

California June 14, 2020

## Mobility changes

This dataset is intended to help remediate the impact of COVID-19. It shouldn't be used for medical diagnostic, prognostic, or treatment purposes. It also isn't intended to be used for guidance on personal travel plans.

Each Community Mobility Report dataset is presented by location and highlights the percent change in visits to places like grocery stores and parks within a geographic area. [How to use this report.](#)

Location accuracy and the understanding of categorized places varies from region to region, so we don't recommend using this data to compare changes between countries, or between regions with different characteristics (e.g. rural versus urban areas).

We'll leave a region out of the report if we don't have statistically significant levels of data. To learn how we calculate these trends and preserve privacy, read [About this data.](#)

### Retail & recreation

# -32%

compared to baseline




Mobility trends for places like restaurants, cafes, shopping centers, theme parks, museums, libraries, and movie theaters.

### Grocery & pharmacy

# -8%

compared to baseline



Mobility trends for places like grocery markets, food warehouses, farmers markets, specialty food shops, drug stores, and pharmacies.

### Parks

# +19%

compared to baseline



Mobility trends for places like national parks, public beaches, marinas, dog parks, plazas, and public gardens.

## Transit stations

-31%

compared to baseline



Mobility trends for places like public transport hubs such as subway, bus, and train stations.

## Workplaces

-16%

compared to baseline



Mobility trends for places of work.

## Residential

+6%

compared to baseline



Mobility trends for places of residence.

# Alameda County

## Retail & recreation

**-52%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-20%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+43%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-48%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-18%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+9%** compared to baseline



# Amador County

## Retail & recreation

**+13%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**+8%** compared to baseline



## Parks\*



## Transit stations\*




## Workplaces

**-19%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*



**\* Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Butte County


## Retail & recreation

**-21%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+7%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+20%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*



## Workplaces

**-8%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+2%** compared to baseline



# Calaveras County


## Retail & recreation

**-11%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy\*

**+23%** compared to baseline



## Parks\*

**+133%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*




## Workplaces

**-10%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*

**+7%** compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Colusa County

## Retail & recreation\*

-8% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy\*



## Parks\*



## Transit stations

+1% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-13% compared to baseline



## Residential\*



# Contra Costa County

## Retail & recreation

-39% compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

-6% compared to baseline



## Parks

+46% compared to baseline



## Transit stations

-31% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-15% compared to baseline



## Residential

+7% compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Del Norte County


## Retail & recreation\*

**+19%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy\*

**+28%** compared to baseline



## Parks\*

**+50%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*



## Workplaces

**-3%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*



# El Dorado County


## Retail & recreation

**-17%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+6%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+163%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-25%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-22%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+3%** compared to baseline



**\* Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Fresno County

## Retail & recreation

**-23%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+5%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+47%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-9%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-11%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+2%** compared to baseline



# Glenn County

## Retail & recreation\*

**+12%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy\*

**+17%** compared to baseline



## Parks\*



## Transit stations

**+34%** compared to baseline




## Workplaces

**-9%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*



**\* Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Humboldt County


## Retail & recreation

**-31%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+1%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+112%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+24%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-13%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+2%** compared to baseline



# Imperial County

## Retail & recreation

**-48%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-21%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**-69%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-35%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-20%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+12%** compared to baseline





# Inyo County

## Retail & recreation\*

-7% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy\*



## Parks

+48% compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*



## Workplaces

-20% compared to baseline



## Residential\*



# Kern County

## Retail & recreation

-17% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

+3% compared to baseline



## Parks

+61% compared to baseline



## Transit stations

+4% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-9% compared to baseline



## Residential

+2% compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Kings County


## Retail & recreation

-9% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

-1% compared to baseline



## Parks

+7% compared to baseline



## Transit stations

-42% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-7% compared to baseline



## Residential

+2% compared to baseline



# Lake County

## Retail & recreation

+6% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

+15% compared to baseline



## Parks\*

+97% compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*

+25% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-12% compared to baseline



## Residential\*

+4% compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Lassen County


## Retail & recreation\*

-8% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy\*

+25% compared to baseline



## Parks\*



## Transit stations\*



## Workplaces

+8% compared to baseline



## Residential\*



# Los Angeles County

## Retail & recreation

-34% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

-11% compared to baseline



## Parks

+3% compared to baseline



## Transit stations

-34% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-19% compared to baseline



## Residential

+7% compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Madera County


## Retail & recreation

**-34%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**+7%** compared to baseline




## Parks

**+77%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+37%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-13%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+2%** compared to baseline



# Marin County

## Retail & recreation

**-42%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-10%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+17%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-11%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-15%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+7%** compared to baseline




# Mariposa County

## Retail & recreation\*



## Grocery & pharmacy\*

**+8%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+59%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*



## Workplaces

**-10%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*



# Mendocino County

## Retail & recreation

**-11%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+20%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+118%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*

**-11%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-14%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*

**+4%** compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Merced County

## Retail & recreation

**-12%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**-1%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+76%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-2%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-6%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+3%** compared to baseline



# Modoc County

## Retail & recreation\*



## Grocery & pharmacy\*



## Parks\*



## Transit stations\*




## Workplaces\*

**-18%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*




**\* Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Mono County


## Retail & recreation\*

-57% compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy\*

-23% compared to baseline




## Parks\*

+36% compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*

-31% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-32% compared to baseline



## Residential\*



# Monterey County

## Retail & recreation

-19% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

+11% compared to baseline



## Parks

+49% compared to baseline



## Transit stations

-3% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-18% compared to baseline



## Residential

+4% compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Napa County


## Retail & recreation

**-18%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**-8%** compared to baseline



## Parks\*

**+180%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*

**-11%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-23%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+5%** compared to baseline



# Nevada County


## Retail & recreation

**-25%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+5%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+118%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-8%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-17%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+2%** compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.



# Orange County

## Retail & recreation

**-34%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-6%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+25%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-34%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-18%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+7%** compared to baseline



# Placer County

## Retail & recreation

**-18%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+7%** compared to baseline




## Parks

**+99%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+44%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-16%** compared to baseline



## Residential


**+3%** compared to baseline




# Plumas County

## Retail & recreation\*


**+6%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy\*



## Parks\*



## Transit stations\*



## Workplaces\*

**-3%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*



# Riverside County

## Retail & recreation

**-26%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-4%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**-20%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-22%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-18%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+5%** compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Sacramento County

## Retail & recreation

**-26%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**-4%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+48%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-31%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-13%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+4%** compared to baseline



# San Benito County

## Retail & recreation

**-13%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**-7%** compared to baseline



## Parks\*

**+7%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*

**-6%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-6%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*

**+11%** compared to baseline



**\* Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# San Bernardino County


## Retail & recreation

**-21%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-1%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+12%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-11%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-13%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+4%** compared to baseline



# San Diego County

## Retail & recreation

**-33%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-10%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+6%** compared to baseline




## Transit stations

**-41%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-17%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+7%** compared to baseline



# San Francisco County

## Retail & recreation

**-65%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-33%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**-6%** compared to baseline




## Transit stations

**-56%** compared to baseline




## Workplaces

**-24%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+12%** compared to baseline



# San Joaquin County

## Retail & recreation

**-21%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+5%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+52%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-15%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-10%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+3%** compared to baseline



# San Luis Obispo County


## Retail & recreation

**-18%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+4%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+56%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-4%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-19%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+4%** compared to baseline



# San Mateo County

## Retail & recreation

**-43%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-12%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+22%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-71%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-15%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+10%** compared to baseline



# Santa Barbara County

## Retail & recreation

**-26%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-1%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+27%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-26%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-18%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+5%** compared to baseline



# Santa Clara County

## Retail & recreation

**-49%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-19%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+33%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-51%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-14%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+9%** compared to baseline



# Santa Cruz County


## Retail & recreation

**-22%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-3%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+59%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-38%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-13%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+6%** compared to baseline



# Shasta County


## Retail & recreation

**-5%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**+16%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+142%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+30%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-9%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**0%** compared to baseline





# Siskiyou County


## Retail & recreation

**+15%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**+31%** compared to baseline




## Parks\*

**+104%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+58%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**+2%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*

**+3%** compared to baseline



# Solano County

## Retail & recreation

**-25%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**-6%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+31%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+2%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-12%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+4%** compared to baseline



**\* Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Sonoma County

## Retail & recreation

**-29%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-2%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+59%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**-24%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-12%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+5%** compared to baseline



# Stanislaus County

## Retail & recreation

**-15%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+3%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+61%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+13%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-10%** compared to baseline



## Residential


**+2%** compared to baseline



# Sutter County


## Retail & recreation

-5% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

-1% compared to baseline



## Parks\*



## Transit stations\*

-2% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-13% compared to baseline



## Residential

+1% compared to baseline



# Tehama County

## Retail & recreation

-10% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

+20% compared to baseline



## Parks\*

+21% compared to baseline



## Transit stations

+17% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-7% compared to baseline



## Residential\*

+2% compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Trinity County

## Retail & recreation\*



## Grocery & pharmacy\*



## Parks\*



## Transit stations\*



## Workplaces\*

-15% compared to baseline



## Residential\*



# Tulare County

## Retail & recreation

-21% compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

+5% compared to baseline



## Parks

+74% compared to baseline



## Transit stations

+4% compared to baseline



## Workplaces

-8% compared to baseline



## Residential

+2% compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Tuolumne County


## Retail & recreation

**-3%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy\*

**+21%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+56%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*




## Workplaces

**-12%** compared to baseline



## Residential\*

**+6%** compared to baseline



# Ventura County

## Retail & recreation

**-25%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**-6%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+30%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+5%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-11%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+5%** compared to baseline



\* **Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

# Yolo County

## Retail & recreation

**-29%** compared to baseline




## Grocery & pharmacy

**-6%** compared to baseline



## Parks

**+46%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations

**+1%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-7%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+5%** compared to baseline



# Yuba County

## Retail & recreation

**+9%** compared to baseline



## Grocery & pharmacy

**+24%** compared to baseline



## Parks\*

**+67%** compared to baseline



## Transit stations\*

**-7%** compared to baseline



## Workplaces

**-14%** compared to baseline



## Residential

**+1%** compared to baseline



**\* Not enough data for this date:** Currently, there is not enough data to provide a complete analysis of this place. Google needs a significant volume of data to generate an aggregated and anonymous view of trends.

## About this data

These reports show how visits and length of stay at different places change compared to a baseline. We calculate these changes using the same kind of aggregated and anonymized data used to show [popular times](#) for places in Google Maps.

Changes for each day are compared to a baseline value for that day of the week:

- The baseline is the *median* value, for the corresponding day of the week, during the 5-week period Jan 3–Feb 6, 2020.
- The reports show trends over several weeks with the most recent data representing approximately 2-3 days ago—this is how long it takes to produce the reports.

What data is included in the calculation depends on user settings, connectivity, and whether it meets our privacy threshold. If the privacy threshold isn't met (when somewhere isn't busy enough to ensure anonymity) we don't show a change for the day.

We include categories that are useful to social distancing efforts as well as access to essential services.

We calculate these insights based on data from users who have opted-in to Location History for their Google Account, so the data represents a sample of our users. As with all samples, this may or may not represent the exact behavior of a wider population.

## Preserving privacy

These reports were developed to be helpful while adhering to our stringent privacy protocols and protecting people's privacy. No personally identifiable information, like an individual's location, contacts or movement, is made available at any point.

Insights in these reports are created with aggregated, anonymized sets of data from users who have turned on the [Location History](#) setting, which is off by default. People who have Location History turned on can choose to turn it off at any time from their [Google Account](#) and can always delete Location History data directly from their [Timeline](#).

These reports are powered by the same world-class anonymization technology that we use in our products every day and that keep your activity data private and secure. These reports use [differential privacy](#), which adds artificial noise to our datasets enabling high quality results without identifying any individual person. These privacy-preserving protections also ensure that the absolute number of visits isn't shared.

## Further resources

To learn how you can best use this report in your work, visit [Mobility Reports Help](#).

To get the latest report, visit [google.com/covid19/mobility](https://google.com/covid19/mobility)