

Workforce Commuting Patterns Ohio Counties, Based on 1990 Census

County	InCommuters			OutCommuters			Net Comparison Statistics		
	Working in the County	In-Commuters	Percent of In-Commuters	Employed Living in the County	Out-Commuters	Percent of Out-Commuters	Commuting Balance Net flow	Percent of Total Commuters	Percent of Working in the County
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
Adams	6,663	1,394	20.9	8,591	3,322	38.7	(1,928)	-40.9	28.9
Allen	53,656	13,289	24.8	45,641	5,274	11.6	8,015	43.2	14.9
Ashland	20,330	4,105	20.2	21,729	5,504	25.3	(1,399)	-14.6	6.9
Ashtabula	33,976	3,723	11.0	39,993	9,740	24.4	(6,017)	-44.7	17.7
Athens	22,920	3,578	15.6	22,790	3,448	15.1	130	1.9	0.6
Auglaize	18,471	5,318	28.8	20,542	7,389	36.0	(2,071)	-16.3	11.2
Belmont	21,839	4,931	22.6	26,429	9,521	36.0	(4,590)	-31.8	21.0
Brown	8,393	2,490	29.7	14,652	8,749	59.7	(6,259)	-55.7	74.6
Butler	106,033	26,921	25.4	134,645	55,533	41.2	(28,612)	-34.7	27.0
Carroll	6,725	1,811	26.9	10,617	5,703	53.7	(3,892)	-51.8	57.9
Champaign	12,293	2,894	23.5	16,931	7,532	44.5	(4,638)	-44.5	37.7
Clark	55,171	10,322	18.7	64,012	19,163	29.9	(8,841)	-30.0	16.0
Clermont	42,918	15,661	36.5	71,376	44,119	61.8	(28,458)	-47.6	66.3
Clinton	16,746	5,221	31.2	16,029	4,504	28.1	717	7.4	4.3
Columbiana	35,183	6,468	18.4	43,513	14,798	34.0	(8,330)	-39.2	23.7
Coshocton	13,628	1,773	13.0	14,568	2,713	18.6	(940)	-21.0	6.9
Crawford	18,012	3,347	18.6	20,504	5,839	28.5	(2,492)	-27.1	13.8
Cuyahoga	734,002	160,345	21.8	617,552	43,895	7.1	116,450	57.0	15.9
Darke	18,133	2,279	12.6	24,331	8,477	34.8	(6,198)	-57.6	34.2
Defiance	18,150	5,125	28.2	18,254	5,229	28.6	(104)	-1.0	0.6
Delaware	23,174	9,207	39.7	33,211	19,244	57.9	(10,037)	-35.3	43.3
Erie	34,441	8,068	23.4	34,638	8,265	23.9	(197)	-1.2	0.6
Fairfield	29,083	6,028	20.7	47,957	24,902	51.9	(18,874)	-61.0	64.9
Fayette	9,829	2,100	21.4	11,586	3,857	33.3	(1,757)	-29.5	17.9
Franklin	559,710	95,608	17.1	487,305	23,203	4.8	72,405	60.9	12.9
Fulton	17,444	5,706	32.7	18,286	6,548	35.8	(842)	-6.9	4.8
Gallia	12,192	3,283	26.9	11,281	2,372	21.0	911	16.1	7.5
Geauga	24,626	9,464	38.4	39,158	23,996	61.3	(14,532)	-43.4	59.0
Greene	62,206	28,215	45.4	65,058	31,067	47.8	(2,852)	-4.8	4.6
Guernsey	15,716	3,129	19.9	15,280	2,693	17.6	436	7.5	2.8
Hamilton	521,392	164,993	31.6	399,406	43,007	10.8	121,986	58.6	23.4
Hancock	33,743	7,741	22.9	31,152	5,150	16.5	2,591	20.1	7.7
Hardin	10,302	1,669	16.2	12,907	4,274	33.1	(2,605)	-43.8	25.3
Harrison	4,345	1,229	28.3	5,603	2,487	44.4	(1,258)	-33.9	29.0
Henry	11,362	2,907	25.6	13,169	4,714	35.8	(1,807)	-23.7	15.9
Highland	10,883	2,198	20.2	14,169	5,484	38.7	(3,286)	-42.8	30.2
Hocking	7,755	1,962	25.3	10,131	4,338	42.8	(2,376)	-37.7	30.6
Holmes	13,199	3,068	23.2	13,441	3,310	24.6	(242)	-3.8	1.8
Huron	24,130	6,453	26.7	24,760	7,083	28.6	(630)	-4.7	2.6
Jackson	9,347	1,658	17.7	10,180	2,491	24.5	(833)	-20.1	8.9
Jefferson	27,562	6,824	24.8	28,964	8,226	28.4	(1,402)	-9.3	5.1
Knox	17,693	1,939	11.0	20,738	4,984	24.0	(3,045)	-44.0	17.2
Lake	87,628	24,048	27.4	107,589	44,009	40.9	(19,961)	-29.3	22.8
Lawrence	13,109	2,803	21.4	21,921	11,615	53.0	(8,812)	-61.1	67.2
Licking	47,640	8,237	17.3	58,794	19,391	33.0	(11,154)	-40.4	23.4

Workforce Commuting Patterns Ohio Counties, Based on 1990 Census

County	InCommuters			OutCommuters			Net Comparison Statistics		
	Working in the County	In-Commuters	Percent of In-Commuters	Employed Living in the County	Out-Commuters	Percent of Out-Commuters	Commuting Balance Net flow	Percent of Total Commuters	Percent of Working in the County
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
Logan	16,633	3,741	22.5	18,512	5,620	30.4	(1,879)	-20.1	11.3
Lorain	99,508	16,169	16.2	119,944	36,605	30.5	(20,436)	-38.7	20.5
Lucas	219,069	43,313	19.8	200,052	24,296	12.1	19,017	28.1	8.7
Madison	10,980	3,993	36.4	16,243	9,256	57.0	(5,263)	-39.7	47.9
Mahoning	103,128	25,922	25.1	103,902	26,696	25.7	(774)	-1.5	0.8
Marion	25,848	4,245	16.4	26,713	5,110	19.1	(865)	-9.2	3.3
Medina	39,273	11,518	29.3	59,385	31,630	53.3	(20,112)	-46.6	51.2
Meigs	5,089	951	18.7	7,518	3,380	45.0	(2,429)	-56.1	47.7
Mercer	16,119	2,822	17.5	17,951	4,654	25.9	(1,832)	-24.5	11.4
Miami	39,372	9,847	25.0	44,122	14,597	33.1	(4,750)	-19.4	12.1
Monroe	5,906	2,365	40.0	5,318	1,777	33.4	588	14.2	10.0
Montgomery.....	303,152	73,869	24.4	265,562	36,279	13.7	37,590	34.1	12.4
Morgan	3,731	672	18.0	4,938	1,879	38.1	(1,207)	-47.3	32.4
Morrow	6,138	1,398	22.8	12,270	7,530	61.4	(6,132)	-68.7	99.9
Muskingum	33,601	4,925	14.7	34,326	5,650	16.5	(725)	-6.9	2.2
Noble	2,897	589	20.3	4,218	1,910	45.3	(1,321)	-52.9	45.6
Ottawa	16,746	5,489	32.8	17,796	6,539	36.7	(1,050)	-8.7	6.3
Paulding	4,916	842	17.1	8,698	4,624	53.2	(3,782)	-69.2	76.9
Perry	7,648	1,518	19.8	12,010	5,880	49.0	(4,362)	-59.0	57.0
Pickaway	14,996	5,245	35.0	19,496	9,745	50.0	(4,500)	-30.0	30.0
Pike	8,401	3,295	39.2	7,890	2,784	35.3	511	8.4	6.1
Portage	49,643	14,795	29.8	67,179	32,331	48.1	(17,536)	-37.2	35.3
Preble	10,764	2,543	23.6	17,662	9,441	53.5	(6,898)	-57.6	64.1
Putnam	10,394	1,678	16.1	15,384	6,668	43.3	(4,990)	-59.8	48.0
Richland	59,180	10,349	17.5	55,188	6,357	11.5	3,992	23.9	6.7
Ross	24,254	4,561	18.8	25,733	6,040	23.5	(1,479)	-14.0	6.1
Sandusky	25,626	6,091	23.8	27,353	7,818	28.6	(1,727)	-12.4	6.7
Scioto	22,981	3,043	13.2	24,728	4,790	19.4	(1,747)	-22.3	7.6
Seneca	22,448	4,634	20.6	25,728	7,914	30.8	(3,280)	-26.1	14.6
Shelby	24,097	7,157	29.7	21,195	4,255	20.1	2,902	25.4	12.0
Stark	159,464	26,026	16.3	161,334	27,896	17.3	(1,870)	-3.5	1.2
Summit	237,065	56,586	23.9	231,292	50,813	22.0	5,773	5.4	2.4
Trumbull	94,365	24,532	26.0	95,997	26,164	27.3	(1,632)	-3.2	1.7
Tuscarawas	32,925	5,045	15.3	35,114	7,234	20.6	(2,189)	-17.8	6.6
Union	20,633	11,129	53.9	14,853	5,349	36.0	5,780	35.1	28.0
Van Wert	12,208	2,451	20.1	14,119	4,362	30.9	(1,911)	-28.0	15.7
Vinton	2,774	907	32.7	3,746	1,879	50.2	(972)	-34.9	35.0
Warren.....	36,318	16,529	45.5	54,076	34,287	63.4	(17,758)	-34.9	48.9
Washington.....	25,611	5,933	23.2	26,823	7,145	26.6	(1,212)	-9.3	4.7
Wayne.....	45,289	8,449	18.7	47,075	10,235	21.7	(1,786)	-9.6	3.9
Williams	18,234	3,825	21.0	17,801	3,392	19.1	433	6.0	2.4
Wood	50,846	19,360	38.1	54,407	22,921	42.1	(3,561)	-8.4	7.0
Wyandot	9,194	2,178	23.7	10,171	3,155	31.0	(977)	-18.3	10.6

(a) Persons who reported working in the county. (b) Persons working in the county but living in another Ohio county or out of state.
(c) Incommuters as a percentage of persons working in the county. (d) Employed persons living in the county who reported place of work.
(e) Persons living in the county who commuted to jobs outside the county. (f) Outcommuters as a percentage of persons living in the county.
(g) Incommuters less outcommuters. (h) Net flow as a percentage of total commuters. (i) Net flow as a percentage of persons working in the county.
All statistics based on those reporting place of work and county of residency on the 1990 Census.

Workforce Commuting Patterns

A Review of the Numbers: The workforce commuting patterns report (above) presents a range of statistics about commuters. To present definitions and review of these statistics, each of the columns of the table will be presented using Adams County as an example.

Incommuters

1. The number in column (a) represents the number of persons (6,663) who reported **working** in Adams County on the 1990 census, regardless of their place of residence.
2. Column (b) represents the number of incommuters to Adams County or 1,394 persons **working** in the county but living in another county or out of state.
3. Column (c) is incommuters as a percentage of persons **working** in the county. For Adams County, incommuters account for 20.9 % of those working in Adams County.

Outcommuters

1. Column (d) presents the number of employed persons **living** in the county regardless of the place or location of their work. For Adams County, there are 8,591 employed persons living in the county.
2. The column (e) number is 3,322 persons **living** in Adams County who commute to jobs outside the county.
3. Column (f) or 38.7 % is outcommuters from Adams County as a percentage of persons **living** in the county.

Net Comparison Statistics

1. Incommuters minus outcommuters or the commuting balance net flow, for Adams County, is presented in column (g). A negative number indicates that more people outcommute than incommute to county. A positive number would indicate more incommuting than outcommuting. Adams County has a net loss of 1,928 workers to outcommuting. A net loss is typical for most of Ohio Counties.
2. Column (h) presents a measure of how dependent counties are for labor from other counties or how dependent they are for employment and worker income from other counties. A negative percent indicates a dependence on other counties for employment and income for their residents. A positive number indicates a reliance on other counties for meeting their labor force needs. The formula for this column is the commuting balance net flow as a percentage of total commuters (in or out), or Column (g) divided by the sum of columns (b) and (e). If in and out commuters were equal, the result would be zero. Theoretically one

could have a range of +100 percent (if there were zero outcommuting for the county) to - 100 percent (if there were zero incommuters). Adams County, at - 40.9 percent, is dependent on other counties for employment and income of its residents. Seventy of Ohio's counties have a negative number indicating a relatively greater reliance on other counties for employment and income for their citizens, as opposed to needing workers from other counties. The exceptions tend to be the major metro counties, which attract large numbers of workers.

3. Finally, column (i) presents the absolute value of the commuting balance net flow as a percentage of persons working in the county. In short, how significant is the commuting balance net flow to the overall size of the labor force working in the county. In the case of Adams County it is quite high at 28.9 percent. Fifty-five Ohio counties have 10% or higher for this statistic, indicating commuting is a significant factor in the labor force and economies of many Ohio counties.

“No County is an Island:” It has long been recognized that, in a free market economy, labor markets do not adhere to civil jurisdictions or any other arbitrary boundary. By definition, the fluid movements of markets are necessary to have a free market economy. “... workers, businesses and consumers readily move across jurisdictional boundaries, taking their economic impacts with them.”¹ Unfortunately, this means that there is an inherent strain in our political/economic systems, where local citizens, leaders and office holders do not have, within their jurisdictional boundaries, the authority nor resources to fully control or influence the economic destiny and well being of their communities. It is not uncommon for citizens and decision makers to want economic data on their neighborhood, city or county. However, if this becomes too focused and turns into a myopic view or perspective, their good intentions are likely to fail to serve their communities well. Rather, the labor and economic dynamics of one's local jurisdiction are best understood in the context of a larger or regional economy. Success for one's community is more often than not the result of leadership, which is engaged in building relationships, sustained partnerships and strategic focus across jurisdictional boundaries.

Workforce commuting patterns are a major example of how fluid labor markets can be and how much the local economic well being of a county is dependent on regional patterns of economic activity. The wealth of most counties is heavily dependent on the in and out flow of workers. The text above and the accompanying report demonstrate the need to think beyond one's civil jurisdiction.

These data are from the 1990 decennial census. Figures for the 2000 census are likely to be available next year. Although new numbers are likely to show shifts in the relative standing of the counties compared to each other, the total flows of in and out commuting are expected to grow. The growth of our economy over the decade and expansion of transportation systems and highways encourage increased flows and economic and labor market interdependence of our counties.

¹ Cortright, Joseph and Reamer, Andrew, Socioeconomic Data for Understanding Your Regional Economy: A User Guide, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1998.