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Introduction

This analysis of Migration in the North San Joaquin Valley (NSJV) is the second technical report from the NSJV Regional Assessment Project. Through this and the other reports the project is providing knowledge about the resources available to support regional development. These reports will also establish a foundation for a focused regional development strategy that is aligned with other development plans. This report, like the others, applies a variety of analytical tools and methods in order to facilitate a deeper empirical understanding of the NSJV’s areas of competitive advantage and their geographies. Extensive Appendices elaborate on the contents of this report.

Consisting of Merced, Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties, the NSJV region covers an area of some 4,800 square miles at the intersection of the San Francisco Bay Area, the Sacramento Capital Region, and South San Joaquin Valley Region. The migration of human capital can increase labor market efficiencies by facilitating labor specialization and, thereby, contribute to positive economic externalities. Building on this study of migration patterns, it should be possible to deepen understanding of occupational and industrial clusters and in so doing strengthen opportunities associated with those clusters. As such this analysis is another way to highlight regional strengths and weaknesses of a region. By doing this across socio-economic groups we can see which areas are viewed by current and potential residents as favorable to certain ethnic groups, genders, education levels, and more. This can inform a broader discussion about the needs of the NSJV in terms of job creation, diversity and economic opportunity.

The paper is organized as follows. The first section examines overall trends in migration flows. Section two then looks at specific inter-regional patterns of migration. In the third section attention turns to educational characteristics of migrants in the NSJV. Section four examines the income profile of migrants. Finally, section five reviews some demographic characteristics of migrants. It begins with a review of gender, then turns to race and ethnicity, before concluding with a discussion of the age profile of migrants.

Data for this analysis was obtained from the United States Bureau of the Census’ American Community Survey (ACS). Because of reporting methods in the ACS migration data, the years for which data is available on gender, race and age of migrants is different than the years for which data is available on educational attainment and income levels of migrants. As a result, the sections analyzing migration by gender, race and age use 2010 ACS 5-year County-to-County Migration Flows data, while the sections that analyze migration by educational attainment and income level use 2011 ACS, County-to-County Migration Flows data.

Tracking migration mobility is not a new endeavor for the Census Bureau. The Decennial Census has included questions about migration since 1940. However, these questions asked about prior residence five years before and occur only once every ten years. The Survey of Income and Program
Participation (SIPP) has collected migration/geographic mobility data since 1984. It looks at tenure of current residence as well as the seasonality of the move, not where the move originated and ended. The Current Population Survey (CPS) has collected migration data as part of its Annual Social and Economic Supplement since 1947. This data includes moving rates as well as the characteristics of the movers. CPS data, however, is only available at the regional level. These regions are defined as multi-state areas and the entire United States is made up of only four regions: West, Midwest, Northeast and South. The ACS is the only source of annual migration data which includes the origin and the destination of the move. The drawback to this survey, however, is its relative novelty. The earliest data available is the 2009 ACS 5-year survey. Because of this it is difficult to compare current migration patterns with those from the past.

What this working paper will do is analyze current migration rates and patterns for each group: gender, race, age, educational attainment and income level in the most recent year the data is available. Then it will go on to compare the aggregate migration/geographic mobility rates in 2005, which is the earliest date those numbers are available, to the rates in 2012, which is the latest date those numbers are available.
Section One: Trends in NSJV Migration

This section presents information on the overall migration to and from the NSJV and its component counties. Information in this section was obtained from the county-to-county migration database produced by the Statistics of Income (SOI) Division of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). The SOI-IRS County-to-County Migration data shows that migration is inherently volatile with many factors influencing the ability and likelihood of an individual to migrate. While this is sometimes more difficult to see in net migration data due to in-migration and out-migration generally increasing and decreasing at similar times, it becomes clearer when we look at Figure 1 where in-migration and out-migration are separated.

As is expected, migration in the NSJV is very volatile. Both in-migration and out-migration are decreasing from 1991 through 1998 before increasing dramatically. In-migration increased by over 20,000 people per year from 1998 through 2001. Out-migration, while increasing at a slower rate, still increased by almost 20,000 people per year from 1998 through 2006. Since then, both in-migration and out-migration have decreased, almost on a yearly basis.
While examining in-migration and out-migration is beneficial for looking at the magnitude of migration, an easier visualization is to graph net migration. This is done in Figure 2.

Figure 2 - NSJV Net Migration

Net migration is positive for twelve of the twenty-one years for which data is available. Both periods during which net migration was negative were during periods of decreases in both in-migration and out-migration. Conversely, the peak of positive net migration coincides with the period of increased in-migration and out-migration. This implies that in-migration changes at a faster rate than out-migration.

Each component county of the NSJV has migration patterns very similar to the NSJV as a whole. For this reason the graphs for the component counties are not shown here. However, these graphs are available in the appendix in Figures 22 through 27.
Section Two: Inter-Regional Migration Patterns

This section presents information on where the migration flows into the NSJV originate, as well as where the migration flows going out of the NSJV terminate. Information in this section was obtained from the County-to-County Migration Flow estimates from the ACS 5-year data. Data from 2009 to 2012 5-year ACS was examined, however, the migration patterns are so similar in each of the four years that only the most recent year’s data is presented. Unlike the aggregated SOI-IRS data, migration by region does vary across component counties. Therefore 2012 migration is presented for all counties in the NSJV. All other years’ data can be found in the appendix in Figures 28 through 36.

![Figure 3-NSJV Net Migration by Region (2008 - 2012), Population 1 and Over](image)

The only two regions where more people migrated to the NSJV than away from it are the Greater Bay Area and “Other California”. Other California includes all regions (there are 15 regions in California) that are not explicitly listed in this graph. The Bay Area accounts for approximately 95% of the positive net migration in the region and is large enough to offset the negative net migration from Greater Sacramento, the Southern San Joaquin Valley and Out of State. In terms of the magnitude of net migration, Out of State follows the Greater Bay Area, with Greater Sacramento following Out of State.
Unlike the NSJV as a whole, in Merced County migration to Greater Sacramento and “Other California” are positive and negative, respectively. The Greater Bay Area and Out of State remain the two largest components of net migration while the NSJV is now included as the third largest component. Unlike the NSJV, overall net migration in Merced County is negative with Out-of-State and the NSJV offsetting the positive migration gains from the Bay Area and Greater Sacramento.
San Joaquin County has the smallest negative net migration to outside of California of any of the three component counties of the NSJV. Additionally, San Joaquin County has positive net migration from the rest of the NSJV, the SSJV and "Other California". The only negative net migration is seen to Greater Sacramento and Out-of-State, although it is very small.

Figure 6-Stanislaus County Net Migration by Region (2008 - 2012), Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2012 ACS, 5-year data

Similarly to Merced County, Stanislaus County has an aggregate net outflow, albeit on a larger scale than Merced County. Like both Merced and San Joaquin Counties (and the NSJV as a whole), the greatest positive net migration is from the Greater Bay Area. However, this positive net migration to the Bay Area is offset by the equally large negative net migration to the rest of the United States. With these two largest determinants of migration offsetting each other, the negative net migration to Greater Sacramento and the Southern San Joaquin Valley dwarfs the positive net migration from the rest of the NSJV and "Other California".
Section Three: Educational Attainment of NSJV Migrants

This section and the next also use data from the ACS County-to-County Flows. Because of the potential disclosure of individual data on migrants the Census Bureau suppresses the data for specific groups in the NSJV where a small number of people have migrated. This suppression of educational and income data means that estimates for migration by region do not necessarily represent that actual estimate of migration for a given characteristic to/from a given region. For the most part the difference between the reported suppressed estimate, and the actual estimate is less than 1% and can be approximated. This was done in this section and the next section for the NSJV and the rest of California.

Throughout this section migration by educational attainment is measured only for the population 25-years and over. This is done to allow people to reach a maximum education level before being included in migration estimates. For this reason the total number of migrants cannot be compared between migration by educational attainment and migration by other characteristics. Figures 7, 8 and 9 below present information on outflows, inflows and net migration to all other regions in California as well as out-of-state for the NSJV. Estimates of migration by educational attainment by region are provided for the NSJV’s component counties in Figures 37 through 48 in the appendix.

In all education categories inflows were larger than outflows. The difference is the most pronounced among those with less than a high school diploma, although the group with the largest magnitude of outflows and inflows was the Some College/Associates degree category. Far fewer people with bachelor’s and graduate/professional degrees migrated than those with less education, although this
is at least partly due to the fact that there are less people in the population with these types of degrees.

Although Some College/Associates is the largest category of education in the aggregate, it is not the largest category across all regions. “Other California” sees the most out-migration from those with less than a high school education. Within California, the largest out-migration occurs to “Other California” followed by the NSJV, the Greater Bay Area and Greater Sacramento. The largest destination, however, is out-of-state.

Some College/Associates is the largest category for inflows in all regions, however, it is largest from the Greater Bay Area. The Greater Bay Area is also the largest origin of in-migrants, followed by “Other California” and the rest of the NSJV. The High School category of education was generally the second most frequent from each of the regions in California except for the Greater Bay and “Other California”.

Like flows to other regions in California, flows to out-of-state are largest among those with some college or an Associate’s degree. This holds true for both outflows and inflows. Some College/Associates is followed by High School, Less Than High School and Bachelor’s. The least frequent migration took place from those with a graduate or professional degree.
Net migration was highest among those with less than a high school education. This was followed by those with a high school education. Bachelor’s degrees rounded out the categories with positive net migration into the NSJV. Some College/Associates and Graduate/Professional were the two categories to register negative net migration, although the negative migration among those with graduate or professional degrees was very small.

The only positive net migration to the NSJV originated in the Greater Bay Area. The educational makeup of this migration differs slightly from the NSJV as a whole. The largest group was still those with less than a high school education, however, each subsequent level of education brought slightly less net migration into the region with Graduate/Professional bringing the least, albeit still positive migration. The least negative net migration was to Greater Sacramento with the largest negative net migration leaving to a different state. The largest category leaving to Greater Sacramento was those with bachelor’s degrees while the largest category leaving for a different state was those with some college or an associate’s degree.
Section Four: Income Profile of NSJV Migrants

Like migration by educational attainment, migration by income level suffers from data suppression to protect the identity of those that move to/ from a given region. For this reason only total outflows and inflows by income level are reported in the body of the report with the estimates by region used anecdotally to show which regions are the largest origins/ destinations for NSJV residents. Migration by income level is tabulated for County-to-County flows in the ACS from the 2007 5-year data. This data covers the population 1-year and over (because income is measured as household income, not individual income). Because of the suppressing issue discussed above, only flows to California and Out of State are reported. Information on region specific migration is used in the body of this report only to indicate the relative magnitudes of migration to various regions, not to make a specific estimate. Graphs showing actual reported migration by region for the NSJV and its component counties can be found in the appendix in Figures 49 through 60. Figures 10, 11 and 12 below provide information on migration by income level for the NSJV to other regions in California, out-of-state and net flows to/ from the region.

Figure 10-NSJV Flows to Other Regions in California, Population 1 and Over

Inflows and outflows are greatest in the income range of $25,000 to $74,999, although inflows are larger than outflows. This group is followed by the $75,000 to $149,999 and less than $25,000 group with greater than $150,000 having the least migration both in terms of outflows and inflows. In all groups except for incomes greater than $150,000 in-migration is larger than out-migration. The NSJV is losing residents with the highest incomes.

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data
The income group $25,000 to $74,999 was the largest for both inflows and outflows in all regions in California. The most popular destination for that group was to the other counties in the NSJV followed by other parts of California and the Greater Bay Area. In terms of inflows for the income group $25,000 to $74,999 the largest are from the Greater Bay Area and "Other California". The second largest outflows and inflows within California occur from the income group $75,000 to $149,999 for all regions.

The largest outflows across all income groups occurred to destinations outside of California. The largest outflows within California were to "Other California", the Greater Bay Area and the rest of the NSJV. The largest inflows into the NSJV occurred from the Greater Bay Area followed by "Other California", Out-of-State and Greater Sacramento.

Figure 11-NSJV Flows to Out-of-State, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Unlike flows to and from other regions in California, outflows are larger than inflows in all income groups except for the group greater than $150,000. The most migration occurred in the group $25,000 to $74,999 followed by $75,000 to $149,999 and less than $25,000.

The largest net inflow into the NSJV was for the income group $25,000 to $74,999. Additionally, the income groups $75,000 to $149,999 and greater than $150,000 also had positive net migration into the NSJV, although the total number of migrants was fairly small. The only income group with negative net migration was the group less than $25,000.
Net flows were the highest from the Greater Bay Area. The Greater Bay Area was also the only region to have all positive net flows across all income groups. "Other California" was the only other region to have positive net migration. The largest negative net migration is to Out-of-State followed by Greater Sacramento.
Section Five: Demographics of NSJV Migrants

In addition to income level and educational attainment, migration was also measured by demographic indicators such as age, gender and race. Because of the methodologies of the Census Bureau, migration by age, gender and race are calculated using the 2010 ACS 5-year estimates.

The individual county-to-county flows are again subject to suppression when only a small number of people migrate from one county to another to protect the identity of those migrating. Because of this caution should be used when examining the estimate of the number of people migrating to/from a given area.

Gender is the focus of the first subsection Figures 13, 14 and 15 present information on outflows, inflows and net migration by gender for the NSJV. Estimates of migration by gender are provided for the NSJV’s component counties in Figures 61 through 69 in the appendix. The second subsection then focuses on the race and ethnicity of migrants with Figures 16, 17 and 18 presenting information on outflows, inflows and net migration by race and ethnicity for the NSJV. Estimates of migration by race and ethnicity are provided for the NSJV’s component counties in Figures 70 through 78 in the appendix. The final subsection reviews the age profile of migrants with Figures 19, 20 and 21 presenting information on outflows, inflows and net migration by age group for the NSJV. Estimates of migration by age are provided for the NSJV’s component counties in Figures 79 through 87 in the appendix.

Gender

This subsection analyses migration by gender. In this section, migration outflow means the number of people leaving the given geography and moving elsewhere. This is shown graphically by displaying all of the areas where NSJV residents move to. Migration inflow means the number of people moving into a given geography. This is shown graphically by displaying all of the areas from which people have moved to the NSJV. This analysis begins by looking at migration outflows and inflows by gender before going on to look at net migration.

Figure 13 shows that More men left the NSJV than women in 2010. This holds for all destination regions except for the Greater Bay Area which sees slightly more female outmigration than male outmigration. The Greater Bay Area is also the most popular destination for migrants coming from the NSJV, followed closely by the rest of the Northern San Joaquin Valley, other parts of California and Greater Sacramento.
Like migration outflows, men migrated into the NSJV valley in higher numbers than women. Additionally, like outflows, the Greater Bay Area is the most popular origin of migrants coming into the NSJV. This is followed by those moving within the NSJV and finally those moving from other regions of California, narrowly beating out the Out of State migrants.
The largest positive net migration to the NSJV is from the Greater Bay Area followed by Out of State. The largest negative net migration, the most people that left the NSJV for a particular area, is the Greater Sacramento Area. In terms of net migration, men still migrated in greater numbers than women in 2010. Net migration, by definition, must be zero for the NSJV.

5 Race and Ethnicity

This subsection analyses migration by race. In this section, migration outflow means the number of people leaving the given geography and moving elsewhere. This is shown graphically by displaying all of the areas where NSJV residents move to. Migration inflow means the number of people moving into a given geography. This is shown graphically by displaying all of the areas from which people have moved to the NSJV. As with the previous subsection this analysis begins by looking at migration outflows and inflows by race before going on to look at net migration.

Figure 16 shows that the Greater Bay area is the most popular destination for migration out of the NSJV, despite larger White migration to the rest of the NSJV and other parts of California. This is followed by those migrating within the Northern San Joaquin Valley and other parts of California. In all categories White made up the largest percentage and Other/Two or More Races the second highest percentage of movers.
The largest source of migration inflow to the NSJV in 2010 came from the Greater Bay Area. This was followed by those that moved within the rest of the Northern San Joaquin Valley, those that came from Other California and those that migrated from Out of State. Like migration outflow, the majority of each category’s population was White, followed by Other/Two or More Races.
The Greater Bay area boasts the origin of the largest positive net migration into the NSJV in 2010. This was followed by Out of State and other parts of California. The largest negative net migration was to Greater Sacramento followed by the Southern San Joaquin Valley. When looking at net migration the White population is no longer the largest group in each category. Those identifying as Black left for Greater Sacramento in greater numbers than those identifying as White.

5 Age
This subsection analyses migration by age. As previously, migration outflow means the number of people leaving the given geography and moving elsewhere. This is shown graphically by displaying all of the areas where NSJV residents move to. Migration inflow means the number of people moving into a given geography. This is shown graphically by displaying all of the areas from which people have moved to the NSJV. This analysis also begins by looking at migration outflows and inflows by age before going on to look at net migration.

Figure 19 shows that the age group 25 to 64 was the largest component of migration. This is unsurprising because this group is also the group that spans the most years and therefore makes up the largest percentage of the total population of the region as well as the most active employment period of an individuals life.
The Greater Bay Area is the origin of the most people migrating into the NSJV. This is followed by the rest of the Northern San Joaquin Valley and those migrating from other parts of California. The age makeup of the migrants was the least diverse from the Greater Bay Area as the highest percentage of total migrants was in the age group 25 to 64 years.

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
The three largest positive net migration regions were the Greater Bay Area, Out of State and other parts of California, meaning more people migrated into the NSJV from these areas than migrated out of the NSJV to live in these areas. The largest negative net migration regions were Greater Sacramento and the Southern San Joaquin Valley, meaning more people migrated away from the NSJV to live in these areas than migrated from these areas to live in the NSJV. There are two points worth noting in Figure 21. First, even though the age groups 0 to 17 years, 25 to 64 years, and 65 and over all had positive net migration into the NSJV, the age group 18 to 24 years had negative net migration to Merced County on the aggregate. Secondly, the age group 0 to 17 years was the only group to have positive net migration from Southern San Joaquin Valley (SSJV). This could mean that those families migrating from the SSJV had more children than adults.
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Figure 22: Merced County Inflow and Outflow

Source: SOI-IRS County-to-County Migration Data

Figure 23: Merced County Net Migration

Source: SOI-IRS County-to-County Migration Data

Figure 24: San Joaquin County Inflow and Outflow
Figure 25-San Joaquin County Net Migration

Source: SOI-IRS County-to-County Migration Data
Figure 26-Stanislaus County Inflow and Outflow

Source: SOI-IRS County-to-County Migration Data

Figure 27-Stanislaus County Net Migration

Source: SOI-IRS County-to-County Migration Data
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Figure 28 - NSJV Net Migration by Region (2007 - 2011), Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Figure 29 - NSJV Net Migration by Region (2006 - 2010), Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 30-NSJV Net Migration by Region (2005 - 2009), Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2009 ACS 5-year data

Figure 31-Merced County Net Migration by Region (2007 - 2011), Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data
Figure 34 - Stanislaus County Net Migration by Region (2007 - 2011), Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Figure 35 - Stanislaus County Net Migration by Region (2006 - 2010), Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 36-Stanislaus County Net Migration by Region (2005 - 2009), Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2009 ACS 5-year data
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Figure 37-NSJV Outflow by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

Figure 38-NSJV Inflow by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey
Figure 39 - NSJV Net Migration by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

Figure 40 - Merced County Outflow by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey
Figure 41—Merced County Inflow by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

Figure 42—Merced County Net Migration by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey
Figure 43-Stanislaus County Outflow by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

Figure 44-Stanislaus County Inflow by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey
Figure 45-Stanislaus County Net Migration by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

![Bar chart showing net migration by educational attainment and region in Stanislaus County.]

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

Figure 46-San Joaquin County Outflow by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

![Bar chart showing outflow by educational attainment and region in San Joaquin County.]

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey
Figure 47-San Joaquin County Inflow by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

Figure 48-San Joaquin County Net Migration by Educational Attainment by Region, Population 25 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2007-2011 American Community Survey
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Figure 49-NSJV Outflow by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Figure 50-NSJV Inflow by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data
Figure 51-NSJV Net Migration by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Figure 52-Merced Outflow by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data
Figure 53-Merced Inflow by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Figure 54-Merced Net Migration by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data
Figure 55 - Stanislaus County Outflow by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Figure 56 - Stanislaus County Inflow by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data
Figure 57: Stanislaus Net Migration by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Figure 58: San Joaquin County Outflow by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data
Figure 59-San Joaquin County Inflow by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data

Figure 60-San Joaquin Net Migration by Income by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2011 ACS, 5-year data
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A.5 Gender

Figure 61-Merced County Outflow by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 62-Merced County Inflow by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 63-Merced County Net Migration by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 64-Stanislaus County Outflow by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 65-Stanislaus County Inflow by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 66-Stanislaus County Net Migration by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 67-San Joaquin County Outflow by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 68-San Joaquin County Inflow by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 69-San Joaquin County Net Migration by Gender by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

A.5 Race and Ethnicity

Figure 70-Merced County Outflow by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 71: Merced County Inflow by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 72: Merced County Net Migration by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 73-Stanislaus County Outflow by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 74-Stanislaus County Inflow by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 75-Stanislaus County Net Migration by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 76-San Joaquin County Outflow by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 77-San Joaquin County Inflow by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 78-San Joaquin County Net Migration by Race by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
A.5 Age

Figure 79-Merced County Outflow by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 80-Merced County Inflow by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 81-Merced County Net Migration by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 82-Stanislaus County Outflow by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 83-Stanislaus County Inflow by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 84-Stanislaus County Net Migration by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 85-San Joaquin County Outflow by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data

Figure 86-San Joaquin County Inflow by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data
Figure 87-San Joaquin County Net Migration by Age by Region, Population 1 and Over

Source: County-to-County Migration Flows, 2010 ACS 5-year data