

Jurupa Valley, California

Indicators Report

by
The National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

April 20, 2024

Exploring the economics, demographics, and well-being of Jurupa Valley 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 Jurupa Valley (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 Jurupa Valley. These indicators are compared to Riverside 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 Jurupa Valley 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 Jurupa Valley 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 Jurupa Valley, 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 Jurupa Valley, but do not necessarily live in Jurupa Valley.
- **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

Executive Summary	1
Assessing the City with Indicators	1
Demographics	3
A Demographic Snapshot	3
Current Population	5
Employment Report	8
Citywide Employment and Unemployment	8
MSA Employment by Industry	9
Some Employee Detail	10
Income and Earnings	16
Per Capita Personal Income Growth	16
Poverty and Inequality	19
Housing	21
Housing Costs and Affordability	21
Housing Picture	25
Vintage of Residential Housing	27
Occupation of Residential Housing	29
Residential Permitting	31
Commute Patterns	34
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
Migration	42
Overall Migration Flows	42
Demographics of Migration Flows	44
References and Sources	46

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 Jurupa Valley's population are fundamental indicators of the city's growth potential.

A Demographic Snapshot

Statistic	2022	2019
POPULATION		
Population Estimate (#, 5yr)	105,672.0	105,653.0
Veterans (#, 5yr)	2,568.0	3,117.0
Foreign born persons (% , 5yr)	27.5	26.6
Population age 25+ (#, 5yr)	66,385.0	64,013.0
AGE AND SEX		
Persons under 5 years (% , 5yr)	6.4	7.3
Persons under 18 years (% , 5yr)	25.9	28.0
Persons 65 years and over (% , 5yr)	11.4	10.2
Female persons (% , 5yr)	49.6	50.1
INCOME AND POVERTY		
Median household income (\$, 5yr)	91,562.0	70,642.0
Per capita income in past 12 months (\$, 5yr)	28,723.0	22,347.0
Persons in poverty (% , 5yr)	10.3	13.9
Children age less than 18 in poverty (#, 5yr)	4,057.0	5,693.0
Children age less than 18 in poverty (% , 5yr)	15.0	19.4
RACE AND ETHNICITY		
White alone (% , 5yr)	36.6	52.6
African American alone (% , 5yr)	3.4	3.2
American Indian or Alaska Native alone (% , 5yr)	1.2	0.8
Asian alone (% , 5yr)	4.5	3.6
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone (% , 5yr)	0.2	0.1
Two or More Races (% , 5yr)	12.7	3.6
Hispanic or Latino (% , 5yr)	72.0	71.4
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (% , 5yr)	18.5	20.6
HOUSING		
Housing units (#, 5yr)	27,287.0	26,021.0
Owner-occupied housing units (% , 5yr)	69.9	67.0
Median value of owner-occupied housing units (\$, 5yr)	481,500.0	363,000.0
Median selected monthly owner costs-with a mortgage (\$, 5yr)	2,282.0	1,859.0
Median selected monthly owner costs-without a mortgage (\$, 5yr)	556.0	516.0
Median gross rent (\$, 5yr)	1,618.0	1,324.0
FAMILIES AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS		
Households (#, 5yr)	25,957.0	24,907.0
Persons per household (#, 5yr)	4.0	4.2
Living in same house 1 year ago, % of persons age 1+ (5yr)	92.6	89.0
EDUCATION		
High school graduate or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr)	71.7	70.8
Bachelor's degree or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr)	14.6	13.2
HEALTH		
With a disability, under age 65 years (#, 5yr)	5,703.0	7,146.0
Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years (% , 5yr)	12.9	12.7
LABOR FORCE		
In civilian labor force, persons age 16+ (% , 5yr)	63.7	63.4
In civilian labor force, women age 16+ (% , 5yr)	54.8	53.9
Employed, persons age 16+ (% , 5yr)	57.9	56.3
Self employed (% , 5yr)	9.4	8.6
TRANSPORTATION		
Mean travel time to work, workers age 16+ (Mins., 5yr)	29.9	31.6
Drive alone in private vehicle (% , 5yr)	76.4	76.9
Using public transportation (% , 5yr)	1.2	2.0
Worked from home (% , 5yr)	5.6	4.5

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
City				
Jurupa Valley	104,983	-0.16	-1.89	0.31
County and Broader Regions				
Riverside County	2,439,234	0.34	-0.06	1.11
Southern California	21,794,548	-0.41	-2.24	-2.84
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	Southern California	California
Riverside County	2,431.0	2,439.2	0.34	-0.41	-0.35
Riverside	314.8	313.7	-0.36		
Moreno Valley	208.3	208.3	-0.01		
Corona	157.1	157.0	-0.09		
Menifee	107.4	110.0	2.44		
Murrieta	110.6	110.0	-0.54		
Temecula	109.5	108.9	-0.52		
Jurupa Valley	105.2	105.0	-0.16		
Indio	89.8	90.8	1.17		
Hemet	89.2	89.9	0.84		
Perris	78.5	78.9	0.60		
Lake Elsinore	72.0	72.0	-0.02		
Eastvale	70.0	69.5	-0.66		
Beaumont	54.3	56.6	4.12		
San Jacinto	54.3	54.1	-0.37		
Cathedral City	51.6	51.4	-0.36		
Palm Desert	50.6	50.6	-0.02		
Palm Springs	44.2	44.1	-0.17		
Coachella	41.9	42.5	1.26		
La Quinta	37.6	38.0	1.11		
Wildomar	36.4	36.3	-0.28		
Desert Hot Springs	32.4	32.6	0.68		
Banning	30.9	31.2	1.28		
Norco	25.0	25.0	0.01		
Blythe	17.4	17.3	-0.87		
Rancho Mirage	16.9	17.0	0.94		
Calimesa	10.9	11.0	0.11		
Canyon Lake	11.0	10.9	-0.49		
Indian Wells	4.8	4.8	-0.23		

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. Jurupa Valley 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




Source: EDD, Seasonal Adjustment by NEED
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Figure 9: Employment and Unemployment - Last 12 Months




Source: EDD, Seasonal Adjustment by NEED
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Figure 10: Relative Employment Growth Across Regions - since 2010



Source: EDD and BLS, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages
Note: Data points are annual averages of quarterly/monthly data.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Figure 11: Relative Employment Growth Across Regions - since 2019



Source: EDD and BLS, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages
Note: Data points are annual averages of quarterly/monthly data.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

MSA 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 the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA. The following table provides the latest data for the MSA.

Table 4. Employment Growth by Industry in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA for March, 2024

Industry	Employment	Share	Empl Growth	% Growth - Annualized Rate					
				Month	Qtr	6mo	1yr	3yr	5yr
Total Nonfarm	1,694,223	100.0	5,971.1	4.3	0.5	0.8	1.6	3.3	2.1
Total Private	1,425,885	84.2	3,363.1	2.9	0.2	0.6	1.0	3.1	2.4
Goods Producing	216,611	12.8	948.2	5.4	-5.6	-0.1	1.2	1.6	0.9
Mining, Logging and Construction	120,753	7.1	1,778.6	19.5	-2.3	3.7	5.6	2.8	2.7
Mining and Logging	1,600	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	7.7	6.7
Construction	118,854	7.0	1,464.0	16.0	-3.4	3.5	5.7	2.9	2.6
Manufacturing	96,076	5.7	-620.1	-7.4	-9.0	-4.3	-3.8	0.2	-1.0
Durable Goods	58,679	3.5	-417.3	-8.2	-7.6	-4.2	-3.8	-0.8	-2.2
Non-Durable Goods	37,446	2.2	-154.4	-4.8	-9.8	-3.9	-3.9	1.9	1.4
Service Providing	1,477,534	87.2	5,264.7	4.4	1.4	1.0	1.6	3.6	2.3
Trade, Trans & Utilities	452,210	26.7	1,888.6	5.2	2.5	-1.1	-1.3	0.9	3.3
Wholesale Trade	67,659	4.0	-155.0	-2.7	-3.2	-2.3	-2.0	0.5	0.1
Retail Trade	180,685	10.7	416.7	2.8	-3.1	-2.4	-1.4	0.9	-0.1
Trans & Warehousing	197,024	11.6	662.2	4.1	3.8	-0.7	-1.0	1.1	9.6
Utilities	5,718	0.3	-49.7	-9.9	6.1	3.0	3.6	4.7	4.3
Information	13,125	0.8	-47.7	-4.3	-3.7	-2.7	-1.5	2.5	-1.3
Financial Activities	44,464	2.6	-86.6	-2.3	-2.2	-1.3	-1.4	-0.2	-0.1
Finance & Insurance	21,985	1.3	-20.5	-1.1	-2.2	-2.7	-1.8	-3.5	-2.2
Real Estate & Rental & Leasing	22,538	1.3	-36.2	-1.9	-0.4	0.6	-0.9	3.9	2.5
Professional & Business Svcs	166,274	9.8	1,764.0	13.7	0.5	3.2	-0.5	0.7	1.9
Prof, Sci, & Tech	46,211	2.7	201.6	5.4	1.8	0.5	-0.1	3.5	2.5
Admin & Support Svcs	106,331	6.3	1,990.8	25.5	-1.6	5.0	-1.0	-0.6	1.6
Employment Svcs	49,934	2.9	1,065.4	29.5	4.6	7.0	-3.0	-2.4	3.3
Educational & Health Svcs	301,992	17.8	2,216.0	9.2	7.6	6.3	8.0	6.5	4.4
Education Svcs	22,176	1.3	163.7	9.3	1.9	3.7	5.7	9.9	2.6
Health Care & Social Assistance	279,860	16.5	1,961.8	8.8	8.4	6.5	8.2	6.3	4.6
Leisure & Hospitality	182,103	10.7	-703.3	-4.5	-4.5	-4.9	-2.6	8.2	0.7
Arts, Entertainment & Recreation	20,665	1.2	64.7	3.8	-1.9	-10.2	-3.2	14.6	-0.0
Accommodation & Food Svcs	161,299	9.5	-746.8	-5.4	-5.1	-4.5	-2.4	7.5	0.8
Other Svcs	49,608	2.9	174.0	4.3	-3.6	0.2	1.4	6.3	1.5
Government	270,223	15.9	911.3	4.1	4.5	5.1	4.9	4.7	0.7
Federal	21,813	1.3	94.6	5.4	4.0	3.9	3.8	1.0	0.8
State	28,999	1.7	-1.0	-0.0	2.5	1.2	1.9	-2.1	-1.2
Local	219,293	12.9	791.9	4.4	4.8	5.6	5.4	6.2	1.0
County	31,724	1.9	-72.5	-2.7	3.4	1.8	0.3	-3.0	-1.6
City	17,509	1.0	52.9	3.7	6.7	8.4	8.1	8.4	2.9
Local Government Education	134,406	7.9	641.5	5.9	5.6	6.9	7.0	8.4	1.2

Source: EDD, National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

Some Employee Detail

Employed in Jurupa Valley

Figure 12: Employment by Occupation




Figure 13: Employment by Industry




Figure 14: Language Spoken at Home





Figure 15: Citizenship



Employed Residents of Jurupa Valley

Figure 16: Employment by Occupation




Figure 17: Employment by Industry




Figure 18: Language Spoken at Home





Figure 19: Citizenship



Employed Residents vs Workers in Jurupa Valley

Figure 20: Employment by Occupation




Figure 21: Employment by Industry





Figure 22: Language Spoken at Home

N/A

Figure 23: Citizenship



Income and Earnings

Per Capita Income Growth

Definition:

Per capita income is the average income per person in Jurupa Valley. 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 Riverside 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 Jurupa Valley and Broader Regions

Figure 34: Median Home Prices

N/A

Figure 35: Median Rents



Housing Ownership in Jurupa Valley 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 Jurupa Valley 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	104,983.0	106,115.0	96,753.0	-1.1	8.5
Total # of Homes	29,354.0	28,443.0	26,680.0	3.2	10.0
# Occupied Units	28,436.0	27,120.0	25,027.0	4.9	13.6
Persons per Household	3.7	3.9	3.8	-5.7	-4.5
Vacancy Rate (%)	3.1	4.7	6.2	-32.8	-49.5

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



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 Jurupa Valley was built. We break it down into owned versus rented residences and provide a comparison across Riverside 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 hous-

ing. 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 Jurupa Valley is compared with data from Riverside 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.

Jurupa Valley - Ranking Among Comparables

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






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 Riverside County (Rank)



Source: U.S. Census Bureau,
 The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 28 geographies.
 Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDecon.org)

Jurupa Valley - Permitting Activity

Annual Units Permitted - Per Capita in Jurupa Valley

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 Jurupa Valley

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 Jurupa Valley

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 Jurupa Valley. The second provides data on those who work, but do not necessarily live in Jurupa Valley. 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:	26,419	92.2	20,571	89.0	46,990	90.7	75.3
Drove Alone	23,611	82.4	18,212	78.8	41,823	80.8	65.5
Carpooled:	2,808	9.8	2,359	10.2	5,167	10.0	9.8
In 2-person carpool	2,073	7.2	2,080	9.0	4,153	8.0	7.0
In 3-person carpool	340	1.2	53	0.2	393	0.8	1.7
In 4-or-more-person carpool	395	1.4	226	1.0	621	1.2	1.2
Public Transportation (excl Taxi):	103	0.4	401	1.7	504	1.0	2.7
Bus or Trolley Bus	103	0.4	401	1.7	504	1.0	1.8
Streetcar or Trolley Car	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.5
Subway or Elevated	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.2
Railroad	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.1
Ferryboat	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.1
Bicycle	100	0.3	30	0.1	130	0.3	0.7
Walked	101	0.4	0	0.0	101	0.2	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	539	1.9	292	1.3	831	1.6	1.7
Worked at Home	1,406	4.9	1,825	7.9	3,231	6.2	17.2
Total:	28,668	100.0	23,119	100.0	51,787	100.0	

Source: 2022 1-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:	18,645	92.0	9,736	83.6	28,381	89.1	78.0
Drove Alone	16,108	79.4	8,329	71.6	24,437	76.8	68.5
Carpooled:	2,537	12.5	1,407	12.1	3,944	12.4	9.5
In 2-person carpool	1,888	9.3	906	7.8	2,794	8.8	6.9
In 3-person carpool	259	1.3	400	3.4	659	2.1	1.5
In 4-or-more-person carpool	390	1.9	101	0.9	491	1.5	1.1
Public Transportation (excl Taxi):	50	0.2	61	0.5	111	0.3	3.6
Bus or Trolley Bus	50	0.2	61	0.5	111	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	67	0.3	0	0.0	67	0.2	0.7
Walked	140	0.7	118	1.0	258	0.8	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	224	1.1	141	1.2	365	1.1	1.7
Worked at Home	1,150	5.7	1,506	12.9	2,656	8.3	13.6
Total:	20,276	100.0	11,562	99.3	31,838	100.0	

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	903	3.3	548	2.6	1,451	3.0	2.1
5 to 9 minutes	543	2.0	639	3.0	1,182	2.4	7.8
10 to 14 minutes	1,396	5.1	2,864	13.4	4,260	8.8	12.4
15 to 19 minutes	2,840	10.4	2,868	13.5	5,708	11.8	15.4
20 to 24 minutes	4,098	15.0	3,319	15.6	7,417	15.3	14.8
25 to 29 minutes	2,031	7.4	973	4.6	3,004	6.2	6.4
30 to 34 minutes	5,056	18.5	3,656	17.2	8,712	17.9	15.2
35 to 39 minutes	1,129	4.1	1,171	5.5	2,300	4.7	2.9
40 to 44 minutes	1,058	3.9	764	3.6	1,822	3.8	4.1
45 to 59 minutes	2,638	9.7	2,639	12.4	5,277	10.9	8.2
60 to 89 minutes	4,217	15.5	1,165	5.5	5,382	11.1	7.2
90 or more minutes	1,353	5.0	688	3.2	2,041	4.2	3.6
Total:	27,262	100.0	21,294	100.0	48,556	100.0	

Source: 2022 1-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



Source: American Community Survey; 2022 1-yr PUMS
 The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 139 geographies.
 Population: employed residents of the region. A MegaCommuter has a one-way commute in excess of 90 minutes.
 Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDecon.org)

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	418	1.8	425	3.6	843	2.4	2.1
5 to 9 minutes	632	2.7	355	3.0	987	2.9	7.8
10 to 14 minutes	1,004	4.3	1,443	12.3	2,447	7.1	12.4
15 to 19 minutes	3,159	13.5	1,757	15.0	4,916	14.3	15.3
20 to 24 minutes	2,579	11.0	1,422	12.1	4,001	11.6	14.8
25 to 29 minutes	745	3.2	265	2.3	1,010	2.9	6.4
30 to 34 minutes	4,182	17.8	2,253	19.2	6,435	18.7	15.2
35 to 39 minutes	704	3.0	121	1.0	825	2.4	2.9
40 to 44 minutes	760	3.2	1,044	8.9	1,804	5.2	4.1
45 to 59 minutes	1,712	7.3	223	1.9	1,935	5.6	8.2
60 to 89 minutes	1,311	5.6	705	6.0	2,016	5.8	7.2
90 or more minutes	555	2.4	522	4.5	1,077	3.1	3.6
Total:	17,761	75.8	10,535	89.9	28,296	82.1	

Source: 2022 1-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 Jurupa Valley work. As evidenced in the first table, some of Jurupa Valley’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 Jurupa Valley 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:	28,330	98.8	23,119	100.0	51,449	99.3	99.6
Worked in county of residence	11,007	38.4	12,564	54.3	23,571	45.5	85.3
worked outside of county of residence	17,323	60.4	10,555	45.7	27,878	53.8	14.3
Worked outside state of residence	338	1.2	0	0.0	338	0.7	0.4
Total:	28,668	100.0	23,119	100.0	51,787	100.0	

Source: 2022 1-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:	28,668	100.0	23,119	100.0	51,787	100.0	95.8
Worked in place of residence	4,115	14.4	4,698	20.3	8,813	17.0	42.3
Worked outside place of residence	24,553	85.6	18,421	79.7	42,974	83.0	53.4
Not living in a place	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.2
Total:	28,668	100.0	23,119	100.0	51,787	100.0	

Source: 2022 1-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			United States	
	Median	California Median	Ratio	Median	Ratio
Car, truck, or van - drove alone	40,027	48,335	109.1	45,677	107.4
Car, truck, or van - carpooled	29,047	35,926	106.5	34,518	103.2
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	11,494	34,625	43.7	41,443	34.0
Walked	21,778	30,552	93.9	27,247	98.0
Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other means	25,743	40,631	83.5	36,218	87.1
Worked from home	45,825	79,738	75.7	69,180	81.2
Total:	37,819	49,818	75.9	46,365	81.6

Source: 2022 1-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	9,696	53.5	13,402	80.0	7,347	79.0	35,984	77.6	68.4
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	2,183	12.1	2,236	13.3	906	9.7	6,421	13.8	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	198	1.1	78	0.5	83	0.9	417	0.9	3.6
Walked	55	0.3	118	0.7	11	0.1	231	0.5	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	317	1.7	160	1.0	63	0.7	697	1.5	2.4
Worked at Home	714	3.9	760	4.5	891	9.6	2,645	5.7	13.6
Total:	13,163	72.7	16,754		9,301		46,395		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	5,503	46.5	9,556	83.3	5,418	77.3	24,437	76.8	68.5
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	1,552	13.1	988	8.6	602	8.6	3,944	12.4	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	96	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	111	0.3	3.6
Walked	49	0.4	96	0.8	27	0.4	258	0.8	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	242	2.0	76	0.7	71	1.0	432	1.4	2.4
Worked at Home	714	6.0	760	6.6	891	12.7	2,645	8.3	13.6
Total:	8,156	68.9	11,476		7,009		31,827		

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	1,354	29.6	2,342	44.0	32,300	77.6	35,996	77.6	68.7
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	248	5.4	555	10.4	5,618	13.5	6,421	13.8	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	35	0.8	47	0.9	333	0.8	415	0.9	3.6
Walked	0	0.0	52	1.0	177	0.4	229	0.5	2.1
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	20	0.4	24	0.5	653	1.6	697	1.5	2.4
Worked at Home	75	1.6	58	1.1	2,523	6.1	2,656	5.7	13.6
Total:	1,732	37.8	3,078	57.9	41,604		46,414		

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	1,214	44.8	1,723	68.7	21,500	76.9	24,437	76.8	68.7
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	287	10.6	341	13.6	3,316	11.9	3,944	12.4	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	72	2.7	24	1.0	15	0.1	111	0.3	3.6
Walked	0	0.0	52	2.1	204	0.7	256	0.8	2.1
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	38	1.4	1	0.0	393	1.4	432	1.4	2.4
Worked at Home	75	2.8	58	2.3	2,523	9.0	2,656	8.3	13.6
Total:	1,686	62.2	2,199	87.7	27,951		31,836		

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 Jurupa Valley 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

Category	Population	Net Inflows				
		All Migration	Same State		Across States	From Abroad
			W/in County	Between Counties		
No income	16,957	144	130	-50	3	61
With income	66,444	734	279	743	-449	161
\$1 to \$9,999 or less	9,544	19	80	10	-106	35
\$10,000 to \$14,999	6,520	28	-4	59	-47	20
\$15,000 to \$24,999	10,062	218	-33	196	28	27
\$25,000 to \$34,999	8,997	256	150	105	1	0
\$35,000 to \$49,999	10,392	266	57	234	-36	11
\$50,000 to \$64,999	6,347	22	3	129	-170	60
\$65,000 to \$74,999	3,129	46	-2	78	-30	0
\$75,000 or more	11,453	-121	28	-68	-89	8
All:	83,401	878	409	693	-446	222

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			From Abroad
			W/in County	Between Counties	Across States	
Never married	34,310	631	197	333	-9	110
Now married, except separated	36,618	-122	118	71	-419	108
Divorced	6,719	290	64	235	-13	4
Separated	1,947	4	-7	11	0	0
Widowed	3,807	75	37	43	-5	0
Total:	83,401	878	409	693	-446	222

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

Table 19: Migration by Tenure

Category	Population	Net Inflows				
		All Migration	Same State			From Abroad
			W/in County	Between Counties	Across States	
Householder lived in owner-occupied housing units	84,344	-307	-18	393	-782	100
Householder lived in renter-occupied housing units	20,331	-493	-417	119	-265	70
Total:	104,675	-800	-435	512	-1,047	170

Source: 2022 1-year American Community Survey, Summary File

Figure 91: Domestic Movements of Residents by Tenure




Table 20: Migration by Age

Category	Population	Net Inflows					From Abroad
		All Migration	Same State			Across States	
			W/in County	Between Counties	Between Counties		
1 to 4 years	5,291	228	68	163	-12	9	
5 to 17 years	20,655	169	19	141	-27	36	
18 and 19 years	3,303	-4	49	-59	-33	39	
20 to 24 years	8,566	213	77	191	-55	0	
25 to 29 years	8,248	-12	-6	100	-112	6	
30 to 34 years	7,636	23	8	-29	33	11	
35 to 39 years	7,579	288	61	218	-12	21	
40 to 44 years	6,918	53	82	-36	-39	46	
45 to 49 years	6,091	-17	-70	27	0	26	
50 to 54 years	6,418	-14	27	13	-68	14	
55 to 59 years	5,809	46	27	67	-90	42	
60 to 64 years	5,677	78	-33	109	-3	5	
65 to 69 years	4,034	95	22	96	-23	0	
70 to 74 years	3,161	78	82	26	-30	0	
75 years and over	4,814	87	69	40	-22	0	
Total Population:	104,200	1,311	482	1,067	-493	255	

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

Table 21: Migration by Educational Attainment

Category	Population	Net Inflows					From Abroad
		All Migration	Same State			Across States	
			W/in County	Between Counties	Between Counties		
Less than high school graduate	18,801	547	165	298	2	82	
High school graduate (includes equiv)	20,800	246	40	243	-85	48	
Some college or assoc. degree	17,078	53	93	125	-187	22	
Bachelor's degree	6,651	-209	-25	-102	-90	8	
Graduate or professional degree	3,055	68	-4	67	-6	11	
Total:	66,385	705	269	631	-366	171	

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	31,880	31,880
Moved Within Same County	40,509	17,010
Moved to Different County, Same State	24,207	40,071
Moved Between States	4,709	13,438
Total Population:	31,809	31,660

Source: 2022 1-year American Community Survey, Summary File

Table 23: Median Age of Migration Flows

Flow	In-Migration	Out-Migration
Same House 1 Year Ago	35.4	35.4
Moved Within Same County	26.3	21.8
Moved to Different County, Same State	31.6	30.7
Moved Between States	20.9	41.7
Total Population:	35.3	35.1

Source: 2022 1-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/>