly owner costs-without a mortgage (\$, 5yr)	389.0	310.0
Median gross rent (\$, 5yr)	890.0	718.0
<b>FAMILIES AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS</b>		
Households (#, 5yr)	2,732.0	2,912.0
Persons per household (#, 5yr)	3.8	3.7
Living in same house 1 year ago, % of persons age 1+ (5yr)	94.1	91.3
<b>EDUCATION</b>		
High school graduate or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr)	54.0	59.3
Bachelor's degree or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr)	4.5	3.3
<b>HEALTH</b>		
With a disability, under age 65 years (#, 5yr)	749.0	966.0
Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years (% , 5yr)	6.7	10.1
<b>LABOR FORCE</b>		
In civilian labor force, persons age 16+ (% , 5yr)	60.4	63.7
In civilian labor force, women age 16+ (% , 5yr)	53.8	55.3
Employed, persons age 16+ (% , 5yr)	52.4	54.2
Self employed (% , 5yr)	6.5	4.5
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>		
Mean travel time to work, workers age 16+ (Mins., 5yr)	16.7	20.4
Drive alone in private vehicle (% , 5yr)	86.8	79.4
Using public transportation (% , 5yr)	0.6	1.3
Worked from home (% , 5yr)	2.4	2.4

Source: American Community Survey, Summary Files

Note: Data are from the 1-year files unless indicated by the notation 5yr.

## 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	3 Year	5 Year
<b>City</b>				
Farmersville	10,151	-0.68	-10.83	-10.49
<b>County and Broader Regions</b>				
Tulare County	475,064	0.12	-0.91	-0.06
South Central Valley	3,534,481	0.01	-0.90	0.05
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	South Central Valley	California
Tulare County	474.5	475.1	0.12	0.01	-0.35
Visalia	142.1	143.0	0.68		
Tulare	69.5	69.7	0.32		
Porterville	62.7	62.6	-0.11		
Dinuba	25.2	25.5	0.98		
Lindsay	12.6	12.5	-0.66		
Exeter	10.3	10.2	-0.65		
Farmersville	10.2	10.2	-0.68		
Woodlake	7.6	7.7	0.84		

Source: CA DOF; Calculations by National Economic Education Delegation

Figure 1: Population Growth (1)




Figure 2: Population Growth (2)




Figure 3: Population by Age - Detailed Age Categories




Figure 4: Population by Age - Broad Age Categories




Figure 5: Population by Educational Attainment




Figure 6: Population by Race/Ethnicity





Figure 7: Population by Race/Ethnicity Over Time



# 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 em-

ployment 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. Farmersville 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 - Last 12 Months



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



## 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 industry-level employment data for Tulare County. The following table provides the latest data for the County.

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

Industry	Employment	Share	Empl Growth	% Growth - Annualized Rate					
				Month	Qtr	6mo	1yr	3yr	5yr
<b>Total Nonfarm</b>	143,801	100.0	-8.2	-0.1	1.0	1.5	2.6	4.5	2.6
<b>Total Private</b>	109,129	75.9	-24.6	-0.3	0.8	2.0	2.4	4.7	3.1
<b>Goods Producing</b>	21,607	15.0	63.6	3.6	1.7	3.5	2.4	3.3	2.6
Mining, Logging and Construction	7,709	5.4	28.0	4.5	3.1	8.3	5.8	4.2	4.9
Manufacturing	13,882	9.7	34.5	3.0	0.9	0.3	0.8	3.0	1.5
Durable Goods	3,000	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-6.2	0.0	-1.2
Non-Durable Goods	10,857	7.5	25.9	2.9	1.6	0.5	2.9	3.9	2.4
<b>Service Providing</b>	122,555	85.2	53.9	0.5	2.2	2.5	2.6	4.7	2.6
Trade, Trans & Utilities	30,755	21.4	12.9	0.5	-2.7	-1.4	0.0	2.6	2.3
Wholesale Trade	4,400	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.8	0.5
Retail Trade	16,528	11.5	-37.8	-2.7	-5.0	-4.1	-1.7	0.2	0.5
Information	600	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-2.9
Financial Activities	3,522	2.4	-90.5	-26.2	-6.3	3.2	-2.8	-1.9	-2.5
Finance & Insurance	2,000	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-4.8	-5.6	-5.2
Professional & Business Svcs	11,073	7.7	-26.0	-2.8	-2.6	-2.3	-1.4	1.1	0.2
Educational & Health Svcs	23,339	16.2	82.3	4.3	7.4	8.9	9.9	10.3	7.9
Leisure & Hospitality	14,374	10.0	-29.1	-2.4	2.9	4.2	0.5	9.4	4.1
Arts, Entertainment & Recreation	1,100	0.8	0.0	0.0	46.4	0.0	10.0	27.8	4.4
Accommodation & Food Svcs	13,167	9.2	26.1	2.4	1.2	2.0	-0.1	8.4	4.1
Other Svcs	3,960	2.8	8.9	2.7	2.2	4.9	2.4	5.8	2.7
<b>Government</b>	34,868	24.2	48.0	1.7	3.8	2.1	3.3	3.7	1.3
Federal	900	0.6	0.0	0.0	-34.4	-33.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
State	1,600	1.1	0.0	0.0	29.5	-11.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Local	32,215	22.4	31.4	1.2	2.3	1.9	3.6	4.0	1.4

Source: EDD, National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

## Some Employee Detail

### Employed in Farmersville

Figure 12: Employment by Occupation




Figure 13: Employment by Industry






Figure 14: Language Spoken at Home



Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.  
 Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation ([www.NEEDecon.org](http://www.NEEDecon.org)).

Figure 15: Citizenship



Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.  
 Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation ([www.NEEDecon.org](http://www.NEEDecon.org)).



## Employed Residents of Farmersville

Figure 16: Employment by Occupation




Figure 17: Employment by Industry






Figure 18: Language Spoken at Home



Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.  
 Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation ([www.NEEDecon.org](http://www.NEEDecon.org)).

Figure 19: Citizenship



Source: American Community Survey, 2022 5-yr Summary Files.  
 Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation ([www.NEEDecon.org](http://www.NEEDecon.org)).

## Employed Residents vs Workers in Farmersville

Figure 20: Employment by Occupation




Figure 21: Employment by Industry




Figure 22: Language Spoken at Home





Figure 23: Citizenship



# Income and Earnings

## Per Capita Income Growth

### Definition:

Per capita income is the average income per person in Farmersville. 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





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 Tulare County

Figure 28: Income Levels




Figure 29: Growth over Time





Figure 30: Comparison with All Cities Nationwide



## 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





Figure 33: Means Across the Income Distribution



# 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 Farmersville and Broader Regions

Figure 34: Median Home Prices





Figure 35: Median Rents



## Housing Ownership in Farmersville and Broader Regions

Figure 36: Home Ownership Rates




Figure 37: Home Ownership by Age




Figure 38: Income by Tenure




Figure 39: Income Distribution by Tenure




Figure 40: Income Distribution of Home Owners





Figure 41: Income Distribution of Renters



## Housing Burden in Farmersville 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



# 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	2010
Total Population	10,151.0	11,396.0	10,588.0	-10.9	-4.1
Total # of Homes	2,783.0	2,826.0	2,726.0	-1.5	2.1
# Occupied Units	2,707.0	2,765.0	2,595.0	-2.1	4.3
Persons per Household	3.7	4.1	4.1	-9.0	-8.1
Vacancy Rate (%)	2.7	2.2	4.8	26.5	-43.2

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**



## 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



## Vintage of Residential Housing

### Why is it important?

This section provides evidence on the year in which residential housing in Farmersville was built. We break it down into owned versus rented residences and provide a comparison across Tulare 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



## 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 Farmersville is compared with data from Tulare 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.

### **Farmersville - Ranking Among Comparables**

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

**N/A**

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

N/A

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

N/A

**Farmersville - Permitting Activity**

**Annual Units Permitted - Per Capita in Farmersville**

Figure 69: Units Permitted Each Year

Figure 70: Average Annual Growth in Units Permitted

N/A

N/A

**Annual Number of Buildings Permitted - Per Capita in Farmersville**

Figure 71: Units Permitted Each Year

Figure 72: Average Annual Growth in Buildings Permitted

N/A

N/A

**Annual Value of Property Permitted - Per Capita in Farmersville**

Figure 73: Value Permitted Each Year

Figure 74: Average Annual Growth in Value Permitted

N/A

N/A

## 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 hous-

ing 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 Farmersville. The second provides data on those who work, but do not necessarily live in Farmersville. 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**

Mode of Transit	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Car, Truck, or Van:	2,352	95.0	1,633	88.8	3,985	93.6	78.0
Drove Alone	2,183	88.2	1,399	76.1	3,582	84.1	68.4
Carpooled:	169	6.8	234	12.7	403	9.5	9.5
In 2-person carpool	52	2.1	205	11.1	257	6.0	6.9
In 3-person carpool	110	4.4	18	1.0	128	3.0	1.5
In 4-or-more-person carpool	7	0.3	11	0.6	18	0.4	1.1
Public Transportation (excl Taxi):	13	0.5	0	0.0	13	0.3	3.6
Bus or Trolley Bus	13	0.5	0	0.0	13	0.3	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	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.7
Walked	15	0.6	28	1.5	43	1.0	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.7
Worked at Home	8	0.3	89	4.8	97	2.3	13.6
<b>Total:</b>	<b>2,388</b>	<b>96.5</b>	<b>1,750</b>	<b>95.2</b>	<b>4,138</b>	<b>97.2</b>	

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

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

Mode of Transit	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Car, Truck, or Van:	630	74.6	520	53.8	1,150	65.8	78.0
Drove Alone	553	65.5	494	51.1	1,047	59.9	68.5
Carpooled:	77	9.1	26	2.7	103	5.9	9.5
In 2-person carpool	61	7.2	11	1.1	72	4.1	6.9
In 3-person carpool	16	1.9	15	1.6	31	1.8	1.5
In 4-or-more-person carpool	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.1
Public Transportation (excl Taxi):	10	1.2	0	0.0	10	0.6	3.6
Bus or Trolley Bus	10	1.2	0	0.0	10	0.6	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	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.7
Walked	0	0.0	28	2.9	28	1.6	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.7
Worked at Home	8	0.9	89	9.2	97	5.5	13.6
<b>Total:</b>	<b>648</b>	<b>76.8</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>65.9</b>	<b>1,285</b>	<b>73.5</b>	

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**


Mode of Transit	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Less than 5 minutes	234	9.5	82	4.6	316	7.6	2.0
5 to 9 minutes	292	11.9	299	16.9	591	14.2	7.5
10 to 14 minutes	368	14.9	177	10.0	545	13.1	12.2
15 to 19 minutes	439	17.8	412	23.3	851	20.5	15.0
20 to 24 minutes	540	21.9	329	18.6	869	20.9	14.3
25 to 29 minutes	127	5.2	114	6.5	241	5.8	6.3
30 to 34 minutes	214	8.7	177	10.0	391	9.4	15.0
35 to 39 minutes	42	1.7	0	0.0	42	1.0	2.9
40 to 44 minutes	75	3.0	49	2.8	124	3.0	4.3
45 to 59 minutes	36	1.5	0	0.0	36	0.9	8.6
60 to 89 minutes	0	0.0	22	1.2	22	0.5	7.9
90 or more minutes	13	0.5	0	0.0	13	0.3	4.0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>2,380</b>	<b>96.7</b>	<b>1,661</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>4,041</b>	<b>97.3</b>	

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**



## Commute Times for Those Employed in the City

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

Mode of Transit	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Less than 5 minutes	44	5.3	87	10.3	131	7.9	2.0
5 to 9 minutes	70	8.4	195	23.0	265	16.0	7.5
10 to 14 minutes	169	20.3	106	12.5	275	16.6	12.2
15 to 19 minutes	111	13.3	108	12.8	219	13.2	15.0
20 to 24 minutes	19	2.3	28	3.3	47	2.8	14.3
25 to 29 minutes	42	5.0	0	0.0	42	2.5	6.3
30 to 34 minutes	127	15.3	13	1.5	140	8.5	15.0
35 to 39 minutes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.9
40 to 44 minutes	23	2.8	0	0.0	23	1.4	4.3
45 to 59 minutes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8.6
60 to 89 minutes	35	4.2	11	1.3	46	2.8	7.9
90 or more minutes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>76.9</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>64.7</b>	<b>1,188</b>	<b>71.9</b>	

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 Farmersville work. As evidenced in the first table, some of Farmersville’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 Farmersville city boundary.

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

Place of Work	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Worked in state of residence:	2,388	96.5	1,750	95.2	4,138	97.2	99.6
Worked in county of residence	2,223	89.8	1,655	90.0	3,878	91.1	84.1
worked outside of county of residence	165	6.7	95	5.2	260	6.1	15.4
Worked outside state of residence	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.4
<b>Total:</b>	2,388	96.5	1,750	95.2	4,138	97.2	

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**

Place of Work	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Living in a place:	2,388	96.5	1,750	95.2	4,138	97.2	95.9
Worked in place of residence	96	3.9	367	20.0	463	10.9	39.5
Worked outside place of residence	2,292	92.6	1,383	75.2	3,675	86.3	56.4
Not living in a place	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.1
<b>Total:</b>	2,388	96.5	1,750	95.2	4,138	97.2	

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	Ratio	United States	
	Median	Median		Median	Ratio
Car, truck, or van - drove alone	23,568	48,566	99.9	46,171	99.3
Car, truck, or van - carpooled	23,219	36,463	131.1	34,487	131.0
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)		40,179		45,100	
Walked	27,917	29,366	195.7	27,142	200.2
Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other means		40,433		36,140	
Worked from home		75,153		67,180	
<b>Total:</b>	23,686	48,747	48.6	46,099	51.4

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**

Mode of Transit	< \$25,000		\$25,000-\$74,999		\$75,000+		All		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	1,913	75.3	954	72.2	219		3,582	84.1	68.4
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	230	9.1	89	6.7	0	0.0	403	9.5	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	0	0.0	13	1.0	0	0.0	13	0.3	3.6
Walked	19	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	43	1.0	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.4
Worked at Home	50	2.0	39	3.0	0	0.0	97	2.3	13.6
<b>Total:</b>	2,212	87.1	1,095	82.8	219		4,138	97.2	100.0

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

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

Mode of Transit	< \$25,000		\$25,000-\$74,999		\$75,000+		All		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	320	32.9	430	76.6	137	59.8	1,047	59.9	68.5
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	44	4.5	7	1.2	20	8.7	103	5.9	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	4.4	10	0.6	3.6
Walked	19	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	28	1.6	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.4
Worked at Home	50	5.1	39	7.0	0	0.0	97	5.5	13.6
<b>Total:</b>	433	44.5	476	84.8	167	72.9	1,285	73.5	

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**

Mode of Transit	In Poverty		100-149% of Pov		>150% of Pov		All		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	346	46.6	385	52.7	2,851	87.2	3,582	84.1	68.7
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	59	7.9	125	17.1	219	6.7	403	9.5	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	0.4	13	0.3	3.6
Walked	0	0.0	9	1.2	34	1.0	43	1.0	2.1
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.4
Worked at Home	49	6.6	0	0.0	48	1.5	97	2.3	13.6
<b>Total:</b>	454	61.1	519	71.0	3,165	96.8	4,138	97.2	

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

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

Mode of Transit	In Poverty		100-149% of Pov		>150% of Pov		All		All of CA (%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	14	5.4	85	34.4	948	64.2	1,047	59.9	68.7
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	15	5.8	0	0.0	88	6.0	103	5.9	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	0.7	10	0.6	3.6
Walked	0	0.0	9	3.6	19	1.3	28	1.6	2.1
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.4
Worked at Home	49	18.8	0	0.0	48	3.3	97	5.5	13.6
<b>Total:</b>	78	30.0	94	38.1	1,113	75.4	1,285	73.5	

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 Farmersville is a net recipient (migration inflows) or donor (migration outflows) of population is very im-

portant 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

Category	Population	Net Inflows				
		All Migration	Same State		Across States	From Abroad
			W/in County	Between Counties		
No income	1,669	-343	-32	-281	-30	0
With income	6,331	-79	-40	-10	-74	45
\$1 to \$9,999 or less	1,355	-15	-43	0	0	28
\$10,000 to \$14,999	948	46	35	11	0	0
\$15,000 to \$24,999	1,588	-48	-36	-21	0	9
\$25,000 to \$34,999	845	-17	-6	0	-11	0
\$35,000 to \$49,999	795	-34	3	0	-45	8
\$50,000 to \$64,999	415	15	15	0	0	0
\$65,000 to \$74,999	134	-8	-8	0	0	0
\$75,000 or more	251	-18	0	0	-18	0
<b>All:</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>-422</b>	<b>-72</b>	<b>-291</b>	<b>-104</b>	<b>45</b>

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





## Demographics of Migration Flows

**Table 18: Migration by Marital Status**

Category	Population	Net Inflows				
		All Migration	Same State		Across States	From Abroad
			W/in County	Between Counties		
Never married	3,414	-431	-215	-147	-69	0
Now married, except separated	3,271	-32	108	-167	-18	45
Divorced	669	18	35	0	-17	0
Separated	129	0	0	0	0	0
Widowed	517	23	0	23	0	0
<b>Total:</b>	8,000	-422	-72	-291	-104	45


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

**Table 19: Migration by Tenure**

Category	Population	Net Inflows				
		All Migration	Same State		Across States	From Abroad
			W/in County	Between Counties		
Householder lived in owner-occupied housing units	7,124	81	96	23	-83	45
Householder lived in renter-occupied housing units	3,123	-535	-61	-449	-25	0
<b>Total:</b>	10,247	-454	35	-426	-108	45

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

**Figure 91: Domestic Movements of Residents by Tenure**



**Table 20: Migration by Age**

Category	Population	Net Inflows				
		All Migration	Same State		Across States	From Abroad
			W/in County	Between Counties		
1 to 4 years	394	-25	-25	0	0	0
5 to 17 years	2,454	-194	84	-274	-4	0
18 and 19 years	484	-37	-3	-13	-21	0
20 to 24 years	983	-152	-73	-31	-48	0
25 to 29 years	880	-74	-62	-12	0	0
30 to 34 years	632	19	19	0	0	0
35 to 39 years	429	-65	20	-85	0	0
40 to 44 years	737	3	6	0	-3	0
45 to 49 years	481	-93	-11	-82	0	0
50 to 54 years	695	0	0	0	0	0
55 to 59 years	832	24	24	0	0	0
60 to 64 years	352	-8	0	0	-8	0
65 to 69 years	250	10	0	0	-7	17
70 to 74 years	182	-3	-4	12	-11	0
75 years and over	462	33	0	11	-6	28
<b>Total Population:</b>	10,247	-562	-25	-474	-108	45

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

**Table 21: Migration by Educational Attainment**

Category	Population	Net Inflows				
		All Migration	Same State		Across States	From Abroad
			W/in County	Between Counties		
Less than high school graduate	2,726	-170	-53	-155	-7	45
High school graduate (includes equiv)	1,643	83	72	11	0	0
Some college or assoc. degree	1,297	-68	-31	-12	-25	0
Bachelor's degree	169	-7	-4	0	-3	0
Graduate or professional degree	97	8	8	0	0	0
<b>Total:</b>	5,932	-154	-8	-156	-35	45

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	20,533	20,533
Moved Within Same County	30,897	25,403
<b>Total Population:</b>	20,625	20,830

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	29.9	29.9
Moved Within Same County	21.8	23.5
Moved from Abroad	90.2	
<b>Total Population:</b>	29.7	28.9

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 released 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/>