San Francisco, California

Indicators Report

by
The National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

April 20, 2024

Exploring the economics, demographics, and well-being of San Francisco 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 San Francisco (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 San Francisco. These indicators are compared to San Francisco 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 San Francisco 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 San Francisco 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 San Francisco, 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 San Francisco, but do not necessarily live in San Francisco.
- **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 Assessing the City with Indicators	1 1
Demographics A Demographic Snapshot Current Population	3 3 5
Employment Report Citywide Employment and Unemployment	8 9 10
Per Capita Personal Income Growth	16 16 19
Housing Costs and Affordability	27
Mode of Transportation	34 34 36 37 38 40
Overall Migration Flows	12 12 14

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 San Francisco's population are fundamental indicators of the city's growth potential.

A Demographic Snapshot

Statistic	2022	2019
POPULATION		
Population Estimate (#, 5yr)	851,036.0	874,961.0
Veterans (#, 5yr)	20,019.0	23,619.0
Foreign born persons (%, 5yr)	33.9	34.3
Population age 25+ (#, 5yr)	680,343.0	695,330.0
AGE AND SEX		
Persons under 5 years (%, 5yr)	4.3	4.5
Persons under 18 years (%, 5yr)	13.6	13.4
Persons 65 years and over (%, 5yr)	16.7	15.4
Female persons (%, 5yr)	48.5	49.0
INCOME AND POVERTY		
Median household income (\$, 5yr)	136,689.0	112,449.0
Per capita income in past 12 months (\$, 5yr)	86,186.0	68,883.0
Persons in poverty (%, 5yr)	10.5	10.3
Children age less than 18 in poverty (#, 5yr)	9,988.0	11,501.0
Children age less than 18 in poverty (%, 5yr)	8.9	10.0
RACE AND ETHNICITY	44.0	46.4
White alone (%, 5yr)	41.9	46.4
African American alone (%, 5yr)	5.2	5.2
American Indian or Alaska Native alone (%, 5yr) Asian alone (%, 5yr)	0.6 34.8	0.4 34.4
· · · · · ·	0.4	0.4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone (%, 5yr) Two or More Races (%, 5yr)	9.5	5.6
Hispanic or Latino (%, 5yr)	9.5 15.5	15.2
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (%, 5yr)	38.3	40.5
HOUSING	30.3	40.5
Housing units (#, 5yr)	408,198.0	397,812.0
Owner-occupied housing units (%, 5yr)	38.6	37.6
Median value of owner-occupied housing units (\$, 5yr)	1,348,700.0	1,097,800.0
Median selected monthly owner costs-with a mortgage (\$, 5yr)	4,001.0	3,647.0
Median selected monthly owner costs-without a mortgage (\$, 5yr)	887.0	704.0
Median gross rent (\$, 5yr)	2,316.0	1,895.0
FAMILIES AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS		
Households (#, 5yr)	360,842.0	362,354.0
Persons per household (#, 5yr)	2.3	2.4
Living in same house 1 year ago, % of persons age 1+ (5yr)	83.9	84.7
EDUCATION		
High school graduate or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr)	88.8	88.5
Bachelor's degree or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr)	59.8	58.1
HEALTH		
With a disability, under age 65 years (#, 5yr)	43,466.0	42,005.0
Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years (%, 5yr)	3.4	3.5
LABOR FORCE		
In civilian labor force, persons age 16+ (%, 5yr)	70.4	71.1
In civilian labor force, women age 16+ (%, 5yr)	66.5	67.1
Employed, persons age 16+ (%, 5yr)	64.7	66.2
Self employed (%, 5yr)	10.0	10.5
TRANSPORTATION Mean travel time to work workers ago 16 (Mine Fur)	04.0	04.0
Mean travel time to work, workers age 16+ (Mins., 5yr)	24.6	31.8
Drive alone in private vehicle (%, 5yr)	28.9	32.3
Using public transportation (%, 5yr)	36.3 23.6	52.7 6.6
Worked from home (%, 5yr)	∠3.6	0.0

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)

	2023		% Change					
Region	Population	1 Year	1 Year 3 Year					
	City							
San Francisco	831,703	-0.64	-6.53	-5.59				
C	ounty and Bro	ader Regi	ons					
San Francisco County	831,703	-0.64	-6.53	-5.59				
Bay Area	7,548,792	-0.45	-2.58	-2.62				
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)

				% Change	е
City	2022	2023	Local	Bay Area	California
San Francisco County San Francisco	837.0 837.0	831.7 831.7	-0.64 -0.64	-0.45	-0.35

Source: CA DOF; Calculations by National Economic Education Delegation



The source of the parameter of Finance Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

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





San Francisco Race/Ethnicity, 2022 15.9% 7.5% 35.6 Black, Nonhispanic White, Nonhispanic Asian, Nonhispanic Other, Nonhispanic Hispanic Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1-yr American Community Survey Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

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. San Francisco Summary for March, 2024

	Change From:							
Category	Current Value	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 Unemploy- Figure 9: Employment and Unemployment - Last








Figure 10: Relative Employment Growth Across Figure 11: Relative Employment Growth Across Regions - since 2010 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 San Francisco County. The following table provides the latest data for the County.

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

		Empl % Growth - Annualized Rate							
Industry	Employment	Share	Growth	Month	Qtr	6mo	1yr	3yr	5yr
Total Nonfarm	755,086	100.0	-277.9	-0.4	-0.1	0.8	-1.1	3.9	-0.1
Goods Producing	36,512	4.8	71.9	2.4	-2.7	-1.9	-1.9	3.2	-0.5
Mining, Logging and Construction	23,555	3.1	259.3	14.2	-0.3	-1.6	-0.4	2.6	-0.1
Manufacturing	13,017	1.7	-77.3	-6.9	-4.4	-2.2	-3.7	5.4	-0.8
Durable Goods	8,848	1.2	-28.1	-3.7	-2.0	-0.0	-1.2	7.9	2.5
Non-Durable Goods	4,330	0.6	-23.2	-6.2	-5.0	-4.3	-6.2	2.5	-4.7
Service Providing	717,602	95.0	-668.5	-1.1	-0.6	0.9	-1.1	3.9	-0.1
Trade, Trans & Utilities	72,401	9.6	-41.9	-0.7	3.4	1.6	-0.1	0.7	-2.7
Wholesale Trade	11,233	1.5	0.6	0.1	-5.2	-4.7	-3.0	1.6	-4.6
Retail Trade	36,956	4.9	-14.4	-0.5	2.9	2.3	-0.4	0.4	-3.7
Information	55,036	7.3	-767.2	-15.3	-8.2	-7.3	-10.6	-0.5	1.9
Financial Activities	61,466	8.1	-212.5	-4.1	-4.5	-2.3	-4.4	1.2	0.0
Finance & Insurance	46,198	6.1	-164.6	-4.2	-3.2	-1.5	-4.1	0.6	0.4
Real Estate & Rental & Leasing	15,099	2.0	-124.4	-9.4	-13.9	-5.3	-5.6	2.4	-1.4
Professional & Business Srvcs	211,697	28.0	-461.4	-2.6	-2.1	-1.5	-3.6	2.4	1.0
Prof, Sci, & Tech	156, 100	20.7	-867.9	-6.4	-4.1	-2.6	-4.2	3.2	2.0
Educational & Health Srvcs	103,630	13.7	432.2	5.1	-3.2	5.1	4.8	4.4	2.3
Education Srvcs	17,455	2.3	-21.0	-1.4	1.4	2.3	1.7	0.5	-3.7
Health Care & Social Assistance	86,360	11.4	352.2	5.0	-4.7	5.5	5.6	5.4	4.2
Leisure & Hospitality	85,444	11.3	49.3	0.7	3.4	4.8	3.8	26.9	-3.4
Arts, Entertainment & Recreation	16,240	2.2	41.3	3.1	15.5	14.1	11.5	29.7	1.3
Accommodation & Food Srvcs	69,698	9.2	90.9	1.6	2.7	3.5	2.4	26.3	-4.2
Other Srvcs	27,178	3.6	133.4	6.1	4.2	5.6	1.2	9.7	-0.6
Government	103,222	13.7	567.9	6.8	7.1	6.1	2.7	1.7	0.9
Federal	12,128	1.6	-86.0	-8.1	-5.5	-2.8	0.0	-2.0	-1.5
State	40,496	5.4	26.3	0.8	1.7	5.8	0.5	1.4	1.6
Local	49,438	6.5	217.0	5.4	4.3	4.7	4.6	2.2	0.5

Source: EDD, National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

Some Employee Detail

Employed in San Francisco







Figure 12: Employment by Occupation






58.9 Speak only English Speak Spanish (SS) 8.0 SS - English very well SS - English less than very well 27.9 Speak other languages (SOL) 27.9 18.3 SOL - English very well 18.3 SOL - English less than very well 20 40 60 Percent (%) of Workers San Francisco San Francisco County Source: American Community Survey, 2022 1-yr Summary Files. Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 14: Language Spoken at Home





Employed Residents of San Francisco




Figure 16: Employment by Occupation








Figure 18: Language Spoken at Home 59.6 Speak only English Speak Spanish (SS) 6.8 SS - English very well SS - English less than very well 30.5 Speak other languages (SOL) 30.5 SOL - English very well 19.4 SOL - English less than very well 20 40 60 Percent (%) of Workers San Francisco San Francisco County Source: American Community Survey, 2022 1-yr Summary Files. Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).





Employed Residents vs Workers in San Francisco





Figure 20: Employment by Occupation






Percent of Workers 59.6 Speak only English Speak Spanish (SS) 13.2 6.8 SS - English very well SS - English less than very well 30.5 Speak other languages (SOL) 19.4 SOL - English very well 18.3 11.1 SOL - English less than very well 20 40 60 **Employed Residents** Locally Employed Source: American Community Survey, 2022 1-yr Summary Files. Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org).

Figure 22: Language Spoken at Home





Income and Earnings

Per Capita Income Growth

Definition:

Per capita income is the average income per person in San Francisco. 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 San Francisco County

Figure 28: Income Levels Figure 29: Growth over Time





Figure 30: Comparison with All Cities Nationwide Palo Alto, CA Mountain View, CA Newport Beach, CA Newton, MA Sammamish, WA Pleasanton, CA 103.433 102.015 96.596 91.760 Pleasanton, CA (6)
Redmond, WA (7)
Sunnyvale, CA (8)
Bellevue, WA (9)
SAN FRANCISCO, CA (10)
Santa Monica, CA (11)
San Ramon, CA (12)
Kirkland, WA (13)
Seattle, WA (14)
Scottsdale, AZ (15)
Dublin, CA (16)
Santa Clara, CA (17)
San Mateo, CA (18)
Redwood City, CA (19)
Sandy Springs, GA (20)
Walnut Creek, CA (21) 91.595 90.876 90.396 90.295 89.736 86.377 84.461 84.412 82.716 81.572 81.375 80.283 80.275 79.509 79.089 78.365 0 5 1 0 1 5 2 0 5 3 0 5 4 0 4 5 0 5 5 6 5 7 0 7 5 0 5 5 0 0 5 1 0 1 5 2 0 5 5 0 0 5 1 0 1 5 2 0 5 0 0 Per Capita Income in 2022, Thousands of Dollars Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1-yr American Community Survey The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 598 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 Inequality: Gini Coefficient 52 50 48 46 2010 2015 2020 2025 2005 Year: Through 2022 San Francisco (52%) San Francisco County (52%) California (49.5%) United States (48.6%) Source: American Community Survey, 1-yr Summary Files Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

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 San Francisco and Broader Regions




Figure 35: Median Rents 3.5 Thousands of Current \$ 3.0 2.5 2.0 1.5 1.0 Jan-26 Jan-14 Jan-16 Jan-18 Jan-20 Jan-22 Jan-24 Monthly, through Mar-24 San Francisco (3.3) San Francisco County (3.3) - United States (2.0) Source: Zillow Research. Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Housing Ownership in San Francisco 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 San Francisco 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

				% Cha	nge from
Indicator	2023	2019	2010	2019	2010
Total Population	831,703.0	891,021.0	805,235.0	-6.7	3.3
Total # of Homes	418,139.0	399,372.0	376,162.0	4.7	11.2
# Occupied Units	377,680.0	368,977.0	345,168.0	2.4	9.4
Persons per Household	2.1	2.3	2.3	-9.8	-6.3
Vacancy Rate (%)	9.7	7.6	8.2	27.1	17.4

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 10.0 Percent Change Since 2010 7.5 5.0 2.5 0.0 -2.5 2010 2015 2020 Year, through 2023 San Francisco (4.3%) San Francisco County (4.3%) California (9.3%) Source: CA, Department of Finance Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)






Figure 52: Housing in Buildings with Two to Four Figure 53: Housing in Buildings with Five or More Units Units





Vintage of Residential Housing

Why is it important?

This section provides evidence on the year in which residential housing in San Francisco was built. We break it down into owned versus rented residences and provide a comparison across San Francisco 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 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 61: Year Occupied by Current Residents Figure 62: Year Occupied by Current Residents across Regions by Tenure




Figure 63: Year Occupied by Current Residents Figure 64: Year Occupied by Current Residents for Owned Housing for Rented Housing




Figure 65: Year Occupied by Current Residents for All Housing 2015 Median Year Occupied 2010 2005 2000 2010 2015 2020 2025 2005 Year, through 2022 San Francisco County (2015) San Francisco (2015) United States (2015) California (2014) Source: American Community Survey 1-year Summary Files. Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Residential Permitting

Definition:

This indicator provides evidence on the number of residential buildings that are permitted for construction each year. Permit data for San Francisco is compared with data from San Francisco 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.

San Francisco - Ranking Among Comparables






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

Paradise town, CA (1 San Buenaventura, CA (277 Irwindale, CA (278 86.39 1.36 1.36 Tuolumne Unincorporated Area, CA Lawndale, CA 1.35 1.35 Healdsburg, CA Watsonville, CA Sacramento Unincorporated Area, CA 1.34 1.33 El Cajon, CA Calimesa, CA 1.32 1.31 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 1.31 Ridgecrest, CA Beverly Hills, CA San Rafael, CA San Anselmo town, CA 1.30 1.28 Angels, CA Campbell, CA 1.26 1.25 Glendale, CA (292) Modesto, CA (294) Canyon Lake, CA (295) 1.25 1.24 1.24 Dunsmuir, CA (515) 0.00 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 **Units Permitted** Per 1,000 in Population: 2023 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 67: Number of Units Permitted - California Comparables (Rank)





San Francisco - Permitting Activity

Annual Units Permitted - Per Capita in San Francisco

Figure 69: Units Permitted Each Year



Permitted

(Over 1, 5, and 10 years)

1.7

-0.7

-7.5 -7.1

1 Year

Sam Francisco

California

United States


Source: U.S. cresse Bureau.
Graph by National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)


Figure 70: Average Annual Growth in Units

Annual Number of Buildings Permitted - Per Capita in San Francisco

Figure 72: Average Annual Growth in Buildings Permitted







Annual Value of Property Permitted - Per Capita in San Francisco

Figure 73: Value Permitted Each Year






Figure 74: Average Annual Growth in Value

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 Figure 76: Percent of Workers Commuting by Car Alone Carpool





Figure 77: Percent of Workers using Public Figure 78: Percent of Workers Who Work From



The first table on this page presents data for those who LIVE in San Francisco. The second provides data on those who work, but do not necessarily live in San Francisco. 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

	Mal	е	Fema	ale	All Wor	kers	All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van:	87,951	30.6	75, 415	30.6	163, 366	31.1	75.3
Drove Alone	74,949	26.0	60,317	24.5	135, 266	25.7	65.5
Carpooled:	13,002	4.5	15,098	6.1	28,100	5.3	9.8
In 2-person carpool	9,152	3.2	10,736	4.4	19,888	3.8	7.0
In 3-person carpool	2,316	0.8	2,195	0.9	4,511	0.9	1.7
In 4-or-more-person carpool	1,534	0.5	2,167	0.9	3,701	0.7	1.2
Public Transportation (excl Taxi):	41,685	14.5	36,964	15.0	78,649	15.0	2.7
Bus or Trolley Bus	26,647	9.3	25,972	10.5	52,619	10.0	1.8
Streetcar or Trolley Car	7,934	2.8	6,881	2.8	14,815	2.8	0.5
Subway or Elevated	3,590	1.2	2,265	0.9	5,855	1.1	0.2
Railroad	3,469	1.2	1,656	0.7	5,125	1.0	0.1
Ferryboat	45	0.0	190	0.1	235	0.0	0.1
Bicycle	11,262	3.9	4,724	1.9	15,986	3.0	0.7
Walked	22,247	7.7	21,265	8.6	43,512	8.3	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	6,599	2.3	5,755	2.3	12,354	2.3	1.7
Worked at Home	81,461	28.3	69,853	28.4	151, 314	28.8	17.2
Total:	251, 205	87.3	213, 976	86.9	465, 181	88.4	

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

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

	Male		Fema	ale	All Wor	All of CA	
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van:	149,502	34.5	106,624	29.2	256, 126	32.2	75.3
Drove Alone	125,920	29.0	86,141	23.6	212,061	26.7	65.5
Carpooled:	23,582	5.4	20,483	5.6	44,065	5.5	9.8
In 2-person carpool	17,290	4.0	13,876	3.8	31,166	3.9	7.0
In 3-person carpool	4,433	1.0	4,237	1.2	8,670	1.1	1.7
In 4-or-more-person carpool	1,859	0.4	2,370	0.6	4,229	0.5	1.2
Public Transportation (excl Taxi):	64,173	14.8	57,864	15.8	122,037	15.4	2.6
Bus or Trolley Bus	28,014	6.5	27,549	7.5	55,563	7.0	1.8
Streetcar or Trolley Car	23,595	5.4	22,558	6.2	46,153	5.8	0.5
Subway or Elevated	6,118	1.4	3,504	1.0	9,622	1.2	0.2
Railroad	3,569	0.8	2,157	0.6	5,726	0.7	0.1
Ferryboat	2,877	0.7	2,096	0.6	4,973	0.6	0.1
Bicycle	11,745	2.7	4,492	1.2	16,237	2.0	0.7
Walked	22,216	5.1	20,599	5.6	42,815	5.4	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	9,271	2.1	5,377	1.5	14,648	1.8	1.7
Worked at Home	81,461	18.8	69,853	19.1	151,314	19.0	17.2
Total:	338, 368	78.0	264, 809	72.4	603, 177	75.9	

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.

Commute Times for Employed Residents

Table 9	SEV OF	WORKERS	BY TDAVEL	TIME TO	WORK
Table 8.	SEX UI	- WURKERS	DI IRAVEL	. I IIVIE I O	WURK

	Mal	9	Fema	All Wor	kers	All of CA	
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Less than 5 minutes	2,189	0.8	1,173	0.5	3,362	0.7	2.1
5 to 9 minutes	8,432	3.2	9,322	4.1	17,754	3.6	7.8
10 to 14 minutes	15,815	5.9	12,457	5.5	28,272	5.7	12.4
15 to 19 minutes	22,471	8.4	19,777	8.7	42,248	8.6	15.4
20 to 24 minutes	24,291	9.1	22,336	9.8	46,627	9.5	14.8
25 to 29 minutes	12,940	4.8	10,557	4.6	23,497	4.8	6.4
30 to 34 minutes	32,944	12.3	28,511	12.5	61,455	12.5	15.2
35 to 39 minutes	7,333	2.7	5,153	2.3	12,486	2.5	2.9
40 to 44 minutes	6,791	2.5	8,216	3.6	15,007	3.1	4.1
45 to 59 minutes	16,323	6.1	12,677	5.6	29,000	5.9	8.2
60 to 89 minutes	16,815	6.3	11,009	4.8	27,824	5.7	7.2
90 or more minutes	3,400	1.3	2,935	1.3	6,335	1.3	3.6
Total:	169,744	63.5	144, 123	63.2	313,867	63.8	

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

Figure 79: Percent of Employed Population With Figure 80: Percent of Employed Population With Commutes of More than 30 Minutes

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

WORKFLAG	JE GEOGRA	APHI					
	Male	Э	Fema	ıle	All Wor	kers	All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Less than 5 minutes	3,468	0.8	1,637	0.5	5, 105	0.7	2.1
5 to 9 minutes	9,974	2.4	9,295	2.7	19,269	2.6	7.8
10 to 14 minutes	18,461	4.4	13,530	3.9	31,991	4.2	12.4
15 to 19 minutes	26,776	6.4	20,837	6.0	47,613	6.3	15.3
20 to 24 minutes	29,528	7.1	24,184	7.0	53,712	7.1	14.8
25 to 29 minutes	15,181	3.7	11,513	3.3	26,694	3.5	6.4
30 to 34 minutes	42,980	10.3	34,281	9.9	77,261	10.2	15.2
35 to 39 minutes	10,374	2.5	6,461	1.9	16,835	2.2	2.9
40 to 44 minutes	15,222	3.7	11,176	3.2	26,398	3.5	4.1
45 to 59 minutes	29,681	7.1	24,578	7.1	54,259	7.2	8.2
60 to 89 minutes	40,261	9.7	26,989	7.8	67,250	8.9	7.2
90 or more minutes	15,001	3.6	10,475	3.0	25,476	3.4	3.6
Total:	256,907	61.8	194,956	56.2	451,863	59.8	

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 Figure 83: Percent of Local Employees With Commutes of More than 30 Minutes

Commutes of More than 90 Minutes





Figure 84: Rank: Share of MegaCommuters Across Similar Geographies

2025



Place of Work

This section provides evidence on where workers living in San Francisco work. As evidenced in the first table, some of San Francisco'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 San Francisco 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:	250, 513	87.0	212,977	86.4	463, 490	88.1	99.6
Worked in county of residence	204, 150	70.9	178,744	72.6	382,894	72.8	85.3
worked outside of county of residence	46,363	16.1	34,233	13.9	80,596	15.3	14.3
Worked outside state of residence	692	0.2	999	0.4	1,691	0.3	0.4
Total:	251, 205	87.3	213, 976	86.9	465, 181	88.4	

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

Figure 85: Percent of Workers Employed Outside of Their County of Residence 25





Table 11. SEX OF WORKERS BY PLACE OF WORK-PLACE LEVEL

	Male		Fema	Female		All Workers	
Place of Work	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Living in a place:	251, 205	87.3	213, 976	86.9	465, 181	88.4	95.8
Worked in place of residence	204,150	70.9	178,744	72.6	382,894	72.8	42.3
Worked outside place of residence	47,055	16.3	35,232	14.3	82,287	15.6	53.4
Not living in a place	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.2
Total:	251, 205	87.3	213, 976	86.9	465, 181	88.4	

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	California		United Sta	tes
	Median	Median	Ratio	Median	Ratio
Car, truck, or van - drove alone	81, 325	48, 335	95.4	45,677	94.0
Car, truck, or van - carpooled	60,366	35,926	95.3	34,518	92.3
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	65, 131	34,625	106.7	41, 443	82.9
Walked	65,450	30,552	121.5	27,247	126.8
Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other means	86,228	40,631	120.3	36,218	125.6
Worked from home	125,512	79,738	89.2	69,180	95.7
Total:	87,863	49,818	176.4	46,365	189.5

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.

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

	< \$25	,000	\$25,000-\$	74,999	\$75,00	00+	All		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	19, 161	15.3	38, 393	26.4	73, 216	27.1	139,879	26.6	68.4
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	6,575	5.2	8,384	5.8	13,805	5.1	31,399	6.0	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	23,135	18.5	28,050	19.3	56,248	20.9	116,647	22.2	3.6
Walked	10,422	8.3	11,689	8.1	25,543	9.5	51,311	9.8	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	3,951	3.2	6,976	4.8	21,560	8.0	34,253	6.5	2.4
Worked at Home	11,519	9.2	17,998	12.4	79,328	29.4	114,010	21.7	13.6
Total:	74,763	59.7	111,490	76.8	269,700		487, 499	92.7	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	\$75,00	00+	All		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	33,993	20.6	63, 445	28.7	107, 375	28.2	221,098	27.8	68.5
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	10,651	6.4	14,462	6.5	22,369	5.9	51,560	6.5	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	33,095	20.0	49,065	22.2	109, 139	28.6	205,667	25.9	3.6
Walked	10,222	6.2	11,508	5.2	25,434	6.7	50,740	6.4	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	4,745	2.9	8,214	3.7	23,343	6.1	38,185	4.8	2.4
Worked at Home	11,519	7.0	17,998	8.1	79,328	20.8	114,010	14.3	13.6
Total:	104, 225	63.0	164, 692	74.4	366, 988	96.3	681, 260	85.7	

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.

²⁾ For regions with more than one geography, the medians are averages weighted by working population.

Commute Mode by Poverty Status

Table 15. MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK BY POVERTY STATUS

	In Pov	erty	100-1499	6 of Pov	>150% (of Pov	All		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	4,988	16.3	3,084	11.7	127, 012	25.9	135, 084	25.8	65.8
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	1,158	3.8	1,328	5.0	25,419	5.2	27,905	5.3	9.8
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	4,308	14.1	3,418	12.9	70,412	14.4	78,138	14.9	2.6
Walked	3,760	12.3	1,932	7.3	35,501	7.2	41, 193	7.9	2.1
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	1,516	5.0	417	1.6	26,025	5.3	27,958	5.3	2.4
Worked at Home	3,430	11.2	2,801	10.6	144,751	29.5	150,982	28.9	17.2
Total:	19, 160	62.8	12,980	49.1	429, 120	87.6	461, 260	88.1	

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

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

	In Pov	erty/	100-1499	6 of Pov	>150% (of Pov	All		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	9,099	24.5	6,421	20.7	196, 239	26.3	211,759	26.7	65.8
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	2,258	6.1	2,226	7.2	39,296	5.3	43,780	5.5	9.8
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	6,457	17.4	3, 104	10.0	112,075	15.0	121,636	15.4	2.6
Walked	3,421	9.2	1,884	6.1	35,191	4.7	40,496	5.1	2.1
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	1,840	5.0	691	2.2	27,905	3.7	30,436	3.8	2.4
Worked at Home	3,430	9.2	2,801	9.0	144,751	19.4	150,982	19.1	17.2
Total:	26,505	71.4	17, 127	55.2	555, 457	74.6	599,089	75.6	100.0

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.

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 San Francisco 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

		N	et Inflows			
				ne State		-
			W/in	Between	Across	From
Category	Population	All Migration	County	Counties	States	Abroad
No income	67,086	2,329	0	-320	-108	2,757
With income	648,593	2,112	0	-8,706	3,583	7,235
\$1 to \$9,999 or loss	67, 183	885	0	87	350	448
\$10,000 to \$14,999	47,799	-268	0	-1,319	180	871
\$15,000 to \$24,999	52,356	114	0	-902	440	576
\$25,000 to \$34,999	44,257	1,452	0	203	728	521
\$35,000 to \$49,999	55,251	363	0	296	-701	768
\$50,000 to \$64,999	47,764	-1,511	0	-1,261	-922	672
\$65,000 to \$74,999	28,286	-142	0	-635	81	412
\$75,000 or more	305,697	1,219	0	-5,175	3,427	2,967
All:	715, 679	4,441	0	-9,026	3,475	9,992

Source: 2022 1-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

			Sam	e State		_
Category	Population	All Migration	W/in County	Between Counties	Across States	From Abroad
Never married	318,661	11,772	0	1,346	4,087	6, 339
Now married, except separated	299,281	-4,358	0	-7,930	534	3,038
Divorced	52,193	-2,303	0	-1,879	-721	297
Separated	10, 198	-419	0	-400	-19	0
Widowed	35,346	-251	0	-163	-406	318
Total:	715, 679	4,441	0	-9,026	3,475	9,992

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

Table 19: Migration by Tenure

	Net Inflows Same State						
			W/in	Between	Across	From	
Category	Population	All Migration	County	Counties	States	Abroad	
Householder lived in owner-occupied housing units	352,641	-18,588	0	-15,763	-5,532	2,707	
Householder lived in renter-occupied housing units	422, 233	15,802	0	1,486	7,339	6,977	
Total:	774, 874	-2,786	0	-14,277	1,807	9,684	

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

Year: Through 2022

Owner: Intra-State Renter: Intra-State Renter:

Figure 91: Domestic Movements of Residents by Tenure

Table 20: Migration by Age

		N				
			San	ne State		_
			W/in	Between	Across	From
Category	Population	All Migration	County	Counties	States	Abroad
1 to 4 years	25,970	-2,120	0	-1,594	-583	57
5 to 17 years	77,102	-2,040	0	-2,445	-793	1,198
18 and 19 years	12,067	-290	0	-206	-283	199
20 to 24 years	41,590	9,873	0	4,234	3,500	2,139
25 to 29 years	72,983	4,423	0	1,066	1,840	1,517
30 to 34 years	88,023	-1,591	0	-3,744	-236	2,389
35 to 39 years	74,617	-1,445	0	-2,397	-301	1,253
40 to 44 years	57,235	74	0	-1,631	1,009	696
45 to 49 years	51,024	-583	0	-1,140	119	438
50 to 54 years	54,808	-1,756	0	-1,384	-724	352
55 to 59 years	51,778	-932	0	-931	-170	169
60 to 64 years	46,140	-1,653	0	-757	-1,258	362
65 to 69 years	42,056	9	0	-55	-31	95
70 to 74 years	40,048	-604	0	-470	-134	0
75 years and over	65,637	-533	0	-1,014	207	274
Total Population:	801,078	832	0	-12,468	2, 162	11,138

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

Table 21: Migration by Educational Attainment

		N	let Inflows					
			Same State					
			W/in	Between	Across	From		
Category	Population	All Migration	County	Counties	States	Abroad		
Less than high school graduate	71,563	-230	0	-595	-127	492		
High school graduate (includes equiv)	69,972	-1,846	0	-2,308	-252	714		
Some college or assoc. degree	107,225	-1,417	0	-1,873	266	190		
Bachelor's degree	226,483	-3,082	0	-5,331	186	2,063		
Graduate or professional degree	169, 106	1,984	0	-2,350	248	4,086		
Total:	644, 349	-4,591	0	-12,457	321	7,545		

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

Table 22: Median Income of Migration Flows

-		
Flow	In-Migration	Out-Migration
Same House 1 Year Ago	65,996	65,996
Moved Within Same County	85,419	85,419
Moved to Different County, Same State	68,646	74,242
Moved Between States	77,314	62,240
Moved from Abroad	59,659	
Total Population:	68,484	68,368

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

Table 23: Median Age of Migration Flows

rabio zor modian rigo or migranori i rono		
Flow	In-Migration	Out-Migration
Same House 1 Year Ago	44.2	44.2
Moved Within Same County	33.7	33.7
Moved to Different County, Same State	29.2	32.5
Moved Between States	28.3	30.2
Moved from Abroad	30.8	
Total Population:	40.7	41.3

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 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/