Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) Regional Council includes 69 districts which represent 191 cities in the SCAG region.

SCAG Regional Council District 42 includes Burbank and Glendale
Represented by: Hon. Vartan Gharpetian

This profile report was prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments and shared with the City of Burbank. SCAG provides local governments with a variety of benefits and services including, for example, data and information, GIS training, planning and technical assistance, and sustainability planning grants.
Source: 2012 SCAG city boundary data, which is provided by the county Local Agency Formation Commissions.
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I. Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide current information and data for the City of Burbank for planning and outreach efforts. Information on population, housing, transportation, employment, retail sales, and education can be utilized by the city to make informed planning decisions. The profile provides a portrait of the city and its changes since 2000, using average figures for Los Angeles County as a comparative baseline. In addition, the most current data available for the region is also included in the Statistical Summary (page 3). This profile demonstrates the current trends occurring in the City of Burbank.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the largest Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in the nation. The SCAG region includes six counties (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura) and 191 cities. As the designated MPO, SCAG is mandated by federal law to research and develop a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which incorporates a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) per California state law. SCAG is currently undertaking a variety of planning and policy initiatives to foster a more sustainable Southern California.

In 2008, SCAG initiated the Local Profiles Project as a part of a larger initiative to provide a variety of services to its member cities and counties. Through extensive input from member jurisdictions, the inaugural Local Profiles Reports were released at the General Assembly in May 2009. The Profiles have been updated every two years.

Local Profiles provide basic information about each member jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the following:
- How much growth in population has taken place since 2000?
- Has the local jurisdiction been growing faster or slower than the county or regional average?
- Have there been more or fewer school-age children?
- Have homeownership rates been increasing or decreasing?
- How and where do residents travel to work?
- How has the local economy been changing in terms of employment share by sectors?
- Have the local retail sales revenues recovered to pre-recession levels?

Answers to questions such as these provide a snapshot of the dynamic changes affecting each local jurisdiction.

Factors Affecting Local Changes Reflected in the 2017 Report

Overall, member jurisdictions since 2000 were impacted by a variety of factors at the national, regional, and local levels. For example, the vast majority of member jurisdictions included in the 2017 Local Profiles reflect the national demographic trends toward an older and a more diverse population. Evidence of the slow process towards economic recovery is also apparent through gradual increases in employment, retail sales, building permits, and home prices. Work destinations and commute times correlate with regional development patterns and the geographical location of local jurisdictions, particularly in relation to the regional transportation system.
**Uses of the Local Profiles**

Following release at the SCAG General Assembly, the Local Profiles are posted on the SCAG website and are used for a variety of purposes including, but not limited to, the following:

- Data and communication resources for elected officials, businesses, and residents
- Community planning and outreach
- Economic development
- Visioning initiatives
- Grant application support
- Performance monitoring

The primary user groups of the Profiles include member jurisdictions and state and federal legislative delegates of Southern California. This profile report is a SCAG member benefit and the use of the data contained within this report is voluntary.

**Report Organization**

This profile report has three sections. The first section presents a Statistical Summary for the City of Burbank. The second section provides detailed information organized by subject areas and includes brief highlights on the impacts of the recent economic recession and recovery at the regional level. The third section, Methodology, describes technical considerations related to data definitions, measurement, and data sources.
## 2016 STATISTICAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Burbank</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>Burbank relative to Los Angeles County*</th>
<th>SCAG Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Total Population</strong></td>
<td>105,110</td>
<td>10,241,335</td>
<td>[1%]</td>
<td>18,954,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Population Density</strong></td>
<td>6,065</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Person per sq Mile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Median Age (Years)</strong></td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>-24.7%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Non-Hispanic White</strong></td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Non-Hispanic Asian</strong></td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Non-Hispanic Black</strong></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Non-Hispanic American</strong></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 All Other Non-Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Number of Households</strong></td>
<td>41,705</td>
<td>3,382,269</td>
<td>[1.2%]</td>
<td>6,132,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Average Household Size</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Median Household Income ($)</strong></td>
<td>$66,440</td>
<td>$57,864</td>
<td>$8,576</td>
<td>$61,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Number of Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>46,339</td>
<td>3,589,189</td>
<td>[1.3%]</td>
<td>6,629,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Homeownership Rate</strong></td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Median Existing Home Sales Price ($)</strong></td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$466,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 - 2016 Median Home Sales Price Change</strong></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Drive Alone to Work</strong></td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Number of Jobs</strong></td>
<td>112,796</td>
<td>4,455,554</td>
<td>[2.5%]</td>
<td>7,920,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 - 2015 Total Jobs Change</strong></td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>41,589</td>
<td>[3%]</td>
<td>117,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Average Salary per Job ($)</strong></td>
<td>73,268</td>
<td>56,700</td>
<td>16,568</td>
<td>$53,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 K-12 Public School Student Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>15,167</td>
<td>1,471,103</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,961,726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2016; Nielsen Co.; California Department of Finance E-5, May 2016; CoreLogic/DataQuick; California Department of Education; and SCAG

* Numbers with [ ] represent Burbank’s share of Los Angeles County. The other numbers represent the difference between Burbank and Los Angeles County.

Mapped jurisdictional boundaries are as of July 1, 2012 and are for visual purposes only. Report data, however, are updated according to their respective sources.
II. Population

*Population Growth*


- Between 2000 and 2016, the total population of the City of Burbank increased by 4,794 to 105,110 in 2016.

- During this 16-year period, the city’s population growth rate of 4.8 percent was lower than the Los Angeles County rate of 7.6 percent.

- 1% of the total population of Los Angeles County is in the City of Burbank.

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5, 2016
Between 2000 and 2016, the age group 55-64 experienced the largest increase in share, growing from 8.5 to 12.8 percent.

The age group that experienced the greatest decline, by share, was age group 5-20, decreasing from 19.7 to 16.6 percent.

The age group 55-64 added the most population, with an increase of 5,394 people between 2000 and 2016.
### Population by Race/Ethnicity


- Between 2000 and 2016, the share of Hispanic population in the city decreased from 24.9 percent to 24.0 percent.


- Between 2000 and 2016, the share of Non-Hispanic White population in the city decreased from 59.4 percent to 57.7 percent.

- Please refer to the Methodology section for definitions of the racial/ethnic categories.

- Between 2000 and 2016, the share of Non-Hispanic Asian population in the city increased from 9.0 percent to 12.2 percent.


- Between 2000 and 2016, the share of Non-Hispanic Black population in the city increased from 1.9 percent to 2.7 percent.
Between 2000 and 2016, the share of Non-Hispanic American Indian population in the city decreased from 0.3 percent to 0.2 percent.

Between 2000 and 2016, the share of All Other Non-Hispanic population group in the city decreased from 4.5 percent to 3.3 percent.
III. Households

*Number of Households (Occupied Housing Units)*

Between 2000 and 2016, the total number of households in the City of Burbank increased by 97 units, or 0.2 percent.

During this 16-year period, the city's household growth rate of 0.2 percent was lower than the county growth rate of 7.9 percent.

1.2 percent of Los Angeles County's total number of households are in the City of Burbank.

In 2016, the city's average household size was 2.5, lower than the county average of 3.0.
**Households by Size**

Percent of Households by Household Size: 2016

- In 2016, 77.1 percent of all city households had 3 people or fewer.
- About 30.7 percent of the households were single-person households.
- Approximately 8.7 percent of all households in the city had 5 people or more.

Source: Nielsen Co., 2016

**Households by Income**

Percent of Households by Household Income: 2016

- In 2016, about 40 percent of households earned less than $50,000 annually.
- Approximately 31 percent of households earned $100,000 or more.

Source: Nielsen Co., 2016
**Household Income**


- From 2000 to 2016, median household income increased by $19,590.
- Note: Dollars are not adjusted for annual inflation.

Source: Nielsen Co., 2016

**Renters and Homeowners**


Between 2000 and 2016, homeownership rates increased and the share of renters decreased.

IV. Housing

**Total Housing Production**

Total Permits Issued for all Residential Units: 2000 - 2016

- Between 2000 and 2016, permits were issued for 3,071 residential units.

Permits Issued for all Residential Units per 1,000 Residents: 2000 - 2016

- In 2000, the City of Burbank had 0.7 permits per 1,000 residents compared to the overall county figure of 2 permits per 1,000 residents.
- In 2016, the number of permits per 1,000 residents increased to 2.5 permits. For the county overall, it decreased to 1.8 permits per 1,000 residents.
---

**Single-Family Housing Production**

**Permits Issued for Single-Family Units: 2000 - 2016**

Between 2000 and 2016, permits were issued for 540 single family homes.

6.1 percent of these were issued in the last 3 years.

**Single-Family Permits Issued per 1,000 Residents: 2000 - 2016**

- In 2000, the City of Burbank issued 0.6 permits per 1,000 residents compared to the overall county figure of 0.9 permits per 1,000 residents.

- For the city in 2016, the number of permits issued per 1,000 residents decreased to 0.1 permits. For the county overall, it decreased to 0.4 permits per 1,000 residents.

---

Source: Construction Industry Research Board, 2000 - 2016
**Multi-Family Housing Production**

*Permits Issued for Multi-Family Units: 2000 - 2016*

Between 2000 and 2016, there were permits issued for 2,487 multi-family residential units.

**Multi-Family Permits Issued per 1,000 Residents: 2000 - 2016**

- For the city in 2016, the number of permits per 1,000 residents increased to 2.4 permits. For the county overall, it increased to 1.4 permits per 1,000 residents.
Home Sales Prices

Median Home Sales Price for Existing Homes: 2000 - 2016 (in $ thousands)

- Between 2000 and 2016, the median home sales price increased 165 percent from $249,500 to $660,000.

- Median home sales price increased by 41.9 percent between 2010 and 2016.

- In 2016, the median home sales price in the city was $660,000, $140,000 higher than that in the county overall.

- Note: Median home sales price reflects resale of existing homes and provides guidance on the market values of homes sold.

- Between 2000 and 2016, the largest single year increase was 24.7 percent.


Source: CoreLogic/DataQuick, 2016
**Housing Type**

**Housing Type by Units: 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Percent of Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>20,619</td>
<td>44.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>3.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family: 2 to 4 units</td>
<td>4,822</td>
<td>10.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family: 5 units plus</td>
<td>18,999</td>
<td>41 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,339</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5, 2016

- The most common housing type is Single Family Detached.
- Approximately 48.4 percent were single family homes and 51.4 percent were multi-family homes.

**Age of Housing Stock: 2016**

- 62 percent of the housing stock was built before 1970.
- 37 percent of the housing stock was built after 1970.

Source: Nielsen Co., 2016
**Foreclosures**

Number of Foreclosures: 2016

- There were a total of 15 foreclosures in 2016.
- Between 2007 and 2016, there were a total of 1,222 foreclosures.

Source: CoreLogic/DataQuick, 2016

**Housing Cost Share**

Percentage of Housing Cost for Renters and Homeowners, 2014

- Housing costs accounted for an average of 32.6 percent of total household income for renters.
- Housing costs accounted for an average of 25.8 percent of total household income for homeowners.

Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015
V. Transportation

Journey to Work for Residents


- Between 2000 and 2016, the greatest change occurred in the percentage of individuals who traveled to work by carpool; this share decreased by 3.7 percentage points.
- 'Other' refers to bicycle, pedestrian, and home-based employment.


- Between 2000 and 2016, the average travel time to work increased by approximately 1 minute.
Travel Time to Work: 2016

- In 2016, 39.7 percent of Burbank commuters required more than 30 minutes to travel to work.

- Travel time to work figures reflect average one way commute travel times, not round trip.

Sources: 2000 U.S. Decennial Census; 2010 U.S. Census American Community Survey; and Nielsen Co., 2016

Household Vehicle Ownership: 2016

- 46.8 percent of Burbank households own one or no vehicles, while 53.2 percent of households own two or more vehicles.

Sources: 2000 U.S. Decennial Census; 2010 U.S. Census American Community Survey; and Nielsen Co., 2016
Active Transportation

Over the course of the next 25 years, population growth and demographic shifts will continue to transform the character of the SCAG region and the demands placed on it for livability, mobility, and overall quality of life. Our future will be shaped by our response to this growth and the demands it places on our systems.

SCAG is responding to these challenges by embracing sustainable mobility options, including support for enhanced active transportation infrastructure. Providing appropriate facilities to help make walking and biking more attractive and safe transportation options will serve our region through reduction of traffic congestion, decreasing greenhouse gas emissions, improving public health, and enhancing community cohesion and sustainability.

Beginning with the 2017 Local Profiles, SCAG will be providing information on the active transportation resources being implemented throughout our region. The 2017 Local Profiles initiates this enhanced active transportation element with a compilation of bicycle lane mileage by facility type at the county level. This data, provided by our County Transportation Commissions for the year 2012, will serve as a baseline to measure regional progress over subsequent years. It is expected that with each cycle of the Local Profiles, additional active transportation data resources will become available for inclusion in these reports at the local jurisdictional level.

Bike Lane Mileage by Class: 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
<th>Class 4</th>
<th>Total Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG Region</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County Transportation Commissions, 2012

**Class 1 (Bike Path):** Separated off-road trail for the exclusive use of bicycles & pedestrians.

**Class 2 (Bike Lane):** Striped on-road lane for bike travel along a roadway.

**Class 3 (Bike Route):** Roadway dedicated for shared use by pedestrians, bicyclists, & motor vehicles.

**Class 4 (Protected Bike Lane):** Lane separated from vehicle traffic by more than striping, such as grade separation or barriers.
### VI. Employment

**Employment Centers**

#### Top 10 Places Where Residents Commute to Work: 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Number of Commuters</th>
<th>Percent of Total Commuters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Los Angeles</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>40.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Burbank</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>25.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Glendale</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>6.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pasadena</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>2.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Beverly Hills</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Culver City</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Santa Monica</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Santa Clarita</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. West Hollywood</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. San Diego County</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Destinations</td>
<td>8,544</td>
<td>18.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017, LODES Data; Longitudinal-Employer Household Dynamics Program, [https://lehd.ces.census.gov/data/lodes/](https://lehd.ces.census.gov/data/lodes/)

- This table identifies the top 10 locations where residents from the City of Burbank commute to work.
- 25.0% work in the city where they live, while 75.0% commute to other places.
Major Work Destinations*
- Commuter Rails
- Major Airports
- Ports
- High Quality Transit Area**

* Top 10 work destinations in 2011 for City of Burbank residents. Please refer to the Employment section table for details.
(Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2014, LODES 7.0 Version.)
** Based on the SCAG’s 2035 planned year data in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Amendment #1. Please note the HQTA layer is subject to change as SCAG continues to update its transportation network.
Total Jobs

Total Jobs: 2007 - 2015

Sources: California Employment Development Department, 2007 - 2015; InfoGroup; and SCAG

- Total jobs include wage and salary jobs and jobs held by business owners and self-employed persons. The total job count does not include unpaid volunteers or family workers, and private household workers.

- In 2015, total jobs in the City of Burbank numbered 112,796, an increase of 20.4 percent from 2007.

- Manufacturing jobs include those employed in various sectors including food; apparel; metal; petroleum and coal; machinery; computer and electronic products; and transportation equipment.

- Between 2007 and 2015, the number of manufacturing jobs in the city decreased by 0.95 percent.

Jobs by Sector


Sources: California Employment Development Department, 2007 - 2015; InfoGroup; and SCAG
**Jobs in Construction: 2007 - 2015**

- Construction jobs include those engaged in both residential and non-residential construction.
- Between 2007 and 2015, construction jobs in the city decreased by 5.1 percent.

**Jobs in Retail Trade: 2007 - 2015**

- Retail trade jobs include those at various retailers including motor vehicle and parts dealers, furniture, electronics and appliances, building materials, food and beverage, clothing, sporting goods, books, and office supplies.
- Between 2007 and 2015, the number of retail trade jobs in the city increased by 1.3 percent.
Jobs in the professional and management sector include those employed in professional and technical services, management of companies, and administration and support.

Between 2007 and 2015, the number of professional and management jobs in the city increased by 20.9 percent.

**Jobs in Professional and Management: 2007 - 2015**

Sources: California Employment Development Department, 2007 - 2015; InfoGroup; and SCAG
From 2007 to 2015, the share of Information jobs increased from 28.3 percent to 32.6 percent.

See Methodology Section for industry sector definitions.

In 2015, the Information sector was the largest job sector, accounting for 32.6 percent of total jobs in the city.

Other large sectors included Education (18.1 percent), Professional (15 percent), and Leisure (7.9 percent).
Average Salaries

Average Salaries for jobs located in the city increased from $54,736 in 2003 to $73,268 in 2015, a 33.9 percent change.

Note: Dollars are not adjusted for annual inflation.

In 2015, the employment sector providing the highest salary per job in the city was Information ($91,450).

The Non-Classified sector provided the lowest annual salary per job ($24,209).
VII. Retail Sales

Real Retail Sales

Real Retail Sales (in 2015 $ millions): 2001 - 2015

- Real (inflation adjusted) retail sales in the City of Burbank increased by 30.6 percent between 2000 and 2005.
- Real retail sales increased by 0.2 percent between 2005 and 2015.

Real Retail Sales per Person (in 2015 $ thousands): 2001 - 2015

- Between 2001 and 2015, retail sales per person for the city increased from $16,352 to $20,587.
VIII. Education

**Total Student Enrollment**

K-12 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2016

- Between 2000 and 2016, total K-12 public school enrollment for schools within the City of Burbank decreased by 1,680 students, or about 10 percent.

---

**Student Enrollment by Grade**

K-6 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2016

- Between 2000 and 2016, total public elementary school enrollment decreased by 1,895 students or 21.2 percent.
Between 2000 and 2016, total public school enrollment for grades 7-9 decreased by 1,129 students or 24.6 percent.

Between 2000 and 2016, total public school enrollment for grades 10-12 increased by 1,344 students, about 40.6 percent.
In 2016, 88.4 percent of the population 25 years and over completed high school or higher, which is higher than the 2000 level.

In 2016, 38.2 percent of the population 25 years and over completed a Bachelor’s degree or higher, which is higher than the 2000 level.
IX. Public Health

Beginning with the 2017 edition, the Local Profiles will be providing information on public health performance at the local jurisdictional level. Many adverse public health outcomes related to obesity and poor air quality may be preventable through the implementation of a more sustainable and integrated program of community and transportation planning at the regional and local levels. Evidence has shown that built environment factors play an important role in supporting healthy behavior and reducing rates of chronic diseases and obesity. For example, improved active transportation infrastructure, better accessibility to recreational open space, and the development of more walkable communities enhance opportunities for physical exercise and thereby result in a reduction of obesity rates, along with the chronic diseases associated with physical inactivity.

Obesity Rate and Physical Activity Rate (18 Years & Over): 2014

- The obesity rate in the City of Burbank was 20.8 percent in 2014, which was lower than the County rate.

Chronic Disease Rate (18 Years & Over): 2014

- The share of population in the City of Burbank who were ever diagnosed with asthma was 14.2 percent in 2014; for diabetes the rate was 7.1 percent; and for heart disease 5.5 percent.

Source: California Health Interview Survey, 2016.
* "Obesity" is defined as a Body Mass Index (BMI) of 30 or higher.
** "Physical Activity" refers to walking a minimum of 150 minutes per week.
X. SCAG Regional Highlights

Regional Median Sales Price for Existing Homes: 2002 - 2016

- After reaching its peak in 2007, the median sales price for existing homes in the SCAG region dropped by almost half by 2009.
- In 2016, the median sales price had rebounded by about 69 percent from the 2009 low to $466,000.
- Median home sales price was calculated based on total existing home sales in the SCAG region.

Regional Real Retail Sales: 2005 - 2015

- Retail sales tend to follow closely with trends in personal income, employment rates, and consumer confidence.
- Before 2005, real (inflation adjusted) retail sales increased steadily by 11 percent before dropping by about 25 percent between 2005 and 2009.
- In 2015, total real retail sales in the SCAG region increased by about 29 percent since 2009.
X. Data Sources

California Department of Education
California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit
California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division
California State Board of Equalization
Construction Industry Research Board
InfoGroup
CoreLogic/DataQuick
Nielsen Company
U.S. Census Bureau
XI. Methodology

SCAG’s Local Profiles utilizes the most up-to-date information from a number of publically available sources, including the U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance, and the California Department of Education. In the event that public information is not available or is not the most recent, SCAG contracts with a number of private entities to obtain regional data. The following sections describe how each data source was compiled to produce the information displayed in this report.

Statistical Summary Table

In the Statistical Summary Table (page 3), the values in the field “Jurisdiction Relative to County/Region” represent the difference between the jurisdiction’s value and the county/region value, except for the following categories which represent the jurisdiction’s value as a share of the county (or in the case of an entire county as a share of the region): Population, Number of Households, Number of Housing Units, Number of Jobs, Total Jobs Change, and K-12 Student Enrollment.

Median Age, Homeownership Rate, and Median Household Income are based on Nielsen Company data. Number of Housing Units is based on the 2010 Census and estimates from the California Department of Finance. Data for all other categories are referenced throughout the report.

Population Section

Where referenced, data from 2000 to 2016 was taken from the California Department of Finance’s (DOF) E-5 estimates, which were published in May 2016. This dataset was benchmarked to population figures from the 2000 and 2010 U.S. Decennial Censuses. Data relating to population by age group and by race/ethnicity was derived from the 2000 and 2010 U.S. Decennial Censuses, and Nielsen Co. The 2000 figure was based on U.S. Decennial Census figures for April 1, 2000 and the 2010 figure was based on U.S. Decennial Census figures for April 1, 2010.

Below are definitions for race and ethnicity, taken from the U.S. Census Bureau.

The Hispanic or Latino origin category is:
- A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

The race categories are:
- American Indian or Alaska Native – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.
- Asian – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.
- Black or African American – A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa, including those who consider themselves to be "Haitian."
• White – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

• Some other race – This category includes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands) and all other responses not included in the "American Indian or Alaska Native," "Asian," "Black or African American," and "White" race categories described above.


Households Section

The 2000 figure was based on U.S. Decennial Census figures for April 1, 2000 and the 2010 figure was based on U.S. Decennial Census figures for April 1, 2010. Information for 2016 was supplied by the Nielsen Company. Average household size was developed using information from the California Department of Finance (DOF). Households by Size was calculated based on Nielsen Company data. Households refer to the number of occupied housing units.

Housing Section

Housing units are the total number of both vacant and occupied units. Housing units by housing type information was developed using data from the California Department of Finance (DOF). Age of housing stock information was provided by the Nielsen Company.

The number of residential units with permits issued was obtained using Construction Industry Research Board data, which are collected by counties and are self-reported by individual jurisdictions. It represents both new single family and new multifamily housing units that were permitted to be built, along with building permits that were issued for improvements to existing residential structures (e.g., re-roofs, remodels). Please note that SCAG opted to report the annual number of permits issued by each jurisdiction which may be different than the number of housing units completed or constructed annually. This was done using a single data source which provides consistent data for all jurisdictions. The Construction Industry Research Board defines "multi-family housing" to include duplexes, apartments, and condominiums in structures of more than one living unit.

The median home sales price, compiled from CoreLogic/DataQuick, was calculated based on total resales of existing homes in the jurisdiction, including single family units and condominiums. The median price does not reflect the entire universe of housing in the jurisdiction, only those that were sold within the calendar year.

Transportation Section

The journey to work data for the year 2000 was obtained by using the 2000 U.S. Decennial Census Summary File 3. Data for 2010 is based on the 2010 U.S. Census American Community Survey. Information for 2016 was provided by the Nielsen Company.
Employment Section

Data sources for estimating jurisdiction employment and wage information include the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau Local Employment Dynamics Survey, and information from the California Employment Development Department, InfoGroup, and SCAG for years 2007-2015. In many instances, employment totals from individual businesses were geocoded and aggregated to the jurisdictional level.

Employment information by industry type is defined by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). Although the NAICS provides a great level of detail on industry definitions for all types of businesses in North America, for the purposes of this report, this list of industries has been summarized into the following major areas: agriculture, construction, manufacturing, wholesale, retail, information, finance/insurance/real estate, professional/management, education/health, leisure/hospitality, public administration, other services, and non-classified industries.

A brief description of each major industry area is provided below:

- **Agriculture** – This industry includes crop production, animal production and aquaculture, forestry and logging, fishing hunting and trapping, and support activities for agriculture and forestry.
- **Construction** – Industries under this umbrella involve the construction of buildings, heavy and civil engineering construction, and specialty trade contractors.
- **Manufacturing** – This group includes the processing of raw material into products for trade, such as food manufacturing, apparel manufacturing, wood product manufacturing, petroleum and coal products manufacturing, chemical manufacturing, plastics and rubber products manufacturing, nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing and primary metal manufacturing.
- **Wholesale** – Wholesale industries do business in the trade of raw materials and durable goods.
- **Retail** – Retail industries engage in the sale of durable goods directly to consumers.
- **Information** – Businesses in this industry specialize in the distribution of content through a means of sources, including newspaper, periodicals, books, software, motion pictures, sound recording, radio and television broadcasting, cable or subscription programming, telecommunications, data processing/hosting, and other information mediums.
- **Finance/Insurance/Real Estate** – This sector includes businesses associated with banking, consumer lending, credit intermediation, securities brokerage, commodities exchanges, health/life/medical/title/property/casualty insurance agencies and brokerages, and real estate rental/leasing/sales.
- **Professional Management** – This industry involves businesses that specialize in professional/scientific/technical services, management of companies and enterprises, and administrative and support services. Types of establishments that would fall under this category range from law offices, accounting services, architectural/engineering firms, specialized design services, computer systems design and related services, management consulting firms, scientific research and...
development services, advertising firms, office administrative services, facilities support services, among many others.

- **Education/Health** – Organizations include elementary and secondary schools, junior colleges, universities, professional schools, technical and trade schools, medical offices, dental offices, outpatient care centers, medical and diagnostic laboratories, hospitals, nursing and residential care facilities, social assistance services, emergency relief services, vocational rehabilitation services, and child day care services.

- **Leisure/Hospitality** – These industries include organizations in the performing arts, spectator sports, museums, amusement/recreation industries, traveler accommodations, and food and drink services.

- **Public Administration** – This classification includes public sector organizations, including legislative bodies, public finance institutions, executive and legislative offices, courts, police protection, parole offices, fire protection, correctional institutions, administration of governmental programs, space research and technology, and national security.

- **Other Services** – Groups in this group include, for example, automotive repair and maintenance, personal and household goods repair and maintenance, personal laundry services, dry-cleaning and laundry services, religious services, social advocacy organizations, professional organizations, and private households.

- **Non-Classified** – Non-classified organizations involve work activities that are not included in the North American Industry Classification System.

**Retail Sales Section**

Retail sales data is obtained from the California Board of Equalization, which does not publish individual point-of-sale data. All data is adjusted for inflation.

**Education Section**

Student enrollment data is based on public school campuses that are located within each jurisdiction’s respective boundary. Enrollment numbers by grade within a given jurisdiction are tabulated based upon data obtained from the California Department of Education. Enrollment year is based on the end date of the school year; for example, enrollment data for the year 2000 refers to the 1999-2000 school year. City boundaries used in the dataset for all years is based on data provided by the Local Agency Formation Commission for each county in the region.

**Regional Highlights**

Information for this section was developed through data from CoreLogic/DataQuick and the California Board of Equalization.
Data Sources Section

In choosing the data sources used for this report, the following factors were considered:

- Availability for all jurisdictions in the SCAG region,
- The most recognized source on the subject,
- Data sources within the public domain, and
- Data available on an annual basis.

The same data sources are used for all Local Profiles (except where noted) to maintain overall reporting consistency. The jurisdictions are not constrained from using other data sources for their planning activities.

The preparation of this report has been financed in part through grants from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, under the Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f) of Title 23, U.S. Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation. Additional assistance was provided by the California Department of Transportation.
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4. Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker El Centro District 1
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15. Hon. Frank Navarro Colton District 6
16. Hon. Larry McCallon Highland District 7
17. Hon. Deborah Robertson Rialto District 8
18. Hon. L. Dennis Michael Rancho Cucamonga District 9
19. Hon. Ray Marquez Chino Hills District 10
20. Hon. Bill Jahn Big Bear Lake District 11
21. Hon. Fred Minagar Laguna Niguel District 12
22. Hon. Barbara Kogerman Laguna Hills District 13
23. Hon. Donald P. Wagner Irvine District 14
24. Hon. Steve Nagel Fountain Valley District 15
25. Hon. VACANT Tustin District 17
26. Hon. Steve Hwangbo La Palma District 18
27. Hon. Kris Murray Anaheim District 19
28. Hon. Tri Ta Westminster District 20
29. Hon. Art Brown Buena Park District 21
30. Hon. Marty Simonoff Brea District 22
31. Hon. Victor Manalo Artesia District 23
32. Hon. Gene Daniels Paramount District 24
33. Hon. Sean Ashton Downey District 25
34. Hon. José Luis Solache Lynwood District 26
35. Hon. Ali Saleh Bell District 27
36. Hon. Dan Medina Gardena District 28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hon.</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Rex Richardson</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Lena Gonzalez</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Andrew Sarega</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>District 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Margaret Clark</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>District 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Gene Murabito</td>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>District 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Barbara Messina</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>District 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Jonathan Curtis</td>
<td>La Cañada/Flintridge</td>
<td>District 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Carol Herrera</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>District 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Sam Pedroza</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>District 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>James Gazeley</td>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>District 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Judy Mitchell</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>District 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Pam O’Connor</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>District 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Vartan Gharpertian</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>District 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Steven Hofbauer</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>District 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Laura Rosenthal</td>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>District 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Carmen Ramirez</td>
<td>Oxnard</td>
<td>District 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Glen Becerra</td>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>District 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>District 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Gilbert Cedillo</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Paul Krekorian</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Bob Blumenfield</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>David Ryu</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Paul Koretz</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Nury Martinez</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Marqueece Harris-Dawson</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Curren D. Price, Jr.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Herb J. Wesson, Jr.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Mike Bonin</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Mitchell Englander</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Mitch O’Farrell</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>José Huizar</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Joe Buscaino</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Karen Spiegel</td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>District 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Erik Peterson</td>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>District 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Victorville</td>
<td>District 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Michael Wilson</td>
<td>Indio</td>
<td>District 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Antonio Lopez</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>District 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Rusty Bailey</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>District 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Jeffrey Giba</td>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
<td>District 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Hon. Ben Benoit</td>
<td>Wildomar</td>
<td>TCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Hon. Ross Chun</td>
<td>Aliso Viejo</td>
<td>TCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Hon. Maxine Resvaloso</td>
<td>Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>Tribal Government Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Mr. Randall Lewis</td>
<td>Lewis Group of Companies</td>
<td>Business Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Hon. Eric Garcetti</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>(Member at Large)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: