
COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY COMMITTEE

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆
CEDS

IMPERIAL COUNTY COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT • 940 W. Main St., Ste. #203, El Centro, CA

MEETING AGENDA

CEDS Committee

Monday, June 25, 2018 2:00 p.m.

Imperial County Planning Department, Conference Room
801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243

I. Call meeting to order

- a. Roll call
- b. Comments from 05/21/2018 Meeting (No Quorum)

II. Discussion/Action

- a. Review CEDS Draft.
- b. Level of Detail in the Executive Summary.
- c. Regional Priority Activities/Action Plan.
- d. Performance Criteria.
- e. OEDC Process for Agencies to get Projects Approved.
- f. Other Comments.
- g. Schedule Date to Finalize CEDS Document.

III. Other

IV. Next meeting date

TBD

V. Meeting adjourned



U.S. Department of Commerce
Economic Development



County of Imperial

ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT – REVIEW FOR CONTENT ONLY

June 19, 2018

Imperial County CEDS

Prepared for:

Imperial County

Prepared by:

Applied Development Economics, Inc.

1756 Lacassie Avenue, #100, Walnut Creek, CA 94596 ■ 925.934.8712

www.adeusa.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| OVERALL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION..... | 7 |
| ECONOMIC SUMMARY..... | 13 |
| RESILIENCE THROUGH ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING | 26 |
| SWOT ANALYSIS..... | 31 |
| VISION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES | 35 |
| ACTION PLAN | 37 |
| PROGRAM EVALUATION | 48 |
| APPENDIX TABLES | 50 |

LIST OF TABLES

| |
|--|
| Table 1. Summary of 2014-2016 Annual Average Number of Deaths by Leading Causes of Deaths...17 |
| Table 2: Imperial County Industry Employment Trends and Projections, 2007 to 202719 |
| Table 3: Economic Roles of Imperial County Industries.....21 |
| Table 4: Imperial County Industry Employment Trends and Projections, 2007 to 202724 |
| Table 5: Imperial County Retail Demand and Sales, 201725 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) reflects a cohesive and coordinated vision for economic development in Imperial County, embracing the goals of each municipal jurisdiction as well as a wide range of private sector, public and not-for-profit partner organizations. The CEDS meets the planning criteria from the Federal Economic Development Administration (EDA), thereby qualifying each jurisdiction to submit projects to EDA for funding assistance.

VISION STATEMENT

“To develop and strengthen economic development, and to provide a sustainable and healthy environment for the residents of Imperial County by providing training, job opportunities, a sustainable environment, and planning and delivery of transportation services to improve economic self-sufficiency, with an emphasis on Imperial County Target Areas. The County’s economy will be balanced and diversified amongst a variety of sectors, while maintaining its agricultural heritage. The Imperial County region will be fully integrated into the world economy by maximizing the advantages offered by its border location and abundant renewable resources.”

STRATEGIC ASSETS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Imperial County offers a number of economic development assets and opportunities.

Bi-national Trade/Foreign Trade Zone. Strategically located at the U.S. Mexico border in proximity to Mexican maquiladoras in Mexicali, Imperial County offers a tremendous opportunity for international trade. The two Ports of Entry (POE) in and near Calexico support cross border product shipments totaling \$16.1 billion in 2017, of which \$10.6 billion are advanced manufacturing products. The County also has a third POE serving the Yuma area. In addition, an estimated \$1 billion in consumer retail expenditures come from Mexico annually. The County is designated as Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) #237 and offers a flexible location designation that makes most areas of the County eligible to benefit from FTZ status. In addition, Imperial County offers strong governmental coordination through the CaliBaja Mega Region collaboration between Imperial and San Diego counties and Baja California.

It is the county’s goal to promote increased business within Imperial County related to international trade in the areas of advanced manufacturing, logistics and transportation and retail Trade.

Renewable Energy Production/ Broadband Expansion. Imperial County is leader in California in the production of renewable energy, with a current capacity of 2,818 MW. Solar, geothermal and wind energy production comprise nearly 80 percent of this portfolio and have grown significantly in the past five years, with continued expansion forecast. In addition, the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) has developed a state of the art energy storage facility that provides added stability and reliability to the energy network.

Imperial County also manages the South Border Broadband Consortium (SBBC), which includes San Diego County, and is working with both public and private sector partners to build out a high-speed data communications network that serves 21st century business needs.

With these energy and communications assets, Imperial County would be a prime location for data centers, advanced manufacturing, design firms, medical facilities and other businesses with high energy and data requirements.

Construction Materials/Heavy Metals. Imperial County is home to one of the largest gypsum plants in the country, which is owned by U.S. Gypsum, a company that manufactures more than half the drywall in the United States. Imperial County is also a large supplier of construction aggregate materials, including sand and gravel. In addition, reserves of lithium have been discovered and mined in Imperial County. Batteries using this metal power most of the electronic devices and electrical cars in the country.

Military. Naval Air Facility-El Centro (NAF EC) provides combat and readiness training to active and reserve aviation units for the Navy's operating and training forces and other U.S. forces and allied units. The combination of a unique climate, vast unobstructed desert terrain, limited non-military air traffic and the availability of dedicated gunnery and bomb ranges makes NAF EC an ideal environment for a wide range of training activities. NAF EC represents a stable source of economic stimulus to the surrounding region in the form of good-paying jobs, housing and retail demand and local expenditures for supplies and support services. The total economic benefit to the County was estimated in 2010 to be \$105 million annually.

Lower Cost of Living. Imperial County offers a relatively low cost of living, with housing prices about 40 percent of the state average and rents about half of state levels. In addition, overall wages are about 20 percent below state averages, so Imperial County offers an affordable, yet culturally rich living environment while offering lower business costs as well.

Large amount of vacant, affordable land. The cities in Imperial County have zoned large tracts of land for industrial use and are actively pursuing funding for infrastructure to these sites.

Agri-business. Agriculture has historically been an important part of the County economy and opportunities exist to increase value-added food processing in the County as well as to team with the biotechnology industry growing in San Diego County.

Tourism. Tourists to Imperial County generate an estimated \$347.6 million (2016) in the County and support more than 4,700 direct jobs, about 7 percent of total employment in the County. These figures do not include retail shopping that occurs by Mexicali residents. With its favorable winter climate, extensive outdoor recreation resources and easy connections to Mexico, Imperial County is a natural location for continued tourism investment.

INCENTIVES AND DESIGNATIONS

In addition to the FTZ designation mentioned above, Imperial County offers a number of other business incentives.

Opportunity Zones: The 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act created Opportunity Zones within which federal tax savings through stepped up depreciation are available. Imperial County has seven Opportunity Zone Tracts, including large portions of the cities of El Centro, Calexico, Holtville and Brawley, as well as unincorporated areas.

California State Programs: Many Imperial County businesses qualify for several state tax credit programs through the state of California, including the Manufacturers Sales tax Exemption, the California Competes Tax Credit Fund, and New Employment Tax Credit. This latter program applies to former Enterprise Zone areas and eligible census tract with high poverty and unemployment, of which Imperial County has a number.

HUB Zone. Small businesses operating within HUB zones receive federal contracting preferences.

New Market Tax Credits (NMTC). This program attracts investment capital to low-income communities by permitting individual and corporate investors to receive a tax credit against their Federal income tax return in exchange for making equity investments in specialized financial institutions call Community Development Entities (CDEs).

EB-5 Program. The US Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) administers the Immigrant Investor Program, also known as EB-5. Imperial County has three regional centers approved by USCIS to attract foreign investment for job creation. With Imperial County's unemployment rates, investors receive the preferential rate of \$500,000 per investment to access the program and receive immigration visas.

Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ). Established by the State of California, this program offers low interests loans for businesses operating in recycled materials markets.

ADDITIONAL STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Imperial County offers a number of economic development assets and opportunities in addition to those highlighted above.

- Available/ trainable workforce
- Transportation routes/freeway access
- Commercial passenger airport
- Close-knit communities with growing community- based partnerships
- Positive, pro-growth rural business attitude
- Multicultural community
- Simplified development process
- Accessible local officials
- Collaboration among agencies

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES TO ADDRESS ISSUES AND THREATS

Economic development efforts throughout Imperial County are focused on a number of issues:

Workforce Development. Although the County experiences long term high unemployment rates, substantial efforts are underway to focus workforce training and education on key industry priorities. The County educational system benefits from the presence of both Imperial Valley College and San Diego State University – I.V. Campus, as well as other public and private educational/training entities such as the University of Phoenix and the Imperial Valley Regional Occupational Program (IVROP). The Imperial County Workforce Development Board has prioritized training in several key economic sectors, including renewable energy, agribusiness, medical and medical support, warehousing/distribution/transportation, and general customer service.

Infrastructure Planning. A number of efforts are underway to improve transportation and other infrastructure to support economic development, particularly Phase 1 and 2 of the improved border crossings. In addition, recent projects such as the improvements at Brawley airport and the completion of the I-111 bypass has opened new areas for potential business development. Imperial is a Self-Help County, having passed Measure D, which provides local sales tax for 40-years to improve roads in the county and leverage state and federal funding.

Housing Development. Local jurisdictions have committed through their General Plan Housing Elements to support production of 11,900 dwelling units by 2022. This will further support the labor force and the favorable cost of living in the County.

Additional issues which economic development and planning partners in the County are working to address include the following:

- Limited public transportation services for large geographic area
- Need for improved quality of education in K-12 schools
- Technical assistance available but not marketed and offered in a limited capacity
- Need for proactive planning
- Neighboring regions uninformed of the region's resources due to lack of marketing funds and resources
- Lack of medical specialists
- Lack of financial resources
- Drug and human trafficking
- Language barriers
- Seasonal employment
- Salton Sea/New River pollution

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

In order to address the above issues and achieve the county's vision for economic prosperity, the OEDC and its regional economic development and planning partners commit to the following goals and performance criteria.

GOAL 1: PROMOTE A BALANCED, YET DIVERSIFIED REGIONAL ECONOMIC BASE.

- Program Activities:**
- a) Marketing efforts to promote Imperial County
 - b) Small business services by the SBDC

- Output Measures:**
- c) Change in number and mix of jobs per annual EDD data
 - d) Change in the county unemployment rate

GOAL 2: SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION OF INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES TO PROMOTE REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

- Program Activities:**
- a) City and County Capital Improvement Programs

- Output Measure:**
- b) Dollar value of construction of public improvements for the year

GOAL 3: IMPROVE THE EDUCATION AND SKILLS OF THE REGION'S WORKFORCE.

- Program Activities:**
- a) Students graduating from post-secondary education and training programs

- Output measure:**
- b) County educational attainment as measured by the American Community Survey (ACS)

GOAL 4: PROMOTE AND EXPAND TOURISM IN IMPERIAL COUNTY.

- Program Activities:**
- a) Tourism marketing programs
 - b) Development or renovation of visitor-serving attractions/facilities

- Output Measures:**
- a) Change in visitor expenditures per Dean Runyan annual reports

GOAL 5: PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL AND BI-NATIONAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT.

- Program Activities:**
- a) Marketing and business development efforts to attract firms engaged in international trade
 - b) Contacts with Mexican firms to promote location of satellite or support facilities in Imperial County

- Output Measure:**
- c) Change in the number and size of firms engaged in international trade, as measured by InfoUSA, business license records or other similar data

GOAL 6: PROMOTE AGRICULTURE AND OTHER RELATED INDUSTRIES.

- Program Activities:**
- a) Marketing and business development programs to expand the diversity of agricultural products and the number of food processing firms in the County

- Output Measures:**
- b) Change in the value and mix of agricultural produce

c) Change in the number of establishment and employment engaged in food processing and other ag support services.

GOAL 7: PURSUE A POLICY OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT THAT BALANCES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WITH PRESERVATION OF RESOURCES.

Program Activities: a) Marketing and business development efforts as well as public investments to increase renewable energy production, recycling volumes, green building practices and air quality.

Output Measures: b) Change in renewable energy production
c) Change in jobs associated with recycling market development
d) Change in air quality conditions.

GOAL 8: WORK TO ENHANCE THE REGION'S QUALITY OF LIFE.

Program Activities: a) City and County efforts to develop and enhance quality of life amenities as well as workforce housing.

Output Measures: b) Change in housing units constructed or rehabilitated
c) Track changes in Imperial County's ranking among places to live through indexes such as Gallup-Healthways and Sperling's City Comparisons.

OVERALL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

INTRODUCTION

The federal government designated the County of Imperial as the Economic Development District for the entire county. In 1965, the Imperial County Board of Supervisors established the Overall Economic Development Commission (OEDC) to develop its Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). Agencies seeking funding from the Economic Development Administration are advised to present their projects for inclusion in the CEDS to the OEDC at regularly scheduled meetings. A Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy is the result of a local planning process designed to guide the economic growth of an area. The terms "area," "region" and "community" are often used interchangeably to refer to an appropriate political, economic, geographic, or environmental entity for addressing economic development. The CEDS process will help create jobs, foster more stable and diversified economies, and improve living conditions. It provides a mechanism for coordinating the efforts of individuals, organizations, local governments, and private industry concerned with economic development. A CEDS is required to qualify for Economic Development Administration (EDA) assistance under its public works, economic adjustment, and most planning programs. It is also a prerequisite for designation by EDA as an Economic Development District (EDD). The CEDS must be the result of widespread community participation, containing the following:

- an analysis of economic and community development issues and opportunities including incorporation of any relevant materials or suggestions from other government sponsored or supported plans;
- background and history of the economic development situation of the area covered, with a discussion of the economy, including as appropriate, geography, population, labor force, resources, and the environment;
- a discussion of community participation in the planning efforts;
- a section that sets forth goals and objectives for taking advantage of the opportunities;
- strategies for solving the economic development problems of the area serviced;
- a plan of action, including suggested projects to implement objectives and goals set forth in the strategy; and
- performance measurements that will be used to evaluate whether and to what extent goals and objectives have been or are being met.

The Imperial County Board of Supervisors established the OEDC as the acting agency for economic and community development to continue the operations, which include initiating new activities and building economic development within the area.

The membership shall reflect representation from local government (county, city and district), business, industry, finance, agriculture, tourism, organized labor, utilities, public health, education, racial or ethnic minorities and the underemployed or unemployed. In accordance with EDA regulations, membership will be increased as needed to meet the 51 percent private sector for-profit membership. The Commission meets quarterly, or as needed, and is open to the public.

The OEDC through the CEDS Committee is the principal coordinator of the economic development planning process. The Commission is responsible for developing and implementing strategies, programs and projects that encourage new industry development, 8 business expansions and recruitment in Imperial County. Imperial County Community and Economic Development Department (ICCED), as the lead agency, coordinates the OEDC meetings, maintains all recordkeeping functions and submits the CEDS document.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

In accordance with the requirements of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, the County of Imperial established the Overall Economic Development Commission to formulate an Economic Development program consistent with the county's agrarian economy. In compliance with the Economic Development Commission bylaws, the 18 members that make up the OEDC are appointed in the following manner:

- One (1) member nominated and appointed by each of the five (5) members of the Imperial County Board of Supervisors.
- One (1) member appointed by each of the seven (7) incorporated cities in Imperial County.
- Five (5) members appointed by members of the leading minority groups or organizations of the area. One (1) appointment to be representative of the Quechan Indian Tribe. If minority appointments are not filled by the leading minority groups or organizations of the areas, appointments are to be made by the Imperial County Board of Supervisors.
- One (1) member appointed by the County of Imperial.

The Commission is well represented from a geographical standpoint and includes the major economic segments of Imperial County. The OEDC Executive Committee includes the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Secretary, who each serve for a period of one year. The Chairperson has the authority to appoint other committees and subcommittees, which are deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes, tasks and responsibilities of the OEDC.

MINORITY REPRESENTATION OF THE OEDC COMMISSION

The following information is to provide data to determine compliance with EDA Directive 7.06 on minority representation on OEDC Committees. The aspects of compliance are as follows:

1. Every effort shall be made to have minority representation, on the OEDC Commission, in proportion to the population of the county.

- Minority representation should be selected by representatives of the leading minority groups or organizations of the area.

OVERALL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

The overall Imperial County Overall Economic Development Commission for 2018-2019 is as follows:

| OEDC VOTING MEMBERS | | |
|---|---|--|
| <i>CITY REPRESENTATIVES</i> | <i>PRIMARY</i> | <i>ALTERNATE</i> |
| CITY OF BRAWLEY 383 Main St. Brawley, CA 92227 T: (760) 427-2940 F: (760) 351-3088 | Sam Couchman Council Member | George Nava Mayor |
| CITY OF CALEXICO 608 Heber Ave. Calexico, CA 92231 T: (760) 768-2177 F: (760) 357-3831 | David Dale CITY MANAGER | Miguel Figueroa ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR |
| CITY OF CALIPATRIA 125 N. Park Ave. Calipatria, CA 92233 T: (760) 348-4141 F: (760) 348-7035 | Romualdo Medina CITY MANAGER | Natasha Saucedo ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT |
| CITY OF EL CENTRO 1249 W. Main St., El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 337-4543 F: (760) 352-4867 | Marcela Piedra COMMUNITY SERVICES DIRECTOR | |
| CITY OF HOLTVILLE 121 W. Fifth St. Holtville, CA 92250 T: (760) 356-4685 F: (760) 356-4574 | Nick Wells CITY MANAGER | |
| CITY OF IMPERIAL 420 S. Imperial Ave. Imperial, CA 92251 T: (760) 355-4373 F: (760) 355-4314 | Stefan Chatwin CITY MANAGER | Othon Mora |
| CITY OF WESTMORLAND 355 S. Center St. Westmorland, CA 92281 T: (760) 344-3411 F: (760) 344-5307 | Sally Traylor CITY CLERK | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| COUNTY OF IMPERIAL 940 W. Main St. El Centro, CA 92243 T: (442) 265-1101 | Andy Horne DEPUTY CEO | |
| BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPOINTEES | <i>PRIMARY</i> | <i>ALTERNATE</i> |
| DISTRICT 1 | Yolanda Cordero CUSTOMER SERVICE REPRESENTATIVE <i>NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY</i> | |
| DISTRICT 2 | | |
| DISTRICT 3 | Mark Gran PRESIDENT <i>STRICTLY BUSINESS CONSULTING</i> | |
| DISTRICT 4 | Tim Kelley CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER <i>I.V. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.</i> | Sean Wilcock <i>I.V. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION</i> |
| DISTRICT 5 | | |
| MINORITY APPOINTMENTS | <i>PRIMARY</i> | <i>ALTERNATE</i> |
| CAMPESINOS UNIDOS, INC. (VICE-CHAIR) 1535 Main St. Brawley, CA 92227 T: (760) 370-5100 F: (760) 344-0322 | Jose M. Lopez EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR | Dora Rodriguez SOCIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR |
| CLINICAS DE SALUD DEL PUEBLO, INC. 1166 K St. Brawley, CA 92227 T: (760) 344-9951 | Yvonne Bell CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER | Sara Sanders DIRECTOR OF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT |
| OEDC COMMUNITY MEMBERS (non-voting) | <i>PRIMARY</i> | <i>ALTERNATE</i> |
| I.C. DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES 2695 S. Fourth St. El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 353-9858 F: (760) 336-4051 | Araceli Lopez PROGRAM MANAGER | Enrique Nunez STAFF SERVICES ANALYST |
| Eric Reyes | | |
| I.C. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD 2799 S. 4th Street El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 337-5507 F: (760) 337-5005 | Priscilla A. Lopez INTERIM DIRECTOR | Carlos Lopez BUSINESS SERVICES SUPERVISOR |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| I.C. TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 1503 N. Imperial Ave., Ste. #104 El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 592-4494 | Mark Baza EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR | Virginia Mendoza SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNER |
| IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE 380 E. Aten Rd. Imperial, CA 92251 T: (760) 355-6249 F: (760) 355-6172 | Efrain Silva, DEAN OF ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT | |

| | |
|---|--|
| CEDS Voting Members | |
| Public Sector | |
| I.C. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD Carlos Lopez, Business Services Supervisor 2799 S. 4th Street El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 337-5507 F: (760) 337-5005 | |
| CITY OF IMPERIAL Othon Mora, Building Official 420 S. Imperial Ave. Imperial, CA 92251 T: (760) 355-4373 F: (760) 355-4314 | |
| IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE Efrain Silva, DEAN OF ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT 380 E. Aten Rd. Imperial, CA 92251 T: (760) 355-6249 F: (760) 355-6172 | |
| I.C. TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION Mark Baza, Executive Director 1405 N. Imperial Ave., Ste. #1 El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 592-4494 | |
| Private Sector | |
| CALENERGY Diane Cason, VICE PRESIDENT REAL ESTATE ASSETS & COMMUNITY RELATIONS 7030 Gentry Rd. Calipatria, CA 92233 T: (760) 348-4095 | |
| RABOBANK Randy Taylor, VICE PRESIDENT MARKET MANAGER 1448 W. Main St. El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 337-3228 F: (760) 337-3231 | |
| ROOK PUBLIC RELATIONS , Mario Conde, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER 920 Adler Ave. Calexico, CA 92231 T: (760) 562-9549 | |
| | |

| |
|--|
| <p>IMPERIAL PRINTERS Robert Rubio, Co-Owner/Printing Consultant 430 W. Main St. El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 352-1300</p> |
| <p>THE HOLT GROUP, INC. Jorge Galvan, Project Manager 1601 N. Imperial Ave. El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 337-3883</p> |
| <p>STRICTLY BUSINESS CONSULTING Mark Gran, PRESIDENT 690 Broadway St., Suite 1 El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 457-7616 C: (760) 455-9334</p> |
| <p>CAMPESINOS UNIDOS, INC. Jose M. Lopez, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 1535 Main St. Brawley, CA 92227 T: (760) 370-5100 F: (760) 344-0322</p> |
| <p>CEDS Volunteers</p> |
| <p>I.C. TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION Virginia Mendoza, REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNER 1405 N. Imperial Ave., Ste. #1 El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 592-4494</p> |
| <p>SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER Sean Wilcock, DIRECTOR 301-B N. Imperial Ave. El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 312-9800 F: (760) 312-9838</p> |
| <p>I.V. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION Tim Kelley, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER 1405 N. Imperial Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 T: (760) 353-8332 F: (760) 353-9149</p> |
| <p>IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT Rosa Maria Gonzales, COMMUNITY & BUSINESS LIAISON 81-600 Avenue 58 La Quinta, CA 92253 T: (760) 398-5812</p> |
| <p>SO. CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS David Salgado, Regional Affairs Officer 1405 N. IMPERIAL AVE., SUITE 1 EL CENTRO, CA. 92243 T: (213)236-1967</p> |

OEDC AND CEDS COORDINATING STAFF
I.C. COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
940 W. Main St., Ste. #203
El Centro, CA 92243
T: (442) 265-1100
Esperanza Colio Warren, DEPARTMENT MANAGER
Jonathan Garcia, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR

ECONOMIC SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of economic and social conditions in Imperial County. The discussion below is supported by extensive data tables provided in the Appendix. In some cases, data tables are provided in the body of this chapter but for most topics, references are provided for the more detailed tables in the Appendix. In preparing the socioeconomic analysis, the data tables not only provide information for the cities and unincorporated communities in the County, but also comparisons for the surrounding counties in Southern California as well as statewide and national averages and some communities in Arizona. In addition, the tables include the southern counties in the San Joaquin Valley, including Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Kern counties. Imperial County identifies as an agricultural region, so there are interesting comparisons with the Central Valley region.

SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

DEMOGRAPHICS AND HOUSING

Imperial County has increased population by nearly 16,100 since 2010, to a total of 190,624 persons in 2018 (Table A-1). This reflects a 1.1 percent annual growth rate, which exceeds all of the surrounding counties except Riverside, and is well above the state average (Table A-2). According to the State Department of Finance (DOF), this growth was due in part to increasing household sizes, as well as new housing development. Total housing units grew by 0.4 percent per year during this period and the vacancy rate increased from 12.4 percent to 13.2 percent. This is very high, compared to the state average of 7.4 percent in 2018. However, the vacancy rate varies by location throughout the county, with cities like Brawley, Calexico and Holtville ranging from 8.0 to 8.5 percent, closer to the state average. The combined Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for Imperial County and the cities exceeds 11,900 units between 2014 and 2021, a 21 percent increase over the 2014 housing total.

With a median age of 32.2 years, Imperial County has a younger population than the state as whole, although it is very similar to San Bernardino county as well as the southern San Joaquin Valley counties (Table A-3). Imperial County has 31 percent of its population aged 19 years or younger compared to 27 percent for the state, while its working age population (20-64 years) is 56 percent and the state is 62 percent (Table A-4).

Imperial has a relatively large Latino population, at 83 percent, compared to 33 percent of San Diego County or 39 percent for the state (Table A-5). The counties in southern San Joaquin Valley range from 52-63 percent. Given this population mix and its location at the Mexican border, Imperial County has 27 percent of its population with limited English speaking ability, compared to less than 10 percent for the surrounding counties (Table A-6). For comparison, Tulare County has 18 percent, highest among the southern San Joaquin Valley counties. Imperial County also has a higher proportion of family households, at 77 percent compared to 69 percent for the state (Table A-7). However, it also has a higher percentage of female-headed households, at 19 percent, compared to 13 percent for the state.

Imperial County has a slightly higher rate of home ownership, at 56 percent, than the state average. This also compares favorably to Central Valley counties such as Fresno and Kings county but is lower than the surrounding Southern California counties (Table A-9). Based on ACS data for 2016, home sales values are 40 percent of state levels and rents are about half the state averages (Table A-10). This is advantageous considering that Imperial County wages are only about 20 percent less on average. However, Imperial County has a slightly higher percentage of overcrowded units than either the state or the Central Valley counties, perhaps due in part to its larger household sizes (Table A-11).

LABOR FORCE

In terms of educational attainment, more than half of Imperial County residents 25 years and older have high school diplomas, some college experience and/or AA degrees. This is very comparable to statewide statistics (Table A-13). However, 33 percent have no high school diploma compared to 18 percent for the state. Based on research ADE has conducted elsewhere in California, we expect that many workers in this category did not grow up in the US but immigrated here as adults. For those workers with BA degrees in Imperial County, 38 percent are in science, engineering or related fields (Table A-14). A high proportion has degrees in education, at 20 percent, compared to 7 percent for the state.

As of March 2018, Imperial County had the second highest county unemployment rate (15.3 percent) in the state, behind only Colusa County at 18.9 percent. In the past year, the state unemployment rate has improved one percent, from 5.2 percent to 4.2 percent. Imperial County's rate improved three percent, from 18.8 percent in March 2017 (Table A-15). Proportionally, however, this is still less of an improvement than the state average. Tables A-16 and A-17 show unemployment rates for different age groups in the population in 2016 and Imperial County has exceptionally high youth unemployment, at 34 percent for workers under 25 years, compared to 18 percent for the state.

Similar to state and regional trends, unemployment rates in Imperial County are lower for workers with higher educational levels, as shown in Tables A-18 and A-19. However, disparities exist even for workers with AA or BA degrees in Imperial County compared with the state averages and all the comparison counties in Southern California and the San Joaquin Valley.

Workers living in Imperial County are employed in higher percentages in agriculture, retail, education and public administration than the state as a whole (Table A-20). However, the proportion of workers in agriculture is about half the levels in the San Joaquin Valley (Table A-21). In terms of occupational groups, in addition to farming, higher percentages are employed in community service jobs as sales occupations than the state average (Table A-22).

Pay levels in Imperial County are about 20 percent lower overall compared to state averages, but certain industrial, logistics, construction and public protection occupations pay higher in Imperial County (Table A-23). From the perspective of industry-wide averages, jobs in Imperial County pay better than the state in agriculture, retail, education and public administration. For agriculture and manufacturing, average annual wages are lower in Imperial County than the comparative San Joaquin Valley counties (Table A-24).

Imperial County has a higher percentage of workers who both live and work in the County, at 92 percent, compared to 83 percent statewide (Table A-27). The ACS reports that 2 percent of the workforce commutes out of state.

INCOME

The median household income in Imperial County, at \$42,560 in 2016, is 33 percent below the state average, but about comparable to Tulare County among the comparison locations (Table A-28). Imperial County is comparable to the state in the proportion of workers earning between \$20,000 and \$10,000 per year, but has a higher proportion of workers earning less than \$20,000 and slightly lower percentage in the upper income groups (Table A-29). The poverty rate in 2016 was 24 percent, compared to 16 percent for the state (Table A-30). However, this was less than Fresno County (27 percent) or Tulare County (28 percent).

HEALTH INDICATORS

ANNUAL AVERAGE NUMBER OF LOW BIRTH-WEIGHT BABIES

Of all the live births in Imperial County in any given year, on average roughly 180 births a year involve low birth-weight babies (Table A-38). The most recent data in a 2018 California Department of Public Health report indicates that, over the 3-year 2014-2016 period, there were on average 179 low birth-weight new-born babies a year, which is 5.7 percent of all live births. At 5.7 percent of all births, Imperial County's low birth-weight baby rate is better than the 6.8 percent national goal set by federal Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Since the early 2000s, Imperial County has consistently exhibited better rates of low birth-weight new-born babies than California as a whole.

ANNUAL AVERAGE NUMBER OF BIRTHS BY TEEN-AGE MOTHERS

According to the 2018 California Department of Public Health's "County Health Profile", over the 3-year 2014-2016 period, there were on average 260 births a year delivered by teen mothers (Table A-39). At 260 births, the rate of births by teen-age mothers amounts to 37.6 births per 1,000 teen-age women. The CDC has not established a national goal with respect to the number of births per 1,000 teen-age women. However, Imperial County's 2014-2016 rate is slightly more than two times that of California as a whole (17.6 per 1,000), and somewhat higher than many of the comparison rural counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern). While Imperial County exhibits high numbers and rates of teen pregnancies, it is a declining trend, going from a rate of 57.2 per 1,000 for the 2004-2005 three-year period, to 56.5 per 1,000 for the 2009-2011 period, and to the most-recent 37.6 per 1,000 rate.

ANNUAL AVERAGE NUMBER OF TUBERCULOSIS CASES

According to a 2018 "County Health Profile," which is an annual report issued by the California Department of Public Health, there were on average 37 tuberculosis cases a year over the 3-year 2014-2016 period (Table A-40). This amounts to 20.1 cases per 100,000 people, which is significantly higher than federal, state, and comparison county rates. Imperial County has consistently posted high rates of tuberculosis since the early 2000s.

ANNUAL PERCENT OF ADULTS WITH ASTHMA

According to the UCLA Health Policy Institute, 8.5 percent of all adults have asthma, which is slightly higher than the 8.3 percent statewide rate (Table A-41). Other rural comparison counties have higher

rates of adult asthma. In the most extreme example, almost 16 percent of all adults in Kings County have asthma.

SUMMARY OF 2014-2016 ANNUAL AVERAGE NUMBER OF DEATHS BY LEADING CAUSES OF DEATHS

In a peer-reviewed article summarizing national trends with respect to leading causes of deaths, Hannah Nichols found that nearly 75 percent of all deaths in the United States are attributable to ten causes, with the top three of the leading causes of death accounting for over 50 percent of all deaths.¹ The ten leading causes of death in the nation are heart disease, cancer, chronic lower respiratory disease, accidents, stroke (cerebrovascular diseases), Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, influenza and pneumonia, kidney disease, and suicide. The on-set of some of these causes of deaths can be delayed or perhaps even prevented through diet, exercise and life-style choices.

Table 1 below includes data for Imperial County and various comparison areas on six of the ten leading causes of death (more detailed data may be found in Tables A-42 to A-47). Data comes from the 2018 edition of "County Health Profile," which is annually issued by the California Department of Public Health. In other tables in the appendix, we also track trends over time for each of the six causes of death, covering three three-year periods (2004-2006, 2009-2011, and 2014-2016). In addition to the average annual number of deaths over the 2014-2016 period, the table includes deaths per 100,000 people, which the California Department of Public Health calculated on an age-adjusted basis.

Observations for the 2014-2016 period from the table above include the following:

- There were on average 60 deaths a year due to diabetes, which amounts to 33.6 deaths per 100,000 people. The rate of diabetes-related deaths is significantly higher than rates for state and nearby comparison counties of Riverside and San Diego. Interestingly, the highly urbanized San Bernardino county exhibits a rate that is as high as Imperial County's rate. Imperial County's rate of 33.6 diabetes-related deaths per 100,000 people is higher than most rates of comparison rural counties, except Kern County (36.1 per 100,000).
- There were on average 214 deaths a year due to cancer, which amounts to 120.1 deaths per 100,000 people. The age-adjusted rate of cancer-related deaths is considerably lower state and national rates, as well as all urban and rural comparison counties.
- There were on average 155 deaths a year due to heart disease, which amounts to 86.9 deaths per 100,000 people. The age-adjusted rate of heart disease-related deaths is considerably lower the national goal of 103.4 and slightly below the statewide rate of 89.1. Compared to the other counties, only San Diego County exhibited a better rate than Imperial County at 81.2 heart disease-related deaths per 100,000.

¹Hannah Nichols, "The top 10 leading causes of death in the United States" Medical News Today [February 23, 2017] (<http://archive.is/6aQRp>)

Table 1. Summary of 2014-2016 Annual Average Number of Deaths by Leading Causes of Deaths

| Jurisdiction | Diabetes | Cancer | Heart Disease | Stroke | Chronic Lower Respiratory Diseases | Accidents |
|--|----------|--------|---------------|--------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| California | 8,696 | 58,931 | 37,659 | 14,753 | 13,312 | 12,368 |
| Imperial County | 60 | 214 | 155 | 51 | 38 | 76 |
| Riverside County | 487 | 3,679 | 2,650 | 857 | 1,032 | 846 |
| San Bernardino County | 620 | 2,959 | 1,839 | 699 | 901 | 555 |
| San Diego County | 679 | 5,011 | 2,908 | 1,229 | 1,007 | 1,078 |
| Fresno County | 238 | 1,280 | 977 | 397 | 297 | 406 |
| Kern County | 263 | 1,153 | 952 | 259 | 389 | 446 |
| Kings County | 28 | 182 | 105 | 38 | 46 | 51 |
| Tulare County | 108 | 564 | 472 | 159 | 158 | 167 |
| <i>Deaths per 100,000 People: Age-Adjusted</i> | | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | --- | 161.4 | 103.4 | 35.3 | --- | 36.4 |
| California | 20.7 | 140.2 | 89.1 | 34.8 | 34.1 | 30.3 |
| Imperial County | 33.6 | 120.1 | 86.9 | 28.5 | 20.5 | 42.5 |
| Riverside County | 19.3 | 146.2 | 104.6 | 34.2 | 44.3 | 35.7 |
| San Bernardino County | 33.2 | 157.6 | 106.5 | 40.5 | 42.3 | 27.5 |
| San Diego County | 19.3 | 142.8 | 81.2 | 34.3 | 30.7 | 31.2 |
| Fresno County | 26.4 | 141.9 | 108.1 | 44.7 | 30.4 | 43.8 |
| Kern County | 36.1 | 153.4 | 132.6 | 36.8 | 44.0 | 54.0 |
| Kings County | 24.7 | 152.2 | 91.6 | 34.1 | 30.7 | 38.6 |
| Tulare County | 26.5 | 138.4 | 120.5 | 40.9 | 34.0 | 39.8 |

Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

- There were on average 51 deaths a year due to stroke, which amounts to 28.5 deaths per 100,000 people. The age-adjusted rate of stroked-related deaths is somewhat lower than state and national rates, though this was not the case during the 2009-2011 three-year period.
- There were on average 38 deaths a year due to chronic lower respiratory diseases (asthma, bronchitis, emphysema, etc.), which amounts to 20.5 deaths per 100,000 people. The age-adjusted rate of deaths due to chronic lower respiratory diseases is considerably lower than the statewide rate of 34.1 deaths per 100,000, as well as considerably lower than rates exhibited by the comparison counties. Imperial County also exhibited lower rates on age-adjusted basis relative to the comparison areas over the 2004-2006 and 2009-2011 periods.
- There were on average 76 deaths a year due to accidents, which amounts to 42.5 deaths per 100,000 people. The age-adjusted rate of deaths due to accidents is considerably above the

statewide rate of 30.3 deaths per 100,000 and somewhat above the national goal of 36.4 deaths per 100,000. Imperial County also exhibited higher age-adjusted rates of deaths due to accidents than almost all other comparison counties, except Fresno County (43.8 deaths per 100,000 people) Kern County (54.0 deaths per 100,000 people).

EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRY TRENDS

This section summarizes the recent employment trends by industry sector and industry cluster. In general, Imperial County has had good overall job growth that has been led by a small group of key industries. The county employment base is largely driven by agriculture, distribution, and public sector activity, with strong growth in health care and hospitality.

The employment data and projections used in this section come from Economic Modeling Specialists International, Inc. (EMSI), which uses the QCEW and Current Employment Statistics datasets issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), and runs them through a proprietary model that estimates the job counts for industry and occupational categories that BLS does not disclose due to confidentiality restrictions. The EMSI growth projections are derived from the California EDD Labor Market Information Division (LMID) and the National Industry-Occupation Employment Matrix (NIOEM).

EMPLOYMENT DISTRIBUTION AND CHANGE

Between 2007 and 2017, employment in Imperial County increased from 57,170 to 64,263 jobs, which comes out to a compounded annual growth rate (CAGR) of 1.2 percent (Table 2). The largest industry sectors in Imperial County are agriculture, government, retail trade, and health care. Each of these industry groups account for over 7,000 jobs.

The largest job growth occurred in health care and social assistance, which more than tripled during this time, adding 6,468 jobs for a 2017 total of 9,105 jobs (13.2 percent CAGR). Other sectors that added over 1,000 jobs between 2007 and 2017 include agriculture and government. The largest job losses occurred in manufacturing and other services, each of which lost over 1,000 jobs during this period.

According to employment projections from EMSI, Imperial County should expect to add over 10,500 jobs between 2017 and 2027 for a total of over 74,000 jobs. This represents a slight increase in the growth rate with a CAGR of 1.4 percent. Health care and government are each projected to add over 2,000 jobs through 2027. Other large sources of job growth include agriculture, transportation and warehousing, and retail trade.

Table 2: Imperial County Industry Employment Trends and Projections, 2007 to 2027

| NAICS Code | Description | 2007 Jobs | 2017 Jobs | 2027 Jobs (Projected) | 2007 to 2017 Job Change | 2017 to 2027 Job Change | CAGR 2007 to 2017 | CAGR 2017 to 2027 |
|------------|--|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 11 | Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting | 10,191 | 11,484 | 12,278 | 1,292 | 955 | 1.2% | 0.7% |
| 21 | Mining, Quarrying, Oil and Gas Extraction | 23 | 387 | 642 | 363 | 246 | 32.4% | 5.2% |
| 22 | Utilities | 392 | 413 | 477 | 21 | 39 | 0.5% | 1.4% |
| 23 | Construction | 1,952 | 1,417 | 1,356 | (535) | (61) | -3.2% | -0.4% |
| 31 | Manufacturing | 2,569 | 1,404 | 1,545 | (1,165) | 175 | -5.9% | 1.0% |
| 42 | Wholesale Trade | 1,863 | 1,983 | 2,272 | 119 | 410 | 0.6% | 1.4% |
| 44 | Retail Trade | 7,462 | 7,945 | 9,117 | 483 | 1,056 | 0.6% | 1.4% |
| 48 | Transportation and Warehousing | 1,324 | 2,157 | 2,872 | 833 | 902 | 5.0% | 2.9% |
| 51 | Information | 406 | 318 | 331 | (88) | 39 | -2.4% | 0.4% |
| 52 | Finance and Insurance | 918 | 786 | 859 | (132) | 80 | -1.5% | 0.9% |
| 53 | Real Estate and Rental and Leasing | 525 | 475 | 516 | (50) | (33) | -1.0% | 0.8% |
| 54 | Professional, Scientific, Technical Services | 902 | 781 | 761 | (121) | 33 | -1.4% | -0.3% |
| 55 | Management of Companies and Enterprises | 295 | 212 | 174 | (82) | (56) | -3.2% | -2.0% |
| 56 | Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services | 1,521 | 1,518 | 1,597 | (3) | 222 | 0.0% | 0.5% |
| 61 | Educational Services | 288 | 163 | 78 | (126) | (72) | -5.6% | -7.0% |
| 62 | Health Care and Social Assistance | 2,638 | 9,105 | 12,471 | 6,468 | 3,529 | 13.2% | 3.2% |
| 71 | Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation | 144 | 209 | 242 | 65 | 14 | 3.8% | 1.5% |
| 72 | Accommodation and Food Services | 3,393 | 4,151 | 4,838 | 759 | 697 | 2.0% | 1.5% |
| 81 | Other Services (ex. Public Administration) | 3,683 | 877 | 945 | (2,806) | 132 | -13.4% | 0.8% |
| 90 | Government | 16,663 | 18,296 | 20,359 | 1,633 | 2,101 | 0.9% | 1.1% |
| 99 | Unclassified Industry | 17 | 182 | 313 | 165 | 117 | 26.7% | 5.6% |
| | Total | 57,170 | 64,263 | 74,043 | 7,093 | 10,526 | 1.2% | 1.4% |

Source: ADE, Inc.; data from EMSI

Notes: CAGR refers to the compounded annual growth rate.

DEFINING ECONOMIC ROLES

Imperial County’s economy is defined by how various industries fit into the overall economy, based on their role within the economy. To assess these roles, ADE ranked the industries in Imperial County on the basis of two key economic indicators—job growth and employment concentration relative to the state. The economic roles based on these indicators fall into one of four categories, which are described as follows:

- Growing Economic Base Industries:** These industries have shown recent job growth and have an above average employment concentration. They constitute the strength of the economy, and represent opportunities for growth in other areas such as supplier industries.
- Emerging Industries:** These sectors have shown recent job growth, but still have a below average employment concentration. These industries represent potential future growth opportunities because they have not yet accumulated a high concentration of employment. Industries in this category could be considered attractive business attraction targets.

- **Declining Economic Base Industries:** These industries have an above average concentration of employment, but have shown recent job losses. They represent strong industries in a region that have shown some recent vulnerability, and could be considered business retention targets.
- **Declining Non-Base Industries:** These industries have shown recent job losses and have below average employment concentration. They do not have an especially notable regional presence and do not have growth prospects as strong as the industries in the other categories.

The analysis focuses on the ten-year period between 2007 and 2017. During this time, Imperial County's employment base showed overall growth, but had several specific sectors that lost employment.

The growing economic base industries were concentrated in agriculture, mining, utilities, transportation and government (Table 3). These types of industries also comprised the core of the industry clusters that drive the regional economy. The largest individual private sector industries are support activities for agriculture, social assistance, and crop production, which each employ over 4,000 workers.

The emerging industries represent potential opportunities for economic expansion that have yet to achieve high local concentration. These emerging industries are largely concentrated in transportation, health care, amusement, hospitality, and personal services. Except for health care, these industries primarily serve logistics and tourism activity. The largest individual industries are food services and health care services, which each employ over 1,900 workers.

The only industries with above average employment concentrations that showed job losses during this period were livestock, food production and mineral product manufacturing. The losses in manufacturing reflect volatility in the food processing sector, with some individual activities showing significant losses while others show growth. It should be noted that all of the declining economic base industries currently employ less than 800 workers. So, while these industries are concentrated in Imperial County, they do not rank among the largest economic sectors.

The range of industries in Imperial County with lower concentrations of employment is fairly large, and the majority of these sectors have had recent job losses. This means that Imperial County's economy remains driven by a high concentration of very specific industries. The only individual industry with job losses and low concentration with over 1,000 workers is administrative and support services.

Table 3: Economic Roles of Imperial County Industries

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Declining Economic Base Industries (High Concentration, Negative Job Growth)</p> <p>112 Animal Production and Aquaculture 311 Food Manufacturing 327 Nonmetallic Mineral Product Mfg.</p> | <p>Growing Economic Base Industries (High Concentration, Positive Job Growth)</p> <p>115 Support Activities for Agriculture 111 Crop Production 212 Mining (except Oil and Gas) 213 Support Activities for Mining 221 Utilities 424 Merchant Wholesalers, Nondurable 484 Truck Transportation 562 Waste Management and Remediation 624 Social Assistance 901 Federal Government 902 State Government 903 Local Government</p> |
| <p>Declining Non-Base Industries (Low Concentration, Negative Job Growth)</p> <p>236 Construction of Buildings 237 Heavy Construction 238 Specialty Trade Contractors 312 Beverage Manufacturing 315 Apparel Manufacturing 323 Printing and Related Support Activities 332 Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing 334 Computer and Electronic Product Mfg. 337 Furniture Manufacturing 339 Miscellaneous Manufacturing 423 Merchant Wholesalers, Durable Goods 425 Wholesale Electronic Markets 493 Warehousing and Storage 511 Publishing Industries (except Internet) 515 Broadcasting (except Internet) 517 Telecommunications 522 Credit Intermediation and Related Activities 523 Securities, Commodity Contracts, and Other Financial Investments and Related Activities 524 Insurance Carriers 532 Rental and Leasing Services 541 Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services 551 Management of Companies and Enterprises 561 Administrative and Support Services 611 Educational Services 622 Hospitals 623 Nursing and Residential Care Facilities 811 Repair and Maintenance 813 Civic, Professional, and Similar Org. 814 Private Households 531 Real Estate</p> | <p>Emerging Industries (Low Concentration, Positive Job Growth)</p> <p>333 Machinery Manufacturing 485 Transit and Ground Passenger Trans. 488 Support Activities for Transportation 492 Couriers and Messengers 512 Motion Picture and Sound Recording 621 Ambulatory Health Care Services 713 Amusement, Gambling, and Recreation 721 Accommodation 722 Food Services and Drinking Places 812 Personal and Laundry Services</p> |

Source: ADE, Inc.; data from EMSI.

Notes: The time period referenced in the job growth trend goes from 2007 to 2017. Location quotient represents the measure of employment concentration in relation to California. Quotients above 1.0 indicate high employment concentration, as of 2017.

INDUSTRY CLUSTERS

Industry clusters are based on the assumption that interrelated groupings of industries can create spinoff activity that benefits from a region's economic specialization and concentration of particular activity. The cluster analysis looks at "traded clusters," which represent the groups of industries that serve regional and global markets, rather than local demand. Traded clusters drive wealth creation and generally have a higher value added than industries that focus on local markets.

The U.S. Cluster Mapping Project is a joint venture between Harvard Business School and the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA), and uses 51 standard traded cluster definitions that identify primary economic drivers for regions throughout the U.S.² For Imperial County, the Cluster Mapping Project identified the following six clusters as the leading traded clusters:³

- Aerospace/defense
- Agricultural inputs and services
- Distribution and electronic commerce
- Electric power generation and transmission
- Livestock
- Transportation/logistics

It should be noted that the cluster employment totals and trends shown on Table 4 do not include non-covered, military, and self-employment. Even though the aerospace/defense cluster is identified as a primary economic driver, the EMSI database did not show existing employment in those industries, largely because it does not include any of the jobs at military installations. In addition, the Mexicali region on the Mexico side of the border has a large and thriving aerospace industry with over 12,200 jobs,⁴ and the spinoff effects of those activities might show up in Imperial County supplier industries that are not defined as core industries in the aerospace/defense cluster.

In addition, livestock processing has had a large job decline in jobs in recent years, and the employment projections do not show a recovery in that cluster in the near future.

For all of the other leading clusters, the employment trends and projections show positive growth trends and projected growth, while the electric power and transportation/logistics clusters also show continued high employment concentration.

² Delgado, M., M.E. Porter, and S. Stern; "Defining Clusters of Related Industries"; 2014.

³ U.S. Cluster Mapping Project; <http://clustermapping.us/>

⁴ Mexicali Economic Development Corporation; <http://mexicaliindustrial.com/industries.php>

As a group, traded clusters account for over 13,400 jobs in Imperial County, or about 21 percent of the total employment, as shown in Table 1-3.⁵ Traded clusters added less than 1,000 jobs between 2007 and 2017, while the economy as a whole added over 7,000 jobs. However, traded clusters are projected to add nearly 2,000 jobs between 2017 and 2027 and grow at the same rate as the overall job base (1.4 percent CAGR).

The largest industry cluster is agricultural inputs and services, which comprise close to half of the traded cluster employment in Imperial County. Other large clusters with over 500 jobs include metal mining, transportation/logistics, distribution, and food processing. Each of these large clusters is projected to add jobs through 2027.

Tables A-31 to A-36 show trends in products crossing the border, much of which is associated with advanced manufacturing occurring in Mexicali. Further development of component manufacturing and logistics in Imperial County associated with this trade would be one avenue to expand cluster development within the County.

⁵ The traded clusters table excludes those clusters that have not had a presence in Imperial County or projected future employment.

Table 4: Imperial County Industry Employment Trends and Projections, 2007 to 2027

| Traded Cluster | 2017 Jobs (Imperial County) | 2027 Jobs (Imperial County) | 2007 to 2017 Job Change | 2017 to 2027 Job Change | 2017 Location Quotient | 2027 Projected Location Quotient | Leading County Cluster | High Current Location Quotient | High Projected Location Quotient | Positive Recent Growth | Positive Projected Growth |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Aerospace Vehicles and Defense | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | X | | | | |
| Agricultural Inputs and Services | 6,775 | 7,059 | 681 | 284 | 8.11 | 7.19 | X | X | X | X | X |
| Apparel | 10 | 0 | -50 | -10 | 0.06 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| Business Services | 710 | 803 | 4 | 93 | 0.18 | 0.17 | | | | X | X |
| Communications | 164 | 202 | 27 | 38 | 0.40 | 0.49 | | | | X | X |
| Construction Products/Services | 364 | 308 | -202 | -56 | 1.62 | 1.14 | | X | X | | |
| Distribution and Electronic Commerce | 1,901 | 2,158 | 107 | 257 | 0.72 | 0.70 | X | | | X | X |
| Downstream Metal Products | 0 | 14 | -17 | 14 | 0.00 | 0.14 | | | | | X |
| Electric Power | 367 | 464 | 235 | 97 | 5.59 | 6.77 | X | X | X | X | X |
| Environmental Services | 34 | 63 | 34 | 29 | 0.68 | 1.18 | | | X | X | X |
| Financial Services | 239 | 322 | -106 | 83 | 0.29 | 0.34 | | | | | X |
| Food Processing | 706 | 911 | 369 | 205 | 1.10 | 1.28 | | X | X | X | X |
| Furniture | 32 | 38 | -57 | 6 | 0.26 | 0.37 | | | | | X |
| Hospitality and Tourism | 428 | 516 | 54 | 88 | 0.30 | 0.31 | | | | X | X |
| Information Technology and Analytical Instruments | 15 | 12 | -3 | -3 | 0.01 | 0.01 | | | | | |
| Insurance Services | 26 | 49 | -30 | 23 | 0.07 | 0.13 | | | | | X |
| Livestock Processing | 56 | 0 | -1,049 | -56 | 0.67 | 0.00 | X | | | | |
| Marketing, Design, and Publishing | 71 | 110 | 29 | 39 | 0.08 | 0.10 | | | | X | X |
| Medical Devices | 0 | 0 | -22 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | |
| Metal Mining | 515 | 825 | 515 | 310 | 113.94 | 110.73 | | X | X | X | X |
| Metalworking Technology | 0 | 13 | -48 | 13 | 0.00 | 0.08 | | | | | X |
| Nonmetal Mining | 41 | 54 | 18 | 13 | 2.25 | 2.79 | | X | X | X | X |
| Oil and Gas | 85 | 168 | 72 | 83 | 0.77 | 1.65 | | | X | X | X |
| Production Tech/Heavy Machinery | 36 | 69 | 17 | 33 | 0.18 | 0.33 | | | | X | X |
| Recreational Goods | 19 | 27 | 8 | 8 | 0.21 | 0.37 | | | | X | X |
| Transportation and Logistics | 833 | 1,219 | 461 | 386 | 1.37 | 1.71 | x | X | X | X | X |
| Wood Products | 18 | 16 | -31 | -2 | 0.21 | 0.19 | | | | | |
| Total Jobs (All Sectors) | 64,263 | 74,043 | 7,093 | 9,780 | | | | | | | |
| Traded Cluster Jobs | 13,445 | 15,420 | 859 | 1,975 | | | | | | | |

Source: ADE, Inc.; data from EMSI and U.S. Cluster Mapping Project

Notes: The job statistics include covered employment, and exclude some sectors, such as military. Location quotient represents a measure of employment concentration in relation to California. Leading county clusters include those clusters designated as such by the U.S. Cluster Mapping Project. Clusters with no current or recent presence in Imperial County and no projected employment growth or designation as a leading cluster are not included in this table.

Quotients above 1.0 indicate above average employment concentration.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Imperial County has achieved substantial growth in renewable energy production in the past five years (Table A-37). Since 2012, the annual growth rate in total electricity production has been 17 percent, driven mainly by growth in solar facilities and natural gas power plants. Further potential exists for growth in geothermal as well as solar.

RETAIL ANALYSIS

We have updated the recent county retail analysis to add growth in households since 2015 as well as changes in sales levels by store type. The updated countywide analysis is shown in Table 5 below. We estimate households in Imperial County have a purchasing power of \$853 million, not all of which is necessarily spent in Imperial County. Tourism generates another \$235 million in retail demand, making the total retail market in Imperial County about \$1.1 billion. This does not count business to business retail demand. While there is some leakage in the restaurant category, the County achieves twice the sales that would be expected from this local demand, or about \$2.2 billion per year. The “excess capture” of about \$1.2 billion likely comes from Mexican shoppers crossing the border. This figure is fairly consistent with the 2005 estimate by University of Texas researchers, who estimated about \$1 billion in economic benefit from Mexican visitors.⁶ However, it is also likely the total extent of this market is much greater and therefore represents a significant economic development opportunity for Imperial County. The final report will include updated tables for each of the communities.

Table 5: Imperial County Retail Demand and Sales, 2017

| Store Type Category | Households in Imperial County | Visitors to Imperial County | Total US Demand: Imperial County | Info USA Sales: Imperial County Retail Sales | Leakage | Excess Capture |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|
| Total | \$853,542,797 | \$235,100,000 | \$1,088,642,797 | \$2,231,834,000 | \$38,541,309 | \$1,181,732,512 |
| Apparel Store Group | \$53,339,997 | \$9,315,073 | \$62,655,070 | \$119,036,000 | --- | \$56,380,930 |
| General Merchandise Group | \$131,387,553 | \$21,995,194 | \$153,382,747 | \$714,854,000 | --- | \$561,471,253 |
| Specialty Retail Group | \$37,053,810 | \$13,689,733 | \$50,743,543 | \$79,698,000 | --- | \$28,954,457 |
| Food, Eating and Drinking Group | \$296,186,397 | \$144,100,000 | \$440,286,397 | \$526,414,000 | \$38,541,309 | \$124,668,912 |
| Grocery Stores | \$185,823,088 | \$44,400,000 | \$230,223,088 | \$354,892,000 | --- | \$124,668,912 |
| Eating Places | \$110,363,309 | \$99,700,000 | \$210,063,309 | \$171,522,000 | \$38,541,309 | --- |
| Building Materials/ Homefurnishings | \$57,999,991 | \$0 | \$57,999,991 | \$430,051,000 | \$0 | \$372,051,009 |
| Home furnishings and appliances | \$29,793,988 | \$0 | \$29,793,988 | \$141,398,000 | --- | \$111,604,012 |
| Building materials, etc | \$28,206,003 | \$0 | \$28,206,003 | \$288,653,000 | --- | \$260,446,997 |
| Automotive Group | \$277,575,050 | \$46,000,000 | \$323,575,050 | \$361,781,000 | \$0 | \$38,205,950 |
| New Cars & RVs, etc | \$140,992,556 | \$0 | \$140,992,556 | \$155,672,000 | --- | \$14,679,444 |
| Gasoline Service Stations | \$136,582,494 | \$46,000,000 | \$182,582,494 | \$206,109,000 | --- | \$23,526,506 |

Source: ADE, Inc.

⁶ Suad Ghadda and Cynthia Brown, University of Texas-Pan American, Center for Border Economic Studies, "The Economic Impact of Mexican Visitors Along the U.S.-Mexico Border: A Research Synthesis" (2005), page 7.

RESILIENCE THROUGH ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING

This section of the CEDS discusses ways in which officials in the public and private sectors have embraced “resilience” as a framework for planning Imperial County, particularly in the face of natural and/or man-made shocks to the region’s economy and quality of life. First, this section summarizes steps taken by officials to diversify the economy. Then, this section discusses emergency management plans in place to deal with natural and/or man-made disasters.

RESILIENCE THROUGH ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION

Imperial County’s economy is tied closely and directly to the natural environment in many ways. Key economic sectors such as agriculture, renewable energy, natural resources (lithium, sand and gravel, manganese, etc.), retail, and tourism. Whereas the first set of sectors involves extracting natural materials from the ground and air, retail and tourism involves leveraging the natural setting to attract recreational use by visitors. Even the economic sector having to do with national security is related to the natural environment, in so far as the proximity of Imperial County to the West Coast of the United States represents a strategic location relative to evolving national security challenges emanating from the Pacific Ocean. Yet, each of these six sectors (agriculture, energy, resource extraction, retail, tourism, and national security) is highly vulnerable to shocks emanating from beyond Imperial County.

- The April, 2018 E. Coli outbreak attributed to lettuce growers around Yuma, Arizona has affected growers to some extent in Imperial County.
- The price of natural resources extracted from the earth fluctuate daily on the world market, resulting in possible shuttering of operations and loss of jobs on a moment’s notice.
- A significant part of retail spending in Imperial County is attributable to Mexicali day-shoppers, the steady flow of whom can be affected by decisions made in the nation’s capital.
- Similarly, the continuing presence of Naval Air Facility El Centro is also tied to decisions made in Washington D.C.

In an effort to improve the resilience of these leading economic sectors in the face of any kinds of potential shocks, Imperial County officials have attempted to build-on and diversify these critical parts to the county’s economy. Indeed, Goal No.1 in this CEDS is to diversify the county economy. Below are select examples of ways officials are seeking to diversify the economy with resilience in mind.

IMPERIAL VALLEY FOREIGN TRADE ZONE 257

City and County officials entered into a joint powers agreement to create the “Imperial Valley Foreign Trade Zone 257” to “expedite and encourage foreign commerce” in the United States for geographical

areas, in or adjacent to Customs Ports of Entry. Foreign Trade Zone areas are located in and around the cities of Brawley, Calexico, Calipatria, Imperial, and El Centro, as well as in unincorporated areas east of Calexico along Route 7.

In Spring 2017, the US Foreign Trade Zone Board approved a request made by the “Imperial Valley FTZ 257” JPA to allow the FTZ to re-organize under the “Alternative Site Framework” (ASF). The new ASF designation will allow “Imperial Valley FTZ 257” officials to quickly respond to private sector requests to designate new FTZ areas within the “Imperial Valley FTZ 257” service area, with the possibility of designating up to 2,000 acres in the future. Recognizing the benefits of the ASF status, Calipatria is seeking to update the tentative map for the 96-acre area near an airport that also contains this city’s FTZ, so as to broaden allowable types of economic activity.

Merchandise of every description may be held in the Zone without being subject to Customs duties and other ad valorem taxes. A key benefit of the FTZ is relief from “inverted tariffs”, which occurs when the duty rate for an overall finished good is lower than the duty rate of component parts. This relief incentivizes manufacturers that utilize imported materials to locate in FTZ. Other FTZ benefits include: duty exemption on re-exports; duty elimination on waste, scrap, and yield loss; and, duty deferral. These types of tariff and tax reliefs are designed to lower the operation costs and enhance cost-competitiveness for U.S.-based companies engaged in international trade.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Imperial County is a national leader when it comes to development of renewable energy sources. In an effort to further diversify and develop various kinds of renewable energy in Imperial County, County officials updated the County General Plan to include a revamped “Renewable Energy and Transmission Element.” Goals and policies identified in the new Element are aligned with goals and policies in the other chapters of the updated General Plan, lessening conflicts between renewable energy and other land uses, where the former uses are allowed. Moreover, adoption of the new element removes previously existing barriers to renewable energy projects, and lessens the number of reports required when a new development company seeks zoning changes in pursuit of renewable energy projects.⁷

County officials designed the Renewable Energy and Transmission Element to provide guidance and approaches with respect to the future siting of renewable energy projects and electrical transmission lines in the County. Officials intended to take into account both the expansion of new types of renewable energy projects and the potential and probable growth of major transmission facilities anticipated to occur in Imperial County. New transmission lines will be needed to accommodate increased demand for power delivery due to both local and regional demand, system delivery requirements in southern California’s service area, the need to improve overall system reliability and to support the development of expanded renewable energy power production and exportation.⁸ To

⁷ El Centro Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Bureau, “Geothermal/alternative energy transmission element in Imperial County’s general Plan to be updated” (October, 2013) (<https://bit.ly/2JwRGDH>)

⁸ Imperial County, Planning and Development Services Department, “Renewable Energy and Transmission Element”, page 1.

underscore the diversification of renewable sources of energy underway in Imperial County, in 2012, solar amounted to one percent of total megawatts of electricity generated by plants in Imperial County (or 13 MW out of a total of 1,329 MW). Within five years, solar amounted to 44 percent of total megawatts, or 1,239 megawatts out of a total of 2,818 megawatts. Over the same period, geothermal went from 43 percent to 25 percent of total megawatts.

TOURISM

Imperial County is unique in that its tourism economy rests on strong day- and seasonal-visitors. Over the five-year 2013-2017 period, on average 20.8 million persons a year crossed by foot or car into the United States from the three US-Mexico Points of Entry, with the bulk travelling through Calexico West P.O.E.⁹ Mexican citizens living in Mexico who have obtained what is called a Border Crossing Card (“B1” [business visitor] or “B2” [tourist]) from the US Customs and Border Protection can temporarily enter the United States, though once in California temporary visitors must remain within 25 miles of the US-Mexican border and can stay no longer than 30 days per visit.¹⁰ To be eligible for a “B1” or “B2” Visitor Visa, Mexican nationals must have significant ties to Mexico, such as owning property or a business, and have the financial resources to pay for the visit.¹¹ Ghadda and Brown estimate that visitors from Mexicali spend \$1.3 billion on retail goods and services in Imperial County.¹²

In addition to visitors from nearby Mexicali, Imperial County attracts long-term, seasonal vacationers from as far away as Canada. Most of these “snowbirds” arrive at various RV campgrounds across the County starting in mid-October and stay until mid-April the following year. According to Dean Runyan Associates, visitors staying at Imperial County campgrounds spent \$122.4 million in 2016 in the County, out of a total of \$347.6 million for visitors staying at all types of lodging. At \$99.7 million, visitor-spending was mostly at dining places, followed by \$63.3 million for the cost of accommodations. Arts and recreation (\$49.1 million), gasoline (\$46.0 million), retail sales (\$45.0 million), and food stores (\$44.4 million) rounded-out the balance of visitors’ spending in Imperial County in 2016.¹³

To underscore its commitment to the tourist sector, in December 2015, the Imperial County Board of Supervisors adopted a 5-year Strategic Plan, the first two goals of which highlighted tourism within their respective objectives. As one of the seven objectives within Strategic Plan “Goal 1: Identify/Image”, officials committed to exploring and enhancing tourism activities that focus on the unique attributes of Imperial County. To this end, the County is coordinating with Chambers of Commerce and local agencies in implementing joint tourism promotional events.¹⁴ Local officials in

⁹ US DOT, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, “Broder Crossing/Entry Data” (multiple years)

¹⁰ US Customs and Border Control (<https://bit.ly/2xXCxcY>)

¹¹ Nolo Press, “How to Obtain and Use a Border Crossing Card” (<https://bit.ly/2kWCTHt>)

¹² Suad Ghadda and Cynthia Brown, University of Texas-Pan American, Center for Border Economic Studies, “The Economic Impact of Mexican Visitors Along the U.S.-Mexico Border: A Research Synthesis” (2005), page 7

¹³ Dean Runyan Associates, “California Travel Impacts by County, 1992-2016” (an annual study for the Governor’s Office of Business Development and Joint Marketing Venture for Visit California), page 70

¹⁴ Imperial County, “Imperial County 2020 Strategic Plan” page 8.

Calexico have been working with the private sector to expand quality retail aimed at attracting even more shoppers from nearby Mexicali, having taken steps in early 2017 to start Phase Two of the successful Gran Plaza Outlets project that opened in 2013.¹⁵ Phase Two includes 1.1 million square feet of retail, which will be on top of the 287,000 square feet built as part of Phase One completed in 2013.

In addition, Phase 1 of the planned improvements to the POE in Calexico were completed in 2015 and a Phase 2 is planned to further expand the throughput of the border crossing.

RESILIENCE THROUGH EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING

Imperial County is at risk of experiencing a broad range of natural and man-made hazards and threats, in large part because of its topography, urban-rural mix, and growing permanent, transient, and recreational populations.¹⁶ Compounding matters, Imperial County is in one of the most earthquake-prone areas in the United States. Branches of the San Andreas Fault form the eastern boundary of the County, while the San Jacinto-Coyote Creek and Elsinore-Laguna Salada Faults form the western boundary.¹⁷ After Los Angeles County (six), Imperial County had the highest number (three) of federal and state earthquake disaster declarations in the State of California in the sixty years prior to 2010.¹⁸

The Imperial County Office of Emergency Services (OES) provides emergency management services for the County/Operational Area including its seven cities/towns and special districts. OES coordinates emergency operations activities among all the various local jurisdictions and develops written guidelines for emergency preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation to natural / man-made disasters, and technological disasters. OES is mandated by the California Emergency Services Act (Chapter 7, Division 1, Title 2 of Government Code) to serve as the liaison between the State and all the local government political subdivisions comprising Imperial County.

In an effort to improve emergency preparedness, in 2013 the OES worked with stakeholders throughout the County to prepare and ultimately adopt the "Imperial County Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan Update" (MJMHP 2013 Update). While federal law requires that local communities address only natural hazards, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) recommends that local comprehensive mitigation plans address man-made and technological hazards to the extent possible. Towards that goal, the partners involved in preparing the MJMHP 2013 Update addressed an expansive set of hazards.¹⁹

¹⁵ KYMA News, "City council defers nearly half a million dollars for Gran Plaza Outlets" (December 29, 2016) <https://bit.ly/2sJrQ8M>

¹⁶ Imperial County, Office of Emergency Services, Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan, page 91

¹⁷ Imperial County. General Plan: Seismic and Public Safety Element, page 3

¹⁸ Imperial County, Office of Emergency Services, Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan, page 101

¹⁹ Imperial County, Office of Emergency Services, Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan, page 2

In adopting the MJMHP 2013 Update, the County, local jurisdiction, and other entities, such as the Imperial Irrigation District and all of the school districts in the County, have agreed to the same goals, objectives and programs with respect to preparing for and responding to natural or man-made disasters. Recognizing that jurisdictions will have their own unique set of challenges with respect to disaster preparedness and planning, the MJMHP 2013 Update identifies hazard mitigation programs in a comprehensive manner, easily allowing stakeholders to see how their colleagues identify hazards, as well as the various planning and enforcement tools to prepare for and deal with disasters (such as of building codes and programs for expedient retrofitting and rehabilitation of weak structures to reduce the scope of an earthquake disaster). In identifying stakeholders' responses to hazards, the MJMHP 2013 Update addresses matters on a hazard-by-hazard basis, starting first with earthquakes, followed by flooding, extreme weather, wildfire, dam failure, infestation, hazardous materials, naturally-occurring biological threats, and terrorism.

The benefits of developing a multi-jurisdictional plan are: improved communication and coordination among jurisdictions and other regional entities; comprehensive mitigation approaches to reduce risks affecting multiple jurisdictions; publication of action plans on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis showing how each jurisdiction prioritizes and plans for mitigating hazards; possible resource- and cost-sharing that increase efficiency and reduce duplication of efforts; and clear organizational structure assigning responsibilities among jurisdictions.²⁰

²⁰ Imperial County, Office of Emergency Services, Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan, page 279-307

SWOT ANALYSIS

Analysis of indicators in the Economic Summary above as well as community input through the OEDC and CEDS Committee have identified a number of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for economic development in Imperial County. These topics are discussed below in two sections, the first presenting key strengths and opportunities that the County offers that may be expanded or leveraged to increase and diversify job development in the County. The second section identifies issue areas the county and its economic development and planning partners continue to address in order to improve the economic development landscape in the County.

STRATEGIC ASSETS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Bi-national Trade/Foreign Trade Zone. Strategically located at the U.S. Mexico border in proximity to Mexican maquiladoras in Mexicali, Imperial County offers a tremendous opportunity for international trade. The two Ports of Entry (POE) in and near Calexico support cross border product shipments totaling \$16.1 billion in 2017, of which \$10.6 billion are advanced manufacturing products. The County also has a third POE serving the Yuma area. In addition, an estimated \$1 billion in consumer retail expenditures come from Mexico annually. The County is designated as Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) #237 and offers a flexible location designation that makes most areas of the County eligible to benefit from FTZ status. In addition, Imperial County offers strong governmental coordination through the CaliBaja Mega Region collaboration between Imperial and San Diego counties and Baja California.

It is the county's goal to promote increased business within Imperial County related to international trade in the areas of advanced manufacturing, logistics and transportation and retail Trade.

Renewable Energy Production/ Broadband Expansion. Imperial County is leader in California in the production of renewable energy, with a current capacity of 2,818 MW. Solar, geothermal and wind energy production comprise nearly 80 percent of this portfolio and have grown significantly in the past five years, with continued expansion forecast. In addition, the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) has developed a state of the art energy storage facility that provides added stability and reliability to the energy network.

Imperial County also manages the South Border Broadband Consortium (SBBC), which includes San Diego County, and is working with both public and private sector partners to build out a high-speed data communications network that serves 21st century business needs.

With these energy and communications assets, Imperial County would be a prime location for data centers, advanced manufacturing, design firms, medical facilities and other businesses with high energy and data requirements.

Construction Materials/Heavy Metals. Imperial County is home to one of the largest gypsum plants in the country, which is owned by U.S. Gypsum, a company that manufactures more than half the drywall in the United States. Imperial County is also a large supplier of construction aggregate

materials, including sand and gravel. In addition, reserves of lithium have been discovered and mined in Imperial County. Batteries using this metal power most of the electronic devices and electrical cars in the country.

Military. Naval Air Facility-El Centro (NAF EC) provides combat and readiness training to active and reserve aviation units for the Navy's operating and training forces and other U.S. forces and allied units. The combination of a unique climate, vast unobstructed desert terrain, limited non-military air traffic and the availability of dedicated gunnery and bomb ranges makes NAF EC an ideal environment for a wide range of training activities. NAF EC represents a stable source of economic stimulus to the surrounding region in the form of good-paying jobs, housing and retail demand and local expenditures for supplies and support services. The total economic benefit to the County was estimated in 2010 to be \$105 million annually.

Lower Cost of Living. Imperial County offers a relatively low cost of living, with housing prices about 40 percent of the state average and rents about half of state levels. In addition, overall wages are about 20 percent below state averages, so Imperial County offers an affordable, yet culturally rich living environment while offering lower business costs as well.

Large amount of vacant, affordable land. The cities in Imperial County have zoned large tracts of land for industrial use and are actively pursuing funding for infrastructure to these sites.

Agri-business. Agriculture has historically been an important part of the County economy and opportunities exist to increase value-added food processing in the County as well as to team with the biotechnology industry growing in San Diego County.

Tourism. Tourists to Imperial County generate an estimated \$347.6 million (2016) in the County and support more than 4,700 direct jobs, about 7 percent of total employment in the County. These figures do not include retail shopping that occurs by Mexicali residents. With its favorable winter climate, extensive outdoor recreation resources and easy connections to Mexico, Imperial County is a natural location for continued tourism investment.

INCENTIVES AND DESIGNATIONS

In addition to the FTZ designation mentioned above, Imperial County offers a number of other business incentives.

Opportunity Zones: The 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act created Opportunity Zones within which federal tax savings through stepped up depreciation are available. Imperial County has seven Opportunity Zone Tracts, including large portions of the cities of El Centro, Calexico, Holtville and Brawley, as well as unincorporated areas.

California State Programs: Many Imperial County businesses qualify for several state tax credit programs through the state of California, including the Manufacturers Sales tax Exemption, the California Competes Tax Credit Fund, and New Employment Tax Credit. This latter program applies to former Enterprise Zone areas and eligible census tract with high poverty and unemployment, of which Imperial County has a number.

HUB Zone. Small businesses operating within HUB zones receive federal contracting preferences.

New Market Tax Credits (NMTC). This program attracts investment capital to low-income communities by permitting individual and corporate investors to receive a tax credit against their Federal income tax return in exchange for making equity investments in specialized financial institutions called Community Development Entities (CDEs).

EB-5 Program. The US Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) administers the Immigrant Investor Program, also known as EB-5. Imperial County has three regional centers approved by USCIS to attract foreign investment for job creation. With Imperial County's unemployment rates, investors receive the preferential rate of \$500,000 per investment to access the program and receive immigration visas.

Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ). Established by the State of California, this program offers low interest loans for businesses operating in recycled materials markets.

ADDITIONAL STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Imperial County offers a number of economic development assets and opportunities in addition to those highlighted above.

- Available/ trainable workforce
- Transportation routes/freeway access
- Commercial passenger airport
- Close-knit communities with growing community- based partnerships
- Positive, pro-growth rural business attitude
- Multicultural community
- Simplified development process
- Accessible local officials
- Collaboration among agencies

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES TO ADDRESS ISSUES AND THREATS

Economic development efforts throughout Imperial County are focused on a number of issues:

Workforce Development. Although the County experiences long term high unemployment rates, substantial efforts are underway to focus workforce training and education on key industry priorities. The County educational system benefits from the presence of both Imperial Valley College and San Diego State University – I.V. Campus, as well as other public and private educational/training entities such as the University of Phoenix and the Imperial Valley Regional Occupational Program (IVROP). The Imperial County Workforce Development Board has prioritized training in several key economic sectors, including renewable energy, agribusiness, medical and medical support, warehousing/ distribution/transportation, and general customer service.

Infrastructure Planning. A number of efforts are underway to improve transportation and other infrastructure to support economic development, particularly Phase 1 and 2 of the improved border crossings. In addition, recent projects such as the improvements at Brawley airport and the

completion of the I-111 bypass has opened new areas for potential business development. Imperial is a Self-Help County, having passed Measure D, which provides local sales tax for 40-years to improve roads in the county and leverage state and federal funding.

Housing Development. Local jurisdictions have committed through their General Plan Housing Elements to support production of 11,900 dwelling units by 2022 (Table A-12). This will further support the labor force and the favorable cost of living in the County.

Additional issues which economic development and planning partners in the County are working to address include the following:

- Limited public transportation services for large geographic area
- Need for improved quality of education in K-12 schools
- Technical assistance available but not marketed and offered in a limited capacity
- Need for proactive planning
- Neighboring regions uninformed of the region's resources due to lack of marketing funds and resources
- Lack of medical specialists
- Lack of financial resources
- Drug and human trafficking
- Language barriers
- Seasonal employment
- Salton Sea/New River pollution

VISION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

VISION STATEMENT

"To develop and strengthen economic development, and to provide a sustainable and healthy environment for the residents of Imperial County by providing training, job opportunities, a sustainable environment, and planning and delivery of transportation services to improve economic self-sufficiency, with an emphasis on Imperial County Target Areas. The County's economy will be balanced and diversified amongst a variety of sectors, while maintaining its agricultural heritage. The Imperial County region will be fully integrated into the world economy by maximizing the advantages offered by its border location and abundant renewable resources."

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GOALS

1. Strengthen Imperial County's economy by promoting a balanced, yet diversified regional economic base. Investment and employment in Imperial County should be as diverse as possible without excessive concentration in one particular segment of the economy.
2. Support the development and expansion of infrastructure activities to promote regional economic development. Numerous opportunities exist for economic growth in the region, but commercial and industrial development is largely achieved through the expansion of infrastructure facilities to prepare land for development.
3. Improve the education and skills of the region's workforce by supporting the efforts of San Diego State University-Imperial Valley and Imperial Valley College to develop academic, vocational programs, and continuing education programs. Education and training of the workforce represent the cornerstone for successful economic development in Imperial County.
4. Promote and expand tourism in Imperial County.
5. Promote international and bi-national trade development. Globalization will continue to have a growing impact on Imperial County's local economy. The region needs to capitalize on its proximity to the US-Mexico border and international transportation corridor while expanding opportunities for the international market.
6. Promote agriculture and other related industries. Agriculture has long been a major driving force in Imperial County's economy with farmland consisting of very fertile, alluvial deposits derived from the Colorado River flood plain. A mild winter and a long growing season ensures multiple cropping on individual fields throughout the year. Imperial County is a major source of winter fruits and vegetables. Alfalfa, Bermuda grass, and Sudan grass hay varieties produced in the Imperial County provide high quality feed for cattle and horses for domestic and foreign markets.
7. Pursue a policy of sustainable development that balances economic development with preservation of resources.

8. Work to enhance the region's quality of life. An area's quality of life is often cited as a major factor in locating a business. Recreational opportunities, availability and variety of housing types, access to health care and other related factors contribute to a desirable quality of life.

ACTION PLAN

INTRODUCTION

The action plan outlined below is aligned with the visions and goals expressed in the previous chapter. The regional priority actions in the beginning of the chapter reflect the consideration of the CEDS Committee and the OEDC in terms of the most effective combination of activities over the next five years to achieve the broad economic development goals of the county. The last section of this chapter presents the criteria for evaluating projects to be submitted to EDA for potential funding. The OEDC reviews each proposed project per EDA guidance and evaluates the job creation potential as well as other relevant factors to determine which projects best meet the regional priorities.

REGIONAL PRIORITY ACTIONS (RECOMMENDED TO CEDS COMMITTEE)

The following broad initiatives represent the county's top priorities for economic development over the next five-year period.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Imperial County has achieved significant growth in renewable energy production over the past five years. The County has 2,808 MW of energy generating capacity, with solar contributing 1,239 MW, nearly all of which has been developed in the past five years. Geothermal has grown 24 percent in five years and contributes 713 MW of generating capacity. Wind energy, at 265, has doubled since 2012. All three of these renewable energy sources have substantial additional expansion capacity in Imperial County. Supporting this continued energy expansion and related business development is a major priority for Imperial County. In addition, the 30 MW lithium-ion energy storage facility installed by Imperial Irrigation District is a major asset to ensure reliability in the energy network.

INTERNATIONAL AND BI-NATIONAL TRADE

CROSS BORDER TRADE: INDUSTRY AND RETAIL

The volume of goods crossing the border at Calexico is significant, estimated at \$6.5 billion going south and \$9.5 billion going coming north in 2017. Of these amounts, an estimated \$3.8 billion going south and \$6.7 billion coming north consist of advanced manufacturing products. Very little of this trade currently stops in Imperial County but much of it is connected to San Diego and the potential exists for Imperial County to capture a larger share of logistics and manufacturing activity associated with key industry clusters in Mexicali, such as aerospace, computers and electrical machinery.

In addition, current estimates of daily retail spending from Mexican visitors indicates that they spend as much as \$1 billion per year on retail goods in Imperial County. This is a vital infusion of revenue not just for local commercial businesses but for local government as well through sales taxes. Efforts to expand retail centers to better meet this demand are crucial to the fiscal well-being of the county.

CaliBaja. The CaliBaja Bi-National Mega-Region is comprised of San Diego and Imperial counties, together with Baja California, Mexico. Positioned to become a global powerhouse for commercial growth, this mega-region offers unique opportunities for business investment.

Poised literally on the doorstep of North America's largest consumer marketplace, CaliBaja offers global corporations easier access and distinct advantages because of its bi-national location and varied geography. There are intellectual and scientific resources; an established base of experienced, skilled production expertise; ample infrastructure and natural resources; business incentives from two nations; and room for major ongoing expansion. CaliBaja is the fast lane to North America that will expand with business for years to come.

Ports of Entry (POE). The Calexico West/Mexicali is located in the City of Calexico and is the primary port for daily person crossings into the U.S. by car or as pedestrians. This POE is being expanded to include 10 northbound vehicle inspection lanes, the headhouse and a bridge for southbound vehicle lanes. Phase I of this expansion is schedule to be completed in 2018 and Phase II is contingent upon future federal fund authorizations.

The Calexico East POE is a passenger and commercial port located seven miles east of the Calexico West POE and is the principal gateway for trade by truck through Imperial County and Baja California, Mexico. This POE is equipped not only with a number of passenger, pedestrian and bus lanes but also a Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program lane, A Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) lane and one Ready lane that requires users to present Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) enabled cards. Each of these programs allow expedited trade shipments between the U.S and Mexico and Canada. The Imperial County Transportation Commission is pursuing discretionary freight program funding to widen the bridge over the All-American Canal, further reducing delays and related air pollution.

INFRASTRUCTURE

SERVICES TO INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL SITES

Continued efforts to improve infrastructure for industrial and commercial development is a critical element of the economic development priorities among all of the county's jurisdictions. In some cases this involves opening additional areas to development such as the northside of Calexico and areas within the City of Imperial. In other cases, it is expanding and renovating existing infrastructure such as the Downtown water and sewer pipeline replacement project in Brawley.

BROADBAND

High speed broadband service is essential to conducting business in the contemporary economy and affects a wide range of activities including not only technology enterprises such as data centers and advanced manufacturing but also banking, health care, public safety and education. The South Border Broadband Consortium (SBBC) helps to promote expansion of broadband infrastructure and services in both Imperial and San Diego Counties. Coordinated through the IVEDC, the Consortium includes representatives from both the public and private sectors and is undertaking an extensive survey process to document levels of service throughout the county. One potential priority would be a dark fiber network that would allow businesses and public agencies to upload large files at gigabit speeds.

Sections of fiberoptic lines are available in various locations in the County but key elements such as switching infrastructure and neighborhood connectivity are not adequate to achieve a fully functioning network. This could be implemented as a joint private sector/public sector effort to ensure that access to critical locations throughout the County is achieved. There are a number of examples of cities that have leveraged public networks or resources to expand service to the business community and been able to attract technology companies who need gigabit broadband speed to operate. Imperial County has tremendous energy resources that would be attractive to technology companies such as data centers but it is critical to offer sufficient broadband capacity as well.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Workforce education and training is an essential element of the economic development strategy. In addition to educational resources at Imperial College and CSU Dan Diego – Imperial Valley, Mexicali has a number of institutions of higher learning. However, the job base does not exist to retain highly educated workers in Imperial County so there needs to be close coordination between training programs and expanding industries with job opportunities in the County. Renewable energy production, health care, agricultural technology, logistics and general customer service are all areas where training can be closely matched to expanding job opportunities.

QUALITY OF LIFE

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

While Imperial County has generally more affordable housing than other Southern California counties, housing availability in locations important to commuting workers is sometimes lacking. Continued efforts to implement local Housing Element policies to ensure an adequate supply of workforce housing is a priority for successful economic development in Imperial County.

IMPLEMENTATION OF CEDS GOALS

- 1. Strengthen Imperial County's economy by promoting a balanced, yet diversified regional economic base. Investment and employment in Imperial County should be as diverse as possible without excessive concentration in one particular segment of the economy.**

Action 1.1: Continue support of a County-wide economic development agency dedicated and responsible for the promotion of economic development in Imperial County. Encourage the participation of small jurisdictions in the implementation of economic development activities.

Action 1.2: Implement coordinated regional marketing and promotional activities, assisted by the OEDC. Promote location and proximity to metropolitan areas and other markets.

Action 1.3: Continue to promote industrial development in areas suitable for this type of activity and improve the quality of developable land that will result in the attraction of new and expanding existing business and industrial firms and creation of jobs in Imperial County.

Action 1.4: Encourage coordinated land use planning efforts amongst the various jurisdictions to ensure that industrial and commercial zoning areas are located within easy access of transportation (air, land and rail) corridors.

Action 1.5: Promote the availability of low cost resources such as labor, land, electrical power and water as compared to other areas.

Action 1.6: Increase the scope of financial incentives available to firms for the financing of business expansion and product development, including the new federal Opportunity Zone program. Explore the viability of Employment Training Panel (ETP), Industrial Development Bonds (IDB), and other financing options through the Small Business Administration (SBA) and Community Development Corporation (CDC).

Action 1.7: Develop finance mechanisms geared to assist small and/or new businesses in acquiring capital for expansion or new building construction. Continue to expand small business revolving loan fund and microenterprise programs. Continue to utilize those incentives available through the enterprise zone, foreign trade zone, manufacturing enhancement area, hub zone, etc.

2. Support the development and expansion of infrastructure activities to promote regional economic development.

Action 2.1: Construct necessary public works to commercial and industrial areas with potential for development and for improved or expanded services.

Action 2.2: Develop infrastructure that provides regional connectivity as a means of ensuring a redundant backup system.

Action 2.3: Improve transportation corridors in Imperial County and continue to pursue state and federal resources for the expansion and improvement of our highway infrastructure to support economic development.

Action 2.4: Develop transportation (air, land, and rail) projects that seek to enhance the efficient movement of goods and people. Improve the transportation connections between Imperial County, San Diego County, Riverside County, Arizona, and beyond.

Action 2.5: Develop transportation projects linking Imperial County's institutions of higher education: SDSU-IV's Calexico and Brawley campuses, and Imperial Valley College.

Action 2.6: Increase the technological and telecommunications infrastructure systems available to the region. Encourage private enterprise to develop state-of-the-art telecommunication capacity to homes and businesses.

Action 2.7: Work with university and community college partners to secure financing for new physical and programmatic infrastructure that will serve the renewable energy industry in Imperial County

Action 2.8: Promote the expanding electrical infrastructure developed to serve independent power producer needs and long-term population needs.

Action 2.9: Solicit infrastructure projects for potential grant funding from cities and unincorporated communities to assist in the development of commercial and industrial base. Assist municipalities and unincorporated communities as needed in the preparation of grants and applications for project development.

3. Improve the education and skills of the region's workforce by supporting the efforts of San Diego State University-Imperial Valley and Imperial Valley College to develop academic, vocational programs, and continuing education programs, with the goal of reducing unemployment by 5%.

Action 3.1: Develop labor force data, especially with respect to occupational skills. Develop working relationships with the State Employment Development Department, the Workforce Development Board, local university and community college.

Action 3.2: Continue support of job search and training programs for the unemployed and underemployed in Imperial County.

Action 3.3: Assess the needs of local employers and targeted industries and develop programs to address those needs.

Action 3.4: Increase employment opportunities and improve and expand job training activities to mirror needs of industries targeted for attraction.

Action 3.5: Create high tech, higher paying jobs to entice local youth to remain in Imperial County and upgrade 13-16 education to meet needs for health careers, education fields, social service positions, science and technology professions, and higher paying positions in a diversified economy.

Action 3.6: Support and encourage the creation of trade schools and the accreditation of Imperial Valley College to provide the necessary training and education for technical jobs.

Action 3.7: Support four year university with diversified faculty and academic majors.

Action 3.8: Improve the education and skills of the region's workforce by supporting the efforts of San Diego State University-Imperial Valley and Imperial Valley College to develop academic, vocational programs, and continuing education programs. Education and training of the workforce represent the cornerstone for successful economic development in Imperial County.

Action 3.9: Increase overall academic achievement of K-12 students. Support efforts to assist local K-12 educators to enable all students to meet or exceed 50th percentile on standardized tests, including limited English proficient students.

Action 3.10: Work with San Diego State University – Imperial Valley and Imperial Valley College to develop career pathways for K-16 students to generate awareness about career opportunities in Imperial County’s targeted industries.

4. Promote and expand tourism in Imperial County.

Action 4.1: Develop cultural and resort facilities including second homes, recreational facilities, hotels, mobile homes, and recreational vehicle parks.

Action 4.2: Participate in tourism related activities throughout the state and region, i.e. California State Fair, Imperial County Mid Winter Fair and Fiesta, Fiestas Del Sol, and various film commission conferences.

Action 4.3: Continue the restoration and protection of tourism related facilities and activities.

Action 4.4: Initiate a campaign of tourism that promotes the valley’s amenities and destinations such as the sand dunes, agricultural resources, Fossil Canyon, Painted Gorge, bird watching, etc.

Action 4.5: Identify existing recreational facilities and identify the recreational needs of the region’s residents and visitors.

Action 4.6: Coordinate with private enterprise for the development of new businesses that support and promote tourism in the Imperial County.

Action 4.7: Assist and encourage the clean-up and restoration of the New River and Salton Sea as a way to increase recreational and tourism opportunities.

Action 4.8: Participate in the development and promotion of cultural activities such as farmers’ markets, performing arts events, visual arts displays, and similar festivals.

Action 4.9: Encourage local jurisdictions and the County of Imperial to amend their land use policies to ease restrictions related to the development of RV parks and amenities.

5. Promote international and bi-national trade development.

Action 5.2: Increase international awareness of United States/Mexico border opportunities related to NAFTA and maquiladora industry. Develop bi-national marketing strategies and opportunities through economic trade relationships between Mexico and Imperial County.

Action 5.3: Capitalize on development opportunities related to the second border crossing.

Action 5.4: Ascertain impacts of NAFTA and the changing maquiladora industry.

Action 5.5: Continue to develop and promote FTZ/MEA to foreign and international markets.

Action 5.6: Seek financing mechanisms and assist in the promotion of industrial and commercial development of border areas.

6. Promote agriculture and other related industries.

Action 6.1: Develop related agricultural industries and economic activities.

Action 6.2: Develop, support, and market agri-tourism opportunities by conducting outreach to farm operators, the Coalition of Labor, Agriculture, and Business (COLAB), Imperial County Farm Bureau, and Imperial Valley Vegetable Growers Association to initiate agricultural related activities such as agricultural festivals, on-farm dining events, farm tours, and other similar activities for the enjoyment or education of visitors.

Action 6.3: Encourage the continued development of agricultural related industries, such as dairies, and food, fiber and other processing facilities.

Action 6.4: Encourage the development of non-farmable agricultural areas while promoting research and diversity for the farmable agricultural areas.

7. Pursue a policy of sustainable development that balances economic development with preservation of resources.

Action 7.1: Develop renewable energy resources for maximization of industrial and commercial development. Develop geothermal direct heat use, solar, and wind energy.

Action 7.2: Research and develop recycling and waste management facilities. Increase public awareness of the need for efficient and effective long-term solutions for solid waste management, recycling, and increasing scarcity of raw materials.

Action 7.3: Develop waste management facilities for locally generated hazardous waste.

Action 7.4: Utilize smart growth principles and “green” building techniques.

Action 7.5: Promote energy efficient business and industry practices.

Action 7.6: Brand Imperial County as the home for environmentally responsible businesses and a major producer of renewable resources and international business hub.

Action 7.7: Promote Imperial County's naturally abundant geothermal, solar, and wind resources for use in the production of energy. Assist in the research and development of new energy resources.

Action 7.8: Increase public awareness of the importance of recycling, energy efficiency, and resource conservation.

Action 7.9: Develop an ecopark for location of renewable energy and “green technology” industrial projects within the Keystone Planning Area.

8. Work to enhance the region’s quality of life.

Action 8.1: Support the development of a variety of housing options (apartments, condominiums, cluster housing, etc.) to support a growing workforce.

Action 8.2: Balance the proximity of job centers, housing, and services. Educate municipalities about mixed housing densities and other land use controls that support well-suited compact development.

Action 8.3: Develop and preserve recreation opportunities including multi-use trails, sports centers, and regional parks.

Action 8.4: Support a strong social and cultural base. Support arts and cultural activities as a critical element of the regional economy.

Action 8.5: Encourage commercial development that provides services to the residents of Imperial County.

Action 8.6: Identify areas within the Dogwood Road Transportation Corridor suitable for high-density transit-oriented and transit-ready mixed use residential development.

Action 8.7: Develop a regional master plan of multi-use trails to provide connectivity between the various parks, open space areas, and recreational centers.

Action 8.8: Utilize findings in the Imperial County Retail and Leakage Analysis to attract retail development to improve the quality of life for existing and future residents of the County, as well as serving shoppers from Mexicali.

PROGRAM AND PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

The U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) provides investment assistance to communities for projects that contribute to the creation and retention of private sector jobs and alleviate unemployment. Such assistance is designed to help communities achieve lasting improvement by establishing stable and diversified local economies and by improving local conditions.

The OEDC encourages all municipal agencies and community-based organizations to submit projects that enhance the region’s economy. All projects must be consistent with the goals and objectives outlined in Section 5 of this CEDS document. Projects developed for consideration should be consistent with EDA policies. Priority consideration will be given to projects which best meet relative needs of eligible areas and are located in areas of high unemployment and/or low per capita income.

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

The following criteria will be utilized to evaluate projects which require OEDC review as a prerequisite for funding by the EDA and other funding agencies.

Priority will be given to projects which:

- improve the opportunities in the area where such projects are or will be located for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;
- assist in creating or retaining private sector jobs in the near-term and assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities for such area;
- benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families who are residents of the area to be served by the project;
- fill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be located;
- are consistent with the EDA, approved by the OEDC for the area in which it is or will be located, and have been recommended by the OEDC;
- have broad community support and significant private sector investment;
- have a favorable cost-per-job ratio; and
- complement EDA goals, such as reducing the federal trade deficit by increasing export development and assisting minority business development.

Low priority will be given to projects which:

- do not benefit the long-term unemployed;
- cannot be implemented within a reasonable period of time;
- support downtown commercial activities such as parking garages, pedestrian walkways and non-residential street repairs, unless it can be demonstrated that EDA's assistance is critical to and an integral part of the local economic development strategy for the area and required to support other ongoing development investments;
- involve substantial land purchase or public buildings.
- do not have the applicant's share of project funding readily available; and
- support tourism or recreational activities, unless it can be demonstrated that tourism is the major industry in the area or will assist in creating a significant number of jobs and

substantially diversify the area's economy. In which case, the project must directly assist in providing job opportunities for the unemployed and the underemployed residents of the area and otherwise support the long-term growth of the area.

PUBLIC WORKS IMPACT PROGRAM

Priority will be given to Public Works Impact Program projects which:

- will directly or indirectly assist in creating employment opportunities by providing immediate useful work (i.e., construction jobs) or other economic or educational benefits for the unemployed and underemployed residents in the project area;
- will primarily benefit low-income families by providing essential services;
- can be substantially complemented within 12 months from the start of construction; and
- improve the community or economic environment in areas of severe economic distress.

Inclusion of projects throughout the fiscal year is encouraged for those entities that have not identified a project at the time of the CEDS update.

EDA DESCRIPTION AND PROJECT CRITERIA

The Economic Development Administration (EDA) is an agency under the U.S. Department of Commerce and was created by Congress pursuant to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide financial assistance to both rural and urban distressed communities. EDA's mission is to lead the Federal economic development agenda by promoting innovation and competitiveness, preparing American regions for growth and success in the worldwide economy. Public Works is described as empowering distressed communities to revitalize, expand, and upgrade their physical infrastructure to attract new industry, encourage business expansion, diversify local economies, and generate or retain long-term, private sector jobs and investment.

Some of the activities allowable, as described on the EDA website are:

1. are acquisition or development of land and improvements for use in a public works
2. public service or other type of development facility
3. Acquisition, design and engineering, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such a facility, including related machinery and equipment.

EDA Requirements for a Public Works project:

- The Project will, directly or indirectly:
 - Improve the opportunities for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities in the Region where the Project is located;
 - Assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities in the Region
 - Primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families in the Region
- The Project will fulfill a pressing need of the Region, or a part of the Region, in which the Project is located
- The Region in which the Project is located has a CEDS and the Project is consistent with the CEDS.

Not more than fifteen (15) percent of the annual appropriations made available to EDA to fund Public Works Investments may be made in any one (1) State.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

It is important for the OEDC to monitor progress toward achieving the CEDS goals. As the CEDS is updated annually, there will be an opportunity to update key indicators that measure economic development efforts and the outcomes in terms of changes in the County economy. For each goal, an input indicator and output indicator is provided. Input indicators measure the program efforts to achieve the goals while the output indicators measure how well economic conditions are responding to these efforts.

- 1. Promote a balanced, yet diversified regional economic base.
 - Input Measures:**
 - a) Description of marketing efforts to promote Imperial County
 - b) No. of businesses served by the SBDC
 - Output Measures:**
 - c) Change in number and mix of jobs per annual EDD data
 - d) Change in the county unemployment rate

- 2. Support the development and expansion of infrastructure activities to promote regional economic development.
 - Input Measure:**
 - a) Dollar value of City and County CIP budgets
 - Output Measure:**
 - b) Dollar value of construction of public improvements for the year

- 3. Improve the education and skills of the region’s workforce.
 - Input Measure:**
 - a) Students graduating from post-secondary education and training programs
 - Output measure:**
 - b) County educational attainment as measured by the American Community Survey (ACS)

- 4. Promote and expand tourism in Imperial County.
 - Input Measures:**
 - a) Description of tourism marketing programs
 - b) Development or renovation of visitor-serving attractions/facilities
 - Output Measures:**
 - a) Change in visitor expenditures per Dean Runyan annual reports

- 5. Promote international and bi-national trade development.
 - Input Measures:**
 - a) Description of marketing and business development efforts to attract firms engaged in international trade
 - b) Contacts with Mexican firms to promote location of satellite or support facilities in Imperial County
 - Output Measure:**
 - c) Change in the number and size of firms engaged in international trade, as measured by InfoUSA, business license records or other similar data

6. Promote agriculture and other related industries.

Input Measures: a) Description of marketing and business development programs to expand the diversity of agricultural products and the number of food processing firms in the County

Output Measures: b) Change in the value and mix of agricultural produce
c) Change in the number of establishment and employment engaged in food processing and other ag support services.

7. Pursue a policy of sustainable development that balances economic development with preservation of resources.

Input Measures: a) Describe marketing and business development efforts as well as public investments to increase renewable energy production, recycling volumes, green building practices and air quality.

Output Measures: b) Change in renewable energy production
c) Change in jobs associated with recycling market development
d) Change in air quality conditions.

8. Work to enhance the region's quality of life.

Input Measures: a) Describe City and County efforts to develop and enhance quality of life amenities as well as workforce housing.

Output Measures: b) Change in housing units constructed or rehabilitated
c) Track changes in Imperial County's ranking among places to live through indexes such as Gallup-Healthways and Sperling's City Comparisons.

APPENDIX TABLES

Table A-1: Population and Housing Growth, Imperial County, 2010-2018

Table A-2: Population and Housing Growth, California and Comparison Counties, 2010-2018

Table A-3: Median Age

Table A-4: Population by Age Group

Table A-5: Race/ Ethnicity

Table A-6: Persons with Limited English Speaking Ability

Table A-7: Type of Household

Table A-8: Household Size

Table A-9: Housing Tenure

Table A-10: Housing Values and Rents

Table A-11: Percent of Overcrowded Housing by Tenure

Table A-12: 2014-2021 Regional Housing Needs (RHNA) Objectives (New Construction)

Table A-13: Educational Attainment

Table A-14: Type of 4-yr College Degree

Table A-15: Unemployment Rates, March 2017 – March 2018

Table A-16: Labor Force Participation for Prime Working Age Groups

Table A-17: Labor Force Participation for Younger and Older Working Age Groups

Table A-18: Labor Force Participation Rates by Type of College Degree

Table A-19: Labor Force Participation for Workers with High School Diploma or Less

Table A-20: Industry of Employment, Civilian Employed Persons (16 and over), Imperial County

Table A-21: Industry of Employment, Civilian employed persons (16 and over), Comparison Counties

Table A-22: Occupational Distribution, All Civilian Employed 16 and Over

Table A-23: Average Annual Earnings by Occupation, All Civilian Employed Full-time (16 and over), Imperial County

Table A-24: Average Annual Earnings by Occupation, All Civilian Employed Full-time (16 and over), Comparison Counties

Table A-25: Average Annual Earnings by Industry, Civilian Employed Full- Time Workers (16 and over), Imperial County

Table A-26: Average Annual earnings by Industry, Civilian Employed Full- Time Workers (16 and over), Comparison Counties

Table A-27: Journey to Work

Table A-28: Household Income by Quintile

Table A-29: Household Income Distribution

Table A-30: Poverty Status

Table A-31: Annual Value of Shipments Through All Imperial County Points of Entries (2007-2017)(\$mil.)

Table A-32: Annual Value of Shipments by Modes of Transportation: Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-33: Annual Value of Shipments by Commodity Groups Exported to Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-34: Annual Value of Shipments: Advanced Manufacturing Products Exported to Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-35: Annual Value of Shipments by Commodity Groups Imported from Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-36: Annual Value of Shipments: Advanced Manufacturing Products Imported from Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-37: Electric Power Generation ('000 MWh): Power Generating Sources: Imperial County

Table A-38: Annual Average Number of Low Birth-Weight Babies: Three Three-Year Periods

Table A-39: Annual Average Number of Births by Teen-Age Mothers: Three Three-year Periods

Table A-40: Annual Average Number of Tuberculosis Cases: Three Three-Year Periods

Table A-41: Annual Average Adult with Asthma as A Percent of All Adults

Table A-42: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Due to Diabetes: Three Three-Year Periods

Table A-43: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Due to Cancers (All Types): Three Three-Year Periods

Table A-44: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Due to Heart Disease: Three Three-Year Periods

Table A-45: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Due to Stroke: Three Three-Year Periods

Table A-46: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Chronic Lower Respiratory Diseases (Asthma, Bronchitis, Emphysema, etc): Three Three-Year Periods

Table A-47: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Accidental Deaths: Three Three-Year Periods

Table A-48: Trends in Public School Enrollment by Districts: Imperial County: Elementary Schools

Table A-49: Trends in Public School Enrollment by Districts: Imperial County: Middle Schools

Table A-50: Trends in Public School Enrollment by Districts: Imperial County: High School and Others

Table A-51: Trends in 8th Grade CAASPP Math Mean Score

- Table A-52: Trends in 11th Grade CAASPP Math Mean Score
- Table A-53: Trends in 8th Grade CAASPP Reading Mean Score
- Table A-54: Trends in 11th Grade CAASPP Reading Mean Score
- Table A-55: Trends in Number of Students Taking College Preparatory S.A.T. Examination
- Table A-56: Trends in Average Total S.A.T. Scores
- Table A-57: Trends in Number of Graduating Students
- Table A-58: Trends in Enrollment in Private Schools Operating in Imperial County
- Table A-59: Trends in Enrollment at Imperial Valley College
- Table A-60: Number of Imperial Valley College Students Earning Certificates and AA Degree in 2016-2017 By Major
- Table A-61: Trends in Enrollment at San Diego State University-Imperial Valley Campus
- Table A-62: Vehicle Traffic State Routes at Key Intersections in Imperial County
- Table A-63: Truck Traffic State Routes at Key Intersections in Imperial County
- Table A-64: Trends in Passenger and Freight Volume at Imperial County Airport
- Table A-65: Trends in Number of Persons Crossing into the United States At Various Imperial County Points of Entry (Multiple Modes of Transit)
- Table A-66: Trends in Number of Vehicles Crossing into the United States At Various Imperial County Points of Entry (Multiple Modes of Travel)
- Table A-67: Per Capita Income

Table A-1: Population and Housing Growth, Imperial County, 2010-2018

| County / City | POPULATION | | | HOUSING UNITS | | | | | | | Vacancy Rate | Persons per Household |
|--|------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------------------|
| | Total | Household | Group Quarters | Total | Single Detached | Single Attached | 2-4 | Five Plus | Mobile Homes | Occupied | | |
| 2010 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imperial County | 174,528 | 163,844 | 10,684 | 56,067 | 34,576 | 1,911 | 4,775 | 7,173 | 7,632 | 49,126 | 12.4% | 3.34 |
| Brawley | 24,953 | 24,779 | 174 | 8,231 | 5,368 | 220 | 728 | 1,500 | 415 | 7,623 | 7.4% | 3.25 |
| Calexico | 38,572 | 38,472 | 100 | 10,651 | 7,292 | 486 | 1,158 | 1,545 | 170 | 10,116 | 5.0% | 3.80 |
| Calipatria | 7,705 | 3,541 | 4,164 | 1,121 | 859 | 16 | 44 | 141 | 61 | 1,008 | 10.1% | 3.51 |
| El Centro | 42,598 | 41,782 | 816 | 14,476 | 8,086 | 427 | 1,577 | 2,855 | 1,531 | 13,108 | 9.5% | 3.19 |
| Holtville | 5,939 | 5,939 | 0 | 1,937 | 1,278 | 73 | 177 | 203 | 206 | 1,799 | 7.1% | 3.30 |
| Imperial | 14,758 | 14,727 | 31 | 4,751 | 3,427 | 389 | 401 | 464 | 70 | 4,405 | 7.3% | 3.34 |
| Westmorland | 2,225 | 2,225 | 0 | 678 | 465 | 10 | 100 | 83 | 20 | 631 | 6.9% | 3.53 |
| Balance of County | 37,778 | 32,379 | 5,399 | 14,222 | 7,801 | 290 | 590 | 382 | 5,159 | 10,436 | 26.6% | 3.10 |
| 2018 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imperial County | 190,624 | 181,698 | 8,926 | 57,737 | 35,749 | 1,907 | 4,800 | 7,661 | 7,620 | 50,091 | 13.2% | 3.63 |
| Brawley | 27,417 | 27,243 | 174 | 8,388 | 5,498 | 218 | 737 | 1,565 | 370 | 7,700 | 8.2% | 3.54 |
| Calexico | 41,199 | 41,099 | 100 | 10,853 | 7,370 | 484 | 1,178 | 1,651 | 170 | 9,928 | 8.5% | 4.14 |
| Calipatria | 7,488 | 3,744 | 3,744 | 1,122 | 860 | 16 | 44 | 141 | 61 | 978 | 12.8% | 3.83 |
| El Centro | 46,315 | 45,499 | 816 | 14,715 | 8,173 | 427 | 1,577 | 3,007 | 1,531 | 13,113 | 10.9% | 3.47 |
| Holtville | 6,501 | 6,501 | 0 | 1,965 | 1,306 | 73 | 177 | 203 | 206 | 1,808 | 8.0% | 3.60 |
| Imperial | 19,372 | 19,341 | 31 | 5,866 | 4,367 | 389 | 401 | 639 | 70 | 5,315 | 9.4% | 3.64 |
| Westmorland | 2,325 | 2,325 | 0 | 677 | 464 | 10 | 100 | 83 | 20 | 608 | 10.2% | 3.82 |
| Balance of County | 40,007 | 35,946 | 4,061 | 14,151 | 7,711 | 290 | 586 | 372 | 5,192 | 10,641 | 24.8% | 3.38 |
| 2010-2018 Annual Percent Change | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imperial County | 1.1% | 1.3% | -2.2% | 0.4% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.8% | 1.1% |
| Brawley | 1.2% | 1.2% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.3% | -0.1% | 0.2% | 0.5% | -1.4% | 0.1% | 1.3% | 1.1% |
| Calexico | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.1% | -0.1% | 0.2% | 0.8% | 0.0% | -0.2% | 6.8% | 1.1% |
| Calipatria | -0.4% | 0.7% | -1.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | -0.4% | 3.1% | 1.1% |
| El Centro | 1.1% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.8% | 1.1% |
| Holtville | 1.1% | 1.1% | | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 1.4% | 1.1% |
| Imperial | 3.5% | 3.5% | 0.0% | 2.7% | 3.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.1% | 0.0% | 2.4% | 3.2% | 1.1% |
| Westmorland | 0.6% | 0.6% | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | -0.5% | 4.9% | 1.0% |
| Balance of County | 0.7% | 1.3% | -3.5% | -0.1% | -0.1% | 0.0% | -0.1% | -0.3% | 0.1% | 0.2% | -0.9% | 1.1% |

Source: ADE, Inc., based on CA Department of Finance E-5 Reports, May 2010 and May 2018.

Table A-2: Population and Housing Growth, California and Comparison Counties, 2010-2018

| COUNTY | POPULATION | | | HOUSING UNITS | | | | | | | Vacancy Rate | Persons per Household |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| | Total | Household | Group Quarters | Total | Single Detached | Single Attached | 2-4 | Five Plus | Mobile Homes | Occupied | | |
| 2010 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| California | 39,500,973 | 38,659,060 | 841,913 | 14,072,272 | 8,129,123 | 981,331 | 1,126,460 | 3,273,769 | 561,589 | 13,053,295 | 7.2% | 2.96 |
| Imperial | 174,528 | 163,844 | 10,684 | 56,067 | 34,576 | 1,911 | 4,775 | 7,173 | 7,632 | 49,126 | 12.4% | 3.34 |
| Riverside | 2,189,641 | 2,153,812 | 35,829 | 800,707 | 543,209 | 50,784 | 38,409 | 89,577 | 78,728 | 686,260 | 14.3% | 3.14 |
| San Bernardino | 2,035,210 | 1,995,156 | 40,054 | 699,637 | 498,965 | 24,640 | 45,123 | 87,405 | 43,504 | 611,618 | 12.6% | 3.26 |
| San Diego | 3,095,313 | 2,991,515 | 103,798 | 1,164,028 | 603,441 | 104,163 | 84,621 | 326,037 | 45,766 | 1,086,113 | 6.7% | 2.75 |
| Fresno | 930,450 | 912,927 | 17,523 | 315,531 | 211,841 | 7,430 | 33,037 | 48,518 | 14,705 | 289,391 | 8.3% | 3.16 |
| Kern | 839,631 | 802,874 | 36,757 | 284,367 | 202,068 | 7,325 | 28,671 | 23,666 | 22,637 | 254,610 | 10.5% | 3.15 |
| Kings | 152,982 | 131,402 | 21,580 | 43,867 | 31,764 | 2,218 | 3,806 | 4,130 | 1,949 | 41,233 | 6.0% | 3.19 |
| Tulare | 442,179 | 437,407 | 4,772 | 141,696 | 106,862 | 3,890 | 11,948 | 8,678 | 10,318 | 130,352 | 8.0% | 3.36 |
| 2018 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| California | 39,809,693 | 38,960,521 | 849,172 | 14,157,590 | 8,160,784 | 985,936 | 1,129,758 | 3,319,105 | 562,007 | 13,113,840 | 7.4% | 2.97 |
| Imperial | 190,624 | 181,698 | 8,926 | 57,737 | 35,749 | 1,907 | 4,800 | 7,661 | 7,620 | 50,091 | 13.2% | 3.63 |
| Riverside | 2,415,955 | 2,382,370 | 33,585 | 840,904 | 573,990 | 52,025 | 38,682 | 96,568 | 79,639 | 729,920 | 13.2% | 3.26 |
| San Bernardino | 2,174,938 | 2,137,542 | 37,396 | 719,911 | 511,656 | 24,932 | 46,107 | 93,335 | 43,881 | 644,247 | 10.5% | 3.32 |
| San Diego | 3,337,456 | 3,226,683 | 110,773 | 1,210,138 | 617,674 | 105,756 | 86,682 | 353,941 | 46,085 | 1,139,651 | 5.8% | 2.83 |
| Fresno | 1,007,229 | 990,305 | 16,924 | 332,051 | 224,951 | 7,464 | 33,605 | 51,137 | 14,894 | 308,269 | 7.2% | 3.21 |
| Kern | 905,801 | 872,919 | 32,882 | 298,301 | 212,899 | 7,408 | 29,453 | 25,481 | 23,060 | 270,224 | 9.4% | 3.23 |
| Kings | 151,662 | 135,885 | 15,777 | 46,170 | 33,550 | 2,218 | 3,816 | 4,585 | 2,001 | 43,877 | 5.0% | 3.10 |
| Tulare | 475,834 | 471,028 | 4,806 | 149,342 | 113,238 | 3,931 | 12,353 | 9,187 | 10,633 | 137,814 | 7.7% | 3.42 |
| 2018-2018 Annual Percent Change | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| California | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.2% | 0.0% |
| Imperial | 1.1% | 1.3% | -2.2% | 0.4% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.8% | 1.1% |
| Riverside | 1.2% | 1.3% | -0.8% | 0.6% | 0.7% | 0.3% | 0.1% | 0.9% | 0.1% | 0.8% | -1.0% | 0.5% |
| San Bernardino | 0.8% | 0.9% | -0.9% | 0.4% | 0.3% | 0.1% | 0.3% | 0.8% | 0.1% | 0.7% | -2.2% | 0.2% |
| San Diego | 0.9% | 1.0% | 0.8% | 0.5% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.3% | 1.0% | 0.1% | 0.6% | -1.7% | 0.3% |
| Fresno | 1.0% | 1.0% | -0.4% | 0.6% | 0.8% | 0.1% | 0.2% | 0.7% | 0.2% | 0.8% | -1.8% | 0.2% |
| Kern | 1.0% | 1.1% | -1.4% | 0.6% | 0.7% | 0.1% | 0.3% | 0.9% | 0.2% | 0.7% | -1.3% | 0.3% |
| Kings | -0.1% | 0.4% | -3.8% | 0.6% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.3% | 0.8% | -2.3% | -0.4% |
| Tulare | 0.9% | 0.9% | 0.1% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.1% | 0.4% | 0.7% | 0.4% | 0.7% | -0.5% | 0.2% |
| Source: ADE, Inc., based on CA Department of Finance E-5 Report, May 2018. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table A-3: Median Age

| Jurisdiction | Median Age: All | Median Age: Hispanic | Median Age: White |
|--|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| United States | 37.7 | 28.4 | 43.0 |
| California | 36.0 | 28.4 | 45.5 |
| Imperial County | 32.2 | 29.8 | 49.7 |
| Brawley city | 31.9 | 28.1 | 50.5 |
| Calexico city | 32.5 | 32.4 | 39.3 |
| Calipatria city | 32.1 | 29.7 | 44.4 |
| El Centro city | 32.9 | 30.6 | 51.6 |
| Heber CDP | 28.4 | 28.4 | 24.5 |
| Holtville city | 29.4 | 26.6 | 33.3 |
| Imperial city | 29.4 | 27.5 | 39.4 |
| Westmorland city | 27.8 | 27.3 | 68.7 |
| Niland CDP | 43.9 | 49.3 | 24.8 |
| Ocotillo CDP | 33.8 | - | 33.8 |
| Palo Verde CDP | 72.1 | - | 72.1 |
| Salton City CDP | 29.6 | 23.8 | 48.0 |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 49.6 | 17 | 61.2 |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 71.2 | - | 74.1 |
| Seeley CDP | 27.7 | 26.3 | 53.2 |
| Desert Shores CDP | 26.1 | 25 | 70.9 |
| Winterhaven CDP | 54.1 | 75.4 | 77.9 |
| Rest of Imperial County | 34.1 | 29.5 | 48.1 |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 31.3 | 25.7 | 44.7 |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 27.8 | 27.4 | 31.4 |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 65.8 | 37.4 | 71.7 |
| Riverside County | 34.8 | 27.2 | 47.9 |
| San Bernardino County | 32.7 | 27.2 | 44.3 |
| San Diego County | 35.3 | 28.2 | 42.7 |
| Fresno County | 31.6 | 26.2 | 45.3 |
| Kern County | 31.2 | 25.4 | 41.9 |
| Kings County | 31.4 | 26.7 | 38.4 |
| Tulare County | 30.4 | 25.1 | 45.0 |
| Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Tables B01001, B01001H, B0100i, B01002, B01002H, and B01002i | | | |

Table A-4: Population by Age Group

| Jurisdiction | All persons | Persons Under 5 | 5 to 19 | 20 to 24 | 25 to 34 | 35 to 54 | 55 to 64 | 65 or over |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| United States | 318,558,162 | 6% | 20% | 7% | 14% | 26% | 13% | 15% |
| California | 38,654,206 | 7% | 20% | 8% | 15% | 27% | 12% | 13% |
| Imperial County | 178,807 | 8% | 23% | 8% | 14% | 24% | 10% | 12% |
| Brawley city | 25,776 | 9% | 26% | 6% | 14% | 23% | 11% | 12% |
| Calexico city | 39,750 | 8% | 25% | 8% | 12% | 23% | 11% | 13% |
| Calipatria city | 7,511 | 5% | 15% | 13% | 24% | 31% | 7% | 6% |
| El Centro city | 43,699 | 8% | 24% | 8% | 13% | 23% | 12% | 12% |
| Heber CDP | 4,287 | 14% | 21% | 14% | 11% | 23% | 5% | 12% |
| Holtville city | 6,230 | 10% | 25% | 8% | 14% | 22% | 7% | 14% |
| Imperial city | 16,583 | 10% | 27% | 7% | 16% | 27% | 6% | 8% |
| Westmorland city | 2,014 | 9% | 28% | 4% | 16% | 18% | 12% | 13% |
| Niland CDP | 868 | 13% | 14% | 11% | 10% | 16% | 21% | 17% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 126 | 0% | 37% | 8% | 6% | 13% | 25% | 12% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 81 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 89% |
| Salton City CDP | 5,217 | 9% | 25% | 7% | 15% | 24% | 9% | 11% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 501 | 0% | 33% | 8% | 0% | 22% | 15% | 22% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 317 | 0% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 3% | 21% | 65% |
| Seeley CDP | 1,626 | 10% | 24% | 11% | 11% | 25% | 10% | 9% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 1,173 | 11% | 24% | 8% | 17% | 18% | 9% | 13% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 212 | 19% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 37% | 7% | 38% |
| Rest of Imperial County | 22,836 | 6% | 17% | 10% | 16% | 27% | 11% | 11% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 93,704 | 8% | 23% | 10% | 14% | 22% | 9% | 14% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 14,866 | 11% | 28% | 8% | 15% | 23% | 8% | 7% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 2,947 | 1% | 13% | 1% | 4% | 17% | 13% | 52% |
| Riverside County | 2,323,892 | 7% | 23% | 7% | 14% | 26% | 11% | 13% |
| San Bernardino County | 2,106,754 | 7% | 23% | 8% | 15% | 26% | 11% | 10% |
| San Diego County | 3,253,356 | 7% | 19% | 8% | 16% | 26% | 11% | 13% |
| Fresno County | 963,160 | 8% | 24% | 8% | 15% | 24% | 10% | 11% |
| Kern County | 871,337 | 8% | 24% | 8% | 15% | 25% | 10% | 10% |
| Kings County | 150,261 | 8% | 22% | 9% | 17% | 26% | 9% | 9% |
| Tulare County | 455,769 | 9% | 26% | 8% | 14% | 24% | 10% | 10% |
| Source: Applied Development, Inc, based on US Census ACS 5-Year Sample 2012-2016 Table S0101 | | | | | | | | |

Table A-5: Race/ Ethnicity

| Jurisdiction | All persons | White | Latino | Black | Native American | Asian\PI | Other |
|---|-------------|-------|--------|-------|-----------------|----------|-------|
| United States | 318,558,162 | 62% | 17% | 12% | 1% | 5% | 3% |
| California | 38,654,206 | 38% | 39% | 6% | 0% | 14% | 3% |
| Imperial County | 178,807 | 12% | 83% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Brawley city | 25,776 | 14% | 83% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| Calexico city | 39,750 | 2% | 97% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Calipatria city | 7,511 | 6% | 77% | 15% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| El Centro city | 43,699 | 10% | 85% | 2% | 0% | 2% | 1% |
| Heber CDP | 4,287 | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Holtville city | 6,230 | 21% | 78% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Imperial city | 16,583 | 16% | 76% | 3% | 0% | 2% | 2% |
| Westmorland city | 2,014 | 8% | 88% | 3% | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Niland CDP | 868 | 29% | 66% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 126 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 81 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 5,217 | 29% | 68% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 501 | 48% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 317 | 84% | 6% | 7% | 0% | 3% | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 1,626 | 7% | 89% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 1,173 | 10% | 86% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 212 | 25% | 19% | 0% | 32% | 0% | 24% |
| Rest of Imperial County | 22,836 | 23% | 63% | 6% | 4% | 2% | 2% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 93,704 | 34% | 59% | 3% | 1% | 2% | 2% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 14,866 | 3% | 97% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 2,947 | 60% | 32% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 3% |
| Riverside County | 2,323,892 | 37% | 47% | 6% | 0% | 6% | 3% |
| San Bernardino County | 2,106,754 | 30% | 52% | 8% | 0% | 7% | 3% |
| San Diego County | 3,253,356 | 47% | 33% | 5% | 0% | 12% | 3% |
| Fresno County | 963,160 | 31% | 52% | 5% | 0% | 10% | 2% |
| Kern County | 871,337 | 36% | 52% | 5% | 1% | 5% | 2% |
| Kings County | 150,261 | 34% | 53% | 6% | 1% | 4% | 3% |
| Tulare County | 455,769 | 30% | 63% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 2% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table B03002 | | | | | | | |

Table A-6: Persons with Limited English Speaking Ability

| Jurisdiction | Total households | Households: English-speaking | Households: Limited English-speaking | Households: Limited English-speaking: percent |
|------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| United States | 117,716,237 | 112,433,177 | 5,283,060 | 5% |
| California | 12,807,387 | 11,606,208 | 1,201,179 | 10% |
| Imperial County | 45,800 | 36,007 | 9,793 | 27% |
| Brawley city | 7,080 | 5,958 | 1,122 | 19% |
| Calexico city | 9,261 | 5,546 | 3,715 | 67% |
| Calipatria city | 918 | 752 | 166 | 22% |
| El Centro city | 12,352 | 10,068 | 2,284 | 23% |
| Heber CDP | 980 | 581 | 399 | 69% |
| Holtville city | 1,742 | 1,175 | 567 | 48% |
| Imperial city | 4,360 | 4,119 | 241 | 6% |
| Westmorland city | 566 | 398 | 168 | 42% |
| Niland CDP | 338 | 301 | 37 | 12% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 41 | 41 | 0 | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 72 | 72 | 0 | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 1,534 | 1,348 | 186 | 14% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 196 | 186 | 10 | 5% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 179 | 179 | 0 | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 421 | 310 | 111 | 36% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 392 | 305 | 87 | 29% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 131 | 131 | 0 | 0% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 5,237 | 4,537 | 700 | 15% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 33,142 | 30,180 | 2,962 | 10% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 4,411 | 3,165 | 1,246 | 39% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 1,265 | 1,228 | 37 | 3% |
| Riverside County | 705,716 | 656,778 | 48,938 | 7% |
| San Bernardino County | 618,922 | 574,944 | 43,978 | 8% |
| San Diego County | 1,103,128 | 1,024,661 | 78,467 | 8% |
| Fresno County | 299,456 | 269,190 | 30,266 | 11% |
| Kern County | 262,337 | 239,325 | 23,012 | 10% |
| Kings County | 41,845 | 37,823 | 4,022 | 11% |
| Tulare County | 134,153 | 114,167 | 19,986 | 18% |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S1602

Table A-7: Type of Household

| Jurisdiction | Total households | Married-couple family household | Male householder, no wife present | Female householder, no husband present | Nonfamily household |
|--|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| United States | 117,716,237 | 48% | 5% | 13% | 34% |
| California | 12,807,387 | 49% | 6% | 13% | 31% |
| Imperial County | 45,800 | 52% | 6% | 19% | 23% |
| Brawley city | 7,080 | 49% | 7% | 21% | 23% |
| Calexico city | 9,261 | 55% | 4% | 23% | 17% |
| Calipatria city | 918 | 44% | 21% | 20% | 15% |
| El Centro city | 12,352 | 48% | 6% | 22% | 25% |
| Heber CDP | 980 | 60% | 3% | 28% | 9% |
| Holtville city | 1,742 | 52% | 11% | 15% | 22% |
| Imperial city | 4,360 | 64% | 4% | 12% | 19% |
| Westmorland city | 566 | 46% | 5% | 22% | 27% |
| Niland CDP | 338 | 36% | 10% | 15% | 39% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 41 | 27% | 22% | 39% | 12% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 72 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Salton City CDP | 1,534 | 42% | 14% | 10% | 35% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 196 | 33% | 0% | 31% | 36% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 179 | 4% | 30% | 0% | 66% |
| Seeley CDP | 421 | 50% | 2% | 31% | 17% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 392 | 42% | 0% | 2% | 55% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 131 | 14% | 7% | 5% | 75% |
| Rest of Imperial County | 5,237 | 56% | 6% | 14% | 23% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 33,142 | 53% | 6% | 13% | 28% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 4,411 | 60% | 8% | 20% | 11% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 1,265 | 65% | 2% | 13% | 20% |
| Riverside County | 705,716 | 54% | 6% | 13% | 26% |
| San Bernardino County | 618,922 | 51% | 7% | 17% | 24% |
| San Diego County | 1,103,128 | 50% | 5% | 12% | 33% |
| Fresno County | 299,456 | 47% | 8% | 18% | 27% |
| Kern County | 262,337 | 51% | 7% | 16% | 25% |
| Kings County | 41,845 | 51% | 7% | 18% | 24% |
| Tulare County | 134,153 | 52% | 8% | 17% | 22% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S1101 | | | | | |

Table A-8: Household Size

| Jurisdiction | Total households | Married-couple family household | Single-Parent family household | Nonfamily household |
|--|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| United States | 2.6 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 1.3 |
| California | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 1.4 |
| Imperial County | 3.7 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 1.3 |
| Brawley city | 3.6 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 1.3 |
| Calexico city | 4.3 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 1.2 |
| Calipatria city | 3.8 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 1.2 |
| El Centro city | 3.5 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 1.3 |
| Heber CDP | 4.4 | 5.1 | 4.0 | - |
| Holtville city | 3.6 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 1.1 |
| Imperial city | 3.8 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 1.2 |
| Westmorland city | 3.6 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 1.2 |
| Niland CDP | 2.6 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 1.3 |
| Ocotillo CDP | 3.1 | 2.1 | 3.9 | - |
| Palo Verde CDP | 1.1 | - | - | 1.1 |
| Salton City CDP | 3.4 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 1.3 |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 2.6 | 2.2 | 4.8 | - |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 1.8 | 3.4 | 3.2 | - |
| Seeley CDP | 3.9 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 1.8 |
| Desert Shores CDP | 3.0 | 5.5 | 3.4 | 1.1 |
| Winterhaven CDP | 1.6 | 1.9 | 5.3 | 1.3 |
| Rest of Imperial County | 4.4 | 4.9 | - | 1.4 |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 2.7 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 1.2 |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 3.4 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 1.4 |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 1.4 |
| Riverside County | 3.3 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 1.3 |
| San Bernardino County | 3.3 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.3 |
| San Diego County | 2.9 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 1.5 |
| Fresno County | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 1.4 |
| Kern County | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 1.3 |
| Kings County | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 1.4 |
| Tulare County | 3.4 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.3 |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S1101 | | | | |

Table A-9: Housing Tenure

| Jurisdiction | Occupied Units | Owner-Occupied | Renter-Occupied | Homeownership Rate |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| United States | 117,716,237 | 74,881,068 | 42,835,169 | 64% |
| California | 12,807,387 | 6,929,007 | 5,878,380 | 54% |
| Imperial County | 45,800 | 25,544 | 20,256 | 56% |
| Brawley city | 7,080 | 3,785 | 3,295 | 53% |
| Calexico city | 9,261 | 4,711 | 4,550 | 51% |
| Calipatria city | 918 | 457 | 461 | 50% |
| El Centro city | 12,352 | 6,155 | 6,197 | 50% |
| Heber CDP | 980 | 613 | 367 | 63% |
| Holtville city | 1,742 | 974 | 768 | 56% |
| Imperial city | 4,360 | 3,252 | 1,108 | 75% |
| Westmorland city | 566 | 246 | 320 | 43% |
| Niland CDP | 338 | 230 | 108 | 68% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 41 | 37 | 4 | 90% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 72 | 43 | 29 | 60% |
| Salton City CDP | 1,534 | 826 | 708 | 54% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 196 | 135 | 61 | 69% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 179 | 148 | 31 | 83% |
| Seeley CDP | 421 | 170 | 251 | 40% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 392 | 247 | 145 | 63% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 131 | 58 | 73 | 44% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 5,237 | 3,457 | 1,780 | 66% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 33,142 | 19,616 | 13,526 | 59% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 4,411 | 3,079 | 1,332 | 70% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 1,265 | 984 | 281 | 78% |
| Riverside County | 705,716 | 454,924 | 250,792 | 64% |
| San Bernardino County | 618,922 | 365,576 | 253,346 | 59% |
| San Diego County | 1,103,128 | 581,635 | 521,493 | 53% |
| Fresno County | 299,456 | 157,227 | 142,229 | 53% |
| Kern County | 262,337 | 149,309 | 113,028 | 57% |
| Kings County | 41,845 | 20,980 | 20,865 | 50% |
| Tulare County | 134,153 | 75,761 | 58,392 | 56% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Tables B25002 and b2500 | | | | |

Table A-10: Housing Values and Rents

| Jurisdiction | Owner-Occupied Units | | | Renter-Occupied Units | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| | 25th percentile value | 50th percentile value (median) | 75th percentile value | 25th percentile rent | 50th percentile rent (median) | 75th percentile rent |
| United States | \$104,600 | \$184,700 | \$326,600 | \$550 | \$798 | \$1,166 |
| California | \$242,600 | \$409,300 | \$677,200 | \$844 | \$1,181 | \$1,672 |
| Imperial County | \$103,800 | \$159,000 | \$224,400 | \$464 | \$641 | \$858 |
| Brawley city | \$105,300 | \$150,100 | \$197,100 | \$437 | \$611 | \$819 |
| Calexico city | \$123,400 | \$165,300 | \$229,300 | \$482 | \$678 | \$965 |
| Calipatria city | \$66,800 | \$93,200 | \$135,300 | \$493 | \$580 | \$742 |
| El Centro city | \$108,500 | \$164,900 | \$235,100 | \$488 | \$636 | \$804 |
| Heber CDP | \$115,700 | \$152,800 | \$171,200 | \$372 | \$634 | \$816 |
| Holtville city | \$97,100 | \$150,900 | \$184,900 | \$438 | \$543 | \$813 |
| Imperial city | \$151,100 | \$194,200 | \$246,400 | \$762 | \$1,011 | \$1,189 |
| Westmorland city | \$86,200 | \$105,600 | \$162,100 | \$406 | \$521 | \$630 |
| Niland CDP | \$37,700 | \$58,700 | \$83,700 | \$324 | \$347 | \$423 |
| Ocotillo CDP | \$72,700 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Palo Verde CDP | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Salton City CDP | \$60,700 | \$86,600 | \$124,400 | \$612 | \$680 | \$756 |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | \$34,200 | \$65,400 | \$86,600 | - | - | - |
| Bombay Beach CDP | \$32,800 | \$44,500 | - | \$308 | - | - |
| Seeley CDP | \$65,800 | \$100,000 | \$168,800 | \$469 | \$582 | \$726 |
| Desert Shores CDP | \$34,200 | \$56,300 | \$154,200 | \$422 | \$444 | \$627 |
| Winterhaven CDP | \$68,100 | \$74,200 | \$79,800 | \$280 | \$366 | \$417 |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | \$53,300 | \$75,160 | \$122,180 | \$421 | \$484 | \$590 |
| Yuma city, Arizona | \$81,800 | \$120,200 | \$179,800 | \$538 | \$718 | \$891 |
| Somerton city, Arizona | \$85,200 | \$112,800 | \$140,400 | \$253 | \$497 | \$723 |
| Wellton town, Arizona | \$23,800 | \$39,800 | \$125,500 | \$385 | \$529 | \$577 |
| Riverside County | \$171,300 | \$276,300 | \$393,000 | \$788 | \$1,062 | \$1,426 |
| San Bernardino County | \$155,900 | \$256,000 | \$382,300 | \$759 | \$991 | \$1,319 |
| San Diego County | \$318,200 | \$454,600 | \$675,600 | \$984 | \$1,307 | \$1,787 |
| Fresno County | \$131,500 | \$204,900 | \$303,100 | \$600 | \$765 | \$987 |
| Kern County | \$110,100 | \$175,600 | \$265,800 | \$591 | \$755 | \$1,013 |
| Kings County | \$115,600 | \$172,000 | \$242,900 | \$560 | \$732 | \$994 |
| Tulare County | \$112,900 | \$169,600 | \$259,100 | \$525 | \$693 | \$898 |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Tables B25057, B25058, B25059, B25076, B25077, and B25077

Table A-11: Percent of Overcrowded Housing by Tenure

| Jurisdiction | Owner-Occupied Units | | | Renter-Occupied Units | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | 1.0 or less persons per room | 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | 1.51 or more persons per room | 1.0 or less persons per room | 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | 1.51 or more persons per room |
| United States | 98.3% | 1.3% | 0.4% | 93.8% | 4.1% | 2.1% |
| California | 96.0% | 3.0% | 1.0% | 86.8% | 8.2% | 5.0% |
| Imperial County | 93.4% | 4.6% | 2.0% | 84.7% | 12.3% | 3.0% |
| Brawley city | 94.1% | 4.0% | 2.0% | 85.0% | 11.5% | 3.6% |
| Calexico city | 90.0% | 6.8% | 3.2% | 82.6% | 14.4% | 2.9% |
| Calipatria city | 96.7% | 3.3% | 0.0% | 81.8% | 14.3% | 3.9% |
| El Centro city | 93.3% | 4.8% | 1.9% | 85.0% | 11.7% | 3.3% |
| Heber CDP | 93.0% | 7.0% | 0.0% | 82.0% | 7.9% | 10.1% |
| Holtville city | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 86.5% | 9.9% | 3.6% |
| Imperial city | 94.9% | 3.6% | 1.5% | 86.6% | 13.4% | 0.0% |
| Westmorland city | 91.9% | 8.1% | 0.0% | 82.8% | 15.0% | 2.2% |
| Niland CDP | 92.2% | 7.8% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Salton City CDP | 93.3% | 3.4% | 3.3% | 82.6% | 17.4% | 0.0% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 57.4% | 42.6% | 0.0% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 96.6% | 0.0% | 3.4% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Seeley CDP | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 88.0% | 12.0% | 0.0% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 91.9% | 3.6% | 4.5% | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 87.7% | 12.3% | 0.0% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 93.2% | 4.6% | 2.2% | 88.2% | 8.3% | 3.5% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 94.3% | 4.2% | 1.5% | 94.5% | 4.2% | 1.3% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 94.2% | 4.6% | 1.2% | 94.3% | 5.1% | 0.6% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 98.3% | 0.9% | 0.8% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Riverside County | 95.6% | 3.4% | 1.1% | 87.6% | 9.2% | 3.2% |
| San Bernardino County | 94.6% | 4.2% | 1.2% | 86.3% | 9.9% | 3.8% |
| San Diego County | 97.3% | 2.0% | 0.7% | 89.4% | 7.0% | 3.6% |
| Fresno County | 94.8% | 4.2% | 1.0% | 85.8% | 10.6% | 3.6% |
| Kern County | 95.0% | 4.2% | 0.9% | 85.5% | 10.9% | 3.6% |
| Kings County | 94.1% | 4.3% | 1.5% | 87.7% | 9.1% | 3.2% |
| Tulare County | 93.8% | 4.8% | 1.4% | 85.3% | 11.1% | 3.5% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2501 | | | | | | |

Table A-12: 2014-2021 Regional Housing Needs (RHNA) Objectives (New Construction)

| Jurisdiction | Income Category | | | | | Total |
|--|-----------------|----------|-------|----------|----------------|--------|
| | Extremely Low | Very Low | Low | Moderate | Above Moderate | |
| Imperial County | 200 | 200 | 416 | 624 | 624 | 2,064 |
| Brawley | 10 | 30 | 60 | 1,300 | 1,400 | 2,800 |
| Calexico | 408 | 409 | 489 | 490 | 1,428 | 3,224 |
| Calapatria | | 37 | 22 | 22 | 63 | 144 |
| El Centro | 226 | 261 | 300 | 297 | 840 | 1,924 |
| Holtville | | 54 | 31 | 32 | 92 | 209 |
| Imperial | | 349 | 205 | 202 | 553 | 1,309 |
| Westmorland | | 57 | 35 | 36 | 105 | 233 |
| Total | 844 | 1,397 | 1,558 | 3,003 | 5,105 | 11,907 |
| Source: City Housing Elements and SCAG RHNA Summary. | | | | | | |

Table A-13: Educational Attainment

| | Population 25 and Over | Less Than High School diploma\GED | High School diploma\GED | Some College | AA | Bachelors degree | Graduate or Profes. Degree |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----|------------------|----------------------------|
| United States | 213,649,147 | 13% | 28% | 21% | 8% | 19% | 12% |
| California | 25,554,412 | 18% | 21% | 22% | 8% | 20% | 12% |
| Imperial County | 107,679 | 33% | 22% | 24% | 7% | 10% | 4% |
| Brawley city | 15,305 | 28% | 25% | 28% | 7% | 9% | 2% |
| Calexico city | 23,499 | 41% | 18% | 21% | 5% | 11% | 3% |
| Calipatria city | 5,056 | 42% | 32% | 20% | 4% | 2% | 1% |
| El Centro city | 26,353 | 31% | 20% | 23% | 8% | 11% | 7% |
| Heber CDP | 2,189 | 44% | 24% | 17% | 4% | 7% | 5% |
| Holtville city | 3,522 | 42% | 20% | 19% | 6% | 12% | 2% |
| Imperial city | 9,346 | 15% | 20% | 34% | 10% | 14% | 7% |
| Westmorland city | 1,173 | 43% | 21% | 22% | 5% | 7% | 1% |
| Niland CDP | 547 | 53% | 28% | 12% | 7% | 0% | 0% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 70 | 19% | 19% | 40% | 0% | 23% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 81 | 26% | 37% | 37% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 3,074 | 35% | 32% | 19% | 4% | 7% | 3% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 294 | 37% | 41% | 15% | 0% | 7% | 0% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 280 | 11% | 41% | 34% | 2% | 6% | 6% |
| Seeley CDP | 899 | 34% | 20% | 35% | 7% | 4% | 0% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 671 | 54% | 19% | 15% | 0% | 11% | 0% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 172 | 53% | 35% | 8% | 0% | 5% | 0% |
| Rest of Imperial County | 15,148 | 30% | 27% | 26% | 6% | 8% | 3% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 55,872 | 22% | 26% | 26% | 8% | 11% | 7% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 7,920 | 48% | 22% | 14% | 8% | 6% | 3% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 2,537 | 23% | 35% | 22% | 9% | 7% | 5% |
| Riverside County | 1,468,896 | 20% | 26% | 26% | 8% | 13% | 8% |
| San Bernardino County | 1,293,779 | 21% | 26% | 25% | 8% | 13% | 7% |
| San Diego County | 2,161,760 | 14% | 19% | 22% | 9% | 23% | 14% |
| Fresno County | 579,136 | 26% | 23% | 23% | 8% | 13% | 7% |
| Kern County | 518,804 | 26% | 27% | 24% | 7% | 10% | 5% |
| Kings County | 91,823 | 27% | 26% | 26% | 8% | 9% | 4% |
| Tulare County | 263,099 | 32% | 25% | 22% | 7% | 9% | 5% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S1501 | | | | | | | |

Table A-14: Type of 4-yr College Degree

| Jurisdiction | Population 25 and Over | Bachelors degree or higher | Science and Engineering field | Science and Engineering Related field | Business field | Education field | Arts, Humanities, others field |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| United States | 213,649,147 | 64,767,787 | 35% | 9% | 20% | 13% | 23% |
| California | 25,554,412 | 8,176,487 | 41% | 8% | 19% | 7% | 26% |
| Imperial County | 107,679 | 15,029 | 32% | 6% | 17% | 20% | 25% |
| Brawley city | 15,305 | 1,754 | 19% | 4% | 18% | 24% | 36% |
| Calexico city | 23,499 | 3,396 | 33% | 5% | 20% | 20% | 21% |
| Calipatria city | 5,056 | 150 | 30% | 0% | 7% | 8% | 55% |
| El Centro city | 26,353 | 4,755 | 35% | 8% | 17% | 19% | 22% |
| Heber CDP | 2,189 | 251 | 32% | 0% | 36% | 22% | 10% |
| Holtville city | 3,522 | 464 | 31% | 0% | 5% | 33% | 30% |
| Imperial city | 9,346 | 1,950 | 31% | 9% | 15% | 17% | 28% |
| Westmorland city | 1,173 | 103 | 23% | 5% | 17% | 17% | 38% |
| Niland CDP | 547 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 70 | 16 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 81 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 3,074 | 314 | 35% | 14% | 26% | 9% | 15% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 294 | 21 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 280 | 35 | 0% | 0% | 49% | 0% | 51% |
| Seeley CDP | 899 | 33 | 64% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 36% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 671 | 77 | 29% | 0% | 71% | 0% | 0% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 172 | 8 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Rest of Imperial County | 15,148 | 1,702 | 36% | 6% | 12% | 20% | 27% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 55,872 | 9,628 | 29% | 11% | 18% | 20% | 22% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 7,920 | 713 | 9% | 9% | 15% | 27% | 41% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 2,537 | 296 | 27% | 17% | 11% | 35% | 9% |
| Riverside County | 1,468,896 | 311,245 | 33% | 10% | 22% | 10% | 24% |
| San Bernardino County | 1,293,779 | 249,922 | 34% | 11% | 21% | 10% | 24% |
| San Diego County | 2,161,760 | 788,922 | 42% | 8% | 19% | 8% | 23% |
| Fresno County | 579,136 | 114,275 | 32% | 11% | 18% | 11% | 28% |
| Kern County | 518,804 | 81,269 | 36% | 9% | 18% | 12% | 24% |
| Kings County | 91,823 | 11,743 | 32% | 9% | 19% | 15% | 25% |
| Tulare County | 263,099 | 36,813 | 32% | 9% | 17% | 16% | 26% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S1501 | | | | | | | |

Table A-15: Unemployment Rates, March 2017 – March 2018

| Jurisdiction | Unemployment Rate | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Mar-18 | Feb-18 | Mar-17 |
| California | 4.2% | 4.5% | 5.2% |
| Imperial County | 15.3% | 15.9% | 18.4% |
| San Diego County | 3.2% | 3.5% | 4.2% |
| Riverside County | 4.2% | 4.5% | 5.5% |
| San Bernardino County | 3.9% | 4.3% | 5.2% |
| Fresno County | 8.7% | 9.0% | 10.3% |
| Kern County | 9.6% | 9.7% | 11.5% |
| Kings County | 9.2% | 9.8% | 11.2% |
| Tulare County | 11.0% | 11.4% | 12.6% |
| Source: EDD California Labor Market Report | | | |

Table A-16: Labor Force Participation for Prime Working Age Groups

| Jurisdiction | All Ages (16 and over) | | | | Persons 25 to 34 | | | | Persons 35 to 54 | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | Total (16 and over) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (25-34) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (35-54) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate |
| United States | 253,323,709 | 160,860,555 | 64% | 7% | 43,397,907 | 35,673,080 | 82% | 8% | 84,008,866 | 68,267,175 | 81% | 6% |
| California | 30,565,746 | 19,378,683 | 63% | 9% | 5,701,167 | 4,623,375 | 81% | 9% | 10,374,225 | 8,330,053 | 80% | 7% |
| Imperial County | 133,170 | 70,980 | 53% | 17% | 25,057 | 17,448 | 70% | 18% | 43,170 | 29,895 | 69% | 12% |
| Brawley city | 18,545 | 10,589 | 57% | 21% | 3,631 | 2,988 | 82% | 26% | 5,944 | 4,337 | 73% | 17% |
| Calexico city | 29,365 | 16,444 | 56% | 19% | 4,652 | 3,669 | 79% | 24% | 9,250 | 6,982 | 75% | 12% |
| Calipatria city | 6,239 | 1,229 | 20% | 17% | 1,834 | 345 | 19% | 13% | 2,302 | 447 | 19% | 19% |
| El Centro city | 32,486 | 18,517 | 57% | 15% | 5,729 | 4,494 | 78% | 13% | 10,023 | 7,785 | 78% | 11% |
| Heber CDP | 2,991 | 1,756 | 59% | 21% | 483 | 406 | 84% | 25% | 982 | 855 | 87% | 10% |
| Holtville city | 4,325 | 2,227 | 52% | 14% | 842 | 766 | 91% | 12% | 1,373 | 941 | 69% | 12% |
| Imperial city | 11,740 | 7,913 | 67% | 14% | 2,672 | 2,213 | 83% | 12% | 4,408 | 3,615 | 82% | 8% |
| Westmorland city | 1,403 | 718 | 51% | 15% | 329 | 280 | 85% | 17% | 355 | 184 | 52% | 8% |
| Niland CDP | 679 | 448 | 66% | 27% | 83 | 83 | 100% | 35% | 138 | 106 | 77% | 45% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 103 | 38 | 37% | 0% | 8 | 4 | 50% | 0% | 16 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 81 | 30 | 37% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 3,722 | 2,006 | 54% | 19% | 761 | 510 | 67% | 16% | 1,268 | 860 | 68% | 20% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 377 | 51 | 14% | 20% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 108 | 40 | 37% | 25% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 303 | 61 | 20% | 48% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 9 | 2 | 22% | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 1,186 | 696 | 59% | 26% | 174 | 120 | 69% | 55% | 410 | 328 | 80% | 12% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 818 | 465 | 57% | 8% | 199 | 106 | 53% | 27% | 211 | 191 | 91% | 5% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 172 | 43 | 25% | 47% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 78 | 29 | 37% | 69% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 18,635 | 7,748 | 42% | 15% | 3,660 | 1,464 | 40% | 16% | 6,295 | 3,193 | 51% | 11% |

| Jurisdiction | All Ages (16 and over) | | | | Persons 25 to 34 | | | | Persons 35 to 54 | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | Total (16 and over) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (25-34) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (35-54) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 70,851 | 43,715 | 62% | 12% | 13,500 | 10,739 | 80% | 11% | 20,519 | 16,840 | 82% | 8% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 10,095 | 6,774 | 67% | 13% | 2,201 | 1,770 | 80% | 8% | 3,414 | 2,866 | 84% | 14% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 2,608 | 535 | 21% | 22% | 110 | 71 | 65% | 45% | 511 | 304 | 60% | 12% |
| Riverside County | 1,782,752 | 1,071,434 | 60% | 11% | 313,835 | 246,377 | 79% | 11% | 599,492 | 468,464 | 78% | 8% |
| San Bernardino County | 1,598,512 | 962,304 | 60% | 11% | 306,145 | 230,381 | 75% | 11% | 543,500 | 410,337 | 75% | 8% |
| San Diego County | 2,607,875 | 1,697,727 | 65% | 8% | 522,891 | 430,533 | 82% | 8% | 854,198 | 688,078 | 81% | 6% |
| Fresno County | 714,300 | 432,866 | 61% | 12% | 142,862 | 109,821 | 77% | 12% | 230,386 | 175,226 | 76% | 10% |
| Kern County | 642,174 | 376,956 | 59% | 12% | 131,056 | 95,079 | 73% | 12% | 214,002 | 156,492 | 73% | 9% |
| Kings County | 113,021 | 63,179 | 56% | 12% | 25,007 | 17,316 | 69% | 13% | 39,438 | 24,912 | 63% | 9% |
| Tulare County | 327,552 | 191,618 | 59% | 11% | 63,782 | 47,677 | 75% | 10% | 108,124 | 81,691 | 76% | 9% |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2301

Table A-17: Labor Force Participation for Younger and Older Working Age Groups

| Jurisdiction | Persons Under 25 | | | | Persons 55 to 64 | | | | Persons 65 and Over | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | Total (<25) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (55 to 64) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (65+) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate |
| United States | 39,674,562 | 23,148,625 | 84% | 16% | 40,061,742 | 25,768,658 | 64% | 5% | 46,180,632 | 7,969,599 | 17% | 5% |
| California | 5,011,334 | 2,679,658 | 82% | 18% | 4,502,038 | 2,887,341 | 64% | 7% | 4,976,982 | 870,900 | 17% | 6% |
| Imperial County | 25,491 | 11,550 | 66% | 34% | 18,141 | 9,520 | 52% | 12% | 21,311 | 2,609 | 12% | 9% |
| Brawley city | 3,240 | 1,552 | 64% | 36% | 2,729 | 1,274 | 47% | 11% | 3,001 | 432 | 14% | 0% |
| Calexico city | 5,866 | 2,900 | 65% | 35% | 4,282 | 2,407 | 56% | 13% | 5,315 | 475 | 9% | 16% |
| Calipatria city | 1,183 | 196 | 60% | 40% | 517 | 185 | 36% | 3% | 403 | 55 | 14% | 0% |
| El Centro city | 6,133 | 2,697 | 65% | 35% | 5,184 | 2,813 | 54% | 12% | 5,417 | 714 | 13% | 9% |
| Heber CDP | 802 | 347 | 54% | 46% | 225 | 128 | 57% | 11% | 499 | 21 | 4% | 0% |
| Holtville city | 803 | 278 | 82% | 18% | 421 | 134 | 32% | 0% | 886 | 110 | 12% | 44% |
| Imperial city | 2,394 | 1,342 | 66% | 34% | 971 | 525 | 54% | 11% | 1,295 | 222 | 17% | 16% |
| Westmorland city | 230 | 80 | 56% | 44% | 236 | 130 | 55% | 5% | 253 | 44 | 17% | 0% |
| Niland CDP | 132 | 92 | 73% | 27% | 179 | 127 | 71% | 14% | 147 | 40 | 27% | 0% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 33 | 10 | 100% | 0% | 31 | 24 | 77% | 0% | 15 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 9 | 9 | 100% | 0% | 72 | 21 | 29% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 648 | 349 | 79% | 21% | 467 | 251 | 54% | 17% | 578 | 37 | 6% | 0% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 83 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 76 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 110 | 11 | 10% | 0% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 23 | 23 | 39% | 61% | 66 | 36 | 55% | 42% | 205 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 287 | 137 | 63% | 37% | 165 | 106 | 64% | 29% | 150 | 5 | 3% | 0% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 147 | 91 | 100% | 0% | 106 | 68 | 64% | 0% | 155 | 9 | 6% | 0% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 14 | 14 | 100% | 0% | 80 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 3,487 | 1,456 | 67% | 33% | 2,463 | 1,289 | 52% | 11% | 2,730 | 414 | 15% | 2% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 14,979 | 9,841 | 78% | 22% | 8,594 | 4,955 | 58% | 10% | 13,259 | 1,367 | 10% | 9% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 2,175 | 1,363 | 85% | 15% | 1,211 | 739 | 61% | 13% | 1,094 | 30 | 3% | 0% |

| Jurisdiction | Persons Under 25 | | | | Persons 55 to 64 | | | | Persons 65 and Over | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | Total (<25) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (55 to 64) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (65+) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 71 | 50 | 22% | 78% | 396 | 64 | 16% | 0% | 1,520 | 46 | 3% | 20% |
| Riverside County | 313,856 | 165,951 | 77% | 23% | 249,077 | 146,284 | 59% | 9% | 306,492 | 44,742 | 15% | 7% |
| San Bernardino County | 304,733 | 159,841 | 78% | 22% | 225,929 | 131,135 | 58% | 7% | 218,205 | 31,048 | 14% | 6% |
| San Diego County | 446,115 | 262,107 | 84% | 16% | 371,236 | 244,363 | 66% | 6% | 413,435 | 71,956 | 17% | 6% |
| Fresno County | 135,164 | 69,451 | 79% | 21% | 97,963 | 60,191 | 61% | 8% | 107,925 | 17,960 | 17% | 6% |
| Kern County | 123,370 | 63,744 | 78% | 22% | 87,704 | 49,229 | 56% | 8% | 86,042 | 12,450 | 14% | 7% |
| Kings County | 21,198 | 11,807 | 79% | 21% | 13,747 | 7,071 | 51% | 8% | 13,631 | 2,019 | 15% | 3% |
| Tulare County | 64,453 | 29,640 | 80% | 20% | 43,701 | 24,987 | 57% | 7% | 47,492 | 7,700 | 16% | 6% |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2301

Table A-18: Labor Force Participation Rates by Type of College Degree

| Jurisdiction | Bachelor's Degree or Higher | | | | Associate Degree or Some College | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | Total (Persons 25-64) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (Persons 25-64) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate |
| United States | 53,214,243 | 45,817,463 | 86% | 3% | 50,987,681 | 40,331,256 | 79% | 6% |
| California | 6,707,111 | 5,714,459 | 85% | 5% | 6,169,493 | 4,781,357 | 78% | 8% |
| Imperial County | 13,024 | 10,758 | 83% | 7% | 29,726 | 21,551 | 73% | 13% |
| Brawley city | 1,610 | 1,166 | 72% | 5% | 4,844 | 3,662 | 76% | 15% |
| Calexico city | 3,094 | 2,633 | 85% | 15% | 5,909 | 4,650 | 79% | 17% |
| Calipatria city | 125 | 65 | 52% | 0% | 1,183 | 384 | 33% | 14% |
| El Centro city | 4,095 | 3,542 | 87% | 3% | 7,119 | 5,311 | 75% | 10% |
| Heber CDP | 224 | 209 | 93% | 43% | 433 | 392 | 91% | 6% |
| Holtville city | 424 | 404 | 95% | 7% | 733 | 553 | 75% | 11% |
| Imperial city | 1,738 | 1,510 | 87% | 2% | 3,824 | 3,082 | 81% | 12% |
| Westmorland city | 97 | 65 | 67% | 0% | 273 | 206 | 76% | 7% |
| Niland CDP | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 67 | 67 | 100% | 43% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 16 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 18 | 11 | 61% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 9 | 9 | 100% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 195 | 133 | 68% | 14% | 587 | 376 | 64% | 7% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 11 | 11 | 100% | 0% | 21 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 5 | 5 | 100% | 100% | 25 | 12 | 48% | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 33 | 21 | 64% | 0% | 359 | 304 | 85% | 22% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 44 | 44 | 100% | 0% | 67 | 67 | 100% | 0% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 8 | 8 | 100% | 0% | 13 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 1,305 | 942 | 72% | 6% | 4,242 | 2,465 | 58% | 11% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 7,554 | 6,534 | 87% | 3% | 15,442 | 12,446 | 81% | 9% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 693 | 596 | 86% | 6% | 1,683 | 1,506 | 90% | 1% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 87 | 19 | 22% | 0% | 281 | 174 | 62% | 22% |
| Riverside County | 237,886 | 196,494 | 83% | 5% | 393,117 | 299,555 | 76% | 9% |
| San Bernardino County | 208,580 | 174,373 | 84% | 5% | 363,603 | 269,066 | 74% | 8% |
| San Diego County | 648,121 | 551,551 | 85% | 4% | 554,208 | 428,403 | 77% | 7% |
| Fresno County | 92,422 | 79,113 | 86% | 5% | 150,869 | 115,717 | 77% | 10% |
| Kern County | 66,866 | 55,833 | 84% | 4% | 134,626 | 95,988 | 71% | 9% |
| Kings County | 9,842 | 8,198 | 83% | 4% | 27,331 | 19,022 | 70% | 10% |
| Tulare County | 30,320 | 25,742 | 85% | 3% | 63,383 | 46,777 | 74% | 7% |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2301

Table A-19: Labor Force Participation for Workers with High School Diploma or Less

| Jurisdiction | High School Diploma\GED | | | | Less Than HS\GED | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | Total (Persons 25-64) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate | Total (Persons 25-64) | In the Labor Force | Labor Force Partic. Rate | UE Rate |
| United States | 43,788,541 | 31,790,481 | 73% | 8% | 19,478,050 | 11,784,220 | 61% | 11% |
| California | 4,170,491 | 3,031,947 | 73% | 10% | 3,530,335 | 2,315,900 | 66% | 10% |
| Imperial County | 20,265 | 12,564 | 62% | 15% | 23,353 | 12,003 | 51% | 21% |
| Brawley city | 3,249 | 2,326 | 72% | 21% | 2,601 | 1,446 | 56% | 35% |
| Calexico city | 3,632 | 2,492 | 69% | 10% | 5,549 | 3,279 | 59% | 18% |
| Calipatria city | 1,551 | 271 | 18% | 20% | 1,794 | 257 | 14% | 11% |
| El Centro city | 4,386 | 3,232 | 74% | 17% | 5,336 | 3,010 | 56% | 20% |
| Heber CDP | 450 | 415 | 92% | 8% | 583 | 373 | 64% | 15% |
| Holtville city | 553 | 443 | 80% | 7% | 926 | 441 | 48% | 19% |
| Imperial city | 1,651 | 1,161 | 70% | 10% | 838 | 599 | 72% | 17% |
| Westmorland city | 197 | 133 | 68% | 22% | 353 | 190 | 54% | 14% |
| Niland CDP | 117 | 68 | 58% | 43% | 216 | 181 | 84% | 20% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 8 | 4 | 50% | 0% | 13 | 13 | 100% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 723 | 498 | 69% | 19% | 991 | 614 | 62% | 26% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 65 | 10 | 15% | 0% | 87 | 19 | 22% | 53% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 40 | 16 | 40% | 67% | 5 | 5 | 100% | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 175 | 117 | 67% | 20% | 182 | 112 | 62% | 33% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 104 | 42 | 40% | 0% | 301 | 212 | 70% | 18% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 71 | 35 | 49% | 57% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 3,364 | 1,336 | 40% | 13% | 3,507 | 1,218 | 35% | 17% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 11,220 | 8,168 | 73% | 7% | 8,397 | 5,399 | 64% | 20% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 1,614 | 1,264 | 78% | 11% | 2,836 | 2,008 | 71% | 23% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 304 | 131 | 43% | 0% | 345 | 115 | 33% | 27% |
| Riverside County | 305,585 | 221,549 | 73% | 11% | 225,816 | 143,393 | 64% | 12% |
| San Bernardino County | 283,050 | 197,852 | 70% | 11% | 220,341 | 130,222 | 59% | 13% |
| San Diego County | 321,633 | 238,330 | 74% | 9% | 224,363 | 145,163 | 65% | 10% |
| Fresno County | 107,945 | 75,454 | 70% | 12% | 119,975 | 74,864 | 62% | 15% |
| Kern County | 118,234 | 79,808 | 68% | 11% | 113,036 | 69,065 | 61% | 15% |
| Kings County | 20,530 | 12,195 | 59% | 11% | 20,489 | 9,896 | 48% | 15% |
| Tulare County | 55,065 | 38,601 | 70% | 10% | 66,839 | 43,312 | 65% | 14% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2301 | | | | | | | | |

Table 20: Industry of Employment, Civilian Employed Persons (16 and over), Imperial County

| Industries | United States | California | Imperial County | Brawley city | Calexico city | Calipatria city | EI Centro city | Heber CDP | Holtville city | Imperial city | Westmorland city |
|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Total | 148,001,326 | 17,577,142 | 58,456 | 8,407 | 13,311 | 1,014 | 15,682 | 1,394 | 1,926 | 6,801 | 614 |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting | 1% | 2% | 9% | 11% | 7% | 22% | 7% | 10% | 20% | 3% | 24% |
| Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 1% |
| Construction | 6% | 6% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 4% | 1% | 6% | 2% | 2% |
| Manufacturing | 10% | 10% | 4% | 5% | 6% | 2% | 4% | 8% | 7% | 2% | 3% |
| Wholesale trade | 3% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 4% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0% |
| Retail trade | 12% | 11% | 15% | 12% | 17% | 12% | 15% | 19% | 10% | 18% | 9% |
| Transportation and warehousing | 4% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 8% | 3% | 4% | 1% |
| Utilities | 1% | 1% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 1% | 7% | 6% |
| Information | 2% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| Finance and insurance | 5% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 3% | 1% | 0% |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services | 7% | 8% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 3% |
| Management of companies and enterprises | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Admin. and support and waste management svcs. | 4% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 7% | 5% | 3% | 6% | 3% | 2% |
| Educational services | 9% | 8% | 11% | 11% | 10% | 8% | 11% | 7% | 13% | 15% | 5% |
| Health care and social assistance | 14% | 12% | 14% | 16% | 17% | 13% | 15% | 13% | 6% | 11% | 14% |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation | 2% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 5% |
| Accommodation and food services | 8% | 8% | 6% | 8% | 7% | 3% | 6% | 8% | 3% | 5% | 12% |
| Other services, except public administration | 5% | 5% | 4% | 6% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 6% | 5% | 3% | 7% |
| Public administration | 5% | 4% | 10% | 9% | 6% | 10% | 11% | 8% | 7% | 20% | 5% |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2403

Table 21: Industry of Employment, Civilian employed persons (16 and over), Comparison Counties

| All civilian employed 16 and over | Riverside County | San Bernardino County | San Diego County | Fresno County | Kern County | Kings County | Tulare County |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Civilian employed persons (16 and over) | 946,798 | 847,144 | 1,495,776 | 380,621 | 330,594 | 52,048 | 171,147 |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting | 2% | 1% | 1% | 10% | 12% | 15% | 19% |
| Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 0% | 0% |
| Construction | 9% | 7% | 6% | 5% | 6% | 3% | 5% |
| Manufacturing | 9% | 10% | 9% | 7% | 6% | 8% | 8% |
| Wholesale trade | 3% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 4% |
| Retail trade | 13% | 13% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 10% | 11% |
| Transportation and warehousing | 5% | 8% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| Utilities | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Information | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Finance and insurance | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services | 4% | 4% | 10% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 2% |
| Management of companies and enterprises | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Admin. and support and waste management svcs. | 6% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 3% | 4% |
| Educational services | 8% | 9% | 9% | 9% | 8% | 9% | 9% |
| Health care and social assistance | 12% | 13% | 12% | 14% | 11% | 13% | 12% |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation | 3% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 1% |
| Accommodation and food services | 8% | 7% | 9% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 6% |
| Other services, except public administration | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| Public administration | 5% | 5% | 5% | 6% | 7% | 12% | 6% |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2403

Table A-22: Occupational Distribution, All Civilian Employed 16 and Over

| Jurisdiction | Total | Management | Business and financial operations | Professional and advanced technical | Arts, design, entertainment | Community service | Health | Sales and related occupations | Food preparation | Office and building support | Farming, fishing, and forestry | Construction and extraction occupations | Installation, prod., transport, and materials moving |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| United States | 148,001,326 | 10% | 5% | 7% | 2% | 10% | 8% | 14% | 6% | 17% | 1% | 5% | 15% |
| California | 17,577,142 | 10% | 5% | 8% | 3% | 9% | 7% | 16% | 6% | 17% | 2% | 5% | 14% |
| Imperial County | 58,456 | 6% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 15% | 5% | 20% | 4% | 18% | 6% | 4% | 15% |
| Brawley city | 8,407 | 7% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 14% | 7% | 18% | 4% | 22% | 6% | 3% | 16% |
| Calexico city | 13,311 | 5% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 11% | 4% | 23% | 6% | 18% | 6% | 5% | 18% |
| Calipatria city | 1,014 | 2% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 4% | 20% | 2% | 18% | 16% | 2% | 22% |
| El Centro city | 15,682 | 6% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 17% | 6% | 21% | 4% | 16% | 5% | 4% | 14% |
| Heber CDP | 1,394 | 2% | 0% | 3% | 2% | 5% | 4% | 21% | 9% | 22% | 8% | 1% | 23% |
| Holtville city | 1,926 | 7% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 14% | 3% | 13% | 5% | 20% | 15% | 8% | 11% |
| Imperial city | 6,801 | 5% | 4% | 5% | 0% | 26% | 6% | 18% | 3% | 18% | 1% | 3% | 11% |
| Westmorland city | 614 | 4% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 8% | 5% | 16% | 12% | 10% | 17% | 4% | 20% |
| Niland CDP | 328 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 34% | 7% | 12% | 23% | 17% | 6% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 38 | 0% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 26% | 0% | 34% | 24% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 30 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 30% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 70% |
| Salton City CDP | 1,621 | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 9% | 4% | 20% | 6% | 15% | 9% | 7% | 25% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 41 | 27% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 24% | 0% | 0% | 49% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 31 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 16% | 3% | 29% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 52% | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 495 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 20% | 0% | 22% | 7% | 23% | 6% | 2% | 19% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 427 | 0% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 26% | 2% | 13% | 15% | 4% | 22% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 23 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 35% | 26% | 0% | 0% | 39% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| Jurisdiction | Total | Management | Business and financial operations | Professional and advanced technical | Arts, design, entertainment | Community service | Health | Sales and related occupations | Food preparation | Office and building support | Farming, fishing, and forestry | Construction and extraction occupations | Installation, prod., transport, and materials moving |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 6,273 | 11% | 3% | 3% | 0% | 11% | 4% | 15% | 5% | 19% | 7% | 7% | 15% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 35,887 | 8% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 13% | 7% | 13% | 8% | 20% | 4% | 4% | 15% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 5,912 | 4% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 15% | 4% | 14% | 7% | 20% | 11% | 5% | 16% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 418 | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 6% | 10% | 2% | 18% | 8% | 0% | 42% |
| Riverside County | 946,798 | 9% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 10% | 7% | 17% | 6% | 19% | 1% | 7% | 17% |
| San Bernardino County | 847,144 | 7% | 4% | 4% | 1% | 10% | 7% | 16% | 5% | 18% | 0% | 6% | 21% |
| San Diego County | 1,495,776 | 11% | 6% | 10% | 3% | 9% | 7% | 16% | 6% | 17% | 1% | 4% | 11% |
| Fresno County | 380,621 | 8% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 10% | 7% | 15% | 6% | 17% | 8% | 4% | 17% |
| Kern County | 330,594 | 7% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 10% | 6% | 13% | 6% | 16% | 10% | 7% | 18% |
| Kings County | 52,048 | 7% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 11% | 7% | 14% | 5% | 16% | 11% | 3% | 19% |
| Tulare County | 171,147 | 7% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 11% | 7% | 14% | 5% | 14% | 16% | 4% | 18% |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2401

Table A-23: Average Annual Earnings by Occupation, All Civilian Employed Full-time (16 and over), Imperial County

| Occupations | United States | California | Imperial County | Brawley city | Calexico city | Calipatria city | El Centro city | Heber CDP | Holtville city | Imperial city | Westmorland city |
|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| All | \$44,910 | \$48,787 | \$38,778 | \$38,644 | \$31,243 | \$38,828 | \$39,126 | \$40,726 | \$33,069 | \$60,815 | \$28,043 |
| Management | \$72,586 | \$82,233 | \$61,432 | \$72,031 | \$27,466 | - | \$62,147 | - | \$51,156 | \$60,625 | - |
| Business and financial operations | \$62,013 | \$67,914 | \$53,401 | \$60,313 | \$45,104 | - | \$54,444 | - | - | \$58,555 | - |
| Computer and mathematical | \$80,219 | \$95,268 | \$78,875 | - | \$62,143 | - | \$81,190 | - | - | \$80,424 | - |
| Architecture and engineering | \$80,000 | \$94,171 | \$82,775 | - | \$84,455 | - | \$82,917 | - | - | \$81,778 | - |
| Life, physical, and social science | \$64,133 | \$76,019 | \$68,824 | - | - | - | \$68,333 | - | - | - | - |
| Community and social services | \$43,342 | \$50,369 | \$45,445 | \$55,114 | \$40,550 | - | \$49,625 | - | - | \$48,654 | - |
| Legal | \$86,049 | \$104,138 | \$60,882 | - | - | - | \$46,250 | - | - | \$81,114 | - |
| Education, training, and library | \$49,084 | \$60,781 | \$59,071 | \$34,934 | \$27,721 | - | \$70,614 | - | - | \$63,333 | - |
| Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media | \$51,663 | \$60,942 | \$70,739 | - | - | - | \$32,308 | - | - | - | - |
| Health diagnosing and treating practitioners | \$72,741 | \$93,508 | \$69,434 | \$55,640 | \$75,135 | - | \$81,520 | - | - | \$69,552 | - |
| Health technologists and technicians | \$41,036 | \$46,434 | \$47,566 | \$37,344 | \$30,208 | - | \$49,219 | - | - | \$81,583 | - |
| Healthcare support | \$27,783 | \$31,002 | \$26,280 | \$27,045 | \$19,485 | - | \$23,819 | - | \$41,250 | \$23,065 | \$23,393 |
| Fire fighting and prevention, and other prot. svcs | \$41,109 | \$40,867 | \$55,739 | \$62,401 | \$73,229 | - | \$32,292 | - | - | \$65,438 | - |
| Law enforcement, and other protective svcs | \$57,986 | \$85,544 | \$80,505 | \$76,495 | \$66,971 | \$80,556 | \$71,797 | - | - | \$93,688 | - |
| Food preparation and serving-related | \$21,924 | \$23,397 | \$24,092 | \$16,475 | \$25,417 | - | \$20,227 | - | - | - | - |
| Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance | \$26,004 | \$25,670 | \$30,303 | \$45,714 | \$26,450 | - | \$25,875 | - | - | \$40,233 | - |
| Personal care and service | \$24,528 | \$25,061 | \$23,306 | \$30,538 | \$21,141 | \$21,042 | \$17,139 | - | - | \$12,047 | - |
| Sales and related | \$42,341 | \$44,799 | \$31,204 | \$26,625 | \$31,538 | \$35,625 | \$28,568 | - | - | \$33,429 | \$26,042 |
| Office and administrative support | \$35,892 | \$39,944 | \$34,599 | \$38,179 | \$29,321 | \$38,693 | \$33,702 | \$29,375 | \$33,646 | \$40,534 | \$23,618 |
| Farming, Fishing, and forestry | \$25,838 | \$22,858 | \$25,990 | \$27,650 | \$25,605 | \$24,318 | \$29,688 | \$15,833 | \$32,521 | \$19,922 | \$26,957 |
| Construction and extraction | \$40,583 | \$41,110 | \$46,360 | \$41,106 | \$41,797 | - | \$53,036 | - | - | \$65,486 | \$60,417 |
| Installation, maintenance, and repair | \$45,278 | \$45,204 | \$40,956 | \$40,709 | \$37,639 | \$36,875 | \$43,698 | \$56,217 | - | \$61,042 | \$43,750 |
| Production | \$36,404 | \$32,476 | \$39,340 | \$38,352 | \$29,970 | \$64,500 | \$33,917 | \$30,714 | \$19,866 | \$86,731 | - |
| Transportation | \$41,466 | \$40,980 | \$37,294 | \$51,250 | \$30,971 | - | \$29,676 | - | - | \$38,750 | \$27,321 |
| Materials moving | \$30,146 | \$26,596 | \$28,463 | \$15,417 | \$30,313 | \$55,750 | \$24,121 | - | - | \$46,339 | \$55,192 |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2412

Table A-24: Average Annual Earnings by Occupation, All Civilian Employed Full-time (16 and over), Comparison Counties

| Occupations | Riverside County | San Bernardino County | San Diego County | Fresno County | Kern County | Kings County | Tulare County |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| All | \$42,785 | \$41,603 | \$50,081 | \$39,683 | \$39,960 | \$37,387 | \$36,195 |
| Management | \$71,787 | \$66,882 | \$78,481 | \$68,373 | \$71,138 | \$57,418 | \$60,312 |
| Business and financial operations | \$60,461 | \$54,940 | \$65,897 | \$52,357 | \$55,663 | \$53,276 | \$51,324 |
| Computer and mathematical | \$74,259 | \$74,327 | \$89,614 | \$63,834 | \$74,029 | \$51,582 | \$53,399 |
| Architecture and engineering | \$81,591 | \$79,993 | \$88,231 | \$71,497 | \$90,105 | \$79,188 | \$55,135 |
| Life, physical, and social science | \$68,403 | \$73,801 | \$73,412 | \$67,500 | \$70,512 | \$51,106 | \$64,940 |
| Community and social services | \$48,542 | \$51,645 | \$46,891 | \$43,431 | \$48,597 | \$36,111 | \$47,996 |
| Legal | \$87,681 | \$70,120 | \$93,446 | \$76,228 | \$62,405 | \$57,917 | \$80,156 |
| Education, training, and library | \$66,233 | \$60,898 | \$60,947 | \$61,550 | \$58,978 | \$60,430 | \$57,522 |
| Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media | \$50,308 | \$46,123 | \$51,600 | \$50,029 | \$51,678 | \$32,031 | \$42,614 |
| Health diagnosing and treating practitioners | \$89,789 | \$81,689 | \$84,874 | \$91,112 | \$81,395 | \$80,164 | \$80,183 |
| Health technologists and technicians | \$42,750 | \$42,786 | \$41,873 | \$46,924 | \$43,673 | \$41,338 | \$41,671 |
| Healthcare support | \$28,407 | \$28,673 | \$31,135 | \$28,225 | \$27,338 | \$30,128 | \$27,907 |
| Fire fighting and prevention, and other prot. svcs | \$49,177 | \$36,753 | \$37,334 | \$36,070 | \$48,517 | \$35,096 | \$54,250 |
| Law enforcement, and other protective svcs | \$90,803 | \$84,481 | \$82,422 | \$77,823 | \$77,425 | \$81,829 | \$80,140 |
| Food preparation and serving-related | \$22,392 | \$22,176 | \$24,315 | \$21,529 | \$21,544 | \$21,459 | \$20,177 |
| Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance | \$24,732 | \$25,536 | \$24,751 | \$24,969 | \$24,145 | \$25,899 | \$26,722 |
| Personal care and service | \$25,908 | \$22,541 | \$24,989 | \$24,851 | \$20,660 | \$25,948 | \$21,907 |
| Sales and related | \$41,867 | \$38,357 | \$45,202 | \$41,685 | \$35,231 | \$35,423 | \$33,594 |
| Office and administrative support | \$36,709 | \$36,067 | \$39,191 | \$34,774 | \$33,689 | \$32,601 | \$32,888 |
| Farming, Fishing, and forestry | \$21,867 | \$22,452 | \$22,404 | \$22,096 | \$19,926 | \$28,508 | \$23,384 |
| Construction and extraction | \$41,744 | \$43,656 | \$41,128 | \$38,189 | \$50,387 | \$36,758 | \$41,355 |
| Installation, maintenance, and repair | \$45,502 | \$43,702 | \$43,708 | \$39,885 | \$46,087 | \$43,311 | \$40,625 |
| Production | \$33,774 | \$31,815 | \$36,158 | \$31,271 | \$36,201 | \$40,899 | \$32,029 |
| Transportation | \$43,261 | \$44,843 | \$38,554 | \$40,237 | \$44,579 | \$43,571 | \$41,387 |
| Materials moving | \$26,916 | \$27,014 | \$25,984 | \$24,055 | \$29,945 | \$31,023 | \$24,882 |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2412

Table A-25: Average Annual Earnings by Industry, Civilian Employed Full- Time Workers (16 and over), Imperial County

| Industry | United States | California | Imperial County | Brawley city | Calexico city | Calipatria city | EI Centro city | Heber CDP | Holtville city | Imperial city | Westmorland city |
|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Average | \$44,910 | \$48,787 | \$38,778 | \$38,644 | \$31,243 | \$38,828 | \$39,126 | \$40,726 | \$33,069 | \$60,815 | \$28,043 |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting | \$31,482 | \$26,449 | \$29,246 | \$31,763 | \$26,438 | \$30,577 | \$31,006 | \$15,238 | \$33,200 | \$40,385 | \$27,228 |
| Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction | \$68,025 | \$67,665 | \$60,156 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Construction | \$42,191 | \$45,802 | \$38,759 | \$39,744 | \$38,147 | - | \$37,388 | - | - | \$23,947 | - |
| Manufacturing | \$47,819 | \$51,455 | \$35,826 | \$28,851 | \$32,446 | - | \$37,017 | \$45,547 | \$33,554 | \$62,353 | - |
| Wholesale trade | \$48,112 | \$45,963 | \$33,585 | \$41,272 | \$28,050 | - | \$26,793 | - | - | \$33,731 | - |
| Retail trade | \$33,154 | \$35,759 | \$30,227 | \$35,703 | \$29,728 | \$23,750 | \$29,448 | - | \$27,281 | \$37,172 | \$25,208 |
| Transportation and warehousing | \$47,710 | \$46,032 | \$35,017 | \$52,633 | \$30,483 | - | \$31,293 | - | - | \$36,825 | - |
| Utilities | \$67,644 | \$83,879 | \$70,167 | \$67,344 | \$61,293 | \$67,396 | \$65,074 | \$67,617 | - | \$80,625 | \$55,192 |
| Information | \$60,169 | \$74,844 | \$61,750 | - | - | - | \$92,778 | - | - | \$72,440 | - |
| Finance and insurance | \$56,923 | \$64,615 | \$37,857 | \$26,847 | \$33,750 | - | \$60,750 | - | - | \$29,141 | - |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | \$45,360 | \$50,190 | \$31,630 | \$31,176 | \$45,125 | - | \$30,380 | - | - | - | - |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services | \$71,889 | \$81,906 | \$45,465 | \$43,068 | \$62,411 | - | \$32,232 | - | - | \$80,614 | - |
| Management of companies and enterprises | \$68,928 | \$75,361 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Admin. and support and waste management svcs. | \$32,285 | \$31,481 | \$32,396 | \$58,375 | \$32,031 | \$22,000 | \$30,488 | - | \$31,822 | \$75,089 | - |
| Educational services | \$48,580 | \$57,887 | \$48,906 | \$38,537 | \$38,409 | - | \$62,695 | \$46,053 | \$70,563 | \$42,407 | - |
| Health care and social assistance | \$41,648 | \$47,662 | \$32,319 | \$31,758 | \$29,396 | \$27,727 | \$35,347 | \$28,774 | \$14,830 | \$35,167 | \$23,462 |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation | \$36,330 | \$40,393 | \$26,607 | - | \$25,083 | - | \$24,609 | - | - | - | - |
| Accommodation and food services | \$25,062 | \$25,899 | \$23,379 | \$15,917 | \$22,633 | - | \$25,609 | - | - | \$28,466 | - |
| Other services, except public administration | \$34,006 | \$32,291 | \$26,663 | \$30,424 | \$25,530 | - | \$19,331 | \$16,579 | - | \$29,194 | \$30,658 |
| Public administration | \$56,129 | \$68,599 | \$66,870 | \$65,313 | \$66,408 | \$61,667 | \$61,351 | \$76,213 | \$35,859 | \$83,269 | \$25,000 |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2414

Table 26: Average Annual earnings by Industry, Civilian Employed Full- Time Workers (16 and over), Comparison Counties

| Industry | Riverside County | San Bernardino County | San Diego County | Fresno County | Kern County | Kings County | Tulare County |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Average | \$42,785 | \$41,603 | \$50,081 | \$39,683 | \$39,960 | \$37,387 | \$36,195 |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting | \$25,743 | \$25,297 | \$25,461 | \$25,339 | \$21,749 | \$30,472 | \$26,520 |
| Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction | \$61,394 | \$61,599 | \$52,159 | \$66,125 | \$65,620 | \$79,167 | \$41,250 |
| Construction | \$46,877 | \$45,886 | \$47,152 | \$41,564 | \$45,755 | \$43,936 | \$45,521 |
| Manufacturing | \$43,043 | \$40,622 | \$62,746 | \$35,127 | \$42,465 | \$40,298 | \$36,967 |
| Wholesale trade | \$45,207 | \$40,709 | \$48,623 | \$41,746 | \$38,956 | \$42,036 | \$33,557 |
| Retail trade | \$34,997 | \$32,615 | \$35,626 | \$31,926 | \$30,825 | \$30,296 | \$30,938 |
| Transportation and warehousing | \$43,953 | \$41,586 | \$45,766 | \$41,878 | \$44,270 | \$47,802 | \$40,918 |
| Utilities | \$75,934 | \$75,588 | \$87,557 | \$73,662 | \$71,523 | \$49,107 | \$54,044 |
| Information | \$55,728 | \$53,690 | \$72,599 | \$51,515 | \$50,510 | \$41,775 | \$43,017 |
| Finance and insurance | \$56,434 | \$50,610 | \$60,348 | \$46,928 | \$45,135 | \$51,591 | \$41,274 |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | \$45,901 | \$37,138 | \$50,198 | \$40,213 | \$39,134 | \$33,971 | \$40,515 |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services | \$62,386 | \$53,559 | \$75,888 | \$53,710 | \$54,971 | \$46,206 | \$51,843 |
| Management of companies and enterprises | \$52,750 | \$51,250 | \$89,688 | \$86,518 | \$47,117 | - | \$27,344 |
| Admin. and support and waste management svcs. | \$29,049 | \$27,558 | \$32,174 | \$27,994 | \$29,139 | \$26,346 | \$28,325 |
| Educational services | \$59,907 | \$54,976 | \$56,407 | \$55,993 | \$52,056 | \$47,071 | \$51,797 |
| Health care and social assistance | \$42,532 | \$42,742 | \$47,290 | \$42,042 | \$37,647 | \$35,453 | \$36,300 |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation | \$34,751 | \$36,431 | \$37,223 | \$30,673 | \$30,235 | \$26,446 | \$27,040 |
| Accommodation and food services | \$25,576 | \$23,952 | \$26,613 | \$21,822 | \$22,595 | \$22,215 | \$20,362 |
| Other services, except public administration | \$32,590 | \$31,374 | \$32,614 | \$31,335 | \$30,925 | \$31,420 | \$30,300 |
| Public administration | \$70,472 | \$62,889 | \$65,354 | \$60,137 | \$70,005 | \$52,427 | \$59,750 |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table S2414

Table A-27: Journey to Work

| Jurisdiction | Total civilian employed persons (16 and Over)* | Worked In County of Residence | Worked Outside County of Residence (in State) | Worked Outside County of Residence (Outside of State) |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---|---|
| United States | 145,861,221 | 72% | 24% | 4% |
| California | 17,193,695 | 83% | 17% | 0% |
| Imperial County | 57,190 | 92% | 6% | 2% |
| Brawley city | 8,140 | 98% | 1% | 1% |
| Calexico city | 12,768 | 93% | 3% | 3% |
| Calipatria city | 947 | 96% | 2% | 1% |
| El Centro city | 15,288 | 93% | 4% | 4% |
| Heber CDP | 1,306 | 95% | 4% | 2% |
| Holtville city | 1,869 | 85% | 14% | 1% |
| Imperial city | 6,692 | 96% | 4% | 0% |
| Westmorland city | 602 | 98% | 1% | 1% |
| Niland CDP | 328 | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 38 | 45% | 55% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 30 | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 1,628 | 37% | 62% | 1% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 41 | 46% | 54% | 0% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 32 | 47% | 53% | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 525 | 97% | 0% | 3% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 400 | 19% | 78% | 4% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 23 | 74% | 0% | 26% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 6,533 | 92% | 4% | 4% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 38,142 | 95% | 1% | 5% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 5,638 | 92% | 1% | 7% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 408 | 85% | 8% | 7% |
| Riverside County | 923,845 | 69% | 30% | 1% |
| San Bernardino County | 834,181 | 70% | 29% | 1% |
| San Diego County | 1,536,747 | 97% | 2% | 1% |
| Fresno County | 368,119 | 91% | 9% | 0% |
| Kern County | 323,691 | 95% | 5% | 0% |
| Kings County | 54,567 | 78% | 22% | 0% |
| Tulare County | 165,799 | 85% | 14% | 0% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table B08130 (*note: based on usual place of work) | | | | |

Table A-28: Household Income by Quintile

| Households | 20th Percentile | 40th Percentile | 50th Percentile (median) | 60th Percentile | 80th Percentile | 95th Percentile |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| United States | \$22,558 | \$43,263 | \$55,322 | \$69,767 | \$111,894 | \$209,414 |
| California | \$23,308 | \$49,774 | \$63,783 | \$81,045 | \$132,226 | \$250,000 |
| Imperial County | \$15,312 | \$31,490 | \$42,560 | \$56,067 | \$91,888 | \$156,598 |
| Brawley city | \$13,542 | \$30,619 | \$40,745 | \$51,474 | \$86,894 | \$168,281 |
| Calexico city | \$14,255 | \$27,806 | \$34,734 | \$45,605 | \$77,442 | \$139,610 |
| Calipatria city | \$13,160 | \$27,594 | \$34,800 | \$44,354 | \$69,083 | \$136,896 |
| El Centro city | \$15,646 | \$31,043 | \$41,849 | \$54,910 | \$93,597 | \$160,123 |
| Heber CDP | \$20,054 | \$32,061 | \$42,647 | \$54,571 | \$81,115 | \$111,000 |
| Holtville city | \$11,714 | \$21,710 | \$28,115 | \$42,011 | \$74,750 | \$129,699 |
| Imperial city | \$48,545 | \$74,293 | \$85,503 | \$94,688 | \$119,597 | \$185,962 |
| Westmorland city | \$11,586 | \$20,410 | \$27,083 | \$37,286 | \$62,950 | \$100,964 |
| Niland CDP | \$11,187 | \$16,139 | \$18,553 | \$20,125 | - | \$119,875 |
| Ocotillo CDP | \$20,976 | - | - | - | \$101,125 | \$121,646 |
| Palo Verde CDP | \$14,136 | \$15,810 | \$16,667 | \$25,024 | - | \$108,875 |
| Salton City CDP | \$13,480 | \$26,455 | \$36,274 | \$46,213 | \$66,804 | \$120,054 |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | \$17,275 | \$19,033 | - | \$38,545 | \$45,864 | \$72,773 |
| Bombay Beach CDP | \$11,243 | \$12,486 | \$14,803 | \$17,278 | \$50,050 | \$81,705 |
| Seeley CDP | \$9,289 | \$19,000 | \$24,083 | \$26,551 | \$53,094 | \$133,837 |
| Desert Shores CDP | \$9,509 | \$21,113 | \$32,733 | \$35,056 | \$48,188 | \$65,708 |
| Winterhaven CDP | - | \$21,722 | \$22,835 | \$23,420 | \$24,589 | - |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | \$14,825 | \$37,502 | \$48,080 | \$65,172 | \$116,170 | \$200,126 |
| Yuma city, Arizona | \$19,437 | \$35,081 | \$44,216 | \$54,660 | \$83,883 | \$147,374 |
| Somerton city, Arizona | \$14,512 | \$26,038 | \$34,318 | \$43,207 | \$75,029 | \$114,084 |
| Wellton town, Arizona | \$23,443 | \$38,833 | \$45,492 | \$49,561 | \$69,000 | \$96,967 |
| Riverside County | \$24,572 | \$45,691 | \$57,972 | \$72,172 | \$112,688 | \$194,454 |
| San Bernardino County | \$22,532 | \$42,879 | \$54,469 | \$68,175 | \$106,125 | \$181,017 |
| San Diego County | \$27,413 | \$52,203 | \$66,529 | \$83,538 | \$132,688 | \$239,069 |
| Fresno County | \$18,645 | \$35,076 | \$45,963 | \$58,727 | \$96,858 | \$175,682 |
| Kern County | \$20,642 | \$38,104 | \$49,788 | \$63,180 | \$101,319 | \$177,799 |
| Kings County | \$21,391 | \$38,270 | \$47,241 | \$60,325 | \$92,579 | \$166,246 |
| Tulare County | \$18,414 | \$33,751 | \$42,789 | \$53,737 | \$87,307 | \$159,239 |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Tables B19013 and B19080 | | | | | | |

Table A-29: Household Income Distribution

| Jurisdiction | Total Households | < \$20,000 | \$20,000 - \$34,999 | \$35,000 - \$49,999 | \$50,000 - \$74,999 | \$75,000 - \$99,999 | \$100,000 - \$124,999 | \$125,000 - \$149,999 | \$150,000 - \$199,999 | \$200,000 or more |
|------------------------|------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| United States | 117,716,237 | 22% | 10% | 13% | 18% | 12% | 8% | 5% | 5% | 6% |
| California | 12,807,387 | 20% | 9% | 12% | 17% | 12% | 9% | 6% | 7% | 9% |
| Imperial County | 45,800 | 33% | 11% | 12% | 16% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 3% | 2% |
| Brawley city | 7,080 | 33% | 12% | 13% | 16% | 10% | 7% | 2% | 4% | 2% |
| Calexico city | 9,261 | 36% | 15% | 12% | 16% | 9% | 6% | 3% | 3% | 1% |
| Calipatria city | 918 | 33% | 17% | 16% | 14% | 10% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 2% |
| El Centro city | 12,352 | 33% | 11% | 12% | 17% | 10% | 6% | 5% | 4% | 3% |
| Heber CDP | 980 | 33% | 8% | 12% | 17% | 22% | 5% | 1% | 1% | 0% |
| Holtville city | 1,742 | 46% | 11% | 6% | 17% | 9% | 3% | 6% | 1% | 1% |
| Imperial city | 4,360 | 10% | 4% | 7% | 19% | 27% | 17% | 6% | 6% | 4% |
| Westmorland city | 566 | 49% | 6% | 21% | 11% | 8% | 5% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Niland CDP | 338 | 64% | 15% | 6% | 0% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 0% | 0% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 41 | 51% | 0% | 12% | 12% | 0% | 24% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 72 | 60% | 29% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 1,534 | 38% | 10% | 13% | 21% | 10% | 4% | 1% | 3% | 0% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 196 | 52% | 6% | 26% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 179 | 71% | 3% | 6% | 6% | 14% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Seeley CDP | 421 | 51% | 14% | 10% | 15% | 0% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 0% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 392 | 46% | 14% | 24% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 131 | 87% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 5,237 | 27% | 10% | 15% | 17% | 9% | 8% | 5% | 4% | 5% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 33,142 | 28% | 12% | 16% | 19% | 11% | 6% | 3% | 3% | 2% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 4,411 | 39% | 12% | 13% | 16% | 12% | 5% | 1% | 0% | 2% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 1,265 | 23% | 9% | 28% | 25% | 10% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Riverside County | 705,716 | 20% | 10% | 13% | 18% | 13% | 9% | 6% | 6% | 5% |
| San Bernardino County | 618,922 | 23% | 10% | 14% | 19% | 13% | 9% | 5% | 5% | 4% |
| San Diego County | 1,103,128 | 18% | 8% | 12% | 17% | 13% | 10% | 7% | 8% | 8% |

| Jurisdiction | Total Households | < \$20,000 | \$20,000 - \$34,999 | \$35,000 - \$49,999 | \$50,000 - \$74,999 | \$75,000 - \$99,999 | \$100,000 - \$124,999 | \$125,000 - \$149,999 | \$150,000 - \$199,999 | \$200,000 or more |
|---|------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Fresno County | 299,456 | 28% | 12% | 13% | 17% | 11% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| Kern County | 262,337 | 26% | 11% | 13% | 17% | 12% | 8% | 4% | 5% | 3% |
| Kings County | 41,845 | 25% | 11% | 17% | 18% | 12% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 3% |
| Tulare County | 134,153 | 29% | 12% | 15% | 17% | 10% | 6% | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Tables B19013 and B19080 | | | | | | | | | | |

Table A-30: Poverty Status

| Jurisdiction | Total Persons Living Below Poverty | | Children in Poverty | | | Number of Persons 65 or Over in Poverty | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Number | Percent of all | Number | Percent of All in Poverty | Percent of All Children | Number | Percent of All in Poverty | Percent of All Persons 65 or over |
| United States | 46,932,225 | 15% | 15,335,783 | 33% | 21% | 4,195,427 | 9% | 9% |
| California | 6,004,257 | 16% | 1,974,976 | 33% | 22% | 502,380 | 8% | 10% |
| Imperial County | 40,552 | 24% | 16,032 | 40% | 32% | 3,573 | 9% | 17% |
| Brawley city | 7,245 | 28% | 3,142 | 43% | 40% | 440 | 6% | 15% |
| Calexico city | 10,421 | 26% | 4,083 | 39% | 36% | 1,193 | 11% | 22% |
| Calipatria city | 1,155 | 34% | 691 | 60% | 49% | 40 | 3% | 10% |
| El Centro city | 10,667 | 25% | 3,923 | 37% | 32% | 1,008 | 9% | 19% |
| Heber CDP | 598 | 14% | 272 | 45% | 19% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Holtville city | 2,026 | 33% | 780 | 38% | 38% | 156 | 8% | 18% |
| Imperial city | 870 | 5% | 230 | 26% | 4% | 77 | 9% | 6% |
| Westmorland city | 798 | 40% | 397 | 50% | 57% | 60 | 8% | 24% |
| Niland CDP | 327 | 38% | 111 | 34% | 48% | 54 | 17% | 37% |
| Ocotillo CDP | 55 | 44% | 35 | 64% | 76% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Palo Verde CDP | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Salton City CDP | 1,509 | 29% | 593 | 39% | 35% | 118 | 8% | 20% |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | 341 | 68% | 165 | 48% | 100% | 11 | 3% | 10% |
| Bombay Beach CDP | 57 | 18% | 8 | 14% | 57% | 36 | 63% | 18% |
| Seeley CDP | 737 | 46% | 293 | 40% | 59% | 25 | 3% | 17% |
| Desert Shores CDP | 370 | 32% | 194 | 52% | 50% | 49 | 13% | 32% |
| Winterhaven CDP | 47 | 22% | 0 | 0% | 0% | 14 | 30% | 18% |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | 3,329 | 19% | 1,115 | 33% | 24% | 292 | 9% | 11% |
| Yuma city, Arizona | 16,597 | 18% | 6,068 | 37% | 24% | 1,680 | 10% | 13% |
| Somerton city, Arizona | 4,321 | 29% | 1,849 | 43% | 36% | 335 | 8% | 31% |
| Wellton town, Arizona | 569 | 19% | 210 | 37% | 56% | 128 | 22% | 8% |
| Riverside County | 376,689 | 16% | 137,620 | 37% | 23% | 29,968 | 8% | 10% |
| San Bernardino County | 392,195 | 19% | 152,780 | 39% | 27% | 23,170 | 6% | 11% |
| San Diego County | 444,024 | 14% | 129,208 | 29% | 18% | 37,030 | 8% | 9% |
| Fresno County | 254,872 | 27% | 106,238 | 42% | 39% | 13,179 | 5% | 12% |
| Kern County | 194,354 | 23% | 81,808 | 42% | 32% | 9,995 | 5% | 12% |
| Kings County | 28,661 | 22% | 12,079 | 42% | 30% | 1,435 | 5% | 11% |
| Tulare County | 127,130 | 28% | 54,287 | 43% | 38% | 6,541 | 5% | 14% |

Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Tables S1701

Table A-31: Annual Value of Shipments Through All Imperial County Points of Entries (2007-2017)(\$mil.)

| | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 07-12 CAGR | 12-17 CAGR |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| Exports to Mexico | \$4,651.6 | \$4,749.7 | \$3,673.7 | \$4,814.1 | \$5,898.5 | \$5,949.5 | \$5,896.2 | \$6,273.6 | \$6,824.3 | \$6,523.5 | \$6,613.2 | 5.0% | 2.1% |
| Calexico East | \$4,611.0 | \$4,687.2 | \$3,582.8 | \$4,669.0 | \$5,657.2 | \$5,699.6 | \$5,601.7 | \$5,984.3 | \$6,519.1 | \$6,109.4 | \$6,228.2 | 4.3% | 1.8% |
| Calexico West | \$38.8 | \$60.6 | \$89.6 | \$144.8 | \$240.9 | \$249.0 | \$294.4 | \$288.6 | \$305.2 | \$411.9 | \$383.6 | 45.0% | 9.0% |
| Other (Andrade) | \$1.8 | \$2.0 | \$1.3 | \$0.3 | \$0.3 | \$0.9 | \$0.0 | \$0.6 | \$0.0 | \$2.2 | \$1.5 | -12.6% | 10.1% |
| Imports from Mexico | \$7,086.6 | \$6,399.4 | \$4,761.3 | \$5,543.8 | \$6,044.8 | \$7,011.2 | \$7,405.2 | \$8,319.1 | \$9,698.2 | \$9,441.1 | \$9,529.5 | -0.2% | 6.3% |
| Calexico East | \$7,086.6 | \$6,399.4 | \$4,761.3 | \$5,543.8 | \$6,044.8 | \$7,011.2 | \$7,405.2 | \$8,319.1 | \$9,698.2 | \$9,437.8 | \$9,529.1 | -0.2% | 6.3% |
| Calexico West | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.4 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Other (Andrade) | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$3.3 | \$0.0 | 0.0% | 0.0% |

Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (TransBorder Freight Data: Port and Commodity Data Query)[<https://bit.ly/2wLmn5Q>]

Table A-32: Annual Value of Shipments By Modes of Transportation: Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

| (\$millions) | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 07-12 CAGR | 12-17 CAGR |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| Export | \$4,611.0 | \$4,687.2 | \$3,582.8 | \$4,669.0 | \$5,657.2 | \$5,699.6 | \$5,601.7 | \$5,984.3 | \$6,519.1 | \$6,109.4 | \$6,228.2 | 4.3% | 1.8% |
| Trucking | \$4,451.9 | \$4,515.5 | \$3,466.7 | \$4,493.3 | \$5,395.5 | \$5,496.4 | \$5,455.4 | \$5,783.8 | \$6,374.8 | \$5,986.8 | \$6,116.0 | 4.3% | 2.2% |
| Rail and other | \$159.1 | \$171.7 | \$116.2 | \$175.7 | \$261.7 | \$203.2 | \$146.3 | \$200.6 | \$144.3 | \$122.6 | \$112.2 | 5.0% | -11.2% |
| Import | \$7,086.6 | \$6,399.4 | \$4,761.3 | \$5,543.8 | \$6,044.8 | \$7,011.2 | \$7,405.2 | \$8,319.1 | \$9,698.2 | \$9,437.8 | \$9,529.1 | -0.2% | 6.3% |
| Trucking | \$6,981.2 | \$6,324.4 | \$4,745.2 | \$5,520.8 | \$6,006.8 | \$6,974.3 | \$7,373.6 | \$8,286.7 | \$9,672.6 | \$9,422.7 | \$9,518.3 | 0.0% | 6.4% |
| Rail and other | \$105.4 | \$75.0 | \$16.1 | \$23.1 | \$38.0 | \$36.9 | \$31.6 | \$32.4 | \$25.6 | \$15.1 | \$10.7 | -18.9% | -21.9% |

Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (TransBorder Freight Data: Port and Commodity Data Query)[<https://bit.ly/2wLmn5Q>]

Table A-33: Annual Value of Shipments By Commodity Groups Exported to Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

| Commodity Groups | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2017 | 07-12 CAGR | 12-17 CAGR |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|------------|------------|
| | \$4,611.0 | \$4,687.2 | \$3,582.8 | \$4,669.0 | \$5,657.2 | \$5,699.6 | \$5,601.7 | \$5,984.3 | \$6,519.1 | \$6,109.4 | \$6,228.2 | 100% | 4.3% | 1.8% |
| 01-05 Animal Prod | \$129.9 | \$145.1 | \$96.1 | \$106.7 | \$119.3 | \$92.7 | \$64.4 | \$55.1 | \$38.0 | \$32.8 | \$81.6 | 1% | -6.5% | -2.5% |
| 06-15 Vegetable Prod | \$165.9 | \$206.2 | \$215.2 | \$260.6 | \$303.4 | \$306.4 | \$232.1 | \$257.5 | \$240.0 | \$229.6 | \$233.3 | 4% | 13.1% | -5.3% |
| 16-24 Foodstuffs | \$97.5 | \$97.6 | \$84.7 | \$88.3 | \$105.6 | \$87.7 | \$80.1 | \$71.6 | \$77.9 | \$67.8 | \$67.5 | 1% | -2.1% | -5.1% |
| 25-27 Mineral Products | \$74.5 | \$82.0 | \$54.0 | \$88.7 | \$150.0 | \$114.5 | \$89.2 | \$132.7 | \$74.4 | \$81.3 | \$94.1 | 2% | 9.0% | -3.8% |
| 28-38 Chemicals & Allied | \$122.8 | \$160.3 | \$143.8 | \$167.8 | \$184.5 | \$166.8 | \$157.3 | \$165.6 | \$165.0 | \$168.3 | \$171.6 | 3% | 6.3% | 0.6% |
| 39-40 Plastics / Rubbers | \$380.2 | \$399.1 | \$319.1 | \$396.8 | \$448.1 | \$462.7 | \$506.7 | \$514.6 | \$512.0 | \$490.9 | \$518.1 | 8% | 4.0% | 2.3% |
| 41-43 Hides, Leather | \$5.2 | \$9.3 | \$10.4 | \$23.4 | \$18.2 | \$21.9 | \$25.4 | \$25.9 | \$21.1 | \$22.4 | \$42.9 | 1% | 33.2% | 14.4% |
| 44-49 Wood Products | \$211.7 | \$207.4 | \$176.4 | \$209.0 | \$211.0 | \$213.5 | \$225.5 | \$260.6 | \$262.8 | \$265.8 | \$302.8 | 5% | 0.2% | 7.2% |
| 50-63 Textiles | \$46.1 | \$55.8 | \$60.5 | \$112.5 | \$200.2 | \$64.5 | \$69.9 | \$74.2 | \$87.2 | \$77.3 | \$98.9 | 2% | 7.0% | 8.9% |
| 64-67 Footwear/Headgear | \$2.4 | \$4.4 | \$2.8 | \$29.7 | \$39.9 | \$8.6 | \$24.3 | \$14.6 | \$32.3 | \$15.5 | \$22.6 | 0% | 29.2% | 21.3% |
| 68-71 Stone/Glass | \$52.1 | \$51.0 | \$54.8 | \$96.0 | \$93.4 | \$99.6 | \$102.6 | \$77.9 | \$63.0 | \$49.3 | \$56.1 | 1% | 13.8% | -10.8% |
| 72-83 Metals | \$610.6 | \$622.3 | \$416.3 | \$492.3 | \$509.7 | \$570.3 | \$601.6 | \$582.1 | \$575.8 | \$592.2 | \$578.8 | 9% | -1.4% | 0.3% |
| 84-85 Mach/Electrical | \$1,852.2 | \$1,817.4 | \$1,518.7 | \$1,920.9 | \$2,316.0 | \$2,440.5 | \$2,538.2 | \$2,850.4 | \$3,419.9 | \$3,120.7 | \$2,969.3 | 48% | 5.7% | 4.0% |
| 86-89 Transportation | \$652.6 | \$605.7 | \$209.5 | \$397.5 | \$632.6 | \$740.4 | \$585.9 | \$580.1 | \$572.6 | \$467.5 | \$505.1 | 8% | 2.6% | -7.4% |
| 90-97 Miscellaneous | \$195.0 | \$212.6 | \$207.6 | \$260.2 | \$313.7 | \$303.4 | \$294.8 | \$314.0 | \$373.6 | \$426.5 | \$485.0 | 8% | 9.2% | 9.8% |
| 98-99 Service | \$12.2 | \$10.9 | \$12.9 | \$18.6 | \$11.6 | \$6.1 | \$3.9 | \$7.2 | \$3.5 | \$1.5 | \$0.6 | 0% | -12.8% | -37.3% |

Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (TransBorder Freight Data: Port and Commodity Data Query)[<https://bit.ly/2wLmn5Q>] . *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

**Table A-34: Annual Value of Shipments: Advanced Manufacturing Products Exported to Mexico
Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)**

| | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2017 | 07-12 CAGR | 12-17 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|---------------|---------------|
| Advanced Manufacturing | \$2,667.2 | \$2,590.3 | \$1,907.6 | \$2,532.0 | \$3,183.1 | \$3,439.6 | \$3,384.8 | \$3,710.5 | \$4,306.0 | \$3,941.8 | \$3,848.7 | 100% | 5.2% | 2.3% |
| Aircraft, Spacecraft Parts | \$0.6 | \$1.3 | \$8.7 | \$27.1 | \$94.2 | \$115.3 | \$132.6 | \$158.3 | \$131.7 | \$154.1 | \$163.8 | 4% | >100% | 7.3% |
| Computer-Related Mach. | \$972.0 | \$871.4 | \$594.7 | \$736.8 | \$965.5 | \$1,038.9 | \$951.3 | \$943.1 | \$998.2 | \$886.6 | \$920.4 | 24% | 1.3% | -2.4% |
| Electrcal Mach. Equipmnt | \$880.1 | \$945.9 | \$924.0 | \$1,184.1 | \$1,350.6 | \$1,401.6 | \$1,586.9 | \$1,907.3 | \$2,421.8 | \$2,234.0 | \$2,048.9 | 53% | 9.8% | 7.9% |
| Measuring, Testing Instr. | \$134.0 | \$130.1 | \$142.9 | \$168.1 | \$184.3 | \$214.8 | \$212.3 | \$224.7 | \$267.2 | \$300.4 | \$327.8 | 9% | 9.9% | 8.8% |
| Pharmaceutical Products | \$8.4 | \$15.2 | \$21.5 | \$27.7 | \$32.7 | \$30.1 | \$31.2 | \$38.8 | \$29.0 | \$29.1 | \$30.4 | 1% | 29.2% | 0.2% |
| Tools of Base Metal | \$22.1 | \$23.3 | \$16.2 | \$19.3 | \$17.8 | \$14.0 | \$17.6 | \$16.6 | \$19.8 | \$25.4 | \$16.3 | 0% | -8.7% | 3.0% |
| Vehicles (not Railway) | \$649.9 | \$603.0 | \$199.6 | \$368.9 | \$538.1 | \$624.9 | \$452.9 | \$421.6 | \$438.4 | \$312.2 | \$341.1 | 9% | -0.8% | -11.4% |
| Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (TransBorder Freight Data: Port and Commodity Data Query)[https://bit.ly/2wLmn5Q] . *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table A-35: Annual Value of Shipments by Commodity Groups Imported from Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

| Commodity Groups | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2017 | 07-12 CAGR | 12-17 CAGR |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|---------------|---------------|
| | \$7,086.6 | \$6,399.4 | \$4,761.3 | \$5,543.8 | \$6,044.8 | \$7,011.2 | \$7,405.2 | \$8,319.1 | \$9,698.2 | \$9,437.8 | \$9,529.1 | 100% | -0.2% | 6.3% |
| 01-05 Animal Prod | \$75.6 | \$69.0 | \$75.6 | \$76.0 | \$110.9 | \$169.3 | \$170.2 | \$187.7 | \$285.5 | \$273.6 | \$254.4 | 3% | 17.5% | 8.5% |
| 06-15 Vegetable Prod | \$322.8 | \$380.8 | \$284.4 | \$360.2 | \$455.2 | \$399.3 | \$490.1 | \$517.0 | \$622.8 | \$694.3 | \$746.2 | 8% | 4.3% | 13.3% |
| 16-24 Foodstuffs | \$237.7 | \$215.5 | \$287.5 | \$333.2 | \$397.6 | \$389.4 | \$409.4 | \$378.3 | \$375.3 | \$370.2 | \$360.2 | 4% | 10.4% | -1.6% |
| 25-27 Mineral Products | \$1.3 | \$1.8 | \$2.0 | \$1.1 | \$2.3 | \$3.0 | \$3.3 | \$2.6 | \$2.6 | \$5.4 | \$6.8 | 0% | 17.5% | 17.7% |
| 28-38 Chemicals & Allied | \$38.8 | \$44.7 | \$48.5 | \$46.8 | \$30.8 | \$23.7 | \$31.3 | \$31.2 | \$28.2 | \$41.4 | \$52.9 | 1% | -9.4% | 17.4% |
| 39-40 Plastics / Rubbers | \$107.8 | \$98.5 | \$82.0 | \$89.9 | \$90.2 | \$97.8 | \$138.3 | \$130.4 | \$136.2 | \$108.9 | \$131.7 | 1% | -1.9% | 6.1% |
| 41-43 Hides, Leather | \$5.2 | \$5.3 | \$4.7 | \$6.4 | \$9.2 | \$9.4 | \$6.7 | \$23.3 | \$19.7 | \$6.8 | \$5.7 | 0% | 12.5% | -9.6% |
| 44-49 Wood Products | \$16.6 | \$10.0 | \$13.1 | \$23.7 | \$25.2 | \$32.4 | \$42.2 | \$54.6 | \$51.2 | \$52.0 | \$45.0 | 0% | 14.3% | 6.8% |
| 50-63 Textiles | \$31.1 | \$31.7 | \$24.2 | \$22.4 | \$21.7 | \$22.0 | \$20.1 | \$19.5 | \$20.4 | \$28.1 | \$22.7 | 0% | -6.6% | 0.6% |
| 64-67 Footwear/Headgear | \$1.1 | \$4.0 | \$2.8 | \$3.7 | \$4.7 | \$5.1 | \$5.4 | \$7.2 | \$9.3 | \$13.5 | \$13.7 | 0% | 36.4% | 22.1% |
| 68-71 Stone/Glass | \$181.2 | \$184.5 | \$229.8 | \$259.8 | \$254.9 | \$236.2 | \$231.5 | \$226.5 | \$248.7 | \$265.7 | \$238.7 | 3% | 5.5% | 0.2% |
| 72-83 Metals | \$453.4 | \$456.1 | \$299.6 | \$388.7 | \$449.8 | \$477.4 | \$388.9 | \$302.7 | \$328.3 | \$310.9 | \$352.5 | 4% | 1.0% | -5.9% |
| 84-85 Mach/Electrical | \$4,546.4 | \$3,804.4 | \$2,377.4 | \$2,746.0 | \$2,947.3 | \$3,592.8 | \$3,746.2 | \$4,166.7 | \$4,670.6 | \$4,577.3 | \$4,349.3 | 46% | -4.6% | 3.9% |
| 86-89 Transportation | \$274.9 | \$291.5 | \$273.1 | \$326.8 | \$388.1 | \$599.7 | \$690.3 | \$1,072.0 | \$1,612.1 | \$1,340.2 | \$1,502.4 | 16% | 16.9% | 20.2% |
| 90-97 Miscellaneous | \$503.9 | \$546.2 | \$514.1 | \$563.5 | \$581.1 | \$651.4 | \$697.4 | \$810.3 | \$847.6 | \$977.1 | \$1,042.5 | 11% | 5.3% | 9.9% |
| 98-99 Service | \$289.0 | \$255.5 | \$242.6 | \$295.4 | \$275.8 | \$302.3 | \$333.9 | \$389.2 | \$439.6 | \$372.5 | \$404.5 | 4% | 0.9% | 6.0% |

Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (TransBorder Freight Data: Port and Commodity Data Query)[<https://bit.ly/2wLmn5Q>] . *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

**Table A-36: Annual Value of Shipments: Advanced Manufacturing Products Imported From Mexico
Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)**

| | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2017 | 07-12 CAGR | 12-17 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|---------------|---------------|
| Advanced Manufacturing | \$5,134.0 | \$4,462.9 | \$3,035.4 | \$3,522.7 | \$3,778.5 | \$4,705.2 | \$4,959.1 | \$5,831.0 | \$6,924.0 | \$6,711.0 | \$6,742.9 | 100% | -1.7% | 7.5% |
| Aircraft, Spacecraft Parts | \$66.4 | \$84.9 | \$70.8 | \$91.1 | \$141.6 | \$329.1 | \$372.6 | \$593.5 | \$506.2 | \$503.5 | \$547.3 | 8% | >100% | 10.7% |
| Computer-Related Mach. | \$744.2 | \$677.8 | \$497.8 | \$800.3 | \$946.9 | \$990.7 | \$1,013.7 | \$1,153.0 | \$1,196.5 | \$1,141.6 | \$1,009.1 | 15% | 5.9% | 0.4% |
| Electrcal Mach. Equipmnt | \$3,802.2 | \$3,126.6 | \$1,879.6 | \$1,945.7 | \$2,000.4 | \$2,602.1 | \$2,732.5 | \$3,013.7 | \$3,474.1 | \$3,435.8 | \$3,340.2 | 50% | -7.3% | 5.1% |
| Measuring, Testing Instr. | \$300.1 | \$348.5 | \$361.3 | \$421.6 | \$428.8 | \$500.8 | \$511.2 | \$581.0 | \$632.6 | \$773.9 | \$865.3 | 13% | 10.8% | 11.6% |
| Pharmaceutical Products | \$11.8 | \$18.1 | \$23.3 | \$26.8 | \$14.5 | \$10.5 | \$10.9 | \$10.8 | \$8.5 | \$19.8 | \$26.3 | 0% | -2.3% | 20.0% |
| Tools of Base Metal | \$1.0 | \$0.5 | \$0.3 | \$1.5 | \$0.5 | \$1.4 | \$0.5 | \$0.5 | \$0.2 | \$0.3 | \$0.1 | 0% | 7.1% | -36.2% |
| Vehicles (not Railway) | \$208.3 | \$206.5 | \$202.3 | \$235.7 | \$245.8 | \$270.5 | \$317.6 | \$478.4 | \$1,105.8 | \$836.3 | \$954.6 | 14% | 5.4% | 28.7% |
| Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (TransBorder Freight Data: Port and Commodity Data Query)[https://bit.ly/2wLmn5Q] . *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table A-37: Electric Power Generation (MW) by Source of Energy: Imperial County

| | 2002 | 2007 | 2012 | 2017 | 2007 Distribution | 2012 Distribution | 2017 Distribution | 207- 2012 CAGR* | 2012- 2017 CAGR* |
|--|------|------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Plants by Source of Energy (MW) | 797 | 861 | 1,329 | 2,818 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 9% | 16% |
| Solar | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1,239 | 0% | 1% | 44% | --- | 149% |
| Alhambra Solar ^ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | | | | | |
| Calipatria Solar Farm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | | | | | |
| Campo Verde Solar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | | | | | |
| Centinela Solar Energy' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | | | | | |
| Community Solar 1' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | | | | | |
| Crown Cooling Facility' | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| Dominion Solar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | | | | | |
| Heber Solar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | | | | | |
| Imperial Solar Energy Center South | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | | | | | |
| Imperial Solar Energy Center West | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | | | | | |
| Imperial Valley Solar Co (IVSC) 2, LLC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | | | | | |
| Imperial Valley Solar Company 1 LLC | 0 | 0 | 12 | 23 | | | | | |
| Imperial Valley Solar, LLC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200 | | | | | |
| NRG Solar (SDSU) ^ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | | | | | |
| SEPV Imperial Dixieland East' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | | | |
| SEPV Imperial Dixieland West' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | | | |
| Seville 1' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | | | | | |
| Seville 2' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | | | | | |
| Sol Orchard El Centro PV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | | | | | |
| Solar Gen 2' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | | | | | |
| Sonora Solar Facility ^ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | | | | | |
| Agricultural By-Products | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | --- | --- |

| | 2002 | 2007 | 2012 | 2017 | 2007 Distribution | 2012 Distribution | 2017 Distribution | 207- 2012 CAGR* | 2012- 2017 CAGR* |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Mesquite Resource Recovery Project | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Disillate Fuel Oil | 25 | 24 | 12 | 25 | 3% | 1% | 1% | -13% | 16% |
| Brawley | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Rockwood | 13 | 12 | 12 | 25 | | | | | |
| Geothermal | 454 | 513 | 576 | 713 | 60% | 43% | 25% | 2% | 4% |
| CE Turb | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | | | | | |
| Del Ranch Company\AW Hoch | 18 | 18 | 18 | 36 | | | | | |
| GEM II | 10 | 10 | 17 | 19 | | | | | |
| GEM III | 10 | 14 | 12 | 27 | | | | | |
| Heber | 19 | 25 | 22 | 18 | | | | | |
| J J Elmore | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | | | | | |
| J M Leathers | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | | | | | |
| John L. Featherstone Plant | 0 | 0 | 25 | 55 | | | | | |
| North Brawley Geothermal Plant | 0 | 0 | 34 | 50 | | | | | |
| Ormesa 1 | 26 | 26 | 22 | 24 | | | | | |
| Ormesa 1H | 24 | 24 | 29 | 23 | | | | | |
| Ormesa Geothermal II | 21 | 21 | 12 | 24 | | | | | |
| Ormesa IE | 12 | 12 | 14 | 14 | | | | | |
| Salton Sea Unit 1 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 10 | | | | | |
| Salton Sea Unit 2 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 16 | | | | | |
| Salton Sea Unit 3 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 54 | | | | | |
| Salton Sea Unit 4 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | | | | | |
| Salton Sea Unit 5 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 58 | | | | | |
| Second Imperial Geothermal | 48 | 80 | 80 | 80 | | | | | |
| Vulcan | 52 | 68 | 84 | 75 | | | | | |
| Energy Stor. Electricity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0% | 0% | 1% | --- | --- |

| | 2002 | 2007 | 2012 | 2017 | 2007 Distribution | 2012 Distribution | 2017 Distribution | 207- 2012 CAGR* | 2012- 2017 CAGR* |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| El Centro | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | | | | | |
| Natural Gas | 267 | 268 | 535 | 470 | 31% | 40% | 17% | 15% | -3% |
| El Centro | 254 | 255 | 468 | 324 | | | | | |
| Niland Gas Turbine Plant | 0 | 0 | 50 | 121 | | | | | |
| Rockwood | 13 | 13 | 13 | 25 | | | | | |
| Spreckels Sugar Company | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | | | | | |
| Water (Conventional\Pumped) | 41 | 42 | 44 | 63 | 5% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 7% |
| Double Weir | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Drop 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | | | |
| Drop 2 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 10 | | | | | |
| Drop 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 10 | | | | | |
| Drop 4 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 20 | | | | | |
| Drop 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| East Highline | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| Pilot Knob | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| Senator Wash | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | | | | | |
| Siphon Drop Power Plant' | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| Wood/Wood Waste Solids | 0 | 15 | 16 | 14 | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | -2% |
| Mesquite Resource Recovery Project | 0 | 15 | 16 | 14 | | | | | |
| Wind | 0 | 0 | 133 | 265 | 0% | 10% | 9% | --- | 15% |
| Ocotillo Express LLC | 0 | 0 | 133 | 265 | | | | | |

Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Energy Information Administration, "Electricity: EIA-860 detailed data" (multiple years), and California Energy Commission, "Power Plant Statistical Information" (2017 only). *Note: CAGR = "compound annual growth rate". ^Note: from CEC database. 'Note: 2017 data not in CEC data -- assume 2016 EIA-860 data applies to 2017

Table A-38: Annual Average Number of Low Birth-Weight Babies: Three Three-Year Periods

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| California | 37,550 | 34,848 | 33,655 | -1% | -1% |
| Imperial County | 185 | 175 | 179 | -1% | 0% |
| Riverside County | 2,059 | 1,989 | 2,037 | -1% | 0% |
| San Bernardino County | 2,353 | 2,232 | 2,249 | -1% | 0% |
| San Diego County | 3,041 | 2,915 | 1,856 | -1% | -9% |
| Fresno County | 1,505 | 1,218 | 1,176 | -4% | -1% |
| Kern County | 1,004 | 1,044 | 1,010 | 1% | -1% |
| Kings County | 170 | 169 | 147 | 0% | -3% |
| Tulare County | 505 | 515 | 502 | 0% | -1% |
| <i>Low Birth-Weight Babies Per Live Births</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | 5.0% | 7.8% | 6.8% | | |
| California | 6.8% | 6.8% | 6.8% | | |
| Imperial County | 6.1% | 5.6% | 5.7% | | |
| Riverside County | 6.5% | 6.4% | 6.7% | | |
| San Bernardino County | 7.1% | 7.1% | 7.3% | | |
| San Diego County | 6.6% | 6.6% | 5.7% | | |
| Fresno County | 9.3% | 7.5% | 7.6% | | |
| Kern County | 7.1% | 7.2% | 7.3% | | |
| Kings County | 6.6% | 6.6% | 6.4% | | |
| Tulare County | 6.2% | 6.3% | 6.8% | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

Table A-39: Annual Average Number of Births by Teen-Age Mothers: Three Three-year Periods

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| California | 50,841 | 43,089 | 24,209 | -3% | -11% |
| Imperial County | 446 | 423 | 260 | -1% | -9% |
| Riverside County | 3,434 | 2,952 | 1,781 | -3% | -10% |
| San Bernardino County | 3,983 | 3,467 | 2,042 | -3% | -10% |
| San Diego County | 3,721 | 3,148 | 1,737 | -3% | -11% |
| Fresno County | 2,163 | 1,963 | 1,187 | -2% | -10% |
| Kern County | 2,031 | 1,987 | 1,225 | 0% | -9% |
| Kings County | 359 | 313 | 184 | -3% | -10% |
| Tulare County | 1,172 | 1,134 | 656 | -1% | -10% |
| <i>Births By Teen Mothers Per 1,000 Teen Females</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | 37.8 | 31.5 | 17.6 | | |
| California | 57.2 | 56.5 | 37.6 | | |
| Imperial County | 41.2 | 32.1 | 19.5 | | |
| Riverside County | 45.6 | 39.6 | 24.3 | | |
| San Bernardino County | 35.1 | 29.4 | 15.7 | | |
| San Diego County | 56.3 | 49.6 | 29.5 | | |
| Fresno County | 62.2 | 57.2 | 35.3 | | |
| Kern County | 67.0 | 57.8 | 31.5 | | |
| Kings County | 63.5 | 59.8 | 35.7 | | |
| Tulare County | 37.8 | 31.5 | 17.6 | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

Table A-40: Annual Average Number of Tuberculosis Cases: Three Three-Year Periods

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| California | 2,890 | 2,375 | 2,108 | -4% | -2% |
| Imperial County | 32 | 29 | 37 | -2% | 5% |
| Riverside County | 70 | 70 | 56 | 0% | -5% |
| San Bernardino County | 63 | 65 | 61 | 1% | -1% |
| San Diego County | 313 | 236 | 237 | -6% | 0% |
| Fresno County | 78 | 56 | 51 | -6% | -2% |
| Kern County | 39 | 39 | 29 | 0% | -5% |
| Kings County | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0% | -7% |
| Tulare County | 19 | 23 | 17 | 4% | -6% |
| <i>Tuberculosis Cases Per 100,000 People</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | | |
| California | 7.8 | 6.4 | 5.4 | | |
| Imperial County | 19.4 | 16.7 | 20.1 | | |
| Riverside County | 3.6 | 3.2 | 2.4 | | |
| San Bernardino County | 3.2 | 3.2 | 2.9 | | |
| San Diego County | 10.3 | 7.6 | 7.2 | | |
| Fresno County | 8.7 | 6.0 | 5.2 | | |
| Kern County | 5.1 | 4.6 | 3.3 | | |
| Kings County | 3.2 | 3.1 | 2.2 | | |
| Tulare County | 4.6 | 5.2 | 3.7 | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

Table A-41: Annual Average Adult with Asthma As A Percent of All Adults

| Jurisdiction | 2011-2012 | 2015-2016 | 11-12 to 15-16 CAGR |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------------|
| California | 7.7% | 8.3% | 2% |
| Imperial County | 6.5% | 8.5% | 6% |
| Riverside County | 6.8% | 8.6% | 5% |
| San Bernardino County | 7.4% | 8.6% | 3% |
| San Diego County | 6.2% | 10.1% | 10% |
| Fresno County | 13% | 11.2% | -3% |
| Kern County | 10.7% | 12.4% | 3% |
| Kings County | 8.8% | 15.6% | 12% |
| Tulare County | 11.1% | 12% | 2% |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on UCLA Health Policy Institute, Health Profiles. *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | |

Table A-42: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Due to Diabetes: Three Three-Year Periods

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| California | 7,388 | 7,214 | 8,696 | 0% | 4% |
| Imperial County | 41 | 47 | 60 | 3% | 5% |
| Riverside County | 365 | 410 | 487 | 2% | 3% |
| San Bernardino County | 432 | 527 | 620 | 4% | 3% |
| San Diego County | 582 | 572 | 679 | 0% | 4% |
| Fresno County | 233 | 228 | 238 | 0% | 1% |
| Kern County | 191 | 204 | 263 | 1% | 5% |
| Kings County | 39 | 32 | 28 | -4% | -3% |
| Tulare County | 105 | 88 | 108 | -4% | 4% |
| <i>Deaths Due to Diabetes Per 100,000 People: Age-Adjusted</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | 22.1 | 20.2 | 20.7 | | |
| California | 30.3 | 32.0 | 33.6 | | |
| Imperial County | 21.3 | 20.5 | 19.3 | | |
| Riverside County | 30.5 | 33.9 | 33.2 | | |
| San Bernardino County | 21.1 | 19.1 | 19.3 | | |
| San Diego County | 33.0 | 28.5 | 26.4 | | |
| Fresno County | 34.3 | 32.4 | 36.1 | | |
| Kern County | 44.4 | 30.3 | 24.7 | | |
| Kings County | 32.7 | 24.8 | 26.5 | | |
| Tulare County | 22.1 | 20.2 | 20.7 | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

Table A-43: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Due to Cancers (All Types): Three Three-Year Periods

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| California | 54,121 | 56,035 | 58,931 | 1% | 1% |
| Imperial County | 213 | 207 | 214 | -1% | 1% |
| Riverside County | 3,099 | 3,319 | 3,679 | 1% | 2% |
| San Bernardino County | 2,588 | 2,712 | 2,959 | 1% | 2% |
| San Diego County | 4,644 | 4,798 | 5,011 | 1% | 1% |
| Fresno County | 1,182 | 1,245 | 1,280 | 1% | 1% |
| Kern County | 1,061 | 1,050 | 1,153 | 0% | 2% |
| Kings County | 168 | 156 | 182 | -1% | 3% |
| Tulare County | 538 | 566 | 564 | 1% | 0% |
| <i>Deaths Due to Cancer Per 100,000 People: Age-Adjusted</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | 158.6 | 160.6 | 161.4 | | |
| California | 161.3 | 156.4 | 140.2 | | |
| Imperial County | 153.3 | 138.1 | 120.1 | | |
| Riverside County | 180.2 | 162.7 | 146.2 | | |
| San Bernardino County | 180.1 | 170.0 | 157.6 | | |
| San Diego County | 166.7 | 160.6 | 142.8 | | |
| Fresno County | 167.0 | 154.4 | 141.9 | | |
| Kern County | 189.9 | 161.3 | 153.4 | | |
| Kings County | 181.3 | 143.1 | 152.2 | | |
| Tulare County | 166.9 | 160.7 | 138.4 | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

**Table A-44: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Due to Heart Disease:
Three Three-Year Periods**

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| California | 51,246 | 43,724 | 37,659 | -3% | -3% |
| Imperial County | 169 | 167 | 155 | 0% | -1% |
| Riverside County | 3,241 | 2,927 | 2,650 | -2% | -2% |
| San Bernardino County | 2,784 | 2,409 | 1,839 | -3% | -5% |
| San Diego County | 3,774 | 3,335 | 2,908 | -2% | -3% |
| Fresno County | 1,154 | 1,035 | 977 | -2% | -1% |
| Kern County | 1,280 | 984 | 952 | -5% | -1% |
| Kings County | 139 | 132 | 105 | -1% | -5% |
| Tulare County | 570 | 493 | 472 | -3% | -1% |
| <i>Deaths Due to Heart Disease Per 100,000 People: Age-Adjusted</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | 162.0 | 100.8 | 103.4 | | |
| California | 154.0 | 122.4 | 89.1 | | |
| Imperial County | 127.9 | 118.4 | 86.9 | | |
| Riverside County | 188.7 | 152.3 | 104.6 | | |
| San Bernardino County | 211.0 | 164.8 | 106.5 | | |
| San Diego County | 134.4 | 109.7 | 81.2 | | |
| Fresno County | 167.4 | 128.2 | 108.1 | | |
| Kern County | 250.8 | 165.1 | 132.6 | | |
| Kings County | 162.4 | 132.6 | 91.6 | | |
| Tulare County | 183.3 | 147.2 | 120.5 | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

Table A-45: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Due to Stroke: Three Three-Year Periods

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| California | 15,815 | 13,465 | 14,753 | -3% | 2% |
| Imperial County | 53 | 61 | 51 | 3% | -4% |
| Riverside County | 904 | 805 | 857 | -2% | 1% |
| San Bernardino County | 659 | 634 | 699 | -1% | 2% |
| San Diego County | 1,263 | 1,049 | 1,229 | -4% | 3% |
| Fresno County | 429 | 368 | 397 | -3% | 2% |
| Kern County | 285 | 251 | 259 | -3% | 1% |
| Kings County | 48 | 41 | 38 | -3% | -2% |
| Tulare County | 166 | 170 | 159 | 1% | -1% |
| <i>Deaths Due to Stroke Per 100,000 People: Age-Adjusted</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | 50.0 | 33.8 | 35.3 | | |
| California | 47.8 | 38.1 | 34.8 | | |
| Imperial County | 40.4 | 45.3 | 28.5 | | |
| Riverside County | 52.5 | 42.8 | 34.2 | | |
| San Bernardino County | 50.2 | 43.7 | 40.5 | | |
| San Diego County | 45.0 | 34.8 | 34.3 | | |
| Fresno County | 62.4 | 46.2 | 44.7 | | |
| Kern County | 55.7 | 42.4 | 36.8 | | |
| Kings County | 56.6 | 40.0 | 34.1 | | |
| Tulare County | 53.2 | 50.6 | 40.9 | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

Table A-46: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Deaths Chronic Lower Respiratory Diseases (Asthma, Bronchitis, Emphysema, etc.): Three Three-Year Periods

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| California | 12,831 | 13,045 | 13,312 | 0% | 0% |
| Imperial County | 38 | 31 | 38 | -4% | 4% |
| Riverside County | 916 | 941 | 1,032 | 1% | 2% |
| San Bernardino County | 836 | 820 | 901 | 0% | 2% |
| San Diego County | 1,080 | 1,020 | 1,007 | -1% | 0% |
| Fresno County | 291 | 284 | 297 | 0% | 1% |
| Kern County | 369 | 411 | 389 | 2% | -1% |
| Kings County | 48 | 48 | 46 | 0% | -1% |
| Tulare County | 142 | 172 | 158 | 4% | -2% |
| <i>Deaths Due to Chronic Lower-Respiratory Diseases Per 100,000 People: Age-Adjusted</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | --- | --- | --- | | |
| California | 34.7 | 35.0 | 34.1 | | |
| Imperial County | 23.1 | 17.8 | 20.5 | | |
| Riverside County | 47.6 | 42.9 | 44.3 | | |
| San Bernardino County | 42.3 | 40.2 | 42.3 | | |
| San Diego County | 35.4 | 32.9 | 30.7 | | |
| Fresno County | 32.6 | 30.4 | 30.4 | | |
| Kern County | 47.9 | 48.9 | 44.0 | | |
| Kings County | 32.5 | 31.4 | 30.7 | | |
| Tulare County | 34.0 | 38.7 | 34.0 | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

Table A-47: Preventable Deaths: Annual Average Number of Accidental Deaths: Three Three-Year Periods

| Jurisdiction | 2004-2006 | 2009-2011 | 2014-2016 | 04-06 to 09-11 CAGR* | 09-11 to 14-16 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| California | 10,925 | 10,350 | 12,368 | -1% | 4% |
| Imperial County | 73 | 48 | 76 | -8% | 10% |
| Riverside County | 688 | 667 | 846 | -1% | 5% |
| San Bernardino County | 558 | 480 | 555 | -3% | 3% |
| San Diego County | 885 | 963 | 1,078 | 2% | 2% |
| Fresno County | 360 | 326 | 406 | -2% | 5% |
| Kern County | 338 | 330 | 446 | 0% | 6% |
| Kings County | 51 | 53 | 51 | 1% | -1% |
| Tulare County | 210 | 148 | 167 | -7% | 2% |
| <i>Deaths Due to Accidents Per 100,000 People: Age-Adjusted</i> | | | | | |
| Nat'l Goal | 17.1 | 36.0 | 36.4 | | |
| California | 30.2 | 27.6 | 30.3 | | |
| Imperial County | 43.5 | 28.6 | 42.5 | | |
| Riverside County | 37.3 | 31.8 | 35.7 | | |
| San Bernardino County | 30.5 | 25.6 | 27.5 | | |
| San Diego County | 29.2 | 30.6 | 31.2 | | |
| Fresno County | 43.7 | 37.1 | 43.8 | | |
| Kern County | 47.3 | 42.3 | 54.0 | | |
| Kings County | 38.7 | 39.7 | 38.6 | | |
| Tulare County | 53.9 | 36.7 | 39.8 | | |
| Source: ADE, Inc. based on State of California, Dept. of Public Health, County Health Profiles (multiple years: 2008, 2013, and 2018) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | |

Table A-48: Trends in Public School Enrollment by Districts: Imperial County: Elementary Schools

| Jurisdiction | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Imperial County | 18,295 | 18,340 | 18,475 | 18,545 | 18,306 | 18,183 | 18,107 | 18,758 | 18,441 | 18,482 | 18,530 | -0.1% | 0.4% |
| Brawley Elementary | 2,839 | 2,829 | 2,906 | 3,004 | 2,972 | 2,902 | 2,946 | 3,514 | 3,057 | 3,123 | 3,131 | 0.4% | 1.5% |
| Calexico Unified | 4,697 | 4,685 | 4,688 | 4,662 | 4,629 | 4,584 | 4,626 | 4,574 | 4,632 | 4,595 | 4,581 | -0.5% | 0.0% |
| Calipatria Unified | 180 | 119 | 117 | 114 | 118 | 97 | 92 | 93 | 89 | 87 | 71 | -11.6% | -6.0% |
| El Centro Elementary | 3,926 | 3,814 | 3,760 | 3,646 | 3,499 | 3,565 | 3,404 | 3,413 | 3,439 | 3,474 | 3,423 | -1.9% | -0.8% |
| Heber Elementary | 868 | 967 | 1,037 | 1,101 | 1,157 | 1,139 | 1,170 | 1,206 | 1,233 | 1,218 | 1,245 | 5.6% | 1.8% |
| Holtville Unified | 847 | 833 | 799 | 805 | 779 | 736 | 734 | 697 | 730 | 732 | 726 | -2.8% | -0.3% |
| Imperial Unified | 1,519 | 1,648 | 1,737 | 1,691 | 1,672 | 1,658 | 1,708 | 1,762 | 1,792 | 1,846 | 1,864 | 1.8% | 2.4% |
| Magnolia Union Elementary | 120 | 114 | 118 | 111 | 129 | 131 | 135 | 134 | 130 | 124 | 136 | 1.8% | 0.8% |
| McCabe Union Elementary | 995 | 1,065 | 1,126 | 1,160 | 1,222 | 1,237 | 1,267 | 1,352 | 1,368 | 1,364 | 1,389 | 4.5% | 2.3% |
| Meadows Union Elementary | 480 | 483 | 483 | 478 | 490 | 478 | 475 | 468 | 449 | 459 | 488 | -0.1% | 0.4% |
| Mulberry Elementary | 70 | 78 | 73 | 90 | 83 | 91 | 91 | 84 | 85 | 76 | 90 | 5.4% | -0.2% |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 377 | 390 | 395 | 449 | 399 | 414 | 405 | 400 | 384 | 351 | 336 | 1.9% | -4.1% |
| Seeley Union Elementary | 984 | 928 | 872 | 850 | 784 | 766 | 690 | 698 | 690 | 674 | 670 | -4.9% | -2.6% |
| Westmorland Union Elementary | 393 | 387 | 364 | 384 | 373 | 385 | 364 | 363 | 363 | 359 | 380 | -0.4% | -0.3% |

Source: ADE, Inc., based on California Dept. of Education, School Enrollment (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filesenr.asp>). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-49: Trends in Public School Enrollment By Districts: Imperial County: Middle Schools

| Jurisdiction | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Imperial County | 4,419 | 4,517 | 4,478 | 4,431 | 4,519 | 4,483 | 4,446 | 4,031 | 4,359 | 4,406 | 4,480 | 0.3% | 0.0% |
| Brawley Elementary | 863 | 794 | 774 | 790 | 804 | 823 | 861 | 487 | 821 | 788 | 861 | -0.9% | 0.9% |
| Calexico Unified | 1,255 | 1,338 | 1,389 | 1,372 | 1,414 | 1,457 | 1,439 | 1,435 | 1,460 | 1,464 | 1,453 | 3.0% | -0.1% |
| Calipatria Unified | 278 | 323 | 332 | 324 | 353 | 393 | 385 | 370 | 351 | 354 | 356 | 7.2% | -2.0% |
| El Centro Elementary | 687 | 708 | 680 | 601 | 548 | 389 | 388 | 365 | 353 | 372 | 364 | -10.8% | -1.3% |
| Holtville Unified | 372 | 341 | 317 | 312 | 315 | 304 | 301 | 302 | 289 | 285 | 282 | -4.0% | -1.5% |
| Imperial Unified | 773 | 837 | 826 | 885 | 910 | 944 | 910 | 889 | 918 | 964 | 988 | 4.1% | 0.9% |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 191 | 176 | 160 | 147 | 175 | 173 | 162 | 183 | 167 | 179 | 176 | -2.0% | 0.3% |

Source: ADE, Inc., based on California Dept. of Education, School Enrollment (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filesenr.asp>). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-50: Trends in Public School Enrollment By Districts: Imperial County: High School and Others

| Jurisdiction | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Imperial County | 12,964 | 12,998 | 12,860 | 12,924 | 13,149 | 13,455 | 14,604 | 14,799 | 14,961 | 15,161 | 15,170 | 0.7% | 2.4% |
| Brawley Union High | 1,944 | 1,980 | 1,952 | 1,932 | 1,871 | 1,808 | 1,834 | 1,877 | 1,878 | 1,885 | 1,846 | -1.4% | 0.4% |
| Calexico Unified | 2,409 | 2,362 | 2,344 | 2,348 | 2,324 | 2,366 | 3,138 | 3,138 | 3,171 | 3,207 | 3,218 | -0.4% | 6.3% |
| Calipatria Unified | 742 | 714 | 741 | 745 | 700 | 702 | 714 | 711 | 756 | 703 | 723 | -1.1% | 0.6% |
| Central Union High | 4,236 | 4,221 | 4,169 | 4,102 | 4,009 | 4,056 | 4,104 | 4,067 | 4,106 | 4,120 | 4,119 | -0.9% | 0.3% |
| El Centro Elementary | 1,201 | 1,222 | 1,204 | 1,417 | 1,890 | 2,171 | 2,442 | 2,591 | 2,538 | 2,673 | 2,534 | 12.6% | 3.1% |
| Holtville Unified | 622 | 607 | 585 | 595 | 550 | 556 | 551 | 551 | 578 | 568 | 590 | -2.2% | 1.2% |
| Imperial County Office of Education | 695 | 759 | 692 | 655 | 619 | 559 | 540 | 524 | 543 | 585 | 670 | -4.3% | 3.7% |
| Imperial Unified | 919 | 929 | 982 | 979 | 1,010 | 1,061 | 1,093 | 1,152 | 1,187 | 1,225 | 1,270 | 2.9% | 3.7% |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 196 | 204 | 191 | 151 | 176 | 176 | 188 | 188 | 204 | 195 | 200 | -2.1% | 2.6% |

Source: ADE, Inc., based on California Dept. of Education, School Enrollment (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filesenr.asp>). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-51: Trends in 8th Grade CAASPP Math Mean Score

| Jurisdiction | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Imperial County | 2,512 | 2,529 | 2,523 |
| Imperial County Office Of Education | 2,384 | 2,368 | 2,395 |
| Brawley Elementary | 2,492 | 2,496 | 2,491 |
| Calexico Unified | 2,508 | 2,528 | 2,501 |
| Calipatria Unified | 2,516 | 2,485 | 2,488 |
| El Centro Elementary | 2,494 | 2,517 | 2,530 |
| Heber Elementary | 2,541 | 2,573 | 2,586 |
| Holtville Unified | 2,552 | 2,552 | 2,570 |
| Imperial Unified | 2,523 | 2,546 | 2,539 |
| Magnolia Union Elementary | 2,611 | 2,667 | 2,608 |
| Mccabe Union Elementary | 2,565 | 2,629 | 2,592 |
| Meadows Union Elementary | 2,536 | 2,540 | 2,563 |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 2,465 | 2,457 | 2,461 |
| Seeley Union Elementary | 2,530 | 2,520 | 2,539 |
| Westmorland Union Elementary | 2,481 | 2,518 | 2,514 |
| California | 2,534 | 2,541 | 2,540 |
| Riverside | 2,513 | 2,523 | 2,521 |
| San Bernardino | 2,513 | 2,517 | 2,517 |
| San Diego | 2,547 | 2,554 | 2,555 |
| Fresno | 2,514 | 2,521 | 2,517 |
| Kings | 2,513 | 2,522 | 2,520 |
| Tulare | 2,505 | 2,516 | 2,506 |
| Kern | 2,505 | 2,511 | 2,508 |
| Source: California Department of Education, CAASPP Research Data | | | |

Table A-52: Trends in 11th Grade CAASPP Math Mean Score

| Jurisdiction | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Imperial County | 2,526 | 2,537 | 2,534 |
| Imperial County Office Of Education | 2,409 | 2,435 | 2,423 |
| Brawley Elementary | 2,502 | 2,501 | 2,507 |
| Calexico Unified | 2,466 | 2,475 | 2,473 |
| Calipatria Unified | 2,555 | 2,564 | 2,577 |
| Central Union High | 2,516 | 2,545 | 2,530 |
| Holtville Unified | 2,549 | 2,564 | 2,570 |
| Holtville Unified | 2,613 | 2,568 | 2,530 |
| Imperial Unified | 2,466 | 2,483 | 2,469 |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 2,560 | 2,568 | 2,565 |
| California | 2,543 | 2,552 | 2,546 |
| Riverside | 2,539 | 2,543 | 2,540 |
| San Bernardino | 2,577 | 2,583 | 2,579 |
| San Diego | 2,533 | 2,542 | 2,543 |
| Fresno | 2,523 | 2,519 | 2,518 |
| Kings | 2,527 | 2,533 | 2,526 |
| Tulare | 2,536 | 2,539 | 2,528 |
| Kern | 2,526 | 2,537 | 2,534 |
| Source: California Department of Education, CAASPP Research Data | | | |

Table A-53: Trends in 8th Grade CAASPP Reading Mean Score

| Jurisdiction | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Imperial County | 2,533 | 2,546 | 2,541 |
| Imperial County Office Of Education | 2,414 | 2,421 | 2,432 |
| Brawley Elementary | 2,523 | 2,548 | 2,541 |
| Calexico Unified | 2,507 | 2,522 | 2,508 |
| Calipatria Unified | 2,558 | 2,545 | 2,549 |
| El Centro Elementary | 2,520 | 2,538 | 2,540 |
| Heber Elementary | 2,561 | 2,576 | 2,584 |
| Holtville Unified | 2,572 | 2,580 | 2,571 |
| Imperial Unified | 2,562 | 2,588 | 2,577 |
| Magnolia Union Elementary | 2,602 | 2,626 | 2,583 |
| Mccabe Union Elementary | 2,583 | 2,586 | 2,570 |
| Meadows Union Elementary | 2,559 | 2,548 | 2,570 |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 2,497 | 2,497 | 2,492 |
| Seeley Union Elementary | 2,553 | 2,548 | 2,522 |
| Westmorland Union Elementary | 2,505 | 2,498 | 2,511 |
| California | 2,553 | 2,560 | 2,559 |
| Riverside | 2,543 | 2,550 | 2,546 |
| San Bernardino | 2,538 | 2,543 | 2,543 |
| San Diego | 2,565 | 2,574 | 2,575 |
| Fresno | 2,537 | 2,547 | 2,545 |
| Kings | 2,540 | 2,548 | 2,547 |
| Tulare | 2,532 | 2,543 | 2,540 |
| Kern | 2,530 | 2,537 | 2,539 |
| Source: California Department of Education, CAASPP Research Data | | | |

Table A-54: Trends in 11th Grade CAASPP Reading Mean Score

| Jurisdiction | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Imperial County | 2,551 | 2,537 | 2,534 |
| Imperial County Office Of Education | 2,461 | 2,435 | 2,423 |
| Brawley Elementary | 2,525 | 2,501 | 2,507 |
| Calexico Unified | 2,473 | 2,475 | 2,473 |
| Calipatria Unified | 2,613 | 2,564 | 2,577 |
| Central Union High | 2,578 | 2,545 | 2,530 |
| Holtville Unified | 2,585 | 2,564 | 2,570 |
| Holtville Unified | 2,633 | 2,568 | 2,530 |
| Imperial Unified | 2,489 | 2,483 | 2,469 |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 2,592 | 2,568 | 2,565 |
| California | 2,583 | 2,552 | 2,546 |
| Riverside | 2,579 | 2,543 | 2,540 |
| San Bernardino | 2,602 | 2,583 | 2,579 |
| San Diego | 2,576 | 2,542 | 2,543 |
| Fresno | 2,573 | 2,519 | 2,518 |
| Kings | 2,571 | 2,533 | 2,526 |
| Tulare | 2,570 | 2,539 | 2,528 |
| Kern | 2,551 | 2,537 | 2,534 |
| Source: California Department of Education, CAASPP Research Data | | | |

Table A-55: Trends in Number of Students Taking College Preparatory S.A.T. Examination

| Jurisdiction | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Imperial County | 589 | 738 | 740 | 667 | 588 | 638 | 785 | 840 | 816 | 898 | 867 | 2% | 6% |
| Brawley Union High | 115 | 135 | 152 | 107 | 71 | 83 | 99 | 139 | 129 | 156 | 139 | -6% | 11% |
| Calexico Unified | 101 | 119 | 141 | 146 | 131 | 159 | 197 | 214 | 220 | 216 | 210 | 10% | 6% |
| Calipatria Unified | 19 | 32 | 24 | 22 | 21 | 32 | 27 | 26 | 21 | 23 | 32 | 11% | 0% |
| Central Union High | 221 | 303 | 282 | 266 | 243 | 248 | 319 | 322 | 305 | 322 | 313 | 2% | 5% |
| Holtville Unified | 78 | 72 | 82 | 64 | 57 | 43 | 66 | 52 | 42 | 67 | 58 | -11% | 6% |
| Imperial County Office of Education | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Imperial Unified | 53 | 63 | 56 | 62 | 60 | 65 | 74 | 86 | 96 | 105 | 102 | 4% | 9% |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 2 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 32% | 10% |
| <i>Students Taking SAT Exam as Percent of All Twelfth Graders</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imperial County | 25% | 29% | 28% | 25% | 21% | 26% | 31% | 33% | 32% | 33% | 32% | | |
| Brawley Union High | 25% | 29% | 29% | 23% | 15% | 16% | 24% | 30% | 29% | 33% | 31% | | |
| Calexico Unified | 16% | 17% | 21% | 19% | 17% | 23% | 27% | 31% | 30% | 28% | 28% | | |
| Calipatria Unified | 23% | 34% | 34% | 29% | 22% | 38% | 35% | 29% | 34% | 32% | 42% | | |
| Central Union High | 28% | 37% | 30% | 29% | 25% | 28% | 35% | 36% | 34% | 36% | 35% | | |
| Holtville Unified | 60% | 42% | 51% | 48% | 43% | 33% | 43% | 39% | 37% | 47% | 44% | | |
| Imperial County Office of Education | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | |
| Imperial Unified | 34% | 33% | 33% | 34% | 30% | 100% | 38% | 46% | 44% | 45% | 40% | | |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 6% | 31% | 7% | 0% | 16% | 20% | 10% | 4% | 10% | 24% | 23% | | |
| California | 37% | 37% | 36% | 35% | 33% | 38% | 39% | 40% | 41% | 42% | 43% | | |
| Riverside County | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 28% | 32% | 35% | 36% | 42% | 43% | 56% | | |
| San Bernardino County | 30% | 30% | 29% | 26% | 24% | 29% | 31% | 32% | 36% | 39% | 42% | | |
| San Diego County | 40% | 38% | 36% | 35% | 35% | 39% | 40% | 40% | 43% | 45% | 45% | | |
| Fresno County | 28% | 31% | 29% | 28% | 27% | 33% | 34% | 35% | 39% | 42% | 43% | | |
| Kings County | 23% | 24% | 23% | 23% | 23% | 24% | 24% | 25% | 31% | 32% | 30% | | |

| Jurisdiction | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Tulare County | 23% | 22% | 23% | 22% | 23% | 26% | 28% | 30% | 33% | 36% | 35% | | |
| Kern County | 23% | 24% | 22% | 22% | 20% | 27% | 28% | 30% | 33% | 36% | 36% | | |

Source: California Department of Education, Postsecondary Preparation (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/ai/>). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-56: Trends in Average Total S.A.T. Scores

| Jurisdiction | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Imperial County | 1,344 | 1,332 | 1,298 | 1,338 | 1,395 | 1,366 | 1,369 | 1,362 | 1,386 | 1,368 | 1,380 |
| Brawley Union High | 1,356 | 1,362 | 1,329 | 1,363 | 1,462 | 1,443 | 1,417 | 1,362 | 1,427 | 1,345 | 1,368 |
| Calexico Unified | 1,379 | 1,365 | 1,247 | 1,322 | 1,330 | 1,341 | 1,315 | 1,321 | 1,336 | 1,288 | 1,340 |
| Calipatria Unified | 1,214 | 1,277 | 1,205 | 1,220 | 1,326 | 1,231 | 1,295 | 1,344 | 1,276 | 1,363 | 1,401 |
| Central Union High | 1,383 | 1,375 | 1,358 | 1,363 | 1,404 | 1,374 | 1,369 | 1,402 | 1,434 | 1,422 | 1,408 |
| Holtville Unified | 1,296 | 1,263 | 1,243 | 1,312 | 1,373 | 1,342 | 1,346 | 1,284 | 1,398 | 1,326 | 1,320 |
| Imperial County Office of Education | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na |
| Imperial Unified | 1,434 | 1,350 | 1,407 | 1,449 | 1,474 | 1,467 | 1,471 | 1,458 | 1,442 | 1,463 | 1,446 |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified* | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na |
| California | 1,462 | 1,450 | 1,449 | 1,448 | 1,462 | 1,449 | 1,436 | 1,434 | 1,487 | 1,473 | 1,455 |
| Riverside County | 1,404 | 1,396 | 1,386 | 1,396 | 1,413 | 1,408 | 1,391 | 1,394 | 1,393 | 1,386 | 1,339 |
| San Bernardino County | 1,410 | 1,405 | 1,404 | 1,406 | 1,420 | 1,413 | 1,410 | 1,398 | 1,399 | 1,390 | 1,382 |
| San Diego County | 1,454 | 1,444 | 1,468 | 1,448 | 1,472 | 1,474 | 1,461 | 1,472 | 1,493 | 1,480 | 1,474 |
| Fresno County | 1,360 | 1,336 | 1,338 | 1,361 | 1,376 | 1,361 | 1,352 | 1,354 | 1,336 | 1,317 | 1,317 |
| Kings County | 1,330 | 1,344 | 1,345 | 1,347 | 1,358 | 1,355 | 1,339 | 1,370 | 1,350 | 1,325 | 1,351 |
| Tulare County | 1,361 | 1,393 | 1,383 | 1,359 | 1,373 | 1,362 | 1,351 | 1,336 | 1,340 | 1,341 | 1,329 |
| Kern County | 1,416 | 1,404 | 1,404 | 1,401 | 1,424 | 1,403 | 1,389 | 1,382 | 1,396 | 1,373 | 1,371 |

Source: California Department of Education, Postsecondary Preparation (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/ai/>) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. *Note: San Pasquale valley Unified SAT scores not publicly released due to limited number of students taking the test.

Table A-57: Trends in Number of Graduating Students

| Jurisdiction | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Imperial County | 2086 | 2243 | 2241 | 2421 | 2368 | 2326 | 2342 | 2343 | 2509 | 2577 | 2699 | 2% | 3% |
| Brawley Union High | 352 | 413 | 353 | 388 | 452 | 371 | 414 | 403 | 430 | 412 | 469 | 1% | 5% |
| Calexico Unified | 506 | 536 | 644 | 642 | 601 | 626 | 598 | 640 | 701 | 725 | 729 | 4% | 3% |
| Calipatria Unified | 91 | 73 | 68 | 87 | 79 | 77 | 86 | 53 | 65 | 78 | 83 | -3% | 2% |
| Central Union High | 746 | 864 | 840 | 949 | 873 | 876 | 877 | 858 | 891 | 902 | 898 | 3% | 0% |
| Holtville Unified | 155 | 150 | 113 | 124 | 124 | 144 | 122 | 110 | 137 | 124 | 138 | -1% | -1% |
| Imperial County Office of Education | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na |
| Imperial Unified | 188 | 164 | 195 | 200 | 194 | 199 | 212 | 234 | 246 | 258 | 284 | 1% | 7% |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 47 | 43 | 28 | 31 | 42 | 33 | 26 | 28 | 24 | 41 | 35 | -7% | 1% |
| <i>Students Taking SAT Exam as Percent of All Twelfth Graders</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imperial County | 82% | 85% | 85% | 89% | 95% | 91% | 92% | 92% | 93% | 96% | 96% | | |
| Brawley Union High | 76% | 79% | 74% | 80% | 89% | 88% | 90% | 91% | 91% | 93% | 96% | | |
| Calexico Unified | 74% | 80% | 84% | 84% | 88% | 86% | 88% | 88% | 90% | 96% | 98% | | |
| Calipatria Unified | 97% | 100% | 91% | 91% | 94% | 99% | 95% | 87% | 89% | 100% | 95% | | |
| Central Union High | 91% | 93% | 92% | 99% | 98% | 97% | 97% | 97% | 98% | 100% | 97% | | |
| Holtville Unified | 90% | 94% | 85% | 93% | 94% | 95% | 92% | 96% | 96% | 94% | 96% | | |
| Imperial County Office of Education | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | -- na | | |
| Imperial Unified | 99% | 98% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | |
| San Pasqual Valley Unified | 100% | 98% | 72% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 63% | 72% | 85% | | |
| California | 80% | 80% | 80% | 85% | 84% | 84% | 85% | 85% | 86% | 87% | 89% | | |
| Riverside County | 78% | 78% | 81% | 85% | 82% | 84% | 83% | 85% | 89% | 88% | 100% | | |
| San Bernardino County | 77% | 77% | 75% | 79% | 80% | 100% | 81% | 81% | 84% | 100% | 89% | | |
| San Diego County | 74% | 76% | 76% | 81% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 79% | 80% | 100% | 84% | | |
| Fresno County | 78% | 79% | 78% | 81% | 82% | 78% | 80% | 79% | 82% | 86% | 90% | | |

| Jurisdiction | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Kings County | 71% | 73% | 78% | 79% | 100% | 75% | 78% | 78% | 85% | 85% | 95% | | |
| Tulare County | 67% | 76% | 75% | 81% | 82% | 100% | 84% | 85% | 89% | 89% | 92% | | |
| Kern County | 72% | 76% | 74% | 78% | 100% | 80% | 82% | 84% | 87% | 88% | 90% | | |

Source: California Department of Education, Graduation By Race and Gender (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filesgrads.asp>) *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-58: Trends in Enrollment in Private Schools Operating in Imperial County

| Grade Levels | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Imperial County | 2,046 | 1,976 | 1,795 | 1,692 | 1,603 | 1,586 | 1,603 | 1,639 | 1,637 | 1,611 | 1,419 | -5% | -2% |
| Elementary level (K-5) | 973 | 955 | 905 | 865 | 835 | 822 | 824 | 846 | 818 | 794 | 666 | -3% | -4% |
| Middle school level (6-8) | 545 | 498 | 442 | 399 | 377 | 373 | 387 | 407 | 433 | 415 | 362 | -7% | -1% |
| High school level (9-12) | 528 | 523 | 448 | 428 | 391 | 391 | 392 | 386 | 386 | 402 | 391 | -6% | 0% |

Source: ADE, based on California Dept. of Education, Private Schools Directory, <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/si/ps/index.asp> *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-59: Trends in Enrollment at Imperial Valley College

| | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Full-Time Students | 6,672 | 7,154 | 7,426 | 7,195 | 7,290 | 6,119 | 6,053 | 6,625 | 6,873 | 6,812 | 6,854 | -2% | 2% |

Source: ADE, based on Imperial Community College District, Audit Report (many years). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-60: Number of Imperial Valley College Students Earning Certificates and AA Degree in 2016-217 By Major

| Majors | School year 2016-2017 Completions | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | Numbers Receiving Certificates From Less Than One Year Programs | Numbers Receiving Certificates From 1 to 2 Year Programs | Numbers Earning Associates Degree |
| Total | 561 | 0 | 1198 |
| Agriculture, Agriculture Operations, and Related Sciences | 2 | -na | 3 |
| Biological And Biomedical Sciences | --na | -na | 0 |
| Business, Management, Marketing, and Related Support Services | 12 | -na | 68 |
| Communication, Journalism, and Related Programs | 0 | -na | 6 |
| Computer and Information Sciences and Support Services | 2 | -na | 19 |
| Construction Trades | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Education | 2 | -na | 0 |
| Engineering | --na | -na | 8 |
| Engineering Technology and Engineering-Related Fields | 16 | -na | 5 |
| English Language and Literature/Letters | 0 | -na | 9 |
| Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences | 27 | -na | 14 |
| Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics | --na | -na | 10 |
| Health Professions and Related Programs | 78 | 0 | 69 |
| History | --na | -na | 10 |
| Homeland Security, Law Enforcement, Firefighting and Related Protective Services | 15 | 0 | 179 |
| Legal Professions and Studies | 1 | -na | 1 |
| Liberal Arts and Sciences, General Studies and Humanities | 368 | -na | 261 |
| Library Science | 0 | -na | 0 |
| Mathematics and Statistics | 0 | -na | 26 |
| Mechanic and Repair Technologies/Technicians | 20 | -na | 6 |

| Majors | School year 2016-2017 Completions | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | Numbers Receiving Certificates From Less Than One Year Programs | Numbers Receiving Certificates From 1 to 2 Year Programs | Numbers Earning Associates Degree |
| Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies | --na | -na | 206 |
| Parks, Recreation, Leisure, and Fitness Studies | --na | -na | 10 |
| Physical Sciences | --na | -na | 3 |
| Precision Production | 12 | -na | 5 |
| Psychology | --na | -na | 198 |
| Public Administration and Social Service Professions | 1 | -na | 2 |
| Social Sciences | 0 | -na | 61 |
| Visual and Performing Arts | --na | -na | 19 |

Source: ADE, based on Nat'l Center for Education Statistics (<https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=Imperial+Valley+College&s=all&id=115861#programs>)

Table A-61: Trends in Enrollment at San Diego State University-Imperial Valley Campus

| | 2006-2007 | 2007-2008 | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 06/07 - 11/12 CAGR | 11/12 - 16/17 CAGR |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Full-Time Students | 641 | 680 | 739 | 733 | 700 | 675 | 607 | 607 | 694 | 790 | 747 | 1% | 2% |

Source: ADE, based on Imperial Community College District, Audit Report (many years). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-62: Vehicle Traffic State Routes at Key Intersections in Imperial County

| Key Intersections | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 11-16 CAGR |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------|
| Southbound vehicle traffic on SR86 at SR86 (Imperial Ave.) and Adams Ave. intersection (El Centro) | 30,500 | 30,500 | 30,000 | 28,500 | 28,500 | 28,500 | -1.3% |
| Westbound vehicle traffic on Interstate 8 at Interstate 8 and SR 111 Intersection (east of El Centro) | 30,500 | 31,500 | 31,600 | 31,600 | 32,500 | 32,500 | 1.3% |
| Source: ADE, based on Caltrans, "Traffic Volume for all vehicles on California State Highways" [multiple years]. *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | | | |

Table A-63: Truck Traffic State Routes at Key Intersections in Imperial County

| Key Intersections | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 11-16 CAGR |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| Northwestbound truck traffic on SR86 at SR86 and Center Street intersection (Westmorland) | 2,818 | 2,733 | 2,874 | 2,536 | 2,451 | 2,508 | -2.3% |
| Westbound truck traffic on Interstate 8 at Interstate 8 and SR 111 intersection (east of El Centro) | 2,647 | 2,640 | 2,721 | 2,420 | 2,791 | 2,875 | 1.7% |
| Westbound truck traffic on SR98 at SR98 and SR 111 intersection (Calexico) | 1,151 | 1,170 | 1,137 | 1,182 | 1,119 | 1,242 | 1.5% |
| Source: ADE, based on Caltrans, "Traffic Volume for all vehicles on California State Highways" [multiple years]. *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | | | |

Table A-64: Trends in Passenger and Freight Volume At Imperial County Airport

| | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2007-2012 CAGR | 2012-2017 CAGR |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|----------------|----------------|
| Passengers - Departing | 11,626 | 7,057 | 5,641 | 4,751 | 6,136 | 5,491 | 2,630 | 2,717 | 2,601 | 4,136 | 5,606 | -14% | 0.4% |
| Passengers - Arriving | 9,663 | 7,141 | 5,870 | 4,981 | 6,362 | 5,653 | 2,566 | 2,478 | 2,378 | 3,771 | 5,178 | -10% | -2% |
| Freight (lbs) – Depart. | 1,493,480 | 1,374,379 | 1,364,459 | 1,372,272 | 1,254,907 | 1,132,164 | 1,015,704 | 1,055,206 | 1,095,343 | 1,077,065 | 912,562 | -5% | -4% |
| Freight (lbs) – Arriv. | 873,425 | 907,532 | 1,077,072 | 1,142,674 | 1,118,410 | 923,283 | 1,035,250 | 1,192,166 | 1,162,298 | 789,968 | 704,576 | 1% | -5% |
| Source: ADE, Inc., based on US DOT, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, "Air Carriers Statistics (Form 41 Traffic) - All Carriers: T-100 Market (All Carriers)"(multiple years) (Note: 2017 is a 12-month estimate based on US DOT 11-month data). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table A-65: Trends in Number of Persons Crossing into the United States At Various Imperial County Points of Entry (Multiple Modes of Transit)

| Passengers By Modes of Transit | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2007-2012 CAGR | 2012-2017 CAGR |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Pedestrians | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calexico East | 9,429 | 18,030 | 33,930 | 58,771 | 117,624 | 318,599 | 321,586 | 310,344 | 223,374 | 253,992 | 260,454 | 102% | -4% |
| Calexico West | 5,290,977 | 4,359,901 | 3,904,913 | 4,586,846 | 4,451,119 | 4,885,868 | 4,794,339 | 4,567,333 | 4,498,322 | 4,270,911 | 4,212,342 | -2% | -3% |
| Andrade | 1,538,028 | 1,148,149 | 1,517,727 | 895,746 | 832,608 | 893,191 | 831,896 | 800,176 | 817,866 | 833,296 | 831,433 | -10% | -1% |
| Personal Vehicle Passengers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calexico East | 7,003,669 | 7,144,168 | 5,731,129 | 5,152,282 | 5,082,318 | 5,530,414 | 5,915,717 | 6,437,937 | 6,744,400 | 7,041,582 | 7,143,200 | -5% | 5% |
| Calexico West | 10,949,336 | 9,432,447 | 8,625,713 | 7,474,182 | 7,099,725 | 6,981,401 | 7,132,134 | 7,221,528 | 7,644,148 | 7,851,664 | 7,860,166 | -9% | 2% |
| Andrade | 1,161,051 | 981,916 | 883,929 | 793,770 | 789,113 | 828,660 | 795,616 | 911,988 | 1,036,699 | 1,080,857 | 1,177,023 | -7% | 7% |
| Bus Passengers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calexico East | 28,064 | 41,725 | 40,161 | 52,184 | 88,064 | 92,630 | 103,690 | 111,400 | 122,873 | 116,240 | 115,600 | 27% | 5% |
| Calexico West | 25,425 | 33,800 | 625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |
| Andrade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |
| Train Passengers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calexico East | 694 | 531 | 562 | 423 | 329 | 261 | 259 | 247 | 240 | 250 | 247 | -18% | -1% |
| Calexico West | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |
| Andrade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |

Source: ADE, Inc., based on US DOT, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, "Broder Crossing/Entry Data" (multiple years). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-66: Trends in Number of Vehicles Crossing into the United States At Various Imperial County Points of Entry (Multiple Modes of Travel)

| Type of Vehicles | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2007-2012 CAGR | 2012-2017 CAGR |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Personal Vehicles | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calexico East | 3,417,977 | 3,549,486 | 2,953,733 | 2,626,731 | 2,784,769 | 3,016,974 | 3,198,849 | 3,399,697 | 3,622,215 | 3,829,484 | 3,843,383 | -2% | 5% |
| Calexico West | 5,747,309 | 4,950,509 | 4,839,287 | 4,150,569 | 4,095,450 | 4,070,090 | 4,112,348 | 4,071,666 | 4,294,156 | 4,327,034 | 4,409,648 | -7% | 2% |
| Andrade | 546,648 | 491,843 | 449,190 | 390,456 | 387,389 | 415,615 | 394,548 | 453,079 | 523,059 | 506,230 | 591,692 | -5% | 7% |
| Trucks | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calexico East | 323,348 | 325,975 | 276,894 | 303,552 | 312,973 | 322,424 | 325,690 | 325,243 | 337,474 | 349,727 | 360,833 | 0% | 2% |
| Calexico West | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |
| Andrade | 478 | 412 | 284 | 342 | 319 | 279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |
| Bus | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calexico East | 1,170 | 1,669 | 2,451 | 1,897 | 3,193 | 2,564 | 2,571 | 2,785 | 3,064 | 2,906 | 2,881 | 17% | 2% |
| Calexico West | 996 | 1,352 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |
| Andrade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |
| Rail containers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calexico East | 9,774 | 8,101 | 5,977 | 5,903 | 8,265 | 6,609 | 5,120 | 7,148 | 7,200 | 6,387 | 7,679 | -8% | 3% |
| Calexico West | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |
| Andrade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - na | - na |

Source: ADE, Inc., based on US DOT, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, "Broder Crossing/Entry Data" (multiple years). *Note: CAGR = compound annual growth rate.

Table A-67: Per Capita Income

| Jurisdiction | Per Capita Income | Per Capita Income: White | Per Capita Income: Latino | Per Capita Income: All others |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| United States | \$29,829 | \$35,457 | \$17,323 | \$23,722 |
| California | \$31,458 | \$46,083 | \$17,013 | \$31,292 |
| Imperial County | \$16,311 | \$30,517 | \$14,017 | \$26,807 |
| Brawley city | \$16,838 | \$30,700 | \$14,349 | \$20,417 |
| Calexico city | \$13,365 | \$21,714 | \$13,255 | \$11,339 |
| Calipatria city | \$12,529 | \$17,961 | \$10,871 | \$17,102 |
| El Centro city | \$18,172 | \$36,718 | \$15,077 | \$33,061 |
| Heber CDP | \$13,204 | - | \$13,204 | --- |
| Holtville city | \$13,867 | \$21,761 | \$11,655 | \$12,006 |
| Imperial city | \$24,433 | \$33,043 | \$20,891 | \$44,429 |
| Westmorland city | \$11,331 | \$24,741 | \$10,218 | \$3,890 |
| Niland CDP | \$13,903 | \$14,541 | \$13,256 | \$19,108 |
| Ocotillo CDP | \$16,321 | \$16,321 | --- | --- |
| Palo Verde CDP | \$27,193 | \$27,193 | --- | --- |
| Salton City CDP | \$14,697 | \$23,745 | \$10,528 | \$22,255 |
| Salton Sea Beach CDP | \$12,562 | \$23,155 | \$2,804 | --- |
| Bombay Beach CDP | \$19,027 | \$19,538 | --- | --- |
| Seeley CDP | \$10,230 | \$26,742 | \$8,269 | --- |
| Desert Shores CDP | \$10,538 | \$19,483 | \$8,182 | \$40,427 |
| Winterhaven CDP | \$14,294 | \$29,207 | \$11,033 | --- |
| Rest of Imperial Co. | \$20,270 | \$30,641 | \$16,312 | \$17,150 |
| Yuma city, Arizona | \$21,468 | \$31,752 | \$15,399 | \$21,406 |
| Somerton city, Arizona | \$13,511 | \$26,638 | \$13,012 | \$25,688 |
| Wellton town, Arizona | \$22,732 | \$32,004 | \$9,805 | \$4,627 |
| Riverside County | \$24,443 | \$35,576 | \$15,714 | \$24,163 |
| San Bernardino County | \$21,857 | \$31,146 | \$15,824 | \$23,160 |
| San Diego County | \$32,482 | \$44,044 | \$17,920 | \$29,396 |
| Fresno County | \$21,057 | \$34,742 | \$13,597 | \$18,680 |
| Kern County | \$21,094 | \$32,148 | \$13,590 | \$21,766 |
| Kings County | \$19,123 | \$29,131 | \$12,143 | \$25,909 |
| Tulare County | \$18,257 | \$30,636 | \$11,911 | \$22,643 |

Source: Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Table B19301, B19301H, and B19301i (B19025, B19025H, and B19025i for "all others")