Weed, California

Indicators Report

by
The National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

April 21, 2024

Exploring the economics, demographics, and well-being of Weed 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 Weed (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 Weed. These indicators are compared to Siskiyou 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 Weed 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 Weed 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 Weed, 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 Weed, but do not necessarily live in Weed.
- **Migration:** Population changes comes primarily through organic causes: births and deaths. Migration between regions also plays a significant role in population growth. A final section of the report provides evidence on migration into and out of the City.

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

Contents

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

Demographics

Definition:

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

Why is it important?

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

A Demographic Snapshot

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

Statistic	2022	2019
POPULATION		
Population Estimate (#, 5yr)	2,845.0	2,669.0
Veterans (#, 5yr)	150.0	214.0
Foreign born persons (%, 5yr)	7.2	7.0
Population age 25+ (#, 5yr)	1,962.0	1,657.0
AGE AND SEX		
Persons under 5 years (%, 5yr)	3.9	4.3
Persons under 18 years (%, 5yr)	17.0	24.0
Persons 65 years and over (%, 5yr)	17.8	19.1
Female persons (%, 5yr)	48.3	46.7
INCOME AND POVERTY		
Median household income ($, 5yr)	35,641.0	27,227.0
Per capita income in past 12 months ($, 5yr)	48,339.0	36,006.0
Persons in poverty (%, 5yr)	34.7	31.9
Children age less than 18 in poverty (#, 5yr)	169.0	210.0
Children age less than 18 in poverty (%, 5yr)	35.0	33.1
RACE AND ETHNICITY		
White alone (%, 5yr)	68.6	72.6
African American alone (%, 5yr)	8.2	14.3
American Indian or Alaska Native alone (%, 5yr)	2.4	2.5
Asian alone (%, 5yr)	5.3	1.4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone (%, 5yr)	0.0	0.0
Two or More Races (%, 5yr)	7.1	6.3
Hispanic or Latino (%, 5yr)	18.4	19.3
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (%, 5yr)	62.4	59.7
HOUSING		
Housing units (#, 5yr)	1,377.0	1,301.0
Owner-occupied housing units (%, 5yr)	46.3	38.7
Median value of owner-occupied housing units ($, 5yr)	198,800.0	138,500.0
Median selected monthly owner costs-with a mortgage ($, 5yr)	1,195.0	1,097.0
Median selected monthly owner costs-without a mortgage ($, 5yr)	435.0	326.0
Median gross rent ($, 5yr)	744.0	753.0
FAMILIES AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS		
Households (#, 5yr)	1,252.0	1,129.0
Persons per household (#, 5yr)	2.2	2.2
Living in same house 1 year ago, % of persons age 1+ (5yr)	74.9	81.6
EDUCATION		
High school graduate or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr)	86.1	85.5
Bachelor's degree or higher, % of persons age 25+ (5yr)	12.5	11.6
HEALTH		
With a disability, under age 65 years (#, 5yr)	476.0	367.0
Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years (%, 5yr)	8.3	5.1
LABOR FORCE		
In civilian labor force, persons age 16+ (%, 5yr)	48.6	49.9
In civilian labor force, women age 16+ (%, 5yr)	52.3	45.2
Employed, persons age 16+ (%, 5yr)	44.5	43.6
Self employed (%, 5yr)	6.1	5.5
TRANSPORTATION		
Mean travel time to work, workers age 16+ (Mins., 5yr)	13.5	16.8
Drive alone in private vehicle (%, 5yr)	68.1	65.2
Using public transportation (%, 5yr)	0.0	1.1
Worked from home (%, 5yr)	7.2	6.0

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

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

Current Population

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

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

Region	2023 Population	% Change 1 Year	% Change 3 Year	% Change 5 Year
City				
Weed	2,693	−4.33	−1.39	−2.57
County and Broader Regions				
Siskiyou County	43,548	−0.21	−2.06	−2.37
North State	596,413	−0.78	−0.41	−3.98
California	38,940,231	−0.35	−1.79	−2.01

Source: CA DOF; Calculations by National Economic Education Delegation

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

City	2022	2023	% Change Local	% Change North State	% Change California
Siskiyou County	43.6	43.5	−0.21	−0.78	−0.35
Yreka	7.7	7.8	1.20		
Mount Shasta	3.2	3.2	0.85		
Weed	2.8	2.7	−4.33		
Dunsmuir	1.7	1.7	−0.54		
Montague	1.2	1.2	−0.41		
Tulelake	0.9	0.9	−0.45		
Dorris	0.8	0.8	−0.47		
Fort Jones	0.7	0.7	−0.44		
Etna	0.7	0.7	−0.45		

Source: CA DOF; Calculations by National Economic Education Delegation

Figure 1: Population Growth (1)



Figure 2: Population Growth (2)



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

Figure 3: Population by Age - Detailed Age Categories



Figure 4: Population by Age - Broad Age Categories



Figure 5: Population by Educational Attainment



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

Figure 6: Population by Race/Ethnicity



Figure 7: Population by Race/Ethnicity Over Time



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

Employment Report

Citywide Employment and Unemployment

Definition:

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

Why is it important?

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

Table 3. Weed Summary for March, 2024

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

Source: EDD, National Economic Education Delegation

Figure 8: Historical Employment and Unemployment



Figure 9: Employment and Unemployment - Last 12 Months



Figure 10: Relative Employment Growth Across Regions - since 2010



Figure 11: Relative Employment Growth Across Regions - since 2019



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

County Employment by Industry

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

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

			Empl	% Growth - Annualized Rate					
Industry	**Employment**	**Share**	**Growth**	**Month**	**Qtr**	**6mo**	**1yr**	**3yr**	**5yr**
Total Nonfarm	13,339	100.0	13.3	1.2	2.8	2.7	1.1	1.7	0.4
Total Private	9,281	69.6	−4.5	−0.6	2.7	2.4	0.8	1.9	0.7
Goods Producing	1,478	11.1	10.6	9.0	5.1	−0.5	0.6	−2.3	−0.2
Mining, Logging and Construction	746	5.6	14.1	25.7	14.0	5.0	6.9	2.3	5.4
Mining and Logging	163	1.2	8.6	92.3	20.5	4.9	6.4	−4.4	4.0
Construction	581	4.4	0.6	1.3	10.2	4.1	7.6	5.4	6.2
Manufacturing	734	5.5	−4.2	−6.7	−4.7	−5.4	−3.8	−5.9	−3.8
Durable Goods	548	4.1	−1.9	−4.1	−4.9	−5.5	−6.8	−7.5	−5.8
Non-Durable Goods	191	1.4	−0.2	−1.1	17.5	5.5	5.6	1.9	7.0
Service Providing	11,873	89.0	13.0	1.3	3.5	3.6	1.1	2.2	0.5
Trade, Trans & Utilities	2,164	16.2	−6.1	−3.3	−2.3	2.0	1.3	−0.1	0.8
Wholesale Trade	173	1.3	−1.2	−7.9	−15.8	−5.4	−15.3	−2.1	−5.3
Retail Trade	1,623	12.2	−11.6	−8.2	−2.0	0.6	0.5	−1.8	0.3
Information	110	0.8	−0.5	−5.8	−2.5	−15.1	−8.2	−5.0	−3.0
Financial Activities	274	2.1	1.8	8.1	−4.3	−1.5	3.9	−2.3	−2.0
Professional & Business Srvcs	560	4.2	−2.3	−4.9	1.4	−3.0	−3.8	−0.1	−3.3
Educational & Health Srvcs	2,457	18.4	14.2	7.2	6.2	4.7	5.5	4.5	2.1
Leisure & Hospitality	1,730	13.0	−18.3	−11.9	10.2	4.1	−5.7	4.3	0.4
Other Srvcs	521	3.9	9.0	23.1	2.9	13.4	3.8	9.6	6.4
Government	4,050	30.4	−0.3	−0.1	5.5	4.2	2.0	1.6	−0.1
Federal	623	4.7	6.1	12.6	8.0	3.8	−2.3	−4.5	−2.8
State	466	3.5	−0.3	−0.7	3.7	−1.3	−2.2	0.8	0.7
Local	2,959	22.2	17.3	7.3	6.7	5.8	4.0	3.2	0.4

Source: EDD, National Economic Education Delegation (NEED)

Some Employee Detail

Employed in Weed

Figure 12: Employment by Occupation



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

Figure 13: Employment by Industry



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

Figure 14: Language Spoken at Home



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

Figure 15: Citizenship



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

Employed Residents of Weed

Figure 16: Employment by Occupation



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

Figure 17: Employment by Industry



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

Figure 18: Language Spoken at Home



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

Figure 19: Citizenship



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

Employed Residents vs Workers in Weed

Figure 20: Employment by Occupation



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

Figure 21: Employment by Industry



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

Figure 22: Language Spoken at Home



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

Figure 23: Citizenship



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

Income and Earnings

Per Capita Income Growth

Definition:

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



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

Real Per Capita Income Ranking Among Cities in Siskiyou County

Figure 28: Income Levels



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2022 5-yr American Community Survey
The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 9 geographies.
Geographies are selected and ranked based on population.
These are the cities in the same county as the target city.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Figure 29: Growth over Time



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2022 5-yr American Community Survey
The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 9 geographies.
Geographies are selected and ranked based on population.
These are the cities in the same county as the target city.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Figure 30: Comparison with All Cities Nationwide



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

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

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



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

Figure 32: Shares Across the Income Distribution



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

Figure 33: Means Across the Income Distribution



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

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

Housing

Housing Costs and Affordability

Definition:

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

Why is it important?

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

Cost of Housing in Weed and Broader Regions

Figure 34: Median Home Prices



Figure 35: Median Rents

N/A

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

Housing Ownership in Weed and Broader Regions

Figure 36: Home Ownership Rates



Figure 37: Home Ownership by Age



Figure 38: Income by Tenure



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

Figure 39: Income Distribution by Tenure



Figure 40: Income Distribution of Home Owners



Figure 41: Income Distribution of Renters



Housing Burden in Weed and Broader Regions

Figure 42: Home Owners w/ A Mortgage



Figure 43: Home Owners w/o A Mortgage



Figure 44: Renters



Figure 45: Homeowner Housing Burden by Age



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

Housing Picture

Definition:

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

Why is it important?

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

Table 5. Housing Market Indicators

Indicator	2023	2019	2010	% Change from 2019	% Change from 2010
Total Population	2,693.0	2,762.0	2,967.0	-2.5	-9.2
Total # of Homes	1,224.0	1,179.0	1,273.0	3.8	-3.8
# Occupied Units	1,081.0	1,042.0	1,131.0	3.7	-4.4
Persons per Household	2.3	2.5	2.5	-5.5	-6.7
Vacancy Rate (%)	11.7	11.6	11.2	0.5	4.7

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



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

Vintage of Residential Housing

Why is it important?

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

Figure 54: Distribution of Housing Construction



Figure 55: Housing Vintage across Regions



Figure 56: Housing Vintage by Tenure



Figure 57: Vintage of Owned Residences



Figure 58: Vintage of Rented Residences



Figure 59: Vintage of All Residences



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

Occupation of Residential Housing

Why is it important?

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

Figure 60: Year Current Occupant Moved In



Figure 61: Year Occupied by Current Residents across Regions



Figure 62: Year Occupied by Current Residents by Tenure



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

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



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

Residential Permitting

Definition:

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

Weed - Ranking Among Comparables

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



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

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



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

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



Source: U.S. Census Bureau,
The # in parentheses is the ranking out of 6 geographies.
Graph by: National Economic Education Delegation (www.NEEDEcon.org)

Weed - Permitting Activity

Annual Units Permitted - Per Capita in Weed

Figure 69: Units Permitted Each Year

Figure 70: Average Annual Growth in Units Permitted

Annual Number of Buildings Permitted - Per Capita in Weed

Figure 71: Units Permitted Each Year

Figure 72: Average Annual Growth in Buildings Permitted

Annual Value of Property Permitted - Per Capita in Weed

Figure 73: Value Permitted Each Year

Figure 74: Average Annual Growth in Value Permitted

Commute Patterns

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

Mode of Transportation

Figure 75: Percent of Workers Commuting by Car Alone



Figure 76: Percent of Workers Commuting by Carpool



Figure 77: Percent of Workers using Public Transportation



Figure 78: Percent of Workers Who Work From Home



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

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

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

	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van:	448	72.3	393	73.9	841	74.2	78.0
Drove Alone	386	62.3	340	63.9	726	64.1	68.4
Carpooled:	62	10.0	53	10.0	115	10.2	9.5
In 2-person carpool	58	9.4	49	9.2	107	9.4	6.9
In 3-person carpool	0	0.0	4	0.8	4	0.4	1.5
In 4-or-more-person carpool	4	0.6	0	0.0	4	0.4	1.1
Public Transportation (excl Taxi):	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.6
Bus or Trolley Bus	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.3
Streetcar or Trolley Car	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.8
Subway or Elevated	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.3
Railroad	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.2
Ferryboat	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.1
Bicycle	13	2.1	0	0.0	13	1.1	0.7
Walked	37	6.0	21	3.9	58	5.1	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.7
Worked at Home	12	1.9	65	12.2	77	6.8	13.6
Total:	510	82.3	479	90.0	989	87.3	

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

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

	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van:	871	72.5	538	68.6	1,409	77.4	78.0
Drove Alone	783	65.2	495	63.1	1,278	70.2	68.5
Carpooled:	88	7.3	43	5.5	131	7.2	9.5
In 2-person carpool	72	6.0	41	5.2	113	6.2	6.9
In 3-person carpool	12	1.0	2	0.3	14	0.8	1.5
In 4-or-more-person carpool	4	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.2	1.1
Public Transportation (excl Taxi):	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.6
Bus or Trolley Bus	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.3
Streetcar or Trolley Car	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.8
Subway or Elevated	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.3
Railroad	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.2
Ferryboat	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.1
Bicycle	8	0.7	0	0.0	8	0.4	0.7
Walked	37	3.1	21	2.7	58	3.2	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	51	4.2	0	0.0	51	2.8	1.7
Worked at Home	12	1.0	65	8.3	77	4.2	13.6
Total:	979	81.5	624	79.6	1,603	88.1	

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

Commute Times for Employed Residents

Table 8. SEX OF WORKERS BY TRAVEL TIME TO WORK

	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Less than 5 minutes	79	12.8	82	16.8	161	14.8	2.0
5 to 9 minutes	80	13.0	146	30.0	226	20.7	7.5
10 to 14 minutes	85	13.8	23	4.7	108	9.9	12.2
15 to 19 minutes	68	11.0	13	2.7	81	7.4	15.0
20 to 24 minutes	37	6.0	27	5.5	64	5.9	14.3
25 to 29 minutes	60	9.7	20	4.1	80	7.3	6.3
30 to 34 minutes	47	7.6	82	16.8	129	11.8	15.0
35 to 39 minutes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.9
40 to 44 minutes	13	2.1	0	0.0	13	1.2	4.3
45 to 59 minutes	11	1.8	21	4.3	32	2.9	8.6
60 to 89 minutes	18	2.9	0	0.0	18	1.6	7.9
90 or more minutes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.0
Total:	498	80.8	414	85.0	912	83.6	

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

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



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



Figure 81: Rank: Share of MegaCommuters Across Similar Geographies



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

Commute Times for Those Employed in the City

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

	Male		Female		All Workers		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Less than 5 minutes	73	6.2	89	12.1	162	9.2	2.0
5 to 9 minutes	177	14.9	161	21.8	338	19.2	7.5
10 to 14 minutes	107	9.0	98	13.3	205	11.6	12.2
15 to 19 minutes	185	15.6	110	14.9	295	16.8	15.0
20 to 24 minutes	132	11.1	33	4.5	165	9.4	14.3
25 to 29 minutes	21	1.8	40	5.4	61	3.5	6.3
30 to 34 minutes	94	7.9	8	1.1	102	5.8	15.0
35 to 39 minutes	69	5.8	2	0.3	71	4.0	2.9
40 to 44 minutes	8	0.7	0	0.0	8	0.5	4.3
45 to 59 minutes	16	1.4	1	0.1	17	1.0	8.6
60 to 89 minutes	74	6.2	17	2.3	91	5.2	7.9
90 or more minutes	11	0.9	0	0.0	11	0.6	4.0
Total:	967	81.6	559	75.7	1,526	86.7	

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.

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 Weed work. As evidenced in the first table, some of Weed'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 Weed 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:	510	82.3	479	90.0	989	87.3	99.6
Worked in county of residence	474	76.5	458	86.1	932	82.3	84.1
worked outside of county of residence	36	5.8	21	3.9	57	5.0	15.4
Worked outside state of residence	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.4
Total:	510	82.3	479	90.0	989	87.3	

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 #	Male (%)	Female #	Female (%)	All Workers #	All Workers (%)	All of CA (%)
Living in a place:	510	82.3	479	90.0	989	87.3	95.9
Worked in place of residence	255	41.1	260	48.9	515	45.5	39.5
Worked outside place of residence	255	41.1	219	41.2	474	41.8	56.4
Not living in a place	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.1
Total:	510	82.3	479	90.0	989	87.3	

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

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



Commute Mode by Income

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

	City	California		United States	
	Median	*Median*	*Ratio*	*Median*	*Ratio*
Car, truck, or van - drove alone	29,881	48,566	112.5	46,171	111.9
Car, truck, or van - carpooled	15,938	36,463	79.9	34,487	79.9
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)		40,179		45,100	
Walked		29,366		27,142	
Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other means		40,433		36,140	
Worked from home	11,358	75,153	27.6	67,180	29.2
Total:	26,670	48,747	54.7	46,099	57.9

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

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

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

	< $25,000		$25,000-$74,999		$75,000+		All		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	236	35.9	185	57.8	111	82.2	726	64.1	68.4
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	78	11.9	7	2.2	24	17.8	115	10.2	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.6
Walked	25	3.8	19	5.9	0	0.0	58	5.1	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	8	1.2	5	1.6	0	0.0	13	1.1	2.4
Worked at Home	72	11.0	5	1.6	0	0.0	77	6.8	13.6
Total:	419	63.8	221	69.1	135		989	87.3	100.0

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

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

	< $25,000		$25,000-$74,999		$75,000+		All		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	396	41.3	470	74.0	290	99.0	1,278	70.2	68.5
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	92	9.6	36	5.7	3	1.0	131	7.2	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.6
Walked	25	2.6	19	3.0	0	0.0	58	3.2	2.4
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	34	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	59	3.2	2.4
Worked at Home	72	7.5	5	0.8	0	0.0	77	4.2	13.6
Total:	619	64.6	530	83.5	293		1,603	88.1	

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

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

Commute Mode by Poverty Status

Table 15. MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK BY POVERTY STATUS

	In Poverty		100-149% of Pov		>150% of Pov		All		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	106	27.6	96	64.9	520	68.0	722	64.7	68.7
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	25	6.5	10	6.8	80	10.5	115	10.3	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.6
Walked	21	5.5	0	0.0	30	3.9	51	4.6	2.1
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	8	2.1	0	0.0	5	0.7	13	1.2	2.4
Worked at Home	58	15.1	7	4.7	12	1.6	77	6.9	13.6
Total:	218	56.8	113	76.4	647	84.6	978	87.6	

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

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

	In Poverty		100-149% of Pov		>150% of Pov		All		All of CA
Mode of Transit	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	(%)
Car, Truck, or Van: Drove Alone	136	49.8	111	48.3	1,027	69.4	1,274	70.7	68.7
Car, Truck, or Van: Carpooled	8	2.9	6	2.6	117	7.9	131	7.3	9.5
Public Transportation (excl Taxi)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.6
Walked	21	7.7	0	0.0	30	2.0	51	2.8	2.1
Taxicab, Motorcycle, or other	8	2.9	0	0.0	51	3.4	59	3.3	2.4
Worked at Home	58	21.2	7	3.0	12	0.8	77	4.3	13.6
Total:	231	84.6	124	53.9	1,237	83.6	1,592	88.3	

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 Weed is a net recipient (migration inflows) or donor (migration outflows) of population is very important for understanding trends in the City's development. This section outlines migration patterns by age, education, income, marital status, and housing tenure. Understanding recent trends is very important for making policy, investment, and other decisions about the future. Also, understanding the extent to which the population is stable, or experiences significant turnover each year is helpful for planning purposes.

Figure 87: Overall Movements of Residents



Table 17: Migration by Income

		Net Inflows				
			Same State			
Category	Population	All Migration	W/in County	Between Counties	Across States	From Abroad
No income	222	52	27	38	−22	9
With income	2,196	76	48	49	−28	7
$1 to $9,999 or loss	410	38	20	−36	51	3
$10,000 to $14,999	538	82	23	66	−7	0
$15,000 to $24,999	239	0	0	−4	0	4
$25,000 to $34,999	332	59	33	28	−2	0
$35,000 to $49,999	284	−15	−16	5	−4	0
$50,000 to $64,999	59	−24	−14	−10	0	0
$65,000 to $74,999	77	0	0	0	0	0
$75,000 or more	257	−64	2	0	−66	0
All:	2,418	128	75	87	−50	16

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

Figure 88: Overall Movements of Low Income Residents



Figure 89: Overall Movements of Middle Income Residents



Figure 90: Overall Movements of High Income Residents



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

Demographics of Migration Flows

Table 18: Migration by Marital Status

Category	Population	Net Inflows: All Migration	Same State: W/in County	Same State: Between Counties	Across States	From Abroad
Never married	1,001	174	78	80	4	12
Now married, except separated	588	−114	−21	−55	−42	4
Divorced	528	55	9	51	−5	0
Separated	101	0	0	0	0	0
Widowed	200	13	9	11	−7	0
Total:	2,418	128	75	87	−50	16

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

Table 19: Migration by Tenure

Category	Population	Net Inflows: All Migration	Same State: W/in County	Same State: Between Counties	Across States	From Abroad
Householder lived in owner-occupied housing units	1,130	−170	−33	−69	−68	0
Householder lived in renter-occupied housing units	1,563	200	104	143	−47	0
Total:	2,693	30	71	74	−115	0

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

Figure 91: Domestic Movements of Residents by Tenure



Table 20: Migration by Age

		Net Inflows				
			Same State			
Category	Population	All Migration	W/in County	Between Counties	Across States	From Abroad
1 to 4 years	102	−27	−14	−13	0	0
5 to 17 years	371	−23	31	0	−54	0
18 and 19 years	179	51	5	23	11	12
20 to 24 years	221	11	−8	−17	36	0
25 to 29 years	189	12	18	−6	0	0
30 to 34 years	122	−45	−17	−25	−7	4
35 to 39 years	117	−17	0	−7	−10	0
40 to 44 years	144	−1	17	−3	−15	0
45 to 49 years	175	35	0	50	−15	0
50 to 54 years	117	−8	23	0	−31	0
55 to 59 years	341	39	0	0	39	0
60 to 64 years	252	79	0	72	7	0
65 to 69 years	173	−36	10	0	−46	0
70 to 74 years	124	−7	0	0	−7	0
75 years and over	208	9	9	0	0	0
Total Population:	2,835	72	74	74	−92	16

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

Table 21: Migration by Educational Attainment

		Net Inflows				
			Same State			
Category	Population	All Migration	W/in County	Between Counties	Across States	From Abroad
Less than high school graduate	273	−30	0	4	−34	0
High school graduate (includes equiv)	604	65	37	4	20	4
Some college or assoc. degree	840	90	23	61	6	0
Bachelor's degree	135	−3	0	−3	0	0
Graduate or professional degree	110	−62	0	15	−77	0
Total:	1,962	60	60	81	−85	4

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	25,087	25,087
Moved Within Same County	11,830	13,032
Moved to Different County, Same State	25,221	28,625
Moved Between States	8,598	130,493
Total Population:	22,528	24,814

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	49.2	49.2
Moved Within Same County	20.7	20.3
Moved to Different County, Same State	47.1	28.3
Moved Between States	50.3	45.7
Moved from Abroad	18.7	
Total Population:	44.2	41.2

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

References and Sources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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