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I. INTRODUCTION

The Southern California Association of Governments

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the largest Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in the nation, with more than 19 million residents. The SCAG region includes six counties (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura) and 191 incorporated cities. In addition, the SCAG region is a major hub of global economic activity, representing the 16th largest economy in the world and is considered the nation’s gateway for international trade, with two of the largest ports in the nation. The SCAG region is also the most culturally diverse region in the nation, with no single ethnic group comprising a majority of the population. With a robust, diversified economy and a growing population substantially fueled by international immigration, the SCAG region is poised to continue its role as a primary metropolitan center on the Pacific Rim.

SCAG Activities

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. Additionally, SCAG is pursuing a variety of innovative planning and policy initiatives to foster a more sustainable Southern California. In addition to conducting the formal planning activities required of an MPO, SCAG provides local governments with a wide variety of benefits and services including, for example, data and information, GIS training, planning and technical assistance, and support for sustainability planning grants.

The Local Profiles

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

The Local Profiles reports provide a variety of demographic, economic, education, housing, and transportation 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 sector?

Answers to questions such as these provide a snapshot of the dynamic changes affecting each local jurisdiction.
The purpose of this report is to provide current information and data for the City of Rancho Cucamonga for planning and outreach efforts. Information on population, housing, transportation, employment, retail sales, and education can be utilized by the city to make well informed planning decisions. The report provides a portrait of the city and its changes since 2000, using average figures for San Bernardino 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 report illustrates current trends occurring in the City of Rancho Cucamonga.

**Factors Affecting Local Changes Reflected in the 2019 Report**

Overall, member jurisdictions since 2000 have been impacted by a variety of factors at the national, regional, and local levels. For example, the vast majority of member jurisdictions included in the 2019 Local Profiles reflect national demographic trends toward an older and more diverse population. Evidence of continued economic growth is also apparent through increases in employment, retail sales, building permits, and home prices. Work destinations and commute times tend to correlate with local and regional development patterns and the 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:

- As a data and communication resource 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 Local Profiles include member jurisdictions and state and federal legislative delegates of Southern California. This report is a SCAG member benefit and the use of the data contained within this report is voluntary.

**Report Organization**

This report includes three sections. The first section presents a ‘Statistical Summary’ for the City of Rancho Cucamonga. The second section provides detailed information organized by subject area and includes brief highlights of some of the trends identified by that information. The third section, ‘Methodology’, describes technical considerations related to data definitions, measurement, and sources.
## 2018 STATISTICAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rancho Cucamonga</th>
<th>San Bernardino County</th>
<th>Rancho Cucamonga Relative to San Bernardino County*</th>
<th>SCAG Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Total Population</strong></td>
<td>176,671</td>
<td>2,174,938</td>
<td>[8.1%]</td>
<td>19,145,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Population Density (Persons per Square Mile)</strong></td>
<td>4,433</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Median Age (Years)</strong></td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Non-Hispanic White</strong></td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Non-Hispanic Asian</strong></td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Non-Hispanic Black</strong></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native</strong></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 All Other Non-Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Number of Households</strong></td>
<td>57,365</td>
<td>644,247</td>
<td>[8.9%]</td>
<td>6,132,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Average Household Size</strong></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Median Household Income</strong></td>
<td>$83,736</td>
<td>$57,156</td>
<td>$26,580</td>
<td>$64,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Number of Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>59,318</td>
<td>719,911</td>
<td>[8.2%]</td>
<td>6,629,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Homeownership Rate</strong></td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Median Existing Home Sales Price</strong></td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$561,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017 - 2018 Median Home Sales Price Change</strong></td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Drive Alone to Work</strong></td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</strong></td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017 Number of Jobs</strong></td>
<td>85,922</td>
<td>775,176</td>
<td>[11.1%]</td>
<td>8,465,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 - 2017 Total Jobs Change</strong></td>
<td>539</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>[4.6%]</td>
<td>76,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017 Average Salary per Job</strong></td>
<td>$44,600</td>
<td>$46,339</td>
<td>-$1,739</td>
<td>$60,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018 K-12 Public School Student Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>34,334</td>
<td>401,853</td>
<td>[8.5%]</td>
<td>2,975,283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2017; Nielsen Co.; California Department of Finance E-5, May 2018; CoreLogic/DataQuick; California Department of Education; and SCAG

* Numbers with [ ] represent Rancho Cucamonga’s share of San Bernardino County. The unbracketed numbers represent the difference between Rancho Cucamonga and San Bernardino County.

Mapped jurisdictional boundaries are as of July 1, 2016 and are for visual purposes only. Report data, however, are updated according to their respective sources.
II. POPULATION

Population Growth

Population: 2000 - 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the total population of the City of Rancho Cucamonga increased by 48,928 to 176,671.
- During this 18-year period, the city’s population growth rate of 38.3 percent was higher than the San Bernardino County rate of 27.2 percent.
- 8.1 percent of the total population of San Bernardino County is in the City of Rancho Cucamonga.
- Population values for 2000 and 2010 are from the U.S. Decennial Census.
- Values for other years are estimates by the California Department of Finance.
• Between 2000 and 2018, the 55-64 age group experienced the largest increase in share, growing from 6.6 to 12.2 percent.

• The age group that experienced the greatest decline in share was 5-20, decreasing from 27.5 to 20.5 percent.

• The 21-34 age group added the most population, with an increase of 13,770 people between 2000 and 2018.
Population by Race/Ethnicity

Hispanic or Latino of Any Race: 2000, 2010, and 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the share of Hispanic population in the city increased from 27.8 percent to 37.4 percent.

Non-Hispanic White: 2000, 2010, and 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the share of Non-Hispanic White population in the city decreased from 54.8 percent to 37.6 percent.

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

Non-Hispanic Asian: 2000, 2010, and 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the share of Non-Hispanic Asian population in the city increased from 5.8 percent to 12.8 percent.

Non-Hispanic Black: 2000, 2010, and 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the share of Non-Hispanic Black population in the city increased from 7.7 percent to 8.8 percent.
Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native: 2000, 2010, & 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the share of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native population in the city increased from 0.3 percent to 0.4 percent.

All Other Non-Hispanic: 2000, 2010, and 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the share of All Other Non-Hispanic population group in the city decreased from 3.6 percent to 3.0 percent.
III. HOUSEHOLDS

Number of Households (Occupied Housing Units)

Number of Households: 2000 - 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the total number of households in the City of Rancho Cucamonga increased by 16,502 units, or 40.4 percent.

- During this 18-year period, the city’s household growth rate of 40.4 percent was higher than the county growth rate of 21.9 percent.

- 8.9 percent of San Bernardino County’s total number of households are in the City of Rancho Cucamonga.

- In 2018, the city’s average household size was 3.0, lower than the county average of 3.3.

Sources: California Department of Finance, E-5, 2000-2018
Households by Size

- In 2018, 66.8 percent of all city households had 3 people or fewer.
- About 20 percent of the households were single-person households.
- Approximately 16 percent of all households in the city had 5 people or more.

Households by Income

- In 2018, about 27 percent of households earned less than $50,000 annually.
- Approximately 40 percent of households earned $100,000 or more.
Household Income

Median Household Income: 2000, 2010, and 2018

- From 2000 to 2018, median household income increased by $23,091.
- Note: Dollars are not adjusted for annual inflation.

Renters and Homeowners

Percentage of Renters and Homeowners: 2000, 2010, and 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, homeownership rates decreased and the share of renters increased.
IV. HOUSING

Total Housing Production

Total Residential Units Permitted: 2000 - 2018

- In 2018, permits were issued for 194 residential units.

Total Residential Units Permitted per 1,000 Residents: 2000 - 2018

- In 2000, the City of Rancho Cucamonga had 11.1 permits per 1,000 residents compared to the overall county figure of 4.8 permits per 1,000 residents.

- For the city in 2018, the number of permits per 1,000 residents decreased to 1.1 permits. For the county overall, it decreased to 2.2 permits per 1,000 residents.

Source: Construction Industry Research Board, 2000 - 2018
**Single-Family Housing Production**

**Single-Family Units Permitted: 2000 - 2018**

In 2018, permits were issued for 86 single family homes.

- In 2000, the City of Rancho Cucamonga issued 7.1 permits per 1,000 residents compared to the overall county figure of 3.4 permits per 1,000 residents.
- For the city in 2018, the number of permits issued per 1,000 residents decreased to 0.5 permits. For the county overall, it decreased to 1.5 permits per 1,000 residents.

**Source:** Construction Industry Research Board, 2000-2018

---

**Single-Family Units Permitted per 1,000 Residents: 2000 - 2018**

- In 2000, the City of Rancho Cucamonga issued 7.1 permits per 1,000 residents compared to the overall county figure of 3.4 permits per 1,000 residents.
- For the city in 2018, the number of permits issued per 1,000 residents decreased to 0.5 permits. For the county overall, it decreased to 1.5 permits per 1,000 residents.

**Source:** Construction Industry Research Board, 2000-2018
Multi-Family Housing Production

**Multi-Family Units Permitted: 2000 - 2018**

- In 2018, permits were issued for 108 multi-family residential units.

**Multi-Family Units Permitted per 1,000 Residents: 2000 - 2018**

- For the city in 2018, the number of permits per 1,000 residents decreased to 0.6 permits. For the county overall, it increased to 0.6 permits per 1,000 residents.

Source: Construction Industry Research Board, 2000-2018
Between 2000 and 2018, the median home sales price of existing homes increased 179 percent from $183,000 to $510,000.

Median home sales price increased by 64.5 percent between 2010 and 2018.

In 2018, the median home sales price in the city was $510,000, $180,000 higher than that in the county overall.

Note: Median home sales price reflects resale of existing homes, which varies due to type of units sold.

Annual median home sales prices are not adjusted for inflation.
HOUSING TYPE

Housing Type by Units: 2018

<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>37,077</td>
<td>62.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>3,685</td>
<td>6.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family: 2 to 4 units</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>4.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family: 5 units plus</td>
<td>14,259</td>
<td>24.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,318</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5, 2018

- The most common housing type is Single Family Detached.
- 68.8 percent are single family homes and 28.6 percent are multi-family homes.

Age of Housing Stock

- 9.6 percent of the housing stock was built before 1970.
- 90.4 percent of the housing stock was built after 1970.

Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2017; Nielsen Co.
Foreclosures

Number of Foreclosures: 2002 - 2018

- There were 52 foreclosures in 2018.
- Between 2007 and 2018, there were 4,767 foreclosures.

Source: CoreLogic/DataQuick, 2002-2018

Housing Cost Share

Percentage of Housing Cost for Renters and Homeowners: 2017

- Housing costs accounted for an average of 31.2 percent of total household income for renters.
- Housing costs accounted for an average of 24.5 percent of total household income for homeowners.

Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2017
V. TRANSPORTATION

Journey to Work for Residents

Transportation Mode Choice: 2000, 2010, and 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, the greatest change occurred in the percentage of individuals who traveled to work by other modes (e.g. work at home, walking or biking); this share increased by 5.4 percentage points.

- ‘Other’ refers to bicycle, pedestrian, and home-based employment.

- Between 2000 and 2018, the average travel time to work decreased by approximately 2 minutes.


Average Travel Time (minutes): 2000, 2010, and 2018

In 2018, 45.9 percent of Rancho Cucamonga commuters spent more than 30 minutes to travel to work.

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

29.6 percent of Rancho Cucamonga households own one or no vehicles, while 70.4 percent of households own two or more vehicles.
VI. 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, decreased greenhouse gas emissions, improved public health, and enhanced communities.

For the 2017 Local Profiles, SCAG began providing information on the active transportation resources being implemented throughout our region. The 2019 Local Profiles continues the 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 years 2012 and 2016, provides a baseline to measure regional progress in the development of active transportation resources over time.

The Local Profiles reports will seek to provide additional active transportation data resources as they become available at the local jurisdictional level. Information on rates of physical activity (walking) is available in the Public Health section of this report.

### Bike Lane Mileage by Class: 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Class 1 2012</th>
<th>Class 1 2016</th>
<th>Class 2 2012</th>
<th>Class 2 2016</th>
<th>Class 3 2012</th>
<th>Class 3 2016</th>
<th>Class 4 2012</th>
<th>Class 4 2016</th>
<th>Total Lane Miles 2012</th>
<th>Total Lane Miles 2016</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG Region</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County Transportation Commissions: 2012, 2016

**Class 1 (Bike Path):** Separated off-road path for the exclusive use of bicycles and 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, and motor vehicles.

**Class 4 (Protected Bike Lane):** Lane separated from motor vehicle traffic by more than striping (grade separation or barrier).
VII. EMPLOYMENT

Employment Centers


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Number of Commuters</th>
<th>Percent of Total Commuters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rancho Cucamonga</td>
<td>10,413</td>
<td>15.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ontario</td>
<td>6,074</td>
<td>9.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Los Angeles</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>8.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Upland</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. San Bernardino</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>4.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fontana</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>4.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pomona</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>2.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Riverside</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Chino</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Anaheim</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Destinations</td>
<td>31,249</td>
<td>46.2 %</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 Rancho Cucamonga commute to work.
- 15.4% work and live in Rancho Cucamonga, while 84.6% commute to other places.
MAJOR WORK DESTINATIONS

* Top 10 work destinations in 2014 for City of Rancho Cucamonga residents. Please refer to the Employment section table for details.

**Based on the SCAG's 2040 planned year data in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Amendment #3. Please note the HQTA layer is subject to change as SCAG continues to update its transportation networks.

Source: SCAG, U.S. Census Bureau, 2019, LODES Dataset Version 7.3
Total Jobs

Total Jobs: 2007 - 2017

- 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 2017, total jobs in the City of Rancho Cucamonga numbered 85,922, an increase of 31.2 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 2017, the number of manufacturing jobs in the city increased by 3.7 percent.

Jobs by Sector

Jobs in Manufacturing: 2007 - 2017

Sources: California Employment Development Department, 2007 - 2017; InfoGroup; & SCAG
- Construction jobs include those engaged in both residential and non-residential construction.

- Between 2007 and 2017, construction jobs in the city decreased by 14.1 percent.

- 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 2017, the number of retail trade jobs in the city increased by 26.1 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 2017, the number of professional and management jobs in the city increased by 0.43 percent.
From 2007 to 2017, the share of Education jobs increased from 13.2 percent to 18.7 percent.

See ‘Methodology’ section for industry sector definitions.

In 2017, the Education sector was the largest job sector, accounting for 18.7 percent of total jobs in the city.

Other major sectors included Professional (14.5 percent), Retail (13.6 percent), and Manufacturing (11.6 percent).
### Average Salaries

#### Average Annual Salary: 2003 - 2017

- **Average salaries for jobs located in the city increased from $32,720 in 2003 to $44,600 in 2017, a 36.3 percent change.**
- **Note:** Dollars are not adjusted for annual inflation.

#### Average Annual Salary by Sector: 2017 ($ thousands)

- In 2017, the employment sector providing the highest salary per job in the city was **Public Administration** ($71,293).
- The Agriculture sector provided the lowest annual salary per job ($12,936).

Source: California Employment Development Department, 2003 - 2017

Source: California Employment Development Department, 2017


VIII. RETAIL SALES

Real Retail Sales

Real Retail Sales: 2001 - 2017

- Real (inflation adjusted) retail sales in the City of Rancho Cucamonga was $1.9 billion in 2017.

Real Retail Sales per Person: 2001 - 2017

- Real retail sales per person for the city was $11.0 thousand in 2017.

Source: California Board of Equalization, 2001-2017
IX. EDUCATION

Total Student Enrollment

K-12 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, total K-12 public school enrollment for schools within the City of Rancho Cucamonga increased by 5,142 students, or about 17.6 percent.

Student Enrollment by Grade

K-6 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, total public elementary school enrollment increased by 1,370 students or 9.2 percent.
Grades 7-9 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, total public school enrollment for grades 7-9 increased by 1,093 students or 14.3 percent.

Grades 10-12 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2018

- Between 2000 and 2018, total public school enrollment for grades 10-12 increased by 2,679 students, about 39.9 percent.
In 2018, 91.5 percent of the population 25 years old and over completed high school or higher, which is higher than the 2000 level.

In 2018, 33.8 percent of the population 25 years old and over completed a Bachelor degree or higher, which is higher than the 2000 level.
X. PUBLIC HEALTH

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/Physical Activity Rates (18 Years & Older)**

- The obesity rate in the City of Rancho Cucamonga was 30.2 percent, which was higher than the County rate.
- ‘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.

**Chronic Disease Rate (18 Years & Older)**

- The share of population in the City of Rancho Cucamonga ever diagnosed with asthma was 13.7 percent; for diabetes the rate was 8.9 percent; and for heart disease 4.8 percent.

Source: California Health Interview Survey, 2018
XI. SCAG REGIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

Regional Median Sales Price for Existing Homes: 2002 - 2018

- After peaking in 2007, the median sales price for existing homes in the SCAG region dropped by half by 2009.
- By 2018, the median sales price had increased by more than 100 percent since 2009 to a new high of $561,000.
- Median home sales price is calculated based on total existing home sales in the SCAG region.

Regional Retail Sales: 2005 - 2017

- Retail sales tend to follow regional trends in personal income, employment rates, and consumer confidence.
- Between 2005 and 2009, real (inflation adjusted) regional retail sales decreased by 25 percent.
- Total retail sales in the SCAG region increased by about 33 percent between 2009 and 2017.
XII. DATA SOURCES

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

SCAG’s 2019 Local Profiles reports utilize the most current information available from a number of public resources, including the U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance, and the California Department of Education. In cases where public information is not available, or is not the most recent, SCAG contracts with a number of private entities to obtain local and regional data. The following sections describe how each data source is compiled to produce the information provided 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 data provided by the American Community Survey and the Nielsen Company. Number of Housing Units is based on the 2010 Census and estimates provided by the California Department of Finance. Data for all other categories are referenced throughout the report.

Population Section

Where referenced, data for 2000 through 2018 was obtained from the California Department of Finance E-5 estimates, which were published in May, 2018. This dataset is benchmarked to population data 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 Census, the American Community Survey, and the Nielsen Company. The 2000 value is based on U.S. Decennial Census data for April 1, 2000 and the 2010 value is based on U.S. Decennial Census data for April 1, 2010.

Below are definitions for race and ethnicity, as provided by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The ‘Hispanic or Latino Origin’ category refers to:

- Persons of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

The ‘Race’ categories include:

- American Indian or Alaska Native: Persons having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment.

- Asian: Persons 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, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam.

- Black or African American: Persons having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa, including those who consider themselves to be Haitian.
White: Persons 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 (persons 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’, or ‘White’ racial categories described above.

Charts for population based on age were tabulated using data from the 2000 and 2010 U.S. Decennial Census, the American Community Survey, and the Nielsen Company. Charts for race/ethnicity were tabulated using data from the 2000 and 2010 U.S. Decennial Census, the American Community Survey, and the Nielsen Company.

**Households Section**

Households refer to the number of occupied housing units. The 2000 value is based on U.S. Decennial Census data for April 1, 2000 and the 2010 value is based on U.S. Decennial Census data for April 1, 2010. Information for inter-census years was provided by the American Community Survey and the Nielsen Company. Average household size was calculated using information provided by the California Department of Finance. Households by Size calculations are based on data provided by the American Community Survey and the Nielsen Company.

**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. Age of housing stock data was provided by the American Community Survey and 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 multi-family housing units that were permitted to be built, along with building permits that were issued for improvements to existing residential structures. 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.

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

Housing Cost Share refers to the percentage of household income devoted to housing expenses. Housing cost share data for homeowners and renters is provided by the American Community Survey.
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. Decennial Census. Information for inter-census years was provided by the American Community Survey and the Nielsen Company.

Active Transportation Section

Data sources for county bike lane mileage by facility classification was provided by the six County Transportation Commissions in the SCAG region.

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 2007-2017. 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**: Includes crop production, animal production and aquaculture, forestry and logging, fishing, hunting, and trapping, and support activities for agriculture and forestry.
- **Construction**: Includes activities involving the construction of buildings, heavy and civil engineering construction, and specialty trade contractors.
- **Manufacturing**: 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**: Includes activities conducting the trade of raw materials and durable goods.
- **Retail**: Includes activities engaged in the sale of durable goods directly to consumers.
- **Information**: Includes activities that specialize in the distribution of content through a means of sources, including newspaper, internet, periodicals, books, software, motion pictures, sound recording, radio and television broadcasting, cable or subscription programming, telecommunications, data processing/hosting, and other information media.
- **Finance/Insurance/Real Estate**: 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**: Includes activities that specialize in professional/scientific/technical services, management of companies and enterprises, and administrative and support services. Establishment types may include 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, and facilities support services.

• **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**: Includes activities involved in the performing arts, spectator sports, museums, amusement/recreation, travel accommodations, and food and drink services.

• **Public Administration**: Includes public sector organizations, such as 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**: Includes, 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**: All other 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 reported 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.

**Public Health Section**

Data sources for city and county obesity rates (share of population with a BMI of 30 or higher) and rates of physical activity (share of population that walked a minimum of 150 minutes each day) was obtained through the California Health Interview Survey (AskCHIS: Neighborhood Edition). Chronic disease incidence rates were also obtained through the California Health Interview Survey.
**Regional Highlights**

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

**Data Sources Section**

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

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

The same data sources are used for all Local Profiles (except where noted) to maintain overall reporting consistency. 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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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hon. Alan D. Wapner</td>
<td>Ontario SBCTA/SBCOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Vice-President</td>
<td>Hon. Bill Jahn</td>
<td>Big Bear Lake</td>
<td>District 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Vice-President</td>
<td>Hon. Randon Lane</td>
<td>Murrieta</td>
<td>District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm. Past President</td>
<td>Hon. Margaret E. Finlay</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>District 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hon. Luis Plancarte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Hon. Hilda Solis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Hon. Kathryn Barger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Hon. Curt Hagman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Hon. Linda Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Hon. Donald P. Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Hon. Jim Predmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Hon. Jan Harnik</td>
<td>Palm Desert RCTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Hon. Mike T. Judge</td>
<td>Simi Valley VCTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker</td>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Hon. Kathleen Kelly</td>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
<td>District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Hon. Jim Hyatt</td>
<td>Calimesa</td>
<td>District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Hon. Clint Lorimore</td>
<td>Eastvale</td>
<td>District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Hon. Frank Navarro</td>
<td>Colton</td>
<td>District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Hon. James L. Mulvihill</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>District 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Hon. Deborah Robertson</td>
<td>Rialto</td>
<td>District 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Hon. L. Dennis Michael</td>
<td>Rancho Cucamonga</td>
<td>District 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Hon. Ray Marquez</td>
<td>Chino Hills</td>
<td>District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Hon. Fred Minagar</td>
<td>Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Hon. Steve Nagel</td>
<td>Fountain Valley</td>
<td>District 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Hon. Cecilia Iglesias</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>District 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Hon. Charles Puckett</td>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>District 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Hon. Stacy Berry</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>District 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Hon. Trevor O’Neil</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>District 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Hon. Tri Ta</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>District 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Hon. Art Brown</td>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>District 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Hon. Marty Simonoff</td>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>District 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Hon. Sonny R. Santa Ines</td>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>District 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hon.</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Hon. Sean Ashton</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>District 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Hon. Emma Sharif</td>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>District 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Hon. Ali Saleh</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>District 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Hon. Dan Medina</td>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>District 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Hon. Rex Richardson</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Hon. Lena Gonzalez</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Hon. Steve De Ruse</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>District 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Hon. Margaret Clark</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>District 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Hon. Jorge Marquez</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>District 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Hon. Teresa Real Sebastian</td>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>District 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Hon. Jonathan Curtis</td>
<td>La Cañada/Flintridge</td>
<td>District 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Hon. Carol Herrera</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>District 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Hon. Tim Sandoval</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>District 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Hon. James Gazeley</td>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>District 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Hon. Judy Mitchell</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>District 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Hon. Meghan Sahli-Wells</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>District 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Hon. Jess Talamantes</td>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>District 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Hon. Steven Hofbauer</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>District 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Hon. David J. Shapiro</td>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>District 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Hon. Carmen Ramirez</td>
<td>Oxnard</td>
<td>District 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Hon. David Pollock</td>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>District 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Hon. Tim Holmgren</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>District 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Hon. Gilbert Cedillo</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Hon. Paul Krekorian</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Hon. Bob Blumenfield</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Hon. David Ryu</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Hon. Paul Koretz</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Hon. Nury Martinez</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Hon. Monica Rodriguez</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Hon. Marqueece Harris-Dawson</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Hon. Curren D. Price, Jr.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Hon. Herb J. Wesson, Jr.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Hon. Mike Bonin</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Hon. Mitch O’Farrell</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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72. Hon. José Huizar
    Los Angeles
    District 61

73. Hon. Joe Buscaino
    Los Angeles
    District 62

74. Hon. Steve Manos
    Lake Elsinore
    District 63

75. Hon. Lyn Semeta
    Huntington Beach
    District 64

76. Hon. Rita Ramirez
    Victorville
    District 65

77. Hon. Megan Beaman Jacinto
    Coachella
    District 66

78. Hon. Marsha McLean
    Santa Clarita
    District 67

79. Hon. Rusty Bailey
    Riverside
    District 68

80. Hon. Marisela Magana
    Perris
    District 69

81. Hon. Ben Benoit
    Wildomar
    Air District Representative

82. Hon. Peggy Huang
    Yorba Linda
    TCA Representative

83. Hon. Eric Garcetti
    Los Angeles
    Member at Large

84. Mr. Randall Lewis
    Ex-Officio Member
Notes:
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
T: (213) 236-1800
www.scag.ca.gov

REGIONAL OFFICES

**Imperial County**
1503 North Imperial Avenue, Suite 104
El Centro, CA 92243
T: (760) 353-7800

**Orange County**
OCTA Building
600 South Main Street, Suite 1233
Orange, CA 92868
T: (714) 542-3687

**Riverside County**
3403 10th Street, Suite 805
Riverside, CA 92501
T: (951) 784-1513

**San Bernardino County**
Santa Fe Depot
1170 West 3rd Street, Suite 140
San Bernardino, CA 92418
T: (909) 806-3556

**Ventura County**
4001 Mission Oaks Drive, Suite L
Camarillo, CA 93012
T: (805) 642-2800