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## Introduction

Welcome to the 2018 Mendocino County Economic and Demographic Profile. This profile is designed to give community members access to economic and demographic data that are relevant to their county and local community. The data provided in this document can be used for grant writing, market analysis, promotional purposes, business planning, community planning, or simply to satisfy general curiosity.

This profile is organized to reflect five core sets of community characteristics: population, environment, economy, society, and industry. The data and information provided are the latest available as of April 1, 2018 and provide a ten-year history of change wherever data are available.

The document was produced by the Center for Economic Development, (CED) at California State University, Chico, with funding provided by Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC). The CED specializes in providing the most recent, reliable, and relevant information for communities and businesses. For more information about the CED, please visit our website at www. cedcal.com.

The indicators in this document provide insights into different aspects of community social and economic well-being. While each indicator is presented individually in this document, it is important to note that most indicators share substantive connections with other reported data. We encourage readers to think about indicator linkages and how improvements in one indicator can have a positive or negative effect on others. By doing this, we can more effectively work to improve the quality of a community's environment, economy, and society.

The data selected for presentation in this year were based on sponsor requests and feedback, the availability of new data from the U.S. Census Bureau and other data providers of interest to the general public, and the availability of annual data for every county in California. If you are looking for a specific piece of data on the county or any of its communities, please feel free to contact the Center for Economic Development at (530) 898-4598 and our research staff will gladly direct you to the most recent and reliable measure.

Can I copy the tables and charts in this report and insert them in my own documents?
Adobe Acrobat allows you to copy images and paste them into your own documents. If you are using Acrobat Reader version 10, go to the edit menu and select "Take a Snapshot." Click and drag to create a box around the graphic you wish to copy. Reader will copy the image in the box automatically. Simply paste the graphic in your word processor or graphic design software. If you want to improve the quality of the image, zoom in to the document in Acrobat a level of at least 100 percent.

If you copy and paste images from this document, please be sure to include or cite the source of the data as indicated in the data tables. We also request that you credit the Center for Economic Development at CSU, Chico for providing the research and formatting, and our sponsor, Rural County Representatives of California, for making the document available to the public.
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## оЕиоаваРРНС INoICATORS

This section presents basic demographic characteristics such as population, age, and ethnicity, which provide a framework from which most other community indicators are based.

Mendocino County's population fluctuated throughout the time period spanning from 2008-2017. Overall, Mendocino County's population increased by nearly 1,500 residents between 2008 and 2017. With the exception of 2017, the population growth rate of Mendocino County was consistently slower than that of California as a whole. Mendocino County experienced a natural increase in population in every year between 2008 and 2017, although the
magnitude of these increases has lessened somewhat during this population in every year between 2008 and 2017, although the
magnitude of these increases has lessened somewhat during this period. Net migration fluctuated widely since 2008, but was only significant enough to outpace natural increases in population in significant enough to outpace natural increases in population in
2009, 2011, and 2015. The largest total gain in population was seen in 2012 ( 750 new residents), while the largest total loss of population was seen in 2011 ( 441 residents lost). Between 2015 and 2016, the majority of Mendocino County's in-migration came from nearby counties like Sonoma, Lake and Humboldt, although a significant amount also came from more distant although a significant amount also came from more distant
counties like Alameda County in the Bay Area and Los Angeles County in Southern California. As with in-migration, the majority of Mendocino County's out-migration primarily involved neighboring counties.

Between 2007 and 2016, Mendocino County experienced its largest proportional population increases in those aged 65 to 74 years old (79 percent), those aged 85 years and older ( 26 percent), and those aged 55 to 64 years old ( 12 percent). In contrast, Mendocino County saw its largest proportional population decreases in those aged 40 to 54 years old ( 28 percent), those aged 18 to 24 years old (13 percent), and those aged 75 to 84 years old ( 6 percent). In 2016, the largest proportion of Mendocino County's population by age were those aged 40 to 54 years old ( 23 percent). Mendocino County experienced the greatest proportional population growth in its Other/Multiracial and Hispanic/Latino populations (104 percent Other/Multiracial and Hispanic/Latino populations (104 percent
and 14 percent, respectively). In contrast, the county experienced significant proportional declines in its American Indian and Black/African American populations (26 percent and 19 percent, Black/African American populations (26 percent and 19 percent,
respectively). In 2016, the greatest proportion of the Mendocino County population by race/ethnicity were those who identified as White alone (66 percent).

## Total Population

## What is it?

Total population measures the number of people who consider the county to be their primary residence, and does not include those who reside in the county as a result of incarceration, or persons who reside in the county but do not consider it their primary residence. The data are estimated annually by the California Department of Finance and provide a point-in-time estimate for January 1 of each year.

## How is it used?

Population represents a cumulative measurement of the size of the county's consumer market, labor availability, and the potential impact of human habitation on the environment. Population data provide the basis for many of the other indicators in this report.

Mendocino County's population fluctuated throughout the time period spanning from 2008-2017. Overall, Mendocino County's population increased by nearly 1,500 residents between 2008 and 2017. With the exception of 2017 , the population growth rate of Mendocino County was consistently slower than that of California as a whole. As of 2017, only 16,314 residents lived in Ukiah, Mendocino County's largest city.

## Non-Incarcerated Population, Mendocino County

| Year | Mendocino <br> County | 1-year <br> change | CA 1-year <br> change |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 87,715 | $0.11 \%$ | $0.85 \%$ |
| 2009 | 87,677 | $-0.04 \%$ | $0.73 \%$ |
| 2010 | 87,807 | $0.15 \%$ | $0.79 \%$ |
| 2011 | 87,712 | $-0.11 \%$ | $0.78 \%$ |
| 2012 | 87,947 | $0.27 \%$ | $0.95 \%$ |
| 2013 | 88,493 | $0.62 \%$ | $0.99 \%$ |
| 2014 | 89,029 | $0.61 \%$ | $0.86 \%$ |
| 2015 | 88,863 | $-0.19 \%$ | $0.89 \%$ |
| 2016 | 88,378 | $-0.55 \%$ | $0.90 \%$ |
| 2017 | 89,134 | $0.86 \%$ | $0.68 \%$ |

Source: California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit



## City Population, Mendocino County

| City | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fort Bragg | 7,168 | 7,201 | 7,251 | 7,272 | 7,367 | 7,556 | 7,564 | 7,633 | 7,672 | 7,772 |
| Point Arena | 459 | 454 | 451 | 446 | 445 | 446 | 446 | 444 | 448 | 452 |
| Ukiah | 15,963 | 15,983 | 16,042 | 15,885 | 16,023 | 16,168 | 16,170 | 16,156 | $\mathbf{1 6 , 1 8 6}$ | 16,314 |
| Willits | 4,863 | 4,903 | 4,892 | 4,862 | 4,852 | 4,868 | 4,868 | 4,860 | 4,879 | 4,928 |

[^0]
## Components of Population Change

## What is it?

Components of population change measure natural sources of population increase and decrease (i.e., births and deaths) as well as changes due to in-migration and out-migration. The California Department of Finance releases annual estimates on the number of births, deaths, and net migration both into and out of each county. The natural change in population is calculated by subtracting deaths from births. Any remaining change in population is due to net migration, which is calculated by subtracting the number of outmigrants from the number of in-migrants.

## How is it used?

If population growth is primarily due to natural increase, then the county may be a place where many younger families are residing. If natural rate of change is negative (more deaths than births), then the population's age composition may be older. There are many potential motivations for people to move into or out of a county, such as employment opportunities, housing prices, and general quality of life. It should be noted that the components of population change data represent annual totals, while the total population data are a point-in-time measurement of population taken on January 1 st of each calendar year. Because of this difference, the data reported in this section are not directly comparable to the population data presented on page two. Mendocino County experienced a natural increase in population every year between 2008 and 2017, although the magnitude of these increases lessened somewhat during this period. Net migration fluctuated widely after 2008, but was only significant enough to outpace natural increases in population in 2009, 2011, and 2015. The largest total gain in population was seen in 2012 ( 750 new residents), while the largest total loss of population was seen in 2011 (441 residents lost).



## Components of Population Change, Mendocino County

| Year | Births | Deaths | Natural <br> Increase | Net <br> Migration | Total <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 1,188 | 772 | 416 | -280 | 136 |
| 2009 | 1,099 | 822 | 277 | -490 | -213 |
| 2010 | 1,124 | 823 | 301 | 69 | 370 |
| 2011 | 1,012 | 824 | 188 | -629 | -441 |
| 2012 | 1,122 | 802 | 320 | 430 | 750 |
| 2013 | 1,061 | 836 | 225 | -161 | 64 |
| 2014 | 1,054 | 835 | 219 | 181 | 400 |
| 2015 | 1,021 | 847 | 174 | -350 | -176 |
| 2016 | 1,002 | 890 | 112 | 403 | 515 |
| 2017 | 1,016 | 832 | 184 | 161 | 345 |

Source: California Department of Public Health and California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit

## Migration Pataenis

## What is it?

This indicator includes migration patterns between Mendocino County and the ten counties with the highest numbers of in- and out-migrants. Data are collected from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and are based on income tax records for all available households. Migrations to and from group living quarters, such as college dormitories, nursing homes, or correctional institutions, are not included.

## How is it used?

Migration can indicate positive or negative changes in the economic, political, and social structure of an area, based on the characteristics of the area from which the migrants originate. For example, some migration from urban to rural areas may be based upon the lower cost of housing outside of major urban centers, while rural to urban migrants are often seeking better job opportunities. Neighboring counties, as well as those with higher population totals, generally show the largest amount of migration activity. Migration between non-neighboring counties, particularly those that are geographically distant and/ or socioeconomically quite distinct, may thus be worthy of further investigation.

Between 2015 and 2016, the majority of Mendocino County's in-migration came from nearby counties like Sonoma, Lake and Humboldt, although a significant amount also came from more distant counties like Alameda County in the Bay Area and Los Angeles County in Southern California. As with in-migration, the majority of Mendocino County's out-migration primarily involved neighboring counties.

Top 10 In-Migration Counties, 2015-16, Mendocino County

| County | Number of In-Migrants |
| :--- | :---: |
| Sonoma County | 513 |
| Lake County | 209 |
| Alameda County | 122 |
| Humboldt County | 82 |
| Los Angeles County | 78 |
| Sacramento County | 76 |
| Contra Costa County | 75 |
| Marin County | 64 |
| San Mateo County | 58 |
| San Diego County | 57 |

Source: Internal Revenue Service

Top 10 Out-Migration Counties, 2015-16, Mendocino County

| County | Number of Out-Migrants |
| :--- | :---: |
| Sonoma County | 426 |
| Lake County | 284 |
| Sacramento County | 105 |
| Humboldt County | 72 |
| Butte County | 69 |
| Los Angeles County | 65 |
| Alameda County | 63 |
| Washoe County | 46 |
| Multnomah County | 42 |
| Placer County | 36 |

Source: Internal Revenue Service

## Age Distribution

## What is it?

Age distribution data provide the number of permanent residents who fall into a given age range, and are measured on April 1 for each recorded year. Data are provided by American Community Survey one-year estimates. The earliest one-year estimates that are available are the 2006 estimates. Therefore, all analysis of change will be over the 10-year period from 2007 to 2016. These data include incarcerated individuals in total population counts.

## Population by Age

- 2007 ■ 2016




Age distribution information is valuable to companies that target their marketing efforts on specific age groups. Age distribution data can be used to estimate school attendance, need for public services, and workforce projections. A growing young adult population, for instance, could indicate greater need for higher education and vocational training facilities, while a growing middle-aged population may signal the need for greater employment opportunities. An area with a significant proportion of population that is past retirement age will typically have less employment concerns, but a greater need for medical and social service provision. Age distribution data can also be used in conjunction with the components of population change in order to create projections of future population growth. Between 2007 and 2016, Mendocino County experienced its largest proportional population increases in those aged 65 to 74 years old (79 percent), those aged 85 years and older ( 26 percent), and those aged 55 to 64 years old ( 12 percent). In contrast, Mendocino County saw its largest proportional population decreases in those aged 40 to 54 years old ( 28 percent), those aged 18 to 24 years old ( 13 percent), and those aged 75 to 84 years old ( 6 percent). In 2016, the largest proportion of Mendocino County's population by age were those aged 40 to 54 years old ( 23 percent).

Population by Age, Mendocino County

| Age Range | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Under 5 years | 5,489 | 5,326 |
| 5 to 17 years | 14,026 | 13,992 |
| 18 to 24 years | 7,364 | 6,386 |
| 25 to 39 years | 14,815 | 16,505 |
| 40 to 54 years | 19,908 | 14,277 |
| 55 to 64 years | 12,202 | 13,661 |
| 65 to 74 years | 6,150 | 11,028 |
| 75 to 84 years | 4,737 | 4,463 |
| 85 years and over | 1,582 | 1,990 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 1-year Estimates
Population by Age Compared to California, Mendocino County

| Age Range | Percent of Total, 2016 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2007 \text { to } 2016 \\ \text { 10-year Change } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | County | California | County | California |
| Under 5 years | 6.4 \% | 6.5 \% | -3.0\% | - 5.1 \% |
| 5 to 17 Years | 16.3 \% | 17.2 \% | -0.2\% | - 0.0 \% |
| 18 to 24 Years | 8.5 \% | 10.2 \% | -13.3\% | 4.5 \% |
| 25 to 39 Years | 17.2 \% | 21.4 \% | 11.4\% | 5.8 \% |
| 40 to 54 Years | 23.1 \% | 20.2 \% | -28.3\% | 0.8 \% |
| 55 to 64 Years | 14.1 \% | 11.6 \% | 12.0\% | 28.7 \% |
| 65 to 74 Years | 7.1 \% | 7.3 \% | 79.3\% | 40.6 \% |
| 75 to 84 Years | 5.5 \% | 3.8 \% | -5.8\% | 6.9 \% |
| 85 years and over | 1.8 \% | 1.8 \% | 25.8\% | 27.0 \% |

## Population by Race and Ethnicity

## What is it?

Racial and ethnic identification is frequently a product of both collective assignment by others and individual assertion of a felt or claimed identity. It is important to note that both the Census and the American Community Survey measure an individual's race and ethnicity through self-identification, rather than assignment by the interviewer. There are seven major racial/ethnic categories provided: American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, and Other/Multiracial. These data include incarcerated individuals in total population counts.

## How is it used?

Data on population within racial and ethnic categories are often used by advertisers to target their marketing efforts towards particular groups and to estimate how profitable these efforts might be. Grant writers frequently use population data on racial and ethnic groups to secure funding for programs meant to address group-specific social conditions or inequalities. Government officials and political candidates also use population data on race and ethnicity in order to tailor their campaign messages to people who make claims to particular racial and ethnic identities. Between 2010 and 2016, Mendocino County experienced the greatest proportional population growth in its Other/Multiracial and Hispanic/Latino populations (104 percent
 and 14 percent, respectively). In contrast, the county experienced significant proportional declines in its American Indian and Black/African American populations ( 26 percent and 19 percent, respectively). In 2016, the greatest proportion of the Mendocino County population by race/ethnicity were those who identified as White alone (66 percent).

Population by Race/Ethnicity, Mendocino County

| Race/Ethnicity | 2010 | 2016 | Percent of Total in 2016 |  | 2010 to 2016 7-year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | County | California | County | California |
| White alone | 61,160 | 58,018 | 66.4\% | 38.4\% | -5.1\% | -1.8\% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 18,468 | 20,955 | 24.0\% | 38.6\% | 13.5\% | 10.8\% |
| American Indian alone | 3,769 | 2,792 | 3.2\% | 0.4\% | -25.9\% | -11.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 619 | 499 | 0.6\% | 5.6\% | -19.4\% | -0.3\% |
| Asian alone | 1,501 | 1,521 | 1.7\% | 13.7\% | 1.3\% | 12.7\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander | 183 | 185 | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 1.1\% | 5.7\% |
| Other/Multiple | 1,690 | 3,439 | 3.9\% | 3.1\% | 103.5\% | 53.5\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-Year Estimates

Population by Race/Ethnicity as a Percent of Total Population, 2016


Six-Year Population Percent Change, 2010-2016
■ Mendocino County ■ Califomia


Population by Race/ Ethnicity
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## Ewroweral Nolctions

Environmental indicators describe the quality of the physical places with which humans interact, and focus in particular on land, air, and water resources. These indicators are useful in identifying the potential impacts that a regional population may be having on the natural environment around them.

The bulk of Mendocino County's population is clustered along State Route 1 between Albion and Fort Bragg and along Highway 101 between Hopland and Brooktrails. There is also significant population clusters around Laytonville, Boonville, and the Round Valley region in the county's northeast corner. The amount of harvested acreage in Mendocino County declined gradually between 2007 and 2016.

Travel times to work in Mendocino County decreased across almost all time ranges between 2010 and 2016, with the exception of those taking 15 to 24 minutes ( 1 percent increase) and those taking 45 to 59 minutes (31 percent). In 2016, the greatest proportion of the county population (45 percent) traveled between 5 and 14 minutes to work. A majority of Mendocino County residents (74 percent) drove alone to work in 2016, and 10 percent carpooled with others and 8 percent worked from home. The only proportional increase in frequency was seen in those bicycling to work (6 percent), while the greatest proportional decrease was seen in those using a taxi, motorcycle, or other means of transportation (52 percent). The proportion of local jobs held by those commuting into the county for work rose unevenly to reach a high point of almost 34 percent in 2013, before declining to 28 percent between 2014 and 2015. A similar pattern of uneven increase between 2006 and 2013 and subsequent decrease in 2014 and 2015 can be seen in the proportion of the local employed workforce commuting out of the county for work, which also increased significantly between 2011 and 2012. The number of workers commuting into the county outnumbered those commuting out of the county between 2006 and 2008, and those commuting out subsequently
became greater in number. northeast corner. The amount or harvested acreage in Mendocino County


## Land Area \& Population Density

## What is it?

Population density is determined by dividing a county's total nonincarcerated population by its land area in square miles. Population density data indicate how closely or loosely county residents are grouped together, and are often functions of both total population and the characteristics of the built environment, such as the relative proportion of single- vs. multiple-family housing in a county.

## How is it used?

Population density data can be useful for municipal and regional planners who are developing infrastructural projects and wish to benefit from economies of scale. For example, areas with high population density would likely exhibit more frequent utilization of public transportation resources than areas with lower density, and are also frequently more energy efficient. Population density data can be useful for businesses seeking to open a new location, as greater density generally implies greater demand for labor. Changes in population density can also help in the interpretation of migration patterns as people move into and out of particular cities and neighborhoods. As can be seen in the adjacent map, the bulk of Mendocino County's population is clustered along State Route 1 between Albion and Fort Bragg and along Highway 101 between Hopland and Brooktrails. There is also significant population clusters around Laytonville, Boonville, and the Round Valley region in the county's northeast corner.


Land Area and Population Density, Mendocino County

|  | Land Area <br> (sq. miles) | Total <br> Year | Population Density <br> (per sq. mile) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3,509 | 87,715 | 25.0 | 235.3 |
| 2008 | 3,509 | 87,677 | 25.0 | 237.0 |
| 2009 | 3,509 | 87,807 | 25.0 | 238.7 |
| 2010 | 3,509 | 87,712 | 25.0 | 240.0 |
| 2011 | 3,509 | 87,965 | 25.1 | 241.5 |
| 2013 | 3,509 | 88,291 | 25.2 | 243.4 |
| 2014 | 3,509 | 89,029 | 25.4 | 245.8 |
| 2015 | 3,509 | 88,863 | 25.3 | 248.2 |
| 2016 | 3,509 | 88,771 | 25.3 | 251.3 |
| 2017 | 3,509 | 89,134 | 25.4 | 253.4 |

Source: California Department of Finance

## Harvested Acreage

## What is it?

Harvested acreage reports the total amount of land that is used in any aspect of agricultural production as a proportion of a county's total land area. Data on harvested acreage are reported annually by individual County Agricultural Commissioners to the U.S.
Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately, there is no consistent method for estimating harvested acreage from county to county or from year to year. However, commissioners are required to base their estimate on a local survey that is statistically representative of all agricultural producers in an area.

## How is it used?

Agriculture is often a dominant land use in rural counties, and harvested acreage as a proportion of total land area can indicate the relative importance of agriculture to a local economy. In addition to being a major economic factor, agriculture can also form the basis for community and regional identity, as well as factor when determining use policies for areas surrounding farmland. The amount of harvested acreage in Mendocino County declined gradually between 2007 and 2016. Mendocino County's harvested acreage was used almost exclusively for animal pastures in 2016, although wine grapes made up an important tertiary crop.

Total Crops Harvested Acreage, Mendocino County

| Crop | 2016 | Percent of <br> Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Pasture, Forage, Misc. | 363,000 | $49.0 \%$ |
| Pasture, Range | 355,000 | $47.9 \%$ |
| Grapes, Wine | 16,900 | $2.28 \%$ |
| Pasture, Irrigated | 3,500 | $0.47 \%$ |
| Pears, Bartlett | 1,160 | $0.16 \%$ |
| Vegetables, Unspecified | 340 | $0.05 \%$ |
| Fruits \& Nuts, Unspecified | 257 | $0.03 \%$ |
| Apples, All | 215 | $0.03 \%$ |
| Pears, Unspecified | 152 | $0.02 \%$ |

Source: California Agricultural Statistics Service, California Department of Finance

Top 5 Crops by Harvested Acreage, Mendocino County



Total Harvested Acreage, Mendocino County

| Year | Total Acres <br> Harvested | Percent of Total <br> Land Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 745,304 | $33.2 \%$ |
| 2008 | 745,281 | $33.2 \%$ |
| 2009 | 749,069 | $33.4 \%$ |
| 2010 | 745,054 | $33.2 \%$ |
| 2011 | 744,873 | $33.2 \%$ |
| 2012 | 744,925 | $33.2 \%$ |
| 2013 | 742,944 | $33.1 \%$ |
| 2014 | 741,041 | $33.0 \%$ |
| 2015 | 740,524 | $33.0 \%$ |
| 2016 | 740,524 | $33.0 \%$ |

Source: California Agricultural Statistics Service, California Department of Finance


## Commute Patterns

## What is it?

Commute patterns data assess the number of jobs in a county relative to its total labor force, as well as the proportion of workers who commute either into or out of the county for work. The U.S. Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employment and Household Dynamics data include all jobs reported to the IRS by businesses, with social security numbers matched to the locations of residential tax returns to determine a worker's location.

Place of Work Patterns, Mendocino County

| Year | Jobs in <br> County | Employed Local <br> Workforce | Local Workforce <br> Employed in County | Workforce <br> Commuting In | Percent <br> Commuting In | Workforce <br> Commuting Out | Percent <br> Commuting Out |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 29,448 | 28,864 | 23,504 | 5,611 | $19.1 \%$ | 5,360 | $18.6 \%$ |
| 2007 | 29,676 | 30,580 | 24,110 | 7,019 | $23.7 \%$ | 6,470 | $21.2 \%$ |
| 2008 | 29,636 | 30,253 | 23,837 | 7,757 | $26.2 \%$ | 6,416 | $21.2 \%$ |
| 2009 | 28,539 | 30,675 | 22,657 | 6,772 | $23.7 \%$ | 8,018 | $26.1 \%$ |
| 2010 | 28,446 | 30,907 | 21,879 | 6,911 | $24.3 \%$ | 9,028 | $29.2 \%$ |
| 2011 | 28,197 | 31,015 | 21,767 | 8,860 | $31.4 \%$ | 9,248 | $29.8 \%$ |
| 2012 | 27,909 | 29,335 | 18,779 | 9,130 | $32.7 \%$ | 10,556 | $36.0 \%$ |
| 2013 | 28,928 | 30,295 | 19,213 | 9,715 | $33.6 \%$ | 11,082 | $36.6 \%$ |
| 2014 | 30,142 | 31,901 | 20,289 | 9,853 | $32.7 \%$ | 11,612 | $36.4 \%$ |
| 2015 | 30,365 | 31,014 | 21,936 | 8,429 | $27.8 \%$ | 9,078 | $29.3 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employment Data


## How is it used?

Commute pattern data are useful for estimating the ability of a county economy to meet the employment needs of its workforce. A larger proportion of workers commuting into the county from outside is indicative of a job surplus relative to labor force size, while a larger proportion of workers commuting out may indicate that there are not enough jobs relative to labor force size. These data can also be used to estimate daytime population, which is the number of people present in the county during normal business hours compared to the total (resident) population, and are often used by businesses in designing their marketing strategy for various products. The proportion of local jobs held by those commuting into the county for work rose unevenly to reach a high point of almost 34 percent in 2013, before declining to 28 percent between 2014 and 2015. A similar pattern of uneven increase between 2006 and 2013 and subsequent decrease in 2014 and 2015 can be seen in the proportion of the local employed workforce commuting out of the county for work, which also increased significantly between 2011 and 2012. The number of workers commuting into the county outnumbered those commuting out of the county between 2006 and 2008, and those commuting out subsequently became greater in number.

County Workforce Commute Patterns ■ Commuting in ■ Commuting Out

## Trave Time to Work

## What is it?

Travel time to work is the amount of time, in minutes, that a worker estimates it takes them to get to work on a normal workday. Travel time can be influenced by distance to work, traffic volume, and the means of transportation utilized (evaluated in the following indicator). Data are taken from the 2007-2016 American Community Survey and are reported as one-year estimates.

## How is it used?

Increasing commute times often capture the push-pull dynamic between wages and housing costs, as well-paying jobs become increasingly concentrated in urban centers that also frequently have higher costs of living. Workers who wish to earn higher wages but want to maintain a lower cost of living may therefore choose to commute longer distances. Longer commute times may also indicate the need for improvements to transportation infrastructure, such as more accessible public transportation resources or expansion of roads to reduce highway traffic. Conversely, shorter commute times may indicate that wages and housing costs are in better alignment or that transportation infrastructure is sufficient for the local labor force. Travel times to work in Mendocino County decreased across almost all time ranges between 2010 and 2016, with the exception of those taking 15 to 24 minutes ( 1 percent increase) and those taking 45 to 59 minutes ( 31 percent). In 2016, the greatest proportion of the county population ( 45 percent) traveled between 5 and 14 minutes to work.



## Travel Time to Work, Mendocino County

| Travel Time to Work | 2007 | 2016 | Percent of Total in 2016 |  | Change from 2007 to 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | County | California | County | California |
| Less than 5 minutes | 2,323 | 2,433 | 7.4\% | 1.7\% | 4.7\% | -23.4\% |
| 5 to 14 minutes | 14,899 | 14,883 | 45.3\% | 20.1\% | -0.1\% | -4.0\% |
| 15 to 24 minutes | 8,054 | 7,151 | 21.8\% | 28.9\% | -11.2\% | 4.7\% |
| 25 to 34 minutes | 4,568 | 4,366 | 13.3\% | 21.0\% | -4.4\% | 12.7\% |
| 35 to 44 minutes | 1,268 | 532 | 1.6\% | 7.1\% | -58.0\% | 18.5\% |
| 45 to 59 minutes | 922 | 922 | 2.8\% | 8.9\% | 0.0\% | 20.6\% |
| 60 to 89 minutes | 987 | 1,661 | 5.1\% | 8.3\% | 68.3\% | 23.3\% |
| 90 or more minutes | 1,089 | 880 | 2.7\% | 4.0\% | -19.2\% | 33.5\% |
| Total not working at home | 34,110 | 32,828 | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | -3.8\% | 8.2\% |

[^1]
## Means of Transportation to Work

## What is it?

Means of transportation to work is the type of vehicle or mode of transportation most frequently used to get from home to work in an average workday. As with travel time, this indicator is measured through individual self-reports in the American Community Survey, and workers are asked to report the mode of travel most frequently used in the previous week. The data reported here are five-year estimates.


## How is it used?

The most frequently utilized means of transportation to work may indicate how accessible or feasible certain modes of transportation are for a county's labor force. This indicator is especially useful when assessed alongside travel times to work, and can be helpful for county and municipal planners in the development of public transportation resources, bike paths, and other transportation infrastructure. A majority of Mendocino County residents (74 percent) drove alone to work in 2016, and a further 10 percent carpooled with others and 8 percent worked from home. While the proportions of those either driving alone or carpooling are quite comparable to those for the rest of the state of California in 2016, the proportions of those either working from home or walking to work are somewhat larger than the statewide proportions. Between 2010 and 2016, the only proportional increase in frequency was seen in those bicycling to work (6 percent), while the greatest proportional decrease was seen in those using a taxi, motorcycle, or other means of transportation (52 percent).

Means of Transportation to Work, Mendocino County

| Means of Transportation | Mendocino County |  | Percent of Total in 2016 |  | Change from 2010 to 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2016 | County | California | County | California |
| Drove Alone | 26,708 | 26,475 | 74.3\% | 73.5\% | -0.9\% | 6.4\% |
| Carpooled | 4,393 | 3,634 | 10.2\% | 10.6\% | -17.3\% | -5.9\% |
| Public transportation | 182 | 173 | 0.5\% | 5.2\% | -4.9\% | 7.2\% |
| Bicycle | 413 | 437 | 1.2\% | 1.1\% | 5.8\% | 24.9\% |
| Walked | 1,862 | 1,836 | 5.2\% | 2.7\% | -1.4\% | 2.9\% |
| Taxicab, motorcycle, or other means | 354 | 169 | 0.5\% | 1.4\% | -52.3\% | 14.0\% |
| Worked at Home | 3,665 | 2,905 | 8.2\% | 5.4\% | -20.7\% | 16.0\% |
| Total | 37,577 | 35,629 | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | -5.2\% | 5.7\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 and 2016, ACS 5-year estimates
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## ECONOMIC INICATORS

Economic indicators provide valuable insight into the relative availability of financial and employment resources for a county population, as well as the growth or decline of wages in particular industries and the average cost of housing.
*Note: (D) Withheld disclosure of confidential business data.
The size of Mendocino County's labor force gradually declined between 2007 and 2009. Overall, Mendocino County experienced a reduction of over 7.5 percent in the size of its labor force between 2007 and 2016. Employment in Mendocino County decreased steadily between 2007 and 2011, before entering a period of gradual growth. Conversely, unemployment in Mendocino County increased steadily between 2007 and 2010, before entering a period of steady decline from 2011-2016. Mendocino County experienced significant seasonal changes in employment. Employment levels were generally at their highest in June, August and October, and at their lowest levels in November through February.

Total personal income and per capita income in Mendocino County grew steadily between 2007-2016, with the exceptions of 2009 and 2014 when they experienced slight declines. Total personal income in Mendocino County experienced its most significant growth in 2015. Overall, once adjusted for inflation, total personal income in Mendocino County increased by nearly four hundred million dollars between 2007 and 2016. The primary components of personal income in Mendocino County are work earnings, dividends, interest, rent, and medical benefits. A significantly larger portion of Mendocino County's personal income derived from retirement and veterans benefits when compared to the statewide average. Overall, median household income in Mendocino County increased by roughly 7\% between 2007 and 2016. Poverty rates in Mendocino County rose gradually between 2007 and 2016, and Mendocino County's poverty rates consistently remained higher than the statewide average between 2007 and 2016.

From 2007-2016, Mendocino County's fastest growing industries were mining, utilities and health care. In 2016, Mendocino County's farming, forestry/fishing, retail trade and accommodation/food service sectors were disproportionately larger than the statewide average. Conversely, Mendocino County's information, finance/ insurance, educational services and transportation/warehousing sectors were disproportionately smaller than the statewide average. In 2016, nearly 50 percent of Mendocino County's reported earnings derived from the government, health care and retail trade sectors. The percentage of Mendocino County's total earnings derived from the retail trade, forestry/fishing and accommodation/food service sectors were all substantially larger than the statewide average, while total earnings derived from the information, finance/insurance and educational services sectors were exceedingly less substantial than the statewide average.

## Lahor Force

What is it?
The labor force is the number of people living in the county who are considered willing and able to work. This is operationally defined by the California Employment Development Department as all individuals over the age of 16 who are either currently working or currently receiving unemployment benefits (which requires one to be actively seeking work). Therefore, changes in both employment and unemployment levels affect labor force size. Individuals who are unemployed and are no longer actively seeking work are considered discouraged workers, and are not included in labor force estimates. The data are provided as annual averages of monthly estimates from the California Employment Development Department.

## How is it used?

Labor force size is a useful indicator of the overall employment potential for a county. However, because labor force is an aggregate measure of both employment and unemployment, it is often necessary to interpret increases or declines in labor force size alongside these constitutive measures. Because discouraged workers are not included in labor force counts, these data can also be compared to the distribution of a county population by age, in order to identify the number of people of working age (16-65) who are not in a county's workforce.

The size of Mendocino County's labor force gradually declined between 2007 and 2009. Overall, Mendocino County experienced a reduction of over 7.5 percent in the size of its labor force between 2007 and 2016.



Total Labor Force, Mendocino County

| Year | Labor Force |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | County | State | County | State |
| 2007 | 43,120 | 17,893,100 | -0.3\% | 1.4\% |
| 2008 | 43,210 | 18,178,100 | 0.2\% | 1.6\% |
| 2009 | 43,310 | 18,215,100 | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| 2010 | 41,600 | 18,336,300 | -3.9\% | 0.7\% |
| 2011 | 40,950 | 18,415,100 | -1.6\% | 0.4\% |
| 2012 | 40,950 | 18,523,800 | 0.0\% | 0.6\% |
| 2013 | 40,840 | 18,624,300 | -0.3\% | 0.5\% |
| 2014 | 40,460 | 18,755,000 | -0.9\% | 0.7\% |
| 2015 | 39,930 | 18,893,200 | -1.3\% | 0.7\% |
| 2016 | 39,870 | 19,102,700 | -0.2\% | 1.1\% |

[^2]
## Employment

## What is it?

Employment data are reported by the California Employment Development Department, and represent a count of all individuals who either worked at least one hour for a wage or salary, were self-employed, or worked at least 15 unpaid hours in a family business or on a family farm, during the reference week of the previous month in the survey questionnaire. The reference week is usually the week containing the 12 th day of the previous month. Annual employment data are the averages of these monthly survey totals. Individuals who were on vacation, on other kinds of leave, or involved in a labor dispute are also counted as employed.

## How is it used?

Employment is a primary indicator of the economic situation for workers in a county. Increasing employment means more potential jobs for workers, and workers will generally have an easier time finding work in counties with higher employment totals. This is a primary indicator of the health of the economy as the unemployment rate is affected by labor force shifts.

Employment in Mendocino County decreased steadily between 2007 and 2011, before entering a period of gradual growth. Employment in Mendocino County was at its highest in 2007 and lowest in 2011. Overall, the number of employed individuals in Mendocino County experienced over a 7 percent decrease by 2016.


Total Employment, Mendocino County

|  | Employed |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | County | State |  | County | State |
| 2007 | 40,740 | $16,931,600$ |  | $-0.6 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2008 | 40,230 | $16,854,500$ |  | $-1.3 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2009 | 38,960 | $16,182,600$ |  | $-3.2 \%$ | $-4.0 \%$ |
| 2010 | 36,770 | $16,091,900$ |  | $-5.6 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| 2011 | 36,280 | $16,258,100$ |  | $-1.3 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | 36,840 | $16,602,700$ |  | $1.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| 2013 | 37,430 | $16,958,700$ |  | $1.6 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| 2014 | 37,630 | $17,348,600$ |  | $0.5 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2015 | 37,610 | $17,723,300$ |  | $-0.1 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| 2016 | 37,780 | $18,065,000$ |  | $0.5 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division



## Unemployment

What is it?
Unemployment data are counts of the estimated number of people who are actively seeking work, are not working at least one hour per week for pay, and who are not selfemployed. The data are reported by the California Employment Development Department (EDD) from data collected by the U.S. Current Population Survey (CPS). It is important to note that unemployment data do not include individuals who are not actively seeking work and thus no longer qualify for unemployment benefits, and thus represent an inexact estimation of the total unemployed population.

## How is it used?

Although unemployment levels are often used as a primary measure of economic health, it is perhaps more accurate to view them as an indicator of recent economic disruptions than a holistic indicator of growth or decline, due to its direct connection to unemployment benefits provision. Sustained high unemployment rates typically indicate the presence of structural economic and/or social issues within the community, although what is considered "high" may vary from one community to the next.

Unemployment in Mendocino County increased steadily between 2007 and 2010, before entering a period of steady decline from 2011-2016. Overall, the number of unemployed individuals in Mendocino County decreased by 290 individuals by 2016 .



Total Unemployment, Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Unemployed | Unemployment Rate |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County |  |  | County | State |  |  |
| 2007 | 2,370 | $5.5 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ |  |
| 2008 | 2,980 | $6.9 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $25.7 \%$ | $37.7 \%$ |  |
| 2009 | 4,350 | $10.0 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $46.0 \%$ | $53.6 \%$ |  |
| 2010 | 4,830 | $11.6 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ |  |
| 2011 | 4,670 | $11.4 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $-3.3 \%$ | $-3.9 \%$ |  |
| 2012 | 4,110 | $10.0 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $-12.0 \%$ | $-10.9 \%$ |  |
| 2013 | 3,410 | $8.3 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $-17.0 \%$ | $-13.3 \%$ |  |
| 2014 | 2,830 | $7.0 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $-17.0 \%$ | $-15.6 \%$ |  |
| 2015 | 2,310 | $5.8 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $-18.4 \%$ | $-16.8 \%$ |  |
| 2016 | 2,080 | $5.2 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $-10.0 \%$ | $-11.3 \%$ |  |

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division

## Seasonal Employment

## What is it?

Seasonal employment data are calculated using the monthly employment counts provided by the California Employment Development Department, as discussed in Employment indicator, but instead of calculating average employment for each year, the average for each month in the range of years is calculated. As with the previous employment indicator, employment status is determined by whether or not one is employed during the week that includes the 12 th day of the previous month. The mid-month period is used because it is less sensitive to changes in the overall business climate and thus more representative of average month-tomonth conditions.

Average Monthly Labor Statistics, Mendocino County, 2007-2016

| Month | Labor Force | Employed | Unemployed | Unemp. Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jan | 41,918 | 38,081 | 3,836 | $9.16 \%$ |
| Feb | 41,873 | 38,088 | 3,788 | $9.05 \%$ |
| Mar | 42,091 | 38,277 | 3,816 | $9.07 \%$ |
| April | 42,107 | 38,690 | 3,420 | $8.13 \%$ |
| May | 42,513 | 39,333 | 3,183 | $7.49 \%$ |
| Jun | 43,199 | 39,901 | 3,298 | $7.64 \%$ |
| Jul | 42,413 | 39,035 | 3,376 | $7.96 \%$ |
| Aug | 43,043 | 39,774 | 3,272 | $7.61 \%$ |
| Sep | 42,565 | 39,481 | 3,084 | $7.25 \%$ |
| Oct | 42,861 | 39,733 | 3,130 | $7.31 \%$ |
| Nov | 41,883 | 38,552 | 3,331 | $7.95 \%$ |
| Dec | 41,796 | 38,323 | 3,475 | $8.32 \%$ |

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division

Average Monthly Unemployment
Rate, 2007-2016

## How is it used?

Average monthly labor statistics are used to evaluate seasonal trends in employment, and can be used by area business associations and chambers of commerce to coordinate local events and business marketing campaigns. Areas that are economically dependent on agriculture, forestry, or seasonal recreation tend to experience greater fluctuations in employment over the course of the year that are obscured by annual averages. The employment differential between low- and high-employment months can be used to evaluate the relative degree to which an economy is dependent upon seasonal employment. Many seasonal employees locate temporarily and leave during the off-season, but some remain year-round and are unemployed during this period.

Between 2007 and 2016, Mendocino County experienced significant seasonal changes in employment. Employment levels were generally at their highest in June, August and October, and at their lowest levels in November through February. Average unemployment was highest in January at 9.2 percent, and at a low of 7.3 percent in September and October.

## Average Monthly Labor Force, Mendocino County 2007-2016



Average Monthly Employment, 2007-2016


## Jots By Indistry

## What is it?

Published by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), this indicator measures the number of jobs in a county within major industry sectors, regardless of whether or not the workers are themselves county residents. Because the BEA uses business tax returns to identify jobs within each industry, a worker who changed their workplace over the course of the year would be counted twice, once for each business's tax return. Self-employed proprietors and members of business partnerships are also included in jobs by industry data, meaning that someone who owns their own business but also works for another employer would also be counted twice. Unpaid family care workers and volunteers are not included.

## How is it used?

Jobs by industry is a useful measure of the economic diversity and potential resilience of the local economy, and is thus of great utility to local chambers of commerce and economic development organizations. A county with a large proportion of its jobs concentrated in a few industry sectors may be more susceptible to a recession or economic downturn than one with a more diversified economy.

From 2007-2016, Mendocino County's fastest growing industries were mining, utilities and health care. In 2016, Mendocino County's farming, forestry/fishing, retail trade and accommodation/food service sectors were disproportionately larger than the statewide average. Conversely, Mendocino County's information, finance/insurance, educational services and transportation/warehousing sectors were disproportionately smaller than the statewide average.

## Jobs by Industry, Mendocino County, 2016

| Industry | Mendocino County | County Percent of Total | California Percent of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farm employment | 1,782 | 3.6\% | 1.0\% |
| Forestry, fishing, and related activities | 1,368 | 2.8\% | 1.1\% |
| Mining | 161 | 0.3\% | 0.3\% |
| Utilities | 188 | 0.4\% | 0.3\% |
| Construction | 2,878 | 5.8\% | 4.7\% |
| Manufacturing | 3,208 | 6.5\% | 6.1\% |
| Wholesale trade | 1,132 | 2.3\% | 3.8\% |
| Retail trade | 5,989 | 12.1\% | 9.1\% |
| Transportation and warehousing | 862 | 1.7\% | 3.8\% |
| Information | 412 | 0.8\% | 2.6\% |
| Finance and insurance | 1,086 | 2.2\% | 4.4\% |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | g 2,048 | 4.1\% | 5.0\% |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services | 2,441 | 4.9\% | 8.6\% |
| Management of companies and enterprises | 215 | 0.4\% | 1.1\% |
| Administrative and waste services | 2,223 | 4.5\% | 6.4\% |
| Educational services | 513 | 1.0\% | 2.3\% |
| Health care and social assistance | 6,669 | 13.4\% | 11.2\% |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation | 1,350 | 2.7\% | 2.8\% |
| Accommodation and food services | 4,792 | 9.7\% | 7.5\% |
| Other services, except public administration | 3,242 | 6.5\% | 6.2\% |
| Government and government enterprises | 7,025 | 14.2\% | 11.8\% |
| Sum of withheld "(D)" values | (D) | 0.0\% | n/a |
| Total Jobs | 49,584 | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division


Jobs by Industry, Mendocino County, 2007

| Industry | Mendocino County | County <br> Percent of Total | California <br> Percent of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farm employment | 2,148 | 4.2\% | 1.1\% |
| Forestry, fishing, and related activities | 1,652 | 3.3\% | 1.0\% |
| Mining | 101 | n/a | 0.2\% |
| Utilities | 164 | 0.3\% | 0.3\% |
| Construction | 3,805 | 7.5\% | 5.9\% |
| Manufacturing | 3,521 | 6.9\% | 7.4\% |
| Wholesale trade | 1,011 | 2.0\% | 3.8\% |
| Retail trade | 6,216 | 12.2\% | 10.1\% |
| Transportation and warehousing | 852 | 1.7\% | 2.9\% |
| Information | 537 | 1.1\% | 2.7\% |
| Finance and insurance | 1,252 | 2.5\% | 4.6\% |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | 2,680 | 5.3\% | 5.7\% |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services | 2,754 | 5.4\% | 8.3\% |
| Management of companies and enterprises | 240 | 0.5\% | 1.0\% |
| Administrative and waste services | S 2,116 | 4.2\% | 6.4\% |
| Educational services | 561 | 1.1\% | 1.9\% |
| Health care and social assistance | 4,815 | 9.5\% | 8.4\% |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation | 1,238 | 2.4\% | 2.5\% |
| Accommodation and food services | 4,570 | 9.0\% | 6.8\% |
| Other services, except public administration | 3,153 | 6.2\% | 6.0\% |
| Government and government enterprises | 7,423 | 14.6\% | 12.9\% |
| Sum of withheld "(D)" values | (D) | 0.0\% | n/a |
| Total Jobs | 50,809 | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division


## Total Personal Income

## What is it?

Total personal income data are provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis. The indicator represents the sum of all income collected by individuals over the course of each year, including but not limited to earned income, government payments, and returns on investment. The data do not include personal contributions for social insurance (such as payments to Social Security or Medicare). The indicator is tabulated using individual and corporate tax returns from the Internal Revenue Service.

## How is it used?

Total personal income is the basis for several other income indicators in this section. Growing personal income generally indicates a growing economy, as long as the growth is greater than the annual average inflation rate. Increases or decreases in total personal income are most frequently due to changes in worker's earnings, population changes, or both.

Total personal income in Mendocino County grew steadily between 2007-2016, with the exceptions of 2009 and 2014 when it experienced declines, following the statewide changes. Total personal income in Mendocino County experienced its most significant growth in 2015. Overall, once adjusted for inflation, total personal income in Mendocino County increased by nearly four hundred million dollars between 2007 and 2016.





Total Personal Income, Mendocino County

| Year | Mendocino County |  |  | 1-Year Change | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { California } \\ \hline \text { 1-Year } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nominal Personal Income in Millions of Dollars | 1-Year Change | Inflation Adjusted Personal Income in Millions of Dollars (2016) |  |  |
| 2007 | \$3,013 | 4.8\% | \$3,593 | 4.8\% | 2.1\% |
| 2008 | \$3,102 | 2.9\% | \$3,547 | -1.3\% | -1.8\% |
| 2009 | \$2,994 | -3.5\% | \$3,423 | -3.5\% | -4.1\% |
| 2010 | \$3,087 | 3.1\% | \$3,439 | 0.5\% | 0.4\% |
| 2011 | \$3,237 | 4.9\% | \$3,548 | 3.2\% | 5.1\% |
| 2012 | \$3,427 | 5.9\% | \$3,650 | 2.9\% | 4.1\% |
| 2013 | \$3,551 | 3.6\% | \$3,723 | 2.0\% | 0.5\% |
| 2014 | \$3,475 | -2.1\% | \$3,586 | -3.7\% | 3.2\% |
| 2015 | \$3,843 | 10.6\% | \$3,913 | 9.1\% | 7.0\% |
| 2016 | \$3,981 | 3.6\% | \$3,981 | 1.8\% | 3.3\% |

[^3]
## Compponants of Personal Inoome

## What is it?

This indicator disaggregates personal income totals by the sources of personal income, including work earnings, retirement or disability benefits, returns on investment, or transfer payments from sources such as supplemental social security, medical benefits, and unemployment insurance. The U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis provides these county-level data.

## How is it used?

Understanding how income is earned in a county can provide important insights into the structure of a county's economy. If the largest proportion of income is from work earnings, then industry performance is likely to be driving economic growth. In contrast, if a high proportion of total personal income is derived from transfer payments through government benefit programs, this may indicate an elderly or infirm population.

The primary components of personal income in Mendocino County were work earnings, dividends, interest, rent, and medical benefits. A significantly larger portion of Mendocino County's personal income derived from retirement and veterans benefits when compared to the statewide average. While California witnessed a massive 73.5 percent increase in commuter income between 2007 and 2016, Mendocino County experienced a 22.5 percent decrease in commuter income.

## Components of Total Personal Income, Mendocino County, 2016

| Component | Percent of total in 2007 to 2016 Average 2016 <br> Annual Change |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | County | California | County | California |
| Work Earnings | 55.5\% | 71.6\% | 2.7\% | 3.5\% |
| Contributions to SSI, etc. | -5.9\% | -7.4\% | 2.7\% | 3.3\% |
| Commuter Income | -0.5\% | -0.1\% | -22.5\% | 73.5\% |
| Dividends, Interest, \& Rent | 23.6\% | 20.8\% | 1.6\% | 4.3\% |
| Retirement / Disability Benefits | 8.0\% | 4.2\% | 5.0\% | 5.3\% |
| Medical Benefits | 14.6\% | 7.5\% | 10.8\% | 9.1\% |
| Income Maintenance Benefits | 2.3\% | 1.6\% | 1.8\% | 3.4\% |
| Unemployment Benefits | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | -2.0\% | 0.4\% |
| Veterans benefits | 0.8\% | 0.4\% | 4.3\% | 14.8\% |
| Education and training assistance | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 12.9\% | 13.8\% |
| Other Government Benefits | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 288.5\% | 343.2\% |
| Nonprofit Institutions | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 2.2\% | 3.1\% |
| Private Personal Injury Liability | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 12.9\% | 14.0\% |
| Total Personal Income | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 3.2\% | 4.1\% |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis


## Components of Total Personal Income (Millions of Dollars), Mendocino County

| Component | 2007 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Work Earnings | $\$ 1,742.1$ | $\$ 1,739.0$ | $\$ 1,639.5$ | $\$ 1,650.7$ | $\$ 1,697.7$ | $\$ 1,772.1$ | $\$ 1,848.5$ | $\$ 1,929.8$ | $\$ 2,136.3$ | $\$ 2,210.7$ |
| Contributions to SSI, etc. | $-\$ 184.9$ | $-\$ 190.2$ | $-\$ 183.3$ | $-\$ 183.9$ | $-\$ 172.9$ | $-\$ 175.9$ | $-\$ 204.5$ | $-\$ 210.2$ | $-\$ 222.2$ | $-\$ 234.0$ |
| Commuter Income | $\$ 16.8$ | $\$ 14.3$ | $\$ 13.7$ | $\$ 14.5$ | $\$ 16.9$ | $\$ 20.0$ | $\$ 24.8$ | $-\$ 28.0$ | $-\$ 22.8$ | $-\$ 21.0$ |
| Dividends, Interest, and Rent | $\$ 811.1$ | $\$ 853.6$ | $\$ 753.6$ | $\$ 776.7$ | $\$ 866.9$ | $\$ 946.0$ | $\$ 974.9$ | $\$ 836.5$ | $\$ 898.0$ | $\$ 937.9$ |
| Retirement/ Disability Benefits | $\$ 212.4$ | $\$ 223.1$ | $\$ 242.5$ | $\$ 250.2$ | $\$ 258.2$ | $\$ 273.9$ | $\$ 285.1$ | $\$ 298.7$ | $\$ 310.0$ | $\$ 318.2$ |
| Medical Benefits | $\$ 279.1$ | $\$ 308.8$ | $\$ 337.7$ | $\$ 373.0$ | $\$ 370.7$ | $\$ 399.1$ | $\$ 437.9$ | $\$ 490.0$ | $\$ 556.4$ | $\$ 581.6$ |
| Income Maintenance Benefits | $\$ 79.1$ | $\$ 81.4$ | $\$ 90.4$ | $\$ 96.1$ | $\$ 97.1$ | $\$ 96.0$ | $\$ 95.1$ | $\$ 96.9$ | $\$ 96.3$ | $\$ 93.2$ |
| Unemployment Benefits | $\$ 13.9$ | $\$ 19.0$ | $\$ 39.0$ | $\$ 42.7$ | $\$ 35.3$ | $\$ 28.5$ | $\$ 20.8$ | $\$ 13.2$ | $\$ 11.2$ | $\$ 11.1$ |
| Veterans benefits | $\$ 21.3$ | $\$ 22.1$ | $\$ 22.9$ | $\$ 24.4$ | $\$ 24.9$ | $\$ 26.1$ | $\$ 29.0$ | $\$ 29.0$ | $\$ 30.0$ | $\$ 30.6$ |
| Education and training assistance | $\$ 7.5$ | $\$ 8.6$ | $\$ 11.3$ | $\$ 13.4$ | $\$ 13.8$ | $\$ 15.3$ | $\$ 16.3$ | $\$ 15.7$ | $\$ 16.0$ | $\$ 17.2$ |
| Other Government Benefits | $\$ 0.5$ | $\$ 24.6$ | $\$ 10.3$ | $\$ 20.6$ | $\$ 18.2$ | $\$ 2.7$ | $\$ 2.2$ | $\$ 10.2$ | $\$ 13.4$ | $\$ 14.0$ |
| Nonprofit Institutions | $\$ 9.2$ | $\$ 9.0$ | $\$ 9.6$ | $\$ 10.6$ | $\$ 10.2$ | $\$ 10.8$ | $\$ 10.9$ | $\$ 11.2$ | $\$ 11.1$ | $\$ 11.2$ |
| Private Personal Injury Liability | $\$ 4.7$ | $\$ 7.0$ | $\$ 7.3$ | $\$ 7.4$ | $\$ 9.8$ | $\$ 7.3$ | $\$ 6.8$ | $\$ 7.8$ | $\$ 9.3$ | $\$ 10.9$ |
| Total Personal Income | $\$ 3,012.9$ | $\$ 3,120.3$ | $\$ 2,994.6$ | $\$ 3,096.5$ | $\$ 3,246.8$ | $\$ 3,422.2$ | $\$ 3,547.9$ | $\$ 3,500.8$ | $\$ 3,842.9$ | $\$ 3,981.4$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis



Note: Other government benefits is not included for components of total personal income in this figure due to large fluctuations in its 10-year average percent change.

## Per Capita Income

## What is it?

Per capita income is calculated by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis by dividing its estimate of total personal income by the U.S. Census Bureau's estimate of total population.

## How is it used?

Per capita income is one of the most commonly used indicators of the general economic well-being of a county. Changes in this variable may indicate changes in a county's standard of living or the availability of resources to individuals and families. Per capita income also tends to follow long-term business cycles, rising during expansions and falling during recessions. Income influences individual buying power and therefore affects consumer choices and local retail sales.

Per capita income in Mendocino County grew gradually between 2007 and 2016, with the exceptions of 2009 and 2014 when it experienced slight declines. Per capita income in Mendocino County experienced its most significant growth in 2015. Between 2007 and 2016, Mendocino County maintained an inflation-adjusted per capita income roughly $\$ 9,000-\$ 12,000$ lower than the statewide average.



Per Capita Income, Mendocino County

| Year | Mendocino County Nominal <br> Per Capita Income | Mendocino County <br> 1-Year Change | Inflation-adjusted Per Capita Income (2016) |  | Inflation-adjusted <br> 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mendocino County | California | Mendocino County | California |
| 2007 | \$ 34,387 | 5.0\% | \$ 39,298 | \$ 49,366 | 5.0\% | 3.4\% |
| 2008 | \$ 35,361 | 2.8\% | \$ 38,911 | \$ 48,255 | -1.0\% | -2.2\% |
| 2009 | \$ 34,144 | -3.4\% | \$ 37,711 | \$ 46,117 | -3.1\% | -4.4\% |
| 2010 | \$ 35,154 | 3.0\% | \$ 38,186 | \$ 46,395 | 1.3\% | 0.6\% |
| 2011 | \$ 36,903 | 5.0\% | \$ 38,874 | \$ 47,775 | 1.8\% | 3.0\% |
| 2012 | \$ 38,965 | 5.6\% | \$ 40,206 | \$ 49,819 | 3.4\% | 4.3\% |
| 2013 | \$ 40,128 | 3.0\% | \$ 40,810 | \$ 49,674 | 1.5\% | -0.3\% |
| 2014 | \$ 39,029 | -2.7\% | \$ 39,064 | \$ 50,790 | -4.3\% | 2.2\% |
| 2015 | \$ 43,589 | 11.7\% | \$ 43,661 | \$ 54,318 | 11.8\% | 6.9\% |
| 2016 | \$ 45,050 | 3.4\% | \$ 45,050 | \$ 56,532 | 3.2\% | 4.1\% |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

## Earinings By Industry

## What is it?

Earnings by industry data represent the total personal earnings for workers within individual industry sectors, and should not be confused with total business revenues within industries. The total earnings of an industry are calculated by taking the sum of three components: wage and salary disbursements, supplements to wages and salaries, and proprietor's income. Earnings by industry are the components of earnings by place of work from the section on components of personal income. The symbol "(D)" is used for information withheld to avoid disclosing data for individual companies. The symbol "( L )" is used when reported values are less than $\$ 50,000$. Values for both (D) and $(\mathrm{L})$ are included in aggregate totals.

## How is it used?

Earning levels by industry are important indicators of the overall economic contributions of particular industries to a local economy. Similar to the previous Jobs by Industry indicator, these data can also provide important insights into the relative diversification of a county's economy, and thus how resilient an economy is to economic downturns or recessions.

In 2016, nearly 50 percent of Mendocino County's reported earnings derived from the government, health care and retail trade sectors. The percentage of Mendocino County's total earnings derived from the retail trade, forestry/ fishing and accommodation/food service sectors were all substantially larger than the statewide average, while total earnings derived from the information, finance/insurance and educational services sectors were exceedingly less substantial than the statewide average.

Earnings by Industry, Mendocino County, 2016 (in Millions)

| Industry | Mendocino County | County Percent of Total | California Percent of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farm earnings | \$ 35.3 | 1.6\% | 1\% |
| Forestry, fishing, and related activities | \$ 54.4 | 2.5\% | 1\% |
| Mining | \$ 2.7 | 0.1\% | 0\% |
| Utilities | \$ 26.8 | 1.2\% | 1\% |
| Construction | \$ 186.0 | 8.4\% | 5\% |
| Manufacturing | \$ 185.9 | 8.4\% | 9\% |
| Wholesale trade | \$ 52.7 | 2.4\% | 4\% |
| Retail trade | \$ 241.8 | 10.9\% | 6\% |
| Transportation and warehousing | \$ 45.2 | 2.0\% | 3\% |
| Information | \$ 22.0 | 1.0\% | 7\% |
| Finance and insurance | \$ 37.5 | 1.7\% | 5\% |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | \$ 38.4 | 1.7\% | 3\% |
| Professional, scientific, and technical services | \$ 77.7 | 3.5\% | 12\% |
| Management of companies and enterprises | \$ 16.6 | 0.8\% | 2\% |
| Administrative and waste services | \$ 77.9 | 3.5\% | 4\% |
| Educational services | \$ 9.7 | 0.4\% | 2\% |
| Health care and social assistance | \$ 294.6 | 13.3\% | 9\% |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation | \$ 21.9 | 1.0\% | 2\% |
| Accommodation and food services | \$ 144.8 | 6.5\% | 3\% |
| Other services, except public administration | \$ 123.3 | 5.6\% | 4\% |
| Government and government enterprises | \$ 515.6 | 23.3\% | 17\% |
| Value of withheld "(D)" earnings | \$0.0 | 0.0\% | n/a |
| Total Earnings by Place of Work | \$ 2,210.7 | 100.0\% | 100\% |

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division


## Meilian Holvsholid h heome

## What is it?

Household income includes the incomes of the householder (i.e. renter or title holder) and all other people 15 year of age and older in the household, regardless of their relation to the householder. Once income totals for all households are gathered, the median value is the data point at which exactly one-half of households have greater income and one-half of households have less income. The median value is based on the income distribution of all households, including those with no income.

How is it used?
Median household income is a more useful measure of collective economic well-being than per capita income because it aggregates income levels within a basic unit of economic collaboration and decision making. Median income values are also less sensitive to fluctuations at the extreme high and low ends of a county's earnings spectrum, and changes in median household income therefore signal changes within a wide range of earnings in a regional economy.

Median household income in Mendocino County experienced little change between 2007 and 2016. Overall, median household income in Mendocino County increased by roughly 7 percent between 2007 and 2016. Mendocino County consistently maintained a median household income roughly $\$ 20,000$ less than California as a whole.

Median Household Income (Nominal), Mendocino County

| Year | County | California |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | $\$ 42,329$ | $\$ 59,928$ |
| 2008 | $\$ 43,134$ | $\$ 61,017$ |
| 2009 | $\$ 41,488$ | $\$ 58,925$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 40,339$ | $\$ 57,664$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 41,236$ | $\$ 57,275$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 41,088$ | $\$ 58,322$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 42,001$ | $\$ 60,185$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 42,840$ | $\$ 61,927$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 43,237$ | $\$ 64,483$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 45,247$ | $\$ 67,715$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates



## Poverty Rates

## What is it?

The Census Bureau determines whether or not a family is in poverty using a series of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition. If a family's total income is less than that family's poverty threshold, then every person in that household is considered to be in poverty. Official poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but are updated for inflation using the Consumer Price Index. Income thresholds are based on pre-tax earnings and do not include capital gains or noncash benefits such as Medicaid.

## How is it used?

The poverty rate is a very commonly used indicator of the overall economic health and well-being of a region. Despite their wide use, official poverty rates have notable shortcomings. For instance, because the thresholds that define poverty status only vary by family size and composition, and not by the underlying cost of living in a particular neighborhood or community (e.g., housing and insurance costs), they tend to either over- or underestimate the real level of economic hardship in a region.

Poverty rates in Mendocino County rose gradually between 2007 and 2016. Mendocino County's poverty rate was at its lowest of 15.4 percent in 2007 and its highest of 20.9 percent in 2013. Mendocino County's poverty rates consistently remained higher than the statewide average between 2007 and 2016.

Poverty Rates, Mendocino County

| Year | County | California |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | $15.4 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ |
| 2008 | $17.7 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ |
| 2009 | $17.5 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ |
| 2010 | $19.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ |
| 2011 | $20.2 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ |
| 2012 | $21.3 \%$ | $17.0 \%$ |
| 2013 | $20.9 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ |
| 2014 | $18.8 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ |
| 2015 | $20.3 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ |
| 2016 | $19.0 \%$ | $14.4 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates



## Fair Market Rent

## What is it?

Fair market rent is defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as the price point where 40 percent of gross rents for typical, non-substandard housing units are below it and 60 percent of gross rents are above it. Gross rent is the sum of the rent paid to a landlord plus any utility costs incurred by the tenant. Fair market rent calculations typically exclude rents paid for public housing units, rental units built in the last 2 years, rental units considered substandard in quality, seasonal rentals, and rental units on 10 or more acres of land. Fair market rent does not include public housing costs to avoid skewing the distribution of rents downward.

## How is it used?

Fair market rent is an indicator of housing costs for poorer households in a county, and is used to determine whether families or individuals qualify for federal housing certificate and voucher programs and the amount of compensation they would receive. Because calculation of fair market rents incorporates the total distribution of gross rents within a region, it can also be a helpful indicator of overall housing costs, and, by extension, the general cost of living for that region.

Fair market rent in Mendocino County rose gradually between 2009 and 2018. Fair market rent in Mendocino County remained consistently 15-30 percent lower than the statewide average.

## Fair Market Rent, Mendocino County

| Year | 0-Bedroom | 1-Bedroom | 2-Bedroom | 3-Bedroom | 4-Bedroom |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | $\$ 627$ | $\$ 774$ | $\$ 940$ | $\$ 1,283$ | $\$ 1,649$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 646$ | $\$ 797$ | $\$ 969$ | $\$ 1,323$ | $\$ 1,700$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 663$ | $\$ 818$ | $\$ 994$ | $\$ 1,357$ | $\$ 1,743$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 648$ | $\$ 799$ | $\$ 971$ | $\$ 1,325$ | $\$ 1,703$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 700$ | $\$ 749$ | $\$ 989$ | $\$ 1,363$ | $\$ 1,647$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 656$ | $\$ 702$ | $\$ 927$ | $\$ 1,277$ | $\$ 1,544$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 811$ | $\$ 869$ | $\$ 1,147$ | $\$ 1,580$ | $\$ 1,910$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 733$ | $\$ 789$ | $\$ 1,056$ | $\$ 1,505$ | $\$ 1,609$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 706$ | $\$ 776$ | $\$ 1,031$ | $\$ 1,460$ | $\$ 1,590$ |
| 2018 | $\$ 708$ | $\$ 777$ | $\$ 1,033$ | $\$ 1,461$ | $\$ 1,653$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development


Fair Market Rent, 4-Bedroom Units $\quad$ Mendocino County


## SOCIAL INDICATORS

Social indicators explain the capacity of community institutions and organizations to provide for adequate human health, education, safety and social participation. Effective social systems intensify human capacities for collective growth and improvement. Many of the included indicators are often referred to as "quality-of-life" measures because they include non-economic attributes that reflect the general health and well-being of community members.
*Note: (D) Withheld disclosure of confidential health data
Mendocino County crime rates fluctuated between 2007 and 2016, but ultimately rose by 2016. Mendocino County's crime rates consistently remained higher than statewide crime rates from 20072016. Voter registration rates in Mendocino County rose slightly from 2002-2016. Mendocino County experienced a percentage of voter participation between 2002 and 2016 roughly equivalent to the statewide average. Causes of death in Mendocino County differed very little from the statewide averages except for slightly higher rates of pulmonary disease, accidents and cirrhosis.

The number of TANF/CalWORKS recipients in Mendocino County declined gradually between 2007 and 2016. Recipients of TANF/ CalWorks per capita in Mendocino County roughly equivalent to the statewide average between 2007 and 2016. Between 2007 and 2016 the number of Medi-Cal beneficiaries in Mendocino County increased to over double its 2007 total; seeing its greatest increase of nearly 12 percent in 2014.

When compared to the statewide average in 2016, Mendocino County had a high percentage of residents of the age of 18 or over who had completed high school or some college but had not attained a degree. Mendocino County consistently maintained a roughly equivalent percentage of high school dropouts when compared to the rest of California between 2006 and 2016. Overall, dropout rates in Mendocino County declined between 2006 and 2016. The percentage of Mendocino County graduates eligible for the UC or CSU experienced little change with the exception of a massive 39.6 percent percent drop after the 2006-2007 school year. With the exception of the 2006-2007 school year, the percentage of Mendocino County graduates eligible for the UC or CSU systems remained roughly 10 percent lower than the percentage of eligible graduates statewide between 2006 and 2016. SAT scores in Mendocino County fluctuated, but ultimately declined between 2006 and 2016, yet they remained consistently one or more deviations above the statewide average. Mendocino County maintained a higher percentage of students enrolled in free and reduced meal programs than the statewide average between 2008 and 2017. Until 2015, the percentage of students enrolled in English Language Learner (ELL) programs in Mendocino County was consistently lower than the statewide average; in 2015, the percentage of students enrolled in ELL programs in Mendocino County surpassed the statewide average and remained so through 2017.
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## Leading Causes of Death

## What is it?

This indicator lists the top ten most frequent causes of death for all county residents in 2016, and is derived from vital records data provided by the California Department of Public Health.

## How is it used?

Cause of death statistics provide important insights into the overall health of a region, and can be used by health care practitioners and social service providers to coordinate disease prevention and educational efforts. If death rates for preventable causes are greater than those for other counties in a region, this is indicative of a greater need for community health education. If death rates for environmentally influenced factors, such as cancer and influenza, are high, this may indicate the presence of systemic factors that need to be addressed.

Like the rest of California in 2016, Mendocino County's leading causes of death were heart disease and cancer. Causes of death in Mendocino County differed very little from the statewide averages except for slightly higher rates of pulmonary disease, accidents and cirrhosis.

Cause of Death as a Percentage of Total Deaths, 2016

| Cause of Death | Mendocino County | California |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Heart Disease | $21.2 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ |
| Cancer | $22.2 \%$ | $22.7 \%$ |
| Stroke | $4.2 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| Pulmonary Disease | $6.5 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |
| Accidents | $7.4 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ |
| Alzheimer's | $1.6 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |
| Diabetes | $2.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Pneumonia \& Influenza | $1.8 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Cirrhosis | $3.4 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Suicide | $2.3 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| All other causes | $26.6 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ |

Source: California Department of Public Health


## Leading Causes of Death, Mendocino County

| Causes of Death | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Causes | 792 | 823 | 802 | 828 | 773 | 826 | 877 | 861 | 842 | 873 |
| Heart Disease | 215 | 220 | 228 | 193 | 197 | 221 | 188 | 197 | 221 | 185 |
| Cancer | 170 | 178 | 194 | 209 | 176 | 192 | 205 | 196 | 211 | 194 |
| Stroke | 32 | 52 | 36 | 44 | 27 | 44 | 49 | 44 | 48 | 37 |
| Pulmonary Disease | 53 | 49 | 52 | 58 | 45 | 64 | 61 | 49 | 42 | 57 |
| Accidents | 50 | 50 | 55 | 54 | 50 | 43 | 45 | 64 | 49 | 65 |
| Alzheimer's | 18 | 22 | 13 | 16 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 17 | 15 | 14 |
| Diabetes | 15 | 18 | 12 | 19 | 16 | 19 | 17 | 26 | 18 | 23 |
| Pneumonia \& Influenza | 18 | 16 | 16 | 11 | 16 | 15 | 21 | 14 | 19 | 16 |
| Cirrhosis | 17 | 19 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 17 | 21 | 12 | 30 |
| Suicide | 22 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 18 | 13 | 27 | 23 | 15 | 20 |
| All other causes | 182 | 175 | 160 | 187 | 194 | 178 | 226 | 210 | 192 | 232 |

Source: California Department of Public Health

## TANF-CalWORKS Caseload

## What is it?

The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) is California's federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, which gives cash aid and services to eligible needy California families. If a family has little or no cash and is in need of housing, food, utilities, clothing, or medical care, they may be eligible to receive immediate short-term help through CalWORKS. The program also provides access to education, employment, and workforce training programs to assist a family's move toward self-sufficiency. The CalWORKS program is administered by each county's welfare department.

## How is it used?

Data on the number of families that qualify for economic assistance through CalWORKS and similar programs can be important supplements to the official poverty rate, as families experiencing sufficient economic hardship to qualify for CalWORKS may not necessarily also be below official poverty thresholds. Such data are therefore important for county and municipal planners and policymakers in understanding the overall level of economic hardship in a county or region.

The number of TANF/CalWORKS recipients in Mendocino County declined gradually between 2007 and 2016. Recipients of TANF/CalWorks per capita in Mendocino County were roughly equivalent to the statewide average between 2007 and 2016.


TANF/CalWORKs Caseloads, Mendocino County

| Year | Average Number <br> of recipients | Percent of <br> County Population | Percent of <br> State Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 3,070 | $3.5 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| 2008 | 3,078 | $3.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2009 | 3,261 | $3.7 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| 2010 | 3,425 | $3.9 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| 2011 | 3,293 | $3.7 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| 2012 | 3,169 | $3.6 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 3,095 | $3.5 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| 2014 | 2,987 | $3.4 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| 2015 | 2,898 | $3.3 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| 2016 | 2,513 | $2.8 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |

Source: California Department of Social Services



## Medi-Gal Gaseload

## What is it?

Medi-Cal is California's version for the federal Medicaid program, and offers access to free or low-cost health insurance for children and adults with limited resources or income.
Common Medi-Cal recipients include low-income adults, families with children, seniors, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, children in foster care and former foster youth up to age 26.

## How is it used?

Data on Medi-Cal program recipients is helpful in determining the need for public medical assistance in a county. Similar to the CalWORKS caseload data, this indicator can also provide important insights into general economic hardship in a region by identifying needy individuals and families who may not be below official poverty thresholds.

Between 2007 and 2016, the number of Medi-Cal beneficiaries in Mendocino County increased to over double its 2007 total; seeing its greatest increase of nearly 12 percent in 2014. Mendocino County's increase in Medi-Cal beneficiaries mirrors statewide changes throughout California; however, Medi-Cal beneficiaries have consistently made up a significantly larger percentage of Mendocino County's population when compared to the statewide average.



Medi-Cal Users, Mendocino County

| Year | County <br> Beneficiaries | Percentage of County <br> Non-Incarcerated Population | California <br> Beneficiaries | Percentage of California <br> Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 20,012 | $22.8 \%$ | $6,553,258$ | $18.0 \%$ |
| 2008 | 20,298 | $23.1 \%$ | $6,721,003$ | $18.3 \%$ |
| 2009 | 21,446 | $24.5 \%$ | $7,094,877$ | $19.2 \%$ |
| 2010 | 22,302 | $25.4 \%$ | $7,397,748$ | $19.9 \%$ |
| 2011 | 22,789 | $26.0 \%$ | $7,594,640$ | $20.4 \%$ |
| 2012 | 23,130 | $26.4 \%$ | $7,619,341$ | $20.3 \%$ |
| 2013 | 24,722 | $27.8 \%$ | $7,280,074$ | $19.0 \%$ |
| 2014 | 35,146 | $39.5 \%$ | $11,522,700$ | $30.1 \%$ |
| 2015 | 39,634 | $45.0 \%$ | $12,834,234$ | $33.0 \%$ |
| 2016 | 41,878 | $47.4 \%$ | $13,542,960$ | $34.6 \%$ |

[^4]
## School Free and Reduced Meal Program

## What is it?

This indicator provides data on the number and proportion of K - 12 students who are enrolled in a free or reducedprice school meal program. Families only have to claim a household income level that is below the given threshold to enroll their children in the program, and no evidence or auditing of family income is required. Thus, the indicator is an effective proxy for student poverty but does not necessarily reflect the true economic status of enrolled families. Students enrolled in this program are counted on Fall Census Day, which is the first Wednesday in October for each academic year.

## How is it used?

Enrollment data on free and reduced meal programs aid in the estimation of family economic assistance needs in a county. Enrollment totals and proportions can also be used to determine a school's eligibility for receiving funding from official programs and grants intended to alleviate student poverty.

The percentage of Mendocino County students enrolled in free and reduced meal programs experienced minor fluctuations but slight overall growth between 2008 and 2017. Mendocino County maintained a higher percentage of students enrolled in free and reduced meal programs than the statewide average between 2008 and 2017. In 2013, when California witnessed a 10 percent drop in enrollment, enrollment in Mendocino County decreased by only 2.6 percent.


| County Percent of Students Using | - Mendocino County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Free and Reduced Meals Program | ■alifomia |



School Free and Reduced Meals, Mendocino County

| Year | Total Free and <br> Reduced Meals | Total <br> Enrollment | Percent of Students | 8,395 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

[^5]
## Educational Attainment

## What is it?

Educational attainment is the highest degree earned or amount of schooling completed for all county residents aged 18 and older. Schooling completed in foreign countries or ungraded school systems are reported as the equivalent level of schooling in the regular American educational system.

## How is it used?

Educational attainment is a good general indicator of the skill level of a county's workforce. County populations that are more educated are generally more likely to be employed and stay out of poverty. In addition, educational attainment data can be useful for businesses that are considering opening a new location or relocating and want to identify areas with a sufficiently skilled and educated workforce.

When compared to the statewide average in 2016, Mendocino County had a high percentage of residents of the age of 18 or over who had completed high school or some college but had not attained a degree. A smaller percentage of Mendocino
 County residents held bachelor's and/or graduate degrees when compared to the statewide average.

## Education Attainment, Mendocino County

| Educational Attainment | 2007 | 2016 | Percent of Total in 2016 |  | 2007 to 2016 10-year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | County | California | County | California |
| Less than 9th grade | 5,785 | 4,930 | 7.2\% | 8.7\% | - 14.8\% | 0.3\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 7,895 | 6,189 | 9.1\% | 8.1\% | - 21.6\% | -8.9\% |
| High school graduate or equivalent | 17,631 | 17,525 | 25.7\% | 21.6\% | - 0.6\% | -1.8\% |
| Some college, no degree | 13,387 | 20,117 | 29.4\% | 24.1\% | 50.3\% | 21.0\% |
| Associate's degree | 7,656 | 5,267 | 7.7\% | 7.3\% | - 31.2\% | 12.6\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 8,959 | 9,683 | 14.2\% | 19.3\% | 8.1\% | 22.8\% |
| Graduate or professional degree | 5,445 | 4,599 | 6.7\% | 10.9\% | - 15.5\% | 32.0\% |
| Total Persons Age 18 and Over | 66,758 | 68,310 | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 2.3\% | 11.2\% |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey, 2007 \& 2016 1-yr estimates ACS



## Hight School Dropout Rate

## What is it?

High school dropout rate data are calculated by the California Department of Education by adding each school's number of dropouts from the 12th grade for the current year, from the 11th grade the previous year, from the 10th grade two years previous, and from the 9th grade three years previous, and then dividing by the total number of high school graduates for the current year.


High School Dropouts, Mendocino County

| Year | Number of <br> dropouts | 1-year <br> dropout rate | CA 1-year <br> dropout rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-07$ | 236 | $4.9 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ |
| $2007-08$ | 236 | $5.0 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| $2008-09$ | 319 | $7.1 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| $2009-10$ | 146 | $3.4 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| $2010-11$ | 116 | $2.7 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| $2011-12$ | 105 | $2.5 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ | 163 | $3.8 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| $2013-14$ | 131 | $3.1 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| $2014-15$ | 93 | $2.3 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ |
| $2015-16$ | 98 | $2.4 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ |

Source: California Department of Education

## How is it used?

Data on high school dropouts indicate the capacity of county school systems to provide youth with a basic level of education and workforce training. Lower dropout rates are generally correlated with lower poverty rates and higher income levels, as employers frequently require a high school degree for most jobs.

Mendocino County consistently maintained a roughly equivalent percentage of high school dropouts when compared to the rest of California between 2006 and 2016. Overall, dropout rates in Mendocino County declined between 2006 and 2016. Mendocino County saw its lowest high school dropout rates of 2.3 percent in the 2014-2015 school year.

- Cail Dernia Department Education

Number of High School Dropouts ——Mendocino County



## Graduates Eligihle For UC \& CSU Systems

## What is it?

This indicator provides data on the number of high school graduates who completed coursework that is required for admission by either the California State University or the University of California postsecondary education systems. These data were reported by individual public schools to the California Department of Education, and do not include information on other common requirements for college admission such as standardized test scores.

## How is it used?

These data are an important indicator of how well a county school system is preparing its students for higher-wage employment, as a college education is generally correlated with higher earnings from employment. Counties with a low proportion of eligible high school graduates may therefore exhibit greater competition for jobs in lower-wage sectors of the regional economy.

Between 2006 and 2016, the percentage of Mendocino County graduates eligible for the UC or CSU experienced little change with the exception of a 39.6 percent percent drop after the 2006-2007 school year. With the exception of the 2006-2007 school year, the percentage of Mendocino County graduates eligible for the UC or CSU systems remained roughly 10 percent lower than the percentage of eligible graduates statewide between 2006 and 2016.


Graduates Eligible for UC or CSU System, Mendocino County

|  | County Graduates |  | CA Graduates |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Number | Mendocino County |  |
| California |  |  |  |
| $2006-07$ | 556 | $64.4 \%$ | $35.5 \%$ |
| $2007-08$ | 239 | $24.8 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ |
| $2008-09$ | 165 | $18.8 \%$ | $35.3 \%$ |
| $2009-10$ | 248 | $27.1 \%$ | $36.3 \%$ |
| $2010-11$ | 217 | $25.4 \%$ | $40.3 \%$ |
| $2011-12$ | 239 | $26.1 \%$ | $38.3 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ | 192 | $21.9 \%$ | $39.4 \%$ |
| $2013-14$ | 225 | $25.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ |
| $2014-15$ | 215 | $23.8 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ |
| $2015-16$ | 256 | $28.0 \%$ | $45.4 \%$ |

Source: California Department of Education

## Percentage of County Graduates Eligible for UC or CSU System <br> $\longrightarrow$ Mendocino County



## Graduates Eligible for UC or CSU System



## Average SAT Series

What is it?
The SAT is designed to measure verbal and mathematical reasoning abilities that are related to successful performance in college. Like many standardized tests, however, SAT scores are most strongly correlated with socioeconomic status, since betterresourced students will generally have more preparatory options and resources. Sufficiently high SAT scores are a requirement for admission to most American colleges and universities, although the strong correlation with economic status has generated challenges to these requirements from many educators.

## How is it used?

SAT scores are usually treated as an indicator of academic performance and college readiness for children in local schools, except where an exceptionally low or high percentage of students took the test. Because scores are standardized, test results provide a baseline for comparing student performance across all regions of the country. However, their utility has been challenged due to the strong correlation between scores and socioeconomic status.

The average SAT scores in Mendocino County fluctuated but ultimately declined between 2006 and 2016. SAT scores in Mendocino County were consistently above the statewide average.

Average SAT Scores (out of 2,400), Mendocino County

| Year | Mendocino County |  | California |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent of Students who took SAT | Average SAT Scores | Percent of Students who took SAT | Average SAT Scores |
| 2006-07 | 31.4\% | 1,557 | 36.9\% | 1,497 |
| 2007-08 | 28.4\% | 1,521 | 35.9\% | 1,500 |
| 2008-09 | 26.1\% | 1,543 | 34.7\% | 1,502 |
| 2009-10 | 25.2\% | 1,569 | 33.3\% | 1,521 |
| 2010-11 | 25.3\% | 1,559 | 37.9\% | 1,502 |
| 2011-12 | 26.9\% | 1,527 | 39.3\% | 1,492 |
| 2012-13 | 27.3\% | 1,512 | 40.4\% | 1,489 |
| 2013-14 | 25.3\% | 1,538 | 41.1\% | 1,487 |
| 2014-15 | 26.6\% | 1,524 | 42.4\% | 1,473 |
| 2015-16 | 30.8\% | 1,504 | 43.5\% | 1,455 |

Source: California Department of Education
*In newly released 2016 data, the method used to calculate average SAT scores has changed, and therefore is not directly comparable to previous year's data.


## English Learners Enrollment

## What is it?

This indicator provides data on the number of K - 12 students enrolled in English language learning (ELL) programs, which were previously referred to as "English as a second language" (ESL) programs. The California Department of Education tabulates enrollment based on annual reports from individual school districts.


## How is it used?

ELL enrollment data can be an important indicator of international migration or internal migration of non-Englishspeaking populations into an area. The ability and willingness of non-English speakers to learn and use English is also commonly seen as indicative of their willingness to "assimilate" into the English-speaking community, and can therefore influence their access to jobs and community resources.

ELL enrollment in Mendocino County rose between 2007 and 2017, with the exception of the 2008-2009 and 2010-2011 school years. Overall, ELL enrollment in Mendocino County rose by 239 students between 2007 and 2017. ELL enrollment in Mendocino County was at its highest in the 2016-2017 school year, and its lowest in the 2008-2009 school year. Until 2015, the percentage of students enrolled in ELL programs in Mendocino County was consistently lower than the statewide average; in 2015, the percentage of students enrolled in ELL programs in Mendocino County surpassed the statewide average and remained so through 2017.


English Language Learning Program Enrollment, Mendocino County

| Year | Mendocino County |  |  |  | California |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Enrolled E.L.L. Students | Percentage Change in E.L.L. Enrollment | Total Enrolled Students K-12 | Percent of Enrolled Students in E.L.L. | Percent of Enrolled E.L.L Students |
| 2007-08 | 2,632 | 3.5\% | 13,407 | 19.6\% | 25.2\% |
| 2008-09 | 2,527 | -4.0\% | 12,928 | 19.5\% | 24.7\% |
| 2009-10 | 2,665 | 5.5\% | 12,925 | 20.6\% | 24.0\% |
| 2010-11 | 2,537 | -4.8\% | 12,725 | 19.9\% | 24.0\% |
| 2011-12 | 2,546 | 0.4\% | 13,049 | 19.5\% | 22.6\% |
| 2012-13 | 2,555 | 0.4\% | 13,100 | 19.5\% | 21.7\% |
| 2013-14 | 2,716 | 6.3\% | 13,148 | 20.7\% | 22.7\% |
| 2014-15 | 2,757 | 1.5\% | 13,009 | 21.2\% | 21.5\% |
| 2015-16 | 2,865 | 3.9\% | 13,210 | 21.7\% | 21.3\% |
| 2016-17 | 2,871 | 0.2\% | 13,174 | 21.8\% | 21.4\% |
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## Crime Rates

## What is it?

This indicator provides data on property, violent, and total crime rates for Mendocino county. A county's crime rate is the number of reported crimes per 1,000 residents. These data are reported by the California Department of Justice and reflect all misdemeanor and felony reports, but do not include reports for minor violations and infractions.


## How is it used?

The relative level of criminal activity in a county is a major factor in how residents perceive their quality of life. An area with a high crime rate is often seen as a much less attractive place to live than one with a low rate. However, crime rates are also dependent on other factors besides the actual incidence of criminal activity, such as the willingness of residents to report crimes to police and overall population density. Crime rates are also generally correlated with the spatial concentration of disadvantage, such as poverty and unemployment.

Mendocino County crime rates fluctuated between 2007 and 2016, but ultimately rose by 2016. Mendocino County's crime rate was its highest in 2013 when both Mendocino County and California crime rates increased significantly. Mendocino County's crime rates consistently remained higher than statewide crime rates from 2007-2016.

| Total Crime Rate per 1,000 Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mendocino } \\ & \text { County } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $35$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $20 \sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Crime Rate per 1,000 Population, Mendocino County

|  | Property Crime Rate |  |  | Violent Crime Rate |  |  | Total Crime Rate |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | County | California |  | County | California |  | County |  |
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## Property Crimes, Mendocino County

| Year | Burglary | Motor Vehicle <br> Theft | Larceny <br> Over $\mathbf{\$ 4 0 0}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 604 | 157 | 248 | 1,009 |
| 2008 | 597 | 122 | 267 | 986 |
| 2009 | 469 | 99 | 209 | 777 |
| 2010 | 515 | 174 | 247 | 936 |
| 2011 | 506 | 146 | 231 | 883 |
| 2012 | 563 | 190 | 294 | 1,047 |
| 2013 | 599 | 193 | 290 | 1,082 |
| 2014 | 489 | 186 | 244 | 919 |
| 2015 | 411 | 214 | 217 | 842 |
| 2016 | 419 | 199 | 277 | 895 |

Source: California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center

Violent Crimes, Mendocino County

|  |  | Forcible | Aggravated |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Homicide | Rape | Robbery | Assault | Total |
| 2007 | 6 | 37 | 64 | 437 | 544 |
| 2008 | 7 | 42 | 57 | 454 | 560 |
| 2009 | 5 | 31 | 46 | 438 | 520 |
| 2010 | 4 | 43 | 45 | 396 | 488 |
| 2011 | 7 | 19 | 52 | 405 | 483 |
| 2012 | 6 | 27 | 46 | 279 | 358 |
| 2013 | 4 | 31 | 39 | 398 | 472 |
| 2014 | 6 | 21 | 53 | 429 | 509 |
| 2015 | 6 | 73 | 46 | 445 | 570 |
| 2016 | 8 | 55 | 56 | 478 | 597 |

Source: California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center

## Mendocino County <br> $\longrightarrow$ California

 Califomia

## Voter Registration and Participation

What is it?
This indicator provides data on the number of individuals who registered to vote and who participated in state and federal elections during major election years. Data for the previous (even) election year are collected and reported by the California Secretary of State every two (odd) years on February 10th.

## How is it used?

Voter registration in California is now built into many other social service processes, such as receiving a state driver's license or identification, in order to promote enfranchisement and electoral participation. The differential between voter registration and participation is therefore a good indicator of how engaged a county population is with the overall electoral process. Large differences between the voting-age population and the number of registered/ participating individuals may also indicate potential issues in accessing electoral resources and reaching local voting centers.

Voter registration rates in Mendocino County rose slightly from 2002-2016. Mendocino County experienced a percentage of voter participation between 2002 and 2016 roughly equivalent to the statewide average. Both Mendocino County and California as a whole experienced sizeable decreases in voter participation in 2014.



Voter Participation in General Elections, Mendocino County

| Year | Eligible to <br> Register | Registered <br> Voters | Total <br> Voters | Registration <br> Rate | Participation <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2002 | 60,613 | 46,721 | 25,792 | $77.1 \%$ | $55.2 \%$ |
| 2004 | 61,717 | 50,713 | 38,902 | $82.2 \%$ | $76.7 \%$ |
| 2006 | 62,209 | 47,825 | 31,521 | $76.9 \%$ | $65.9 \%$ |
| 2008 | 62,281 | 50,721 | 40,580 | $81.4 \%$ | $80.0 \%$ |
| 2010 | 62,228 | 48,614 | 32,500 | $78.1 \%$ | $66.9 \%$ |
| 2012 | 62,910 | 49,765 | 36,080 | $79.1 \%$ | $72.5 \%$ |
| 2014 | 64,404 | 47,502 | 25,017 | $73.8 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ |
| 2016 | 63,741 | 51,061 | 38,730 | $80.1 \%$ | $75.9 \%$ |
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## INDUSTRY INDICATORS

Industry indicators show the status and growth of key industries linked to economic growth. Most economic development efforts in rural California focus on some, if not all, of these industries. Their growth is linked with the environmental, economic, and social improvement of many rural California communities.

Mendocino County's agricultural sector employs approximately 3.5 percent of the county's workforce, though the number of agricultural jobs in the county slowly declined from 2,146 in 2007 to 1,782 in 2016. Mendocino County's energy and utility sector remained similar to that of other counties in California in terms of its proportional representation. Just over 0.7 percent of the county's jobs are in the energy and utility sector. Mendocino County's construction sector was larger than average when compared to other counties in California. Still, construction jobs have declined in the county at similar rates as construction jobs have declined statewide. The number of manufacturing jobs in Mendocino County fluctuated, but experienced little overall change between 2007 and 2016. Throughout the period spanning 2007-2016, manufacturing jobs in Mendocino County made up a roughly equivalent portion of the county's jobs when compared to the statewide average. Travel and recreation remained a relatively central sector to the Mendocino County economy, consistently accounting for roughly 11 to 12 percent of total county employment during the study period. This contribution increased notably, in both absolute and relative terms, between 2015 and 2016. Government employment remained a fairly central sector in the Mendocino County economy during the study period. Although its contribution to overall county employment decreased considerably between 2009 and 2013, it has consistently accounted for 13 to 15 percent of all jobs in Mendocino County.

Mendocino County's agricultural sector generates upwards of 7 percent of its earnings countywide. Agricultural earnings grew slowly from $\$ 128.9$ million in 2007 to $\$ 166$ million in 2016 . Nearly 0.7 of countywide earnings were attributable to the energy and utility sector as of 2016. Energy and utility earnings have remained relatively flat as an overall percentage of the economy, following statewide trends, growing slightly in real terms from $\$ 17.4$ million in 2007 to $\$ 26.8$ million in 2016. Construction earnings remained relatively steady between 2007 and 2016, but dropped as a percentage of total county earnings, moving from $\$ 186.2$ million in 2007 to $\$ 186.0$ million in 2016. Manufacturing earnings in Mendocino County experienced more extreme fluctuations than manufacturing jobs between 2007 and 2016, though only a moderate overall increase. Travel and recreation earnings made a modest contribution to overall county earnings, and after the recession they rose to consistently account for a larger portion of total county earnings than the average California county ( 6 to 8 percent). Retail earnings in Mendocino County decreased slightly, though this trend has began to reverse in 2015. Earnings from government employment have contributed an outsized portion of total earnings in Mendocino County during the study period, consistently accounting for 22-24 percent of total earnings. Although this contribution declined during the recession period, earnings have increased in both absolute and relative terms since 2013.

## Agricullitural Johs

## What is it?

The agricultural sector of the economy has a vast effect on the economy of many rural areas. When there is a change in agricultural production in such areas, it can often lead to subsequent changes in overall jobs and income. Data on agricultural jobs and income are provided to show how county residents benefit from agriculture when compared to other industries.

## How is it used?

Agriculture is typically a base industry: one that is responsible for bringing in revenue from outside the county to support the local economy. Changes to agricultural employment and earnings can therefore indicate the potential for further changes in other industry sectors where agriculture comprises a major portion of the local economy.

Mendocino County has a significant agricultural sector that employs approximately 3.5 to 4.2 percent of the county's workforce and generates upwards of 7 percent of all county earnings. While the number of agricultural jobs in the county have slowly declined from 2,146 in 2007 to 1,782 in 2016, earnings in the industry overall grew slowly during the same time period, from $\$ 128.9$ million in 2007 to $\$ 166$ million in 2016.


Agricultural Jobs, Mendocino County

|  |  | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Jobs | County | California |  | County | California |
| 2007 | 2,146 | $4.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  | $-0.5 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| 2008 | 1,937 | $3.9 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  | $-9.7 \%$ | $-4.9 \%$ |
| 2009 | 1,922 | $4.0 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  | $-0.8 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| 2010 | 1,954 | $4.1 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |  | $1.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| 2011 | 1,850 | $4.0 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  | $-5.3 \%$ | $-2.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | 1,819 | $3.9 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  | $-1.7 \%$ | $-2.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 1,804 | $3.7 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  | $-0.8 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| 2014 | 1,890 | $3.8 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  | $4.8 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| 2015 | 1,809 | $3.7 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  | $-4.3 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | 1,782 | $3.6 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |  | $-1.5 \%$ | $-1.4 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis



## Agricultural Earnings



## Energy and Utilities Johs

## What is it?

Energy and utilities jobs and earnings data are provided to demonstrate the degree to which county residents rely on and benefit from this industry.

## How is it used?

Like agriculture, energy and utilities often comprise a base industry in rural counties and are thus a valuable indicator of broader potential changes to a county economy.

Mendocino County has a utilities and energy sector that is similar to that of other counties in California in terms of its proportional representation. Nearly 0.7 of industry earnings are attributable to the sector as of 2016, and just over 0.7 percent of the county's jobs are in the sector. The number of jobs in the sector has fluctuated but has typically remained on a positive trend, with 33 percent growth from 2007 to 2016. Earnings have remained relatively flat as an overall percentage of the economy, following statewide trends, growing slightly in real terms from $\$ 17.4$ million in 2007 to \$26.8 million in 2016.



Energy and Utilities Jobs, Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Jobs | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |
| 2007 | 261 | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ |  |
| 2008 | 313 | $0.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ |  |
| 2009 | 298 | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $-4.8 \%$ | $-1.8 \%$ |  |
| 2010 | 278 | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $-6.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |  |
| 2011 | 290 | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |  |
| 2012 | 347 | $0.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ |  |
| 2013 | 167 | $0.4 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $-51.9 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |  |
| 2014 | 389 | $0.8 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $132.9 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |  |
| 2015 | 321 | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $-17.5 \%$ | $-9.3 \%$ |  |
| 2016 | 349 | $0.7 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
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## Energy and Utilities Earnings



Energy and Utilities Earnings (in Thousands), Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year <br> Earnings | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |
| 2007 | $\$ 17,395$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |  | $12.9 \%$ | $-3.2 \%$ |
| 2008 | $\$ 25,176$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |  | $44.7 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ |
| 2009 | $\$ 21,323$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |  | $-15.3 \%$ | $-19.3 \%$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 20,723$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |  | $-2.8 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 23,998$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |  | $15.8 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 21,295$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |  | $-11.3 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 23,978$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |  | $12.6 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 23,771$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |  | $-0.9 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 25,664$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |  | $8.0 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 26,768$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |  | $4.3 \%$ | $-6.8 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

## Energy and Utilities Earnings, <br> Percent of Total <br> Mendocino County $\longrightarrow$ Califomia




## Construction Johs

## What is it?

Construction jobs and earnings data are provided to demonstrate the degree to which county residents rely on and benefit from this industry.

## How is it used?

Construction is often a leading indicator of economic growth, as the industry creates new and improved infrastructure for homes, businesses, and community and government institutions. Furthermore, the construction industry provides employment for a large number of blue-collar workers and generally does not require high educational attainment for entry-level employment.

Mendocino County has a construction sector that is larger than average when compared to other counties in California. Still, construction jobs have declined in the county at similar rates as construction jobs have declined statewide, from 3,805 in 2007 to 2,878 in 2016. Construction earnings have remained relatively steady over the past ten years but dropped as a percentage of total county earnings, moving from $\$ 186.2$ million in 2007 to $\$ 186.0$ million in 2016.


Construction Jobs, Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year | Jobs | County | California |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 3,805 | $7.5 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |  | $-3.4 \%$ | $-3.2 \%$ |
| 2008 | 3,644 | $7.3 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ |  | $-4.2 \%$ | $-9.6 \%$ |
| 2009 | 3,262 | $6.9 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |  | $-10.5 \%$ | $-15.6 \%$ |
| 2010 | 3,080 | $6.5 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |  | $-5.6 \%$ | $-8.1 \%$ |
| 2011 | 2,968 | $6.4 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |  | $-3.6 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| 2012 | 3,019 | $6.5 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |  | $1.7 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| 2013 | 3,033 | $6.2 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ |  | $0.5 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| 2014 | 3,113 | $6.2 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |  | $2.6 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| 2015 | 3,026 | $6.1 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ |  | $-2.8 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |
| 2016 | 2,878 | $5.8 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ |  | $-4.9 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

## Construction Jobs, Percent of Total <br> $\longrightarrow$ Mendocino County

8.0\%



## Construction Earnings



Construction Earnings (in Thousands), Mendocino County

|  | County | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Earnings | County | California |  | County | California |
| 2007 | $\$ 186,256$ | $9.9 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |  | $4.6 \%$ | $-7.7 \%$ |
| 2008 | $\$ 185,258$ | $9.6 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |  | $-0.5 \%$ | $-16.7 \%$ |
| 2009 | $\$ 232,311$ | $12.0 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ |  | $25.4 \%$ | $-15.5 \%$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 287,266$ | $14.3 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |  | $23.7 \%$ | $-4.5 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 250,493$ | $12.4 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |  | $-12.8 \%$ | $-3.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 194,477$ | $9.8 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |  | $-22.4 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 185,005$ | $9.2 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ |  | $-4.9 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 181,799$ | $8.8 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |  | $-1.7 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 194,477$ | $9.1 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ |  | $7.0 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 186,004$ | $8.4 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |  | $-4.4 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis


| Construction Earnings, 1-Year Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - Mendocino County |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0\% $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0\% | $10.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0.0 \% \sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $-10.0 \%+\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $-20.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -30.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006- 2007- 2008- 2009- 2010- 2011- 2012- 2013- 2014- 2015- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |

## Manufacturing Johs

## What is it?

Manufacturing is the mechanical, physical, or chemical transformation of materials, substances, or components into new products, and encompasses a wide variety of specific processes and inputs. Manufacturing jobs and earnings data are provided to demonstrate the degree to which county residents rely on and benefit from this industry.

## How is it used?

Manufacturing is usually an economic base industry, making it an important indicator of changes to a county's economy. Counties that have a solid manufacturing base of export goods benefit from the outside revenue that these businesses bring into the county.

The number of manufacturing jobs in Mendocino County fluctuated, but experienced little overall change between 2007 and 2016. The most significant increase was in 2014. Throughout the period spanning 2007-2016, manufacturing jobs in Mendocino County made up a roughly equivalent portion of the county's jobs when compared to the statewide average. Manufacturing earnings in Mendocino County experienced more extreme fluctuations than manufacturing jobs between 2007 and 2016.

## Manufacturing Jobs, Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year <br> Jobs | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |
| 2007 | 3,535 | $7.0 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ |  | $-0.1 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |
| 2008 | 3,638 | $7.3 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ |  | $2.9 \%$ | $-1.8 \%$ |
| 2009 | 3,126 | $6.6 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ |  | $-14.1 \%$ | $-3.0 \%$ |
| 2010 | 2,958 | $6.3 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |  | $-5.4 \%$ | $-8.4 \%$ |
| 2011 | 2,852 | $6.2 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ |  | $-3.6 \%$ | $-2.7 \%$ |
| 2012 | 3,022 | $6.5 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |  | $6.0 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| 2013 | 3,115 | $6.3 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |  | $3.1 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2014 | 3,250 | $6.5 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |  | $4.3 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2015 | 3,142 | $6.4 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ |  | $-3.3 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2016 | 3,208 | $6.5 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ |  | $2.1 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

## Manuiacturing Earinggs

## Manufacturing Earnings (in Thousands), Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year <br> Earnings | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |
| 2007 | $\$ 157,031$ | $8.3 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ |  | $2.2 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| 2008 | $\$ 165,315$ | $8.6 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |  | $5.3 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ |
| 2009 | $\$ 166,154$ | $8.6 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |  | $0.5 \%$ | $-7.9 \%$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 171,990$ | $8.5 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ |  | $3.5 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 203,455$ | $10.1 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |  | $18.3 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 178,637$ | $9.0 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |  | $-12.2 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 192,119$ | $9.5 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |  | $7.5 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 211,797$ | $10.3 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ |  | $10.2 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 200,987$ | $9.4 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ |  | $-5.1 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 185,912$ | $8.4 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ |  | $-7.5 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

| Manufacturing Earnings, Percent of Total |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mendocino County } \\ & \text { Califomia } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12.0 \% \\ & 10.0 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | + | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 8.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \% \text { - } \\ 2007 \end{array}$ | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |



## Travel and Recreation Johs

## What is it?

This indicator presents data on jobs and earnings within the travel and recreation industry provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

## How is it used?

Visitor-serving industries are often an important economic base industry because they attract spending from outside of the area. This makes travel and recreation industry performance an important local economic indicator. Because the industry is generally dependent on others' discretionary income levels, travel and recreation jobs and earnings are often more sensitive to economic downturns or recessions than thos in other base industries.

Travel and recreation remained a relatively central sector to the Mendocino County economy, consistently accounting for roughly 11 to 12 percent of total county employment during the study period. This contribution increased notably, in both absolute and relative terms, between 2015 and 2016. In contrast, travel and recreation earnings made a much more modest contribution to overall county earnings, and after the recession they rose to consistently account for a larger portion of total county earnings than the average California county ( 6 to 8 percent).

| Travel and Recreation Jobs, <br> Percent of Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $14.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $12.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | Mendocino County <br> California |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $8.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $6.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $4.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |  |  |



Travel and Recreation Jobs, Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year <br> Jobs | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |
| 2007 | 5,810 | $11.48 \%$ | $9.34 \%$ |  | $-1.59 \%$ | $2.79 \%$ |
| 2008 | 5,609 | $11.28 \%$ | $9.54 \%$ |  | $-3.46 \%$ | $0.94 \%$ |
| 2009 | 5,249 | $11.04 \%$ | $9.57 \%$ |  | $-6.42 \%$ | $-3.59 \%$ |
| 2010 | 5,317 | $11.24 \%$ | $9.69 \%$ |  | $1.30 \%$ | $0.53 \%$ |
| 2011 | 5,262 | $11.37 \%$ | $9.73 \%$ |  | $-1.03 \%$ | $2.47 \%$ |
| 2012 | 5,283 | $11.35 \%$ | $9.86 \%$ |  | $0.40 \%$ | $3.41 \%$ |
| 2013 | 5,854 | $11.93 \%$ | $9.89 \%$ |  | $10.81 \%$ | $4.49 \%$ |
| 2014 | 5,899 | $11.77 \%$ | $10.00 \%$ |  | $0.77 \%$ | $3.98 \%$ |
| 2015 | 5,962 | $12.10 \%$ | $10.23 \%$ |  | $1.07 \%$ | $4.94 \%$ |
| 2016 | 6,142 | $12.39 \%$ | $10.26 \%$ |  | $3.02 \%$ | $3.13 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis


## Travel and Recreation Earnings



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis


| Travel and Recreation Earnings, 1-Year Change |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\qquad$ Mendocino County$\qquad$ California |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.0\% $\quad \square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \% \\ & -50 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} -5.0 \% \\ & \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{l\|l\|l\|} \hline-10.0 \% & & \\ & & \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $-20.0 \%$ - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}2006-2007-2008-~ & 2009- & 2010- & 2011- & 2012- & 2013- & 2014- & 2015- \\ 07 & 08 & 09 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 15 & 16\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Retail Johs

## What is it?

Retail jobs and earnings data are provided to demonstrate the degree to which county residents rely on and benefit from this industry.

## How is it used?

The bulk of most retail sales are made to individuals who are living within the local area, as opposed to those visiting from outside the area. Retail activity is traditionally most impacted by changes in base industries like agriculture and manufacturing, and can thus serve as an indicator of change in these sectors. Retail is also one of the largest industry sectors in many local economies.

Between 2007 and 2016, Mendocino County experienced a slight overall decline in the number of retail jobs. Retail jobs made up a fairly larger percent of the total number jobs in Mendocino County when compared to the statewide average. Retail earnings in Mendocino County also decreased slightly, though this trend began to reverse in 2015.

## Retail Jobs, Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year <br> Jobs | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |
| 2007 | 6,218 | $12.3 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |  | $1.7 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2008 | 6,090 | $12.2 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |  | $-2.1 \%$ | $-3.3 \%$ |
| 2009 | 5,860 | $12.3 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |  | $-3.8 \%$ | $-6.1 \%$ |
| 2010 | 5,862 | $12.4 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |  | $0.0 \%$ | $-0.8 \%$ |
| 2011 | 5,729 | $12.4 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |  | $-2.3 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | 5,682 | $12.2 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |  | $-0.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 5,690 | $11.6 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |  | $0.1 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| 2014 | 5,749 | $11.5 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ |  | $1.0 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| 2015 | 5,917 | $12.0 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ |  | $2.9 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2016 | 5,989 | $12.1 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ |  | $1.2 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis


| Retail Jobs, 1-Year Change |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mendocino County } \\ & \text { Califomia } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \% \\ & 3.0 \% \\ & 2.0 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | - |  | 2 |  |  |
| -1.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | , |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| $-2.0 \%$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -3.0\% |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -5.0\% |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $-5.0 \%$$-6.0 \%$$-7.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006- | 2007- | 2008- | 2009- | 2010- | 2011 | 2012- | 2013- | 2014 | - 2015- |
| 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
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## Retail Earnings

## Retail Earnings (in Thousands), Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year <br> Earnings | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |
| 2007 | $\$ 251,987$ | $13.3 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |  | $-0.8 \%$ | $-0.9 \%$ |
| 2008 | $\$ 211,557$ | $11.0 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ |  | $-16.0 \%$ | $-9.7 \%$ |
| 2009 | $\$ 211,067$ | $10.9 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |  | $-0.2 \%$ | $-5.8 \%$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 202,826$ | $10.1 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |  | $-3.9 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 216,972$ | $10.7 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |  | $7.0 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 214,480$ | $10.8 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |  | $-1.1 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 215,409$ | $10.7 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |  | $0.4 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 213,841$ | $10.4 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |  | $-0.7 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 233,530$ | $10.9 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ |  | $9.2 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 241,818$ | $10.9 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ |  | $3.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

| Retail Earnings, Percent of Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | $=$ Mendocino County |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |



## Government Johs

## What is it?

Government jobs and income are provided to demonstrate the degree to which county residents rely on and benefit from this industry.

## How is it used?

Because government institutions often comprise a large portion of the local economy, especially in rural counties, increases or decreases in government spending can have a direct impact on the county economy.

Government employment remained a fairly central sector in the Mendocino County economy during the study period. Although its contribution to overall county employment decreased considerably between 2009 and 2013, it has consistently accounted for 13 to 15 percent of all jobs in Mendocino County. Earnings from government employment, in contrast, have contributed an outsized portion of total earnings in Mendocino County during the study period, consistently accounting for 22-24 percent of total earnings. Although this contribution declined during the recession period, earnings have increased in both absolute and relative terms since 2013.


All Government Worker Jobs, Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year <br> Jobs |  | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |  |
| 2007 | 7,420 | $14.7 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ |  | $-1.0 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |  |
| 2008 | 7,454 | $15.0 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ |  | $0.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |  |
| 2009 | 7,235 | $15.2 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ |  | $-2.9 \%$ | $-0.9 \%$ |  |
| 2010 | 7,156 | $15.1 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ |  | $-1.1 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ |  |
| 2011 | 6,811 | $14.7 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ |  | $-4.8 \%$ | $-2.7 \%$ |  |
| 2012 | 6,735 | $14.5 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ |  | $-1.1 \%$ | $-1.0 \%$ |  |
| 2013 | 6,783 | $13.8 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ |  | $0.7 \%$ | $-0.1 \%$ |  |
| 2014 | 6,732 | $13.4 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ |  | $-0.8 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  |
| 2015 | 6,977 | $14.2 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ |  | $3.6 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ |  |
| 2016 | 7,025 | $14.2 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ |  | $0.7 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |  |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis


| All Government Jobs, 1-Year Change |  |  |  |  |  | $\qquad$ Mendocino County$\qquad$ Califomia |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.0\% $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.0\% ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1.0\% $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -3.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -4.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -5.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2006-$ $2007-$ $2008-$ $2009-$ $2010-$ $2011-$ $2012-$ $2013-$ $2014-$ $2015-$ <br> 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Government Earnings




Government Worker Earnings (in Thousands),
Mendocino County

|  | County <br> Year <br> Earnings | Percent of Total |  |  | 1-Year Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | California |  | County | California |  |
| 2007 | $\$ 445,742$ | $23.6 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ |  | $3.5 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |
| 2008 | $\$ 466,013$ | $24.1 \%$ | $18.6 \%$ |  | $4.5 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| 2009 | $\$ 458,016$ | $23.6 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ |  | $-1.7 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 459,043$ | $22.8 \%$ | $19.2 \%$ |  | $0.2 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 457,731$ | $22.6 \%$ | $18.6 \%$ |  | $-0.3 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 446,642$ | $22.5 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |  | $-2.4 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 453,384$ | $22.5 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ |  | $1.5 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 470,815$ | $22.9 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ |  | $3.8 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 490,856$ | $23.0 \%$ | $17.0 \%$ |  | $4.3 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 515,565$ | $23.3 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ |  | $5.0 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis
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