
COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY COMMITTEE



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

MEETING AGENDA

CEDS Committee

Monday, May 21, 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. Approval of minutes from 04/16/18

II. Discussion/Action

- a. Summary Economic Background and SWOT Analysis.
- b. CEDS Visions and Goals – Changes and/or Modifications.
- c. Action Plan and Evaluation Framework.

III. Other

IV. Next meeting date

TBD

V. Meeting adjourned



U.S. Department of Commerce
Economic Development



County of Imperial

COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY COMMITTEE



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

MEETING MINUTES

CEDS Committee

Monday, April 16, 2018 2:00 p.m.
Imperial County Planning Department, Conference Room
801 W. Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243

PROCEEDINGS

J. GARCIA called a meeting of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Committee to order on April 16, 2018, 2:00 p.m., at the Imperial County Planning Conference Room, 801 W. Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243.

ATTENDEES

Public Sector

I.C. Workforce Development Board
Campesinos Unidos, Inc.
City of Imperial
Imperial Valley College
I.C. Transportation Commission

Primary

Jose M. LOPEZ
Othon MORA
Efrain SILVA

Alternate

Carlos LOPEZ

Virginia MENDOZA

Private Sector

Rook Public Relations
Rabobank
CalEnergy
Strictly Business Consulting
The Holt Group
Imperial Printers

Mario CONDE

Diane CASON

Volunteer

Imperial Irrigation District
Imperial Valley EDC

Southern California
Association of Governments

Sean WILCOCK

David SALGADO

Coordinating Staff

I.C. Community and Econ. Development Esperanza C. WARREN Jonathan GARCIA



U.S. Department
of Commerce



County of Imperial

MINUTES

1. Call meeting to order

- a. Roll call

Roll call was performed by J. GARCIA

Present: Seven (7) committee members and four (2) Volunteers. Quorum was achieved.

- b. Approval of minutes from 02/05/18

M. CONDE opened the discussion with the approval of the minutes for 02/05/18 and motioned to approve the minutes. D. CASON seconded the motion. **Vote: 7 aye, 0 nay, 0 abstain. Motion carries.**

2. Discussion/action

- a. Introduction of Applied Development Economics.

E. Colio WARREN introduced the selected consultant, who will be assisting in the preparation of the 5 year CEDS document. D. SVENSSON, Applied Development Economics (ADE), introduced two members of his team via telephone: Peter Cheng and Tony Daysog. ADE explained their experience working with the County of Imperial in projects such as the Advanced Manufacturing Supply Chain Study and the Retail & Services Leakage Analysis for Brawley, Imperial, Calipatria & Westmorland.

- b. EDA-CEDS Guidelines.

D. SVENSSON explained the four major sections EDA outlines in their guidelines. The first section is a summary background, which contains information about the County, its demographics, socioeconomic factors, employment, unemployment, and a status of its economy. The second section focuses on the emerging and declining emergency clusters. The third section: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, which is very important to EDA in its terms of the view of CEDS. The fourth element is the evaluation framework. D. SVENSSON stated that it is important to evaluate annually the progress of the goals that will be in future meetings.

- c. Anticipated Changes to Existing CEDS.

D. SVENSSON mentioned it is important to create an executive summary with the County's visions and goals for the public that will be easy to understand. S. WILCOX inquired if there is anything that can be done to make the CEDS more of a marketing document. E. SILVA mentioned he would like to see a more thorough analysis of the impact of having Mexicali across the border. C. LOPEZ mentioned he would like to include a detailed analysis of the housing with statistics such as the percentage of out of town people and locals who purchase houses.

- d. Proposed Project Approach and Schedule.



U.S. Department of
Commerce



County of Imperial

The summary background and SWOT analysis will be provided by mid-May. A third meeting will be held by the third week of May to review the analysis and have a discussion to determine if the vision and goals need to be changed and/or modified. ADE will develop an action plan and evaluation framework and return with a complete draft report by early June.

3. *Future agenda items and other business*

- a. Summary Economic Background and SWOT Analysis.
- b. CEDS Vision and Goals – Changes and/or Modifications.
- c. Action Plan and Evaluation Framework.

4. *Next meeting date*

TBD

5. *Meeting adjourned*

Meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.



U.S. Department of
Commerce



County of Imperial

ITEM

A

Summary Economic Background and SWOT Analysis.

May 17, 2018

Imperial County CEDS Preliminary Data Packet

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

ECONOMIC SUMMARY 1

 Introduction..... 1

 Socioeconomic Characteristics..... 1

 Employment and Industry Trends 3

 Renewable Energy 9

 Retail Analysis..... 9

APPENDIX TABLES..... 10

ECONOMIC SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The report represents the first step in the process to create a new five year Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for Imperial County. It provides preliminary information on socioeconomic characteristics in the County, as well as an update of employment and industry trends and retail opportunities.

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.

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-12). 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-13). 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-14). Proportionally, however, this is still less of an improvement than the state average. Tables A-15 and A-16 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-17 and A-18. 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-19). However, the proportion of workers in agriculture is about half the levels in the San Joaquin Valley. 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-20).

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-21). 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-22).

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-23). 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-24). 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-25). The poverty rate in 2016 was 24 percent, compared to 16 percent for the state (Table A-26). However, this was less than Fresno County (27 percent) or Tulare County (28 percent).

EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRY TRENDS

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. 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 Economic Modeling Specialists Int'l. (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 1-1: 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. These types of industries also comprised the core of the industry clusters that drive the regional economy.

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 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.

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.

TABLE 1-2: ECONOMIC ROLES OF IMPERIAL COUNTY INDUSTRIES

Declining Economic Base Industries (High Concentration, Negative Job Growth) 112 Animal Production and Aquaculture 311 Food Manufacturing 327 Nonmetallic Mineral Product Mfg.	Growing Economic Base Industries (High Concentration, Positive Job Growth) 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
Declining Non-Base Industries (Low Concentration, Negative Job Growth) 236 Construction of Buildings 237 Heavy aConstruction 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 Credit Intermediation and Related 522 Activities Securities, Commodity Contracts, and Other Financial Investments and Related 523 Activities 524 Insurance Carriers 532 Rental and Leasing Services Professional, Scientific, and Technical 541 Services Management of Companies and Enterprises 551 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	Emerging Industries (Low Concentration, Positive Job Growth) 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

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 by Harvard Business School and the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA), and defines 51 standard cluster definitions that are used to identify primary economic drivers for regions throughout the U.S. For Imperial County, the Cluster Mapping Project identified the following six clusters as the leading traded clusters: aerospace/defense, agricultural inputs and services, distribution and electronic commerce, electric power generation and transmission, livestock, and transportation/logistics.

As a group, traded clusters account for over 13,400 jobs in Imperial County, or about 21 percent of the total employment. 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-27 to A-32 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.

TABLE 1-3: 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. 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-33). 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 exist 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 2-1 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.¹ 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 2-1: 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.

¹ 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.

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: Educational Attainment

Table A-13: Type of 4-yr College Degree

Table A-14: Unemployment Rates, March 2017 – March 2018

Table A-15: Labor Force Participation for Prime Working Age Groups

Table A-16: Labor Force Participation for Younger and Older Working Age Groups

Table A-17: Labor Force Participation Rates by Type of College Degree

Table A-18: Labor Force Participation for Workers with High School Diploma or Less

Table 19A: Industry of Employment, Civilian Employed Persons (16 and over), Imperial County

Table A-20: Occupational Distribution, All Civilian Employed 16 and Over

Table A-21A: Average Annual Earnings by Occupation, All Civilian Employed Full-time (16 and over), Imperial County

Table A-22A: Average Annual Earnings by Industry, Civilian Employed Full- Time Workers (16 and over), Imperial County

Table A-23: Journey to Work

Table A-24: Household Income by Quintile

Table A-25: Household Income Distribution

Table A-26: Poverty Status

Table A-27: Annual Value of Shipments Through All Imperial County Points of Entries (2007-2017)(\$mil.)

Table A-28: Annual Value of Shipments By Modes of Transportation: Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-29: Annual Value of Shipments By Commodity Groups Exported to Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-30: Annual Value of Shipments: Advanced Manufacturing Products Exported to Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-31: Annual Value of Shipments By Commodity Groups Imported from Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-32: Annual Value of Shipments: Advanced Manufacturing Products Imported From Mexico Via Calexico East Point of Entry (2007-2017)

Table A-33: Electric Power Generation ('000 MWh): Power Generating Sources: Imperial County

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 Report, 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		
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 Table 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	Total Units	Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied	Vacant Units	Homeownership Rate	Vacant Units as Percent of Total Units
United States	134,054,899	117,716,237	74,881,068	42,835,169	16,338,662	64%	12%
California	13,911,737	12,807,387	6,929,007	5,878,380	1,104,350	54%	8%
Imperial County	56,906	45,800	25,544	20,256	11,106	56%	20%
Brawley city	8,301	7,080	3,785	3,295	1,221	53%	15%
Calexico city	11,012	9,261	4,711	4,550	1,751	51%	16%
Calipatria city	1,249	918	457	461	331	50%	27%
El Centro city	14,246	12,352	6,155	6,197	1,894	50%	13%
Heber CDP	1,290	980	613	367	310	63%	24%
Holtville city	2,153	1,742	974	768	411	56%	19%
Imperial city	5,010	4,360	3,252	1,108	650	75%	13%
Westmorland city	771	566	246	320	205	43%	27%
Niland CDP	478	338	230	108	140	68%	29%
Ocotillo CDP	253	41	37	4	212	90%	84%
Palo Verde CDP	166	72	43	29	94	60%	57%
Salton City CDP	2,562	1,534	826	708	1,028	54%	40%
Salton Sea Beach CDP	270	196	135	61	74	69%	27%
Bombay Beach CDP	381	179	148	31	202	83%	53%
Seeley CDP	579	421	170	251	158	40%	27%
Desert Shores CDP	529	392	247	145	137	63%	26%
Winterhaven CDP	240	131	58	73	109	44%	45%
Rest of Imperial Co.	7,416	5,237	3,457	1,780	2,179	66%	29%
Yuma city, Arizona	40,392	33,142	19,616	13,526	7,250	59%	18%
Somerton city, Arizona	4,745	4,411	3,079	1,332	334	70%	7%
Wellton town, Arizona	2,059	1,265	984	281	794	78%	39%
Riverside County	820,300	705,716	454,924	250,792	114,584	64%	14%
San Bernardino County	708,442	618,922	365,576	253,346	89,520	59%	13%
San Diego County	1,187,644	1,103,128	581,635	521,493	84,516	53%	7%
Fresno County	323,857	299,456	157,227	142,229	24,401	53%	8%
Kern County	291,292	262,337	149,309	113,028	28,955	57%	10%
Kings County	44,953	41,845	20,980	20,865	3,108	50%	7%
Tulare County	145,661	134,153	75,761	58,392	11,508	56%	8%
Source Applied Development Economics, based on US Census ACS 2012-2016 5-Year Sample Tables B25002 and b25003							

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: 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-13: 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-14: 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-15: 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-16: 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-17: 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-18: 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 19A: 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 19B: 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-20: 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, entertainmt	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-21A: 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-21B: 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-22A: 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 22B: 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-23: 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-24: 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-25: 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-26: 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-27: 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-28: 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-29: Annual Value of Shipments By Commodity Groups Exported to Mexico Via 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
Total	\$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%
Animal & Animal Products	\$129.9	\$145.1	\$96.1	\$106.7	\$119.3	\$92.7	\$64.4	\$55.1	\$38.0	\$32.8	\$81.6	-6.5%	-2.5%
Vegetable Products	\$165.9	\$206.2	\$215.2	\$260.6	\$303.4	\$306.4	\$232.1	\$257.5	\$240.0	\$229.6	\$233.3	13.1%	-5.3%
Foodstuffs	\$97.5	\$97.6	\$84.7	\$88.3	\$105.6	\$87.7	\$80.1	\$71.6	\$77.9	\$67.8	\$67.5	-2.1%	-5.1%
Mineral Products	\$74.5	\$82.0	\$54.0	\$88.7	\$150.0	\$114.5	\$89.2	\$132.7	\$74.4	\$81.3	\$94.1	9.0%	-3.8%
Chemicals & Allied Industries	\$122.8	\$160.3	\$143.8	\$167.8	\$184.5	\$166.8	\$157.3	\$165.6	\$165.0	\$168.3	\$171.6	6.3%	0.6%
Plastics / Rubbers	\$380.2	\$399.1	\$319.1	\$396.8	\$448.1	\$462.7	\$506.7	\$514.6	\$512.0	\$490.9	\$518.1	4.0%	2.3%
Raw Hides, Skins, Leather, & Furs	\$5.2	\$9.3	\$10.4	\$23.4	\$18.2	\$21.9	\$25.4	\$25.9	\$21.1	\$22.4	\$42.9	33.2%	14.4%
Wood & Wood Products	\$211.7	\$207.4	\$176.4	\$209.0	\$211.0	\$213.5	\$225.5	\$260.6	\$262.8	\$265.8	\$302.8	0.2%	7.2%
Textiles	\$46.1	\$55.8	\$60.5	\$112.5	\$200.2	\$64.5	\$69.9	\$74.2	\$87.2	\$77.3	\$98.9	7.0%	8.9%
Footwear / Headgear	\$2.4	\$4.4	\$2.8	\$29.7	\$39.9	\$8.6	\$24.3	\$14.6	\$32.3	\$15.5	\$22.6	29.2%	21.3%
Stone / Glass	\$52.1	\$51.0	\$54.8	\$96.0	\$93.4	\$99.6	\$102.6	\$77.9	\$63.0	\$49.3	\$56.1	13.8%	10.8%
Metals	\$610.6	\$622.3	\$416.3	\$492.3	\$509.7	\$570.3	\$601.6	\$582.1	\$575.8	\$592.2	\$578.8	-1.4%	0.3%
Machinery / 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	5.7%	4.0%
Transportation	\$652.6	\$605.7	\$209.5	\$397.5	\$632.6	\$740.4	\$585.9	\$580.1	\$572.6	\$467.5	\$505.1	2.6%	-7.4%
Miscellaneous	\$195.0	\$212.6	\$207.6	\$260.2	\$313.7	\$303.4	\$294.8	\$314.0	\$373.6	\$426.5	\$485.0	9.2%	9.8%
Service	\$12.2	\$10.9	\$12.9	\$18.6	\$11.6	\$6.1	\$3.9	\$7.2	\$3.5	\$1.5	\$0.6	-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>]

**Table A-30: Annual Value of Shipments: Advanced Manufacturing Products Exported to Mexico
Via 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
Advanced Manufacturing Products	\$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	5.2%	2.3%
Aircraft; Spacecraft and Parts	\$0.6	\$1.3	\$8.7	\$27.1	\$94.2	\$115.3	\$132.6	\$158.3	\$131.7	\$154.1	\$163.8	>100%	7.3%
Computer-Related Machinery and Parts	\$972.0	\$871.4	\$594.7	\$736.8	\$965.5	\$1,038.9	\$951.3	\$943.1	\$998.2	\$886.6	\$920.4	1.3%	-2.4%
Electrical Machinery; Equipment and Parts	\$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	9.8%	7.9%
Measuring and Testing Instruments	\$134.0	\$130.1	\$142.9	\$168.1	\$184.3	\$214.8	\$212.3	\$224.7	\$267.2	\$300.4	\$327.8	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	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	-8.7%	3.0%
Vehicles Other than Railway	\$649.9	\$603.0	\$199.6	\$368.9	\$538.1	\$624.9	\$452.9	\$421.6	\$438.4	\$312.2	\$341.1	-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>]

Table A-31: Annual Value of Shipments By Commodity Groups Imported from Mexico Via 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
	\$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%
01 - 05 Animal & Animal Products	\$75.6	\$69.0	\$75.6	\$76.0	\$110.9	\$169.3	\$170.2	\$187.7	\$285.5	\$273.6	\$254.4	17.5%	8.5%
06 - 15 Vegetable Products	\$322.8	\$380.8	\$284.4	\$360.2	\$455.2	\$399.3	\$490.1	\$517.0	\$622.8	\$694.3	\$746.2	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	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	17.5%	17.7%
28 - 38 Chemicals & Allied Industries	\$38.8	\$44.7	\$48.5	\$46.8	\$30.8	\$23.7	\$31.3	\$31.2	\$28.2	\$41.4	\$52.9	-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	-1.9%	6.1%
41 - 43 Raw Hides, Skins, Leather, & Furs	\$5.2	\$5.3	\$4.7	\$6.4	\$9.2	\$9.4	\$6.7	\$23.3	\$19.7	\$6.8	\$5.7	12.5%	-9.6%
44 - 49 Wood & Wood Products	\$16.6	\$10.0	\$13.1	\$23.7	\$25.2	\$32.4	\$42.2	\$54.6	\$51.2	\$52.0	\$45.0	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	-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	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	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	1.0%	-5.9%
84 - 85 Machinery / 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	-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	16.9%	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	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	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>]

**Table A-32: Annual Value of Shipments: Advanced Manufacturing Products Imported From Mexico
Via 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
Advanced Manufacturing Products	\$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	-1.7%	7.5%
Aircraft; Spacecraft and Parts	\$66.4	\$84.9	\$70.8	\$91.1	\$141.6	\$329.1	\$372.6	\$593.5	\$506.2	\$503.5	\$547.3	>100%	10.7%
Computer-Related Machinery and Parts	\$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	5.9%	0.4%
Electrical Machinery; Equipment and Parts	\$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	-7.3%	5.1%
Measuring and Testing Instruments	\$300.1	\$348.5	\$361.3	\$421.6	\$428.8	\$500.8	\$511.2	\$581.0	\$632.6	\$773.9	\$865.3	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	-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	7.1%	-36.2%
Vehicles Other than Railway	\$208.3	\$206.5	\$202.3	\$235.7	\$245.8	\$270.5	\$317.6	\$478.4	\$1,105.8	\$836.3	\$954.6	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>]

Table A-33: Electric Power Generation ('000 MWh): Power Generating Sources: Imperial County

Energy Type/Facility	000's MWh				Annual Growth Rates			Percent Distribution		
	2002	2007	2012	2017	'02-'07	'07-'12	'12-'17	2007	2012	2017
Total	4,396.4	4,452.6	5,463.3	12,004.7	0.3%	4.2%	17.1%	100%	100%	100%
Biomass	71.7	72.9	66.0	73.1	0.3%	-2.0%	2.1%	2%	1%	1%
Mesquite Lake Resource Recovery Project - Retired Dec 2008	71.7	72.9	66.0	73.1						
Geothermal	3,587.5	3,698.1	4,011.7	3,710.9	0.6%	1.6%	-1.5%	83%	73%	31%
CE Turbo LLC	2.8	82.0	85.0	0.0						
Del Ranch Company (formerly A W Hoch)	76.7	97.7	104.8	110.8						
GEM II	279.9	350.0	324.0	311.4						
GEM III	345.4	314.6	340.8	286.5						
Heber Geothermal Co	356.6	336.3	336.0	363.6						
J J Elmore	0.0	0.0	352.8	424.3						
J M Leathers	0.0	0.0	187.1	54.1						
John L Featherstone Plant -formerly Hudson Ranch Power I LLC	64.4	44.9	0.0	0.0						
North Brawley	65.5	52.6	36.6	0.0						
Ormesa 1 E	120.4	141.4	137.6	137.1						
Ormesa 1H	124.1	136.9	130.9	103.5						
Ormesa Geothermal II	65.3	74.8	52.7	71.4						
Ormesa I	71.9	128.3	111.0	100.9						
Salton Sea Unit 1	383.6	379.9	344.0	347.3						
Salton Sea Unit 2	343.5	334.1	293.3	312.9						
Salton Sea Unit 3	331.7	354.0	291.4	334.8						
Salton Sea Unit 4	326.3	320.1	368.1	286.2						
Salton Sea Unit 5	326.1	284.0	232.6	310.5						

Energy Type/Facility	000's MWh				Annual Growth Rates			Percent Distribution		
	2002	2007	2012	2017	'02-'07	'07-'12	'12-'17	2007	2012	2017
Second Imperial Geothermal Co SIGC Plant	303.4	265.0	283.3	155.6						
Vulcan	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0						
Hydro	732.0	678.4	1,252.4	1,268.7	-1.5%	13.0%	0.3%	15%	23%	11%
Double Weir	55.6	51.4	51.9	42.9						
Drop 1	52.9	45.9	50.6	40.7						
Drop 2	110.0	104.9	110.9	17.1						
Drop 3	13.3	14.2	18.6	12.0						
Drop 4	4.5	4.2	0.4	4.2						
Drop 5	17.5	12.6	23.7	25.6						
East Highline	28.5	10.6	6.0	6.4						
Pilot Knob	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0						
Senator Wash (Pumping-Generating)	448.7	434.5	990.3	1,119.9						
Turnip	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0						
Natural gas	5.2	3.2	104.3	2,817.8	-9.3%	100.7%	93.3%	0.1%	2%	23%
Brawley (Retired 12/31/2009)	0.0	0.0	71.9	69.5						
El Centro Generating Station	5.2	3.2	3.5	2.1						
Niland Gas Turbine Plant	0.0	0.0	28.8	2,694.4						
Rockwood Gas Turbine Plant	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.8						
Solar	0.0	0.0	28.8	3,592.3	0.0%	0.0%	162.5%	0%	1%	30%
96WI 8ME, LLC (Midway II)	0.0	0.0	0.0	135.4						
Alhambra Solar Facility	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.6						
Arkansas Solar Facility	0.0	0.0	0.0	351.5						
Calipatria Solar Farm	0.0	0.0	0.0	467.6						
Campo Verde Solar Project	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.9						
Centinela Solar Energy	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.2						
ECPV Solar	0.0	0.0	0.0	280.6						

Energy Type/Facility	000's MWh				Annual Growth Rates			Percent Distribution		
	2002	2007	2012	2017	'02-'07	'07-'12	'12-'17	2007	2012	2017
Heber Solar Facility	0.0	0.0	0.0	390.6						
Imperial Solar Energy Center South	0.0	0.0	0.0	48.2						
Imperial Solar Energy Center West	0.0	0.0	28.8	51.7						
Imperial Valley Solar Company (IVSC) 2 LLC	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6						
IVSC1 - (SunPeak 1) - 23MW PV	0.0	0.0	0.0	510.1						
NRG Solar Community I LLC (SDSU Solar)	0.0	0.0	0.0	135.4						
Silver Ridge Mount Signal (Imperial Valley Solar 1)	0.0	0.0	0.0	542.0						
Sonora Solar Facility	0.0	0.0	0.0	542.0						
Wind	0.0	0.0	0.0	542.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0%	5%
Ocotillo Express LLC	0.0	0.0	0.0	542.0						
Source: Applied Development Economics, based on State of California, California Energy Commission, Annual Generation - County (https://bit.ly/2GjIOzX)										

ITEM B

CEDS Visions and Goals – Changes and/or Modifications.



MEMO

TO: Esperanza Colio Warren
Imperial County CEDS Committee

FROM: Doug Svensson, AICP

DATE: May 17, 2018

SUBJECT: Summary of Existing SWOT and CEDS Goals

In preparation for the May 12 CEDS Committee meeting we have updated much of the socioeconomic, industry and retail data trends, which is provided in a data packet under separate cover. We will review the highlights of this material at the meeting. However, the main order of business is to review the existing SWOT analysis and CEDS Goals and Objectives to determine if changes should be made based on new information or changing priorities. The SWOT and goals provide a framework for designing an action plan for the CEDS and to evaluate the proposed projects that may apply for EDA funding. The following is a summary of the existing SWOT and Goals to facilitate the Committee discussion.

EXISTING 2016-2017 SWOT SUMMARY

STRENGTHS

- Close-knit communities
- Positive, pro-growth rural business attitude
- Established North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Corridors
- Growing community- based partnerships
- Commerce between two countries
- Multicultural community
- Access to higher education: Imperial Valley College, San Diego State University – I.V. Campus, University of Phoenix
- Availability of state and federal resources for economic development
- Simplified development process
- Accessible local officials
- Border Area Economic Opportunities
- Lower cost of living
- Affordable housing and land
- Low property taxes
- Regional recreation
- Collaboration among agencies
- Healthy agricultural economy
- Dedicated water supply for non-agricultural projects
- Abundant renewable energy resources

WEAKNESSES

- Lack of infrastructure to support present/future development
- Lack of regional airport for large airfreight transport
- Limited public transportation services for large geographic area
- High unemployment
- Lack of diversified job opportunities
- Lack of high paying jobs
- Limited workforce skills
- Limited higher education attainment
- Lack of career opportunities for college graduates
- 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
- Need for technical skills training

OPPORTUNITIES

- Three Land Ports of Entry with Mexico
- Economic and community ties with Mexicali, Mexico
- Proximity to Mexico maquiladoras
- Large amount of vacant, affordable land
- Available/ trainable workforce
- Renewable energy resources
- CaliBaja Bi-National Mega-Region
- Self-Help County – Measure D, 40-year local sales tax to improve roads in the county
- Business incentives: Foreign Trade Zone, Recycling Market Development Zone
- Proximity to military bases: Naval Air Facility-El Centro and Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma
- Transportation routes/freeway access
- Development of local industrial parks
- Commercial passenger airport
- Favorable climate for renewable energy resources

THREATS

- Congested border crossing traffic
- Air quality
- 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
- Regional partnerships
- Seasonal employment
- Salton Sea/New River pollution
- Need to diversify economy
- State legislation, e.g. labor and environmental laws and transportation funding
- Inability to retain talent pool ("brain-drain")

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."

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

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.

- 1.1. Countywide economic development agency
- 1.2. Coordinated regional marketing activities
- 1.3. Improve quality of developable land
- 1.4. Promote industrial development
- 1.5. Coordinate site access with transportation corridors
- 1.6. Promote availability of low cost resources
- 1.7. Increase the scope of financial incentives
- 1.8. Develop finance mechanism to assist small/new businesses
- 1.9. Support renewable energy industry through university and community college partners
- 1.10. Promote the expanding electrical infrastructure

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

- 2.1. Support development of commercial and industrial areas
- 2.2. Provide regional connectivity to increase redundant backups
- 2.3. Improve transportation corridors
- 2.4. Improve efficient movement of goods and people and increase out of county connections
- 2.5. Link institutions of higher learning through transportation projects
- 2.6. Increase technological and telecommunications infrastructure

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.

- 3.1. Develop labor force data through partnerships
- 3.2. Support job search and training programs for unemployed and underemployed
- 3.3. Assess needs of local employers and target industries
- 3.4. Reduce unemployment by 5 percent
- 3.5. Implement strategies of Imperial County Economic Development Strategic Plan
- 3.6. Create high tech, higher paying jobs
- 3.7. Support creation of trade schools and accreditation of IV College
- 3.8. Support four year university
- 3.9. Support efforts of San Diego State IV and IV College
- 3.10. Increase overall academic achievement of K-12 students

4. Promote and expand tourism in Imperial County.

- 4.1. Develop cultural and resort facilities
- 4.2. Participate with state and regional tourism partners
- 4.3. Continue restoration and tourism related facilities
- 4.4. Initiate tourism campaign

5. Promote international and bi-national trade development.

- 5.1. Increase international awareness of US/Mexico border opportunities
- 5.2. Capitalize on second border crossing
- 5.3. Ascertain impacts of NAFTA and the changing maquiladora industry
- 5.4. Develop and promote FTZ/MEA/EZ to foreign and international markets

6. Promote agriculture and other related industries.

- 6.1. Develop related agricultural industries

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

- 7.1. Develop renewable energy to maximize commercial and industrial development
- 7.2. R & D for recycling and waste management
- 7.3. Develop waste management facilities for local hazardous waste
- 7.4. Utilize smart growth principles and “green” building techniques
- 7.5. Promote energy efficient business and industry practices
- 7.6. Brand Imperial County as home for environmentally response businesses

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

- 8.1. Support the development of a variety of housing options
- 8.2. Balance the proximity of job centers, housing and services
- 8.3. Develop and preserve recreation opportunities
- 8.4. Support a strong social and cultural base
- 8.5. Encourage commercial development that provides services to residents of Imperial County

ITEM C

Action Plan and Evaluation Framework.