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## Why This Report Matters to You

Ohio has been plagued by a systematically weak private sector for the past two decades. In the boom years of the 1990s, Ohio gained fewer jobs than all but 13 states. In the 2000s, Ohio lost more jobs than every state except Michigan. Today there are 537,500 fewer taxpayers supporting roughly the same size government Ohio had in 2000.

Though nearly the same size as 10 years ago, Ohio's government today is more costly than ever. Public-sector workers at the local, state, and federal levels now earn higher salaries than their privatesector neighbors who pay the taxes to support them. This does not include the Cadillac benefit plans or the gold-plated retirement packages guaranteed to our public-sector workers.

While the average government worker at all levels experienced a generous pay increase given the economic times, the average private-sector worker made less money in 2009 than he did in 2008. Additionally, Ohio's median household income fell nearly $\$ 3,000$ to $\$ 45,467$ and is well below the national
median household income of $\$ 50,221$.
Ohio currently has the 18th-highest state and local tax burden and the fifth-worst business environment. Not only do high taxes and anti-business policies keep companies out of Ohio, they encourage the state's existing businesses to move South and West to reduce costs.

With the loss of companies and high taxes, opportunities for Ohio's best and brightest citizens to get ahead are fleeting. It is no coincidence that the Ohio Board of Regents estimates one third of Ohio's college graduates move out of the state within three years of graduation.

Without pro-growth reforms that reduce the cost of government and strengthen the business climate, Ohio's economic problems will only perpetuate. Even as the national economy begins to recover, Ohio will lag behind other states like it did in the 1990s, and people will keep voting with their feet by moving to states where they and their families can prosper.

## Executive Summary

As last year's State of the State report highlighted, over the past two decades Ohio has been plagued by weak private-sector job growth and run away government costs coupled with high taxes. ${ }^{1}$ Unfortunately, not much has changed. Government costs are still rising, and the private sector is still weak.

The average government employee at all levels now makes more than his private-sector neighbor. From 2008 to 2009, the average private-sector Ohioan experienced a decrease in earnings from $\$ 40,216.80$ to $\$ 40,127.88$ while the average government worker received a generous pay raise given the economic climate. The average salary for local government employees jumped almost $\$ 1,000$ from $\$ 40,202.76$ to $\$ 41,160.08$. The average state government salary increased over $\$ 1,500$ from $\$ 48,676.16$ to $\$ 50,188.84$, and the average federal government salary increased nearly $\$ 800$ to $\$ 65,005.20$. $^{2}$

Local government employees now make more than their private-sector peers in 69 of 88 counties (up from 57), state workers earn more than privatesector workers in 83 of 88 counties (down from 85), and federal government workers make more than the average private-sector worker in 87 of 88 counties (no
change). Only in Union County, which has the highest private-sector income, does the average private-sector worker earn more money than his average govern-ment-employee peer. ${ }^{3}$

Just as the average private-sector wage fell from 2008 to 2009, the median household income in Ohio decreased from $\$ 48,011$ to $\$ 45,467$, well below the national median of $\$ 50,221 .{ }^{4}$

While government salaries were increasing from 2008 to 2009, Ohio's private sector lost jobs in every single county. The majority of counties also shed government jobs. However, a comparison of the percentage of private-sector jobs lost to the percentage of government jobs lost shows that the private sector experienced greater losses than government in all but three counties. ${ }^{5}$

In addition to rising government costs and a suffering private sector, Ohio suffers from having the 18th-highest state and local tax burden. ${ }^{6}$ Currently, only 23 percent of Ohio households have an annual income over $\$ 60,000$. While these people earn 67 percent of all income in Ohio, they pay 81 percent of total income taxes, which leaves the 77 percent of Ohioans making under $\$ 60,000$ only paying 19 percent of all

[^0]income taxes. ${ }^{7}$
These problems are not new to Ohio. The growing cost of government has been an issue for the past two decades. Between 1990 and 2009, Ohio's state budget grew 131 percent or 41 percent once controlling for inflation and population growth. ${ }^{8}$ While the average private-sector salary increased with inflation from 2000 to 2009, average salaries for local, state, and federal government employees all increased anywhere from 6 to 16 percent beyond inflation. ${ }^{9}$

The cost of government has risen even during periods of economic downturn due to the power of pub-lic-sector unions. In spite of private-sector employees taking pay cuts and losing their jobs, the unions have negotiated contracts that guarantee their employees significant pay raises at a time when Ohio taxpayers cannot afford the cost.

Weak job growth also has been a long-term problem for the state. From 1990 to 2011, Ohio's private sector only added a net of 176,900 jobs, or about 696 jobs per month. During these years, the size of Ohio's government increased by 63,400 jobs. Consequently, Ohio has the seventh-worst ratio for private-sector/ public-sector job creation during this 21-year period. ${ }^{10}$

From 2000 to 2011, Ohio lost 537,500 privatesector jobs, second only to Michigan. The two industry sectors that have more jobs today than they did in 2000 are Education \& Health Services and Leisure \& Hospitality. Leisure \& Hospitality has just over the
number of jobs it had in 2000. Education \& Health Services, which is funded largely by the government, grew by nearly 185,000 jobs. ${ }^{11}$

Aside from lowering the cost of government and lowering taxes, Ohio must pursue policies that will create jobs, primarily through taking on the special interests in the private sector. From 1990 to 2011, states that protect a worker's right to choose whether or not to join a union to obtain employment added privatesector jobs at three times the rate of forced-unionization states ( 34 percent vs. 11 percent). In terms of net jobs, the 22 states that protect worker freedom added 10,628,400 net private-sector jobs-60 percent more jobs than the 6,634,800 net private-sector jobs gained in the 28 forced-unionization states. To put these numbers in perspective, from 1990 to 2010, forcedunionization states added one job per 33 people while worker freedom states added one job per 12 people. The states in the top five for job growth from 1990 to 2011 are all worker freedom states while the bottom fifteen states are all forced-unionization states that form a pack stretching from Missouri to Maine, plus California and Hawaii. ${ }^{12}$

If Ohio's leaders fail to make big changes and enact game-changing reforms, Ohio will continue to experience the same economic problems that have plagued it for years even as the national economy begins to recover. However, with sound policies in place, Ohio can be a state where all its citizens and businesses have the ability to thrive and prosper.

[^1]
# Ohio's Weak Economy Struggles to Prop Up an Oversized Government 

Last year in our first annual State of the State report, Two Decades of Weak Job Growth and Skyrocketing Government Costs Pose Daunting Challenges for Ohioans, the Buckeye Institute measured the health of Ohio's economy in 2010 compared to the health of Ohio's economy in 1990 and 2000. ${ }^{13}$ Unfortunately, as the title of this year's State of the State suggests, weak job growth and the high cost of government still hold Ohio's economy captive.

## State Trends

During the 1990s, Ohio's booming economy with 17 percent job growth was only 37 th-best compared to the other 49 states. During the economic downturn of the 2000s, Ohio busted worse than any other state besides Michigan. From January 2000 to February 2011, Ohio lost 537,500 private-sector jobs (over 11 percent). ${ }^{14}$

From 1990 to 2011, Ohio's private sector performed 46th-best among the 50 states and Washington, D.C. with only Connecticut, Rhode Island, Michigan, New Jersey, and New York lagging behind. In these 21 years, Ohio's private sector only grew 4.3 percent, adding just 176,900 jobs total or roughly 696 jobs per month in a state of 11.5 million people. ${ }^{15}$

While the private sector suffered, the size and the cost of Ohio's government grew. From 1990 to 2011, Ohio added 63,400 government jobs to its payroll.

For every government job created during these two decades, Ohio added 2.79 private-sector jobs. Only Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, North Carolina, Hawaii, Vermont, and Missouri had worse private-sector/public-sector job creation ratios. During these years, government employment grew 8.9 percentmore than twice the percentage of Ohio's private sector. ${ }^{16}$

Of Ohio's industries in the private sector, five of ten (Mining \& Logging; Construction; Manufacturing; Trade, Transportation \& Utilities; and Information) have fewer jobs today than they did in 1990. Another three of ten (Financial Activities; Professional \& Business Services; and Other Services) have fewer jobs today than they did in 2000. The only two private industry sectors that have added jobs since 2000 are Leisure \& Hospitality and Education \& Health Services. Leisure \& Hospitality has just over the number of jobs it had in 2000. On the other hand, Education \& Health Services has grown by nearly 185,000 jobs. While both health care and education are important and are vital to a prosperous society, it is important to realize that this industry sector, though considered private, is largely funded by the government through programs like Medicaid, Medicare, and public education. ${ }^{17}$

Ohio's government was largely insulated from the effects of the recession. Since 2000, government em-

[^2]
## Average Salaries for Ohio Private-Sector Workers and Government Workers



ployment in Ohio has declined slightly by 300 jobs, but this decline does not even begin to offset the losses in the private sector. Government losses were essentially 0 percent when private-sector losses were 11.1 percent. ${ }^{18}$

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), Ohio's job market improved dramatically from January 2010 to February 2011 adding 76,800 private-sector jobs while losing 4,000 government jobs. ${ }^{19}$ These numbers are based on recent revisions to the BLS data and do not accurately depict the health of Ohio's job market. Given the December 2010 to January 2011 increase of 33,100 private-sector jobs, these numbers cannot be taken as a true reflection of reality. ${ }^{20}$

As Ohio's job market and private-sector employees suffered over the last two decades, the cost of
government in Ohio continued to rise. From 1990 to 2009, Ohio's state budget grew 131 percent and outpaced inflation by 41 percent after controlling for population growth. ${ }^{21}$ Not only does Ohio have more government employees than it did 20 years ago, but the cost of these employees has also risen.

Since 2000, average salaries at all levels of government have increased well beyond the rate of inflation. ${ }^{22}$ Unlike last year when the average private-sector employee earned just over the amount made by the average local government employee, government employees at all levels now make more than their privatesector neighbors. Since last year, the average privatesector salary dropped from $\$ 40,216.80$ to $\$ 40,127.88$. In spite of the economy, the average local government salary jumped from $\$ 40,202.76$ to $\$ 41,160.08$. Like-

[^3]wise, the average state salary rose from $\$ 48,676.16$ to $\$ 50,188.84$, and the average federal government salary rose from $\$ 64,223.12$ to $\$ 65,005.20 .^{23}$

Large increases in government employee compensation over the years can largely be attributed to the power of public-sector unions in Ohio. Since legislation was passed in 1983 giving public-sector workers the right to collectively bargain, government costs have exploded as salaries, benefits, and retirement packages have become increasingly generous.

To support the high cost of government in Ohio, citizens bear the 18th-highest state and local tax burden in the country. The 23 percent of Ohio's households that make over $\$ 60,000$ per year pay a disproportionate share of taxes. These households earned 67 percent of Ohio's adjusted gross income, but paid over 81 percent of the total income tax burden. Thus, 23 percent of Ohio's households paid 81 percent of the income tax burden. ${ }^{24}$

Along with high taxes, a strong private-sector union presence and regulations give Ohio the fifthworst business climate in the United States. Needless to say, Ohio is less than an attractive place for business owners looking to relocate their companies. Ohio does not need to worry about competing with China and India when it cannot even compete with the South and West in our own country.

States that protect a worker's right to choose whether or not to join a union to obtain employment experienced job growth at three times the rate of forced-unionization states from 1990 to 2011. Dur-

From 1990 to 2011, Right-to-Work states added 10.6 million jobs-a 34 percent increase. Forced-unionization states grew just 11 percent, adding only 6.6 million jobs.
ing the boom of the 1990s, the 28 forced-unionization states added a net of $9,162,600$ private-sector jobs. In the same 10-year period, the 22 Right-to-Work states grew an even greater amount adding a net of 9,613,800 jobs. Right-to-Work states added 451,200 more jobs than forced-unionization states even though the total population of forced-unionization states was 65 million greater than Right-to-Work states at this time. To put these numbers in perspective, in the 1990s forced-unionization states added one job for every 19 people. At the same time, Right-to-Work states added one job for every 11 people. From 1990 to 2011, Right-to-Work states added a total of 10,628,400 jobs growing 34 percent while forced-unionization states, including Ohio, only added 6,634,800 jobs and grew just 11 percent. ${ }^{25}$ During this period, Right-toWork states gained about four million more jobs than forced-unionization states even though forced-unionization states had roughly 60 million more people than Right-to-Work states. In other words, from 1990 to 2010, forced unionization states added one job for every 33 people while Right-to-Work states added one job for every 12 people. ${ }^{26}$

Besides Right-to-Work, companies also leave Ohio because of costly regulations with which they must comply. In 2010, Continental Plastics of Wood County moved just across the border into Indiana to avoid a regulation, costing the state 214 jobs. Continental Plastics estimated the move would save the company \$500,000 per year because the use of an incinerator would not be necessary to meet Indiana's

[^4]emission levels standard. Additionally, Continental Plastics cited that labor costs would be lower in Indiana. Thus, the good business decision for this company was leaving the state. ${ }^{27}$

## County Trends

Jobs. From 2008 to 2009, all 88 counties lost private-sector jobs while only 65 counties lost government jobs. Although both sectors lost jobs, the private sector fared much worse than the government in terms of percentage of jobs lost. The private sector out-performed government only in Delaware, Morgan, and Brown Counties. Just 18 counties shed more than 100 government jobs. In contrast, nearly one fourth of the counties $(21 / 88)$ lost over 10 percent of their privatesector jobs. ${ }^{28}$

Cuyahoga County lost 1,870 government jobs, more than any other county. While it sounds impressive, this number only represents a 2 percent loss in government employment. This 2 percent loss seems pale in comparison to the 6 percent of private-sector jobs lost $(36,908)$ in Cuyahoga County. ${ }^{29}$

Since 2000, only 16 counties have experienced private-sector job growth. Delaware County $(31,176)$ added almost triple the number of jobs that secondplace Warren County $(12,278)$ did. Of the 88 counties, 56 lost over 10 percent of their private-sector jobs, with five counties losing over 30 percent of their jobs. Morgan County fared the worst losing 38 percent of its private-sector jobs from 2000 to 2009.

Urban counties with large populations were hit hard as well. Cuyahoga County lost over 120,000 jobs,

Hamilton County lost over 71,000 jobs, and Franklin County lost almost 56,000 jobs. Montgomery, Lucas, Trumbull, Mahoning, and Summit also experienced large losses. ${ }^{30}$

While 72 counties lost private-sector jobs from 2000 to 2009, only 45 counties lost government jobs during this time period. When comparing percentage growth or decline in the private sector versus government, government performed better (i.e., grew more or shrunk less) than the private sector in 78 of 88 counties. ${ }^{31}$

With the great loss of jobs, it is no surprise that Ohio has the fifth-worst business environment compared to the 49 other states. ${ }^{32}$ Between 2007 and 2008 (the most recently available data), Ohio lost over 5,500 active businesses. This can be attributed to businesses either leaving the state or closing down. All counties except Richland, Carroll, and Williams lost businesses during this time frame. As would be expected, the urban areas with large populations lost the greatest number of businesses. However, in terms of percentage of businesses lost, Harrison County led the way with a loss of 8.6 percent. Nine counties lost more than 5 percent of their businesses. ${ }^{33}$

Unemployment. From January 2010 to January 2011, Ohio's unemployment rate dropped from 10.6 percent to 9.4 percent. The unemployment rate improved in all counties except Gallia and Lawrence. Seventy-five counties improved by a whole percentage point or more with Van Wert and Williams both improving by 4.4 percent. Mercer County had the lowest unemployment in January 2011 at 6.8 percent. Ottawa

[^5]County was on the other end of the spectrum with un－ employment at 18.9 percent．${ }^{34}$

In January 2010，Ohio＇s unemployment was al－ most a whole point above the national rate of 9.7 per－ cent．Over the past year，the gap has closed with Ohio＇s unemployment rate only 0.4 above the national rate of 9.0 percent．In spite of Ohio＇s significant improvement in unemployment，only 10 counties were below the national rate．${ }^{35}$

With the decline in the unemployment rate， 75,100 additional people were put to work in 2010. It is also important to note，however，that the state＇s civilian labor force declined by 10,200 people．${ }^{36}$ This number reflects both those who have become discour－ aged and have quit looking for jobs and those who have moved out of state to find better opportunities for themselves and their families．

Population．With high unemployment and sig－ nificant job losses，one would expect Ohio＇s popula－ tion to be relatively stagnant or declining．Although the state＇s population grew from 11，528，072 in 2008 to 11，542，645 in 2009，the population growth of 14，573 people is most likely a product of births outweighing deaths in the state．${ }^{37}$ Birth and death data is not yet available for 2009．However，the yearly average from 2000 to 2008 for net population growth based solely on births minus deaths is 42,188 people．${ }^{38}$

While Ohio＇s population grew from 2008 to 2009， the reality is that people are leaving the state．In fact，
according to IRS migration flows，more people have moved out of Ohio than have moved into Ohio every single year going back to 1980 ．From 1980 to 2008， the IRS estimates Ohio＇s net population loss was just under 865,000 people due to more people moving out of the state than moving into the state．${ }^{39}$

Between 2008 and 2009， 52 of 88 counties expe－ rienced population loss．Cuyahoga led the way with a net population loss of 7,171 people，followed by Montgomery with a loss of 2,339 ，Mahoning with a loss of 1,874 ，and Lucas with a loss of 1,445 ．Franklin County led the way in population growth adding a net of 14,479 people from 2008 to 2009．Delaware Coun－ ty（just north of Columbus）came in second with a net gain of 3,795 people．Interestingly，the counties that make up the Cincinnati area all were among the highest ranked for net population growth．Warren was third with a growth of 3,287 people，and Butler was fourth with a growth of 2，409．

From 2000 to 2009，Ohio＇s population grew only 1.7 percent，ranking 6th－worst among the 50 states and Washington，D．C．Over this time period，the na－ tional population growth rate was 9.1 percent．${ }^{40}$

Income and Wages．As the state has lost jobs and people，Ohioans have experienced a decline in house－ hold income and in private－sector wages．In 2008， Ohio＇s median household income was $\$ 48,011 .{ }^{41}$ One year later，it dropped 5.3 percent to $\$ 45,467$ ．Ohio＇s median household income is significantly below the

34 Ohio Labor Market Information，＂Civilian Labor Force Estimates Query，＂at http：／／ohiolmi．com／asp／laus／vbLaus．htm（March 14， 2011）．
35 Ibid．
36 Ibid．
37 U．S．Census Bureau，＂Ohio by County－GCT－T1．Population Estimates，＂January 2010，at http：／／factfinder．census．gov／servlet／ GCTTable？＿bm＝yゐ－geo＿id＝04000US39ね＿＿box＿head＿nbr＝GCT－T1ふ－ds＿name＝PEP＿2009＿ESTふ＿＿lang＝enね－format＝ST－2ね－＿ sse＝on（March 14，2011）．
38 Ohio Department of Development，＂Reports in Population \＆Housing：Demographic Components，1950－2008 Births and Deaths by County with Graphics，＂January 2010，at http：／／www．development．ohio．gov／research／Reports＿In＿Population＿and＿Housing－ Demographic＿Components．htm（March 14，2011）．
39 Ohio Department of Development，＂Reports in Population \＆Housing：Demographic Components，IRS In Migration Flows of Exemptions to Ohio： 1980 to 2008，＂May 2010，at http：／／www．development．ohio．gov／research／Reports＿In＿Population＿and＿Housing－ Demographic＿Components．htm（March 14，2011）．
40 U．S．Census Bureau，＂Ohio by County－GCT－T1．Population Estimates．＂
41 U．S．Census Bureau，＂Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates：State and County Estimates for 2009，Table est08ALL．xls，＂December 2009，at http：／／www．census．gov／did／www／saipe／data／statecounty／data／2008．html（March 14，2011）．
national median household income, which is $\$ 50,221$. Compared to the other states, Ohio has the 19th-lowest median household income. ${ }^{42}$

From 2008 to 2009, the median householdincome fell in 75 of 88 counties. Sixty-two of these counties experienced declines in income by over $\$ 1,000$. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Wyandot and Fayette Counties were hit the hardest both losing over $\$ 7,000$ in median household income. Seven counties dropped by over $\$ 5,000$, and another nine counties lost over $\$ 4,000$. Of the 13 counties where median household income increased, only three (Marion, Champaign, and Noble) experienced gains over $\$ 2,000$, with Marion leading the way with an increase of $\$ 2,896 .{ }^{43}$

In terms of wages, Ohio also experienced a decline in average private-sector salary while the average salaries for all levels of government continued to increase. The average private-sector yearly pay dropped to $\$ 40,127.88$ from $\$ 40,216.80$. The average local government salary increased from $\$ 40,202.76$ to $\$ 41,160.08$ - nearly a $\$ 1,000$ jump. Likewise, the average salary for state workers climbed over $\$ 1,500$ from $\$ 48,676.16$ to $\$ 50,188.84$. The average federal employee salary increased from $\$ 64,223.12$ to \$65,005.20.44

In last year's State of the State report, we found that local government workers made more than their private-sector neighbors in 57 of 88 counties, state government workers made more than their private-sector neighbors in 85 of 88 counties, and federal workers made more than their private-sector neighbors in 87 of 88 counties. ${ }^{45}$

Local government employees now make more
than their private-sector peers in 69 of 88 counties, state workers earn more than private-sector workers in 83 of 88 counties, and federal government workers make more than the average private-sector worker in 87 of 88 counties. As was the case last year, only in Union County does the average private-sector worker earn more money than average government workers at the local, state, and federal levels. However, it is important to note that Union County has the highest average private-sector salary at $\$ 52,771.16 .{ }^{46}$

The average private-sector salary in 22 counties is under $\$ 30,000$, with Meigs County having the lowest at $\$ 25,500.80$. In 78 counties, the average private-sector salary is below $\$ 40,000$ even though the statewide private-sector average is $\$ 40,127.88$. This fact can largely be attributed to high private-sector salaries in the dense populations of Ohio's urban areas. ${ }^{47}$

Statewide the average local government salary increased from $\$ 40,202.76$ to $\$ 41,160.08$. At the county level, all but six counties (Van Wert, Meigs, Hardin, Highland, Morgan, and Greene) experienced an increase in the average local government salary. In half of the counties, the average local salary increased by over $\$ 1,000$. As one might expect, the highest paid local government employees are from urban counties. Franklin County is at the top with its average local government worker earning $\$ 48,964.24$. Lucas, Cuyahoga, and Hamilton Counties are close behind. ${ }^{48}$

As already mentioned, Ohio's average state-worker salary jumped from $\$ 48,676.16$ to $\$ 50,188.84$. Sixtyfive of 88 counties experienced an increase in average state-worker salaries. Athens County has the highest average yearly pay for state workers at $\$ 63,524.76$.

[^6]State workers in Athens earn $\$ 36,824.84$ more than their private-sector neighbors. In 68 counties, state workers earn at least $\$ 10,000$ more than those in the private sector. ${ }^{49}$

The average federal-worker salary increased byjust under $\$ 800$ from $\$ 64,223.12$ to $\$ 65,005.20$. The average wage for federal workers went up in 47 of 88 counties, with the Erie County average rising by $\$ 4,128.80$. Lorain County still has the highest paid federal workers even though the average salary dropped from $\$ 97,884.80$ in 2008 to $\$ 96,760.04$. The average federal worker in Lorain earns $\$ 62,057.84$ more than his average private-sector neighbor. ${ }^{50}$

Comparing the average salaries for private sector, local government, state government, and federal government with the median household incomes in each county, it is clear many government workers in Ohio bring in more income than most households do. In fact, in 61 counties, state workers earn more income than the median households in those counties. In 56 counties, the average federal worker earns more income than the median household. In contrast, only in six counties do average local government workers earn more than their respective median households. Likewise, the median household income is greater than the average private-sector salary in all but five counties. ${ }^{51}$

Last year's State of the State looked at incomes above and below $\$ 40,000$ to illustrate the difference between private and local government workers compared to state and federal workers. In 2009, average federal workers made more than $\$ 40,000$ in 81 counties, up from 80 last year. Similarly, state workers earned an average above $\$ 40,000$ in 79 counties compared with

76 counties the previous year. For private and local government workers, the numbers are nearly opposite. In local government, the average salary in 74 counties was under $\$ 40,000$, and in the private sector, the average salary in 78 counties was under $\$ 40,000 .{ }^{52}$

Taxes and Transfer Payments. Ohio's high tax burden provides a disincentive for companies and people to settle in the state. Ohio has the 18th-highest state and local tax burden in the nation with those earning over $\$ 60,000$ paying a disproportionate share of taxes. ${ }^{53}$ According to the most recent data available regarding Ohioans' tax returns, 77 percent of Ohioans had household earnings less than $\$ 60,000$ per year. Those in this category earned 33 percent of Ohio's income, but only paid 19 percent of income taxes before credits. On the other hand, 23 percent of households had earnings that exceeded $\$ 60,000$. These households earned 67 percent of Ohio's adjusted gross income, but paid over 81 percent of the total income tax burden. ${ }^{54}$

From 2007 to 2008, Ohio's aggregate adjusted gross income fell from roughly $\$ 363$ billion to $\$ 318$ billion. Additionally, the number of returns dropped by just over 94,000 during this one-year time frame. ${ }^{55}$

At the county level, those making over $\$ 60,000$ always pay a greater share of the tax burden than those making below this amount. Delaware County has the least variance in percentage of income earned versus percentage of income paid in taxes. In Delaware County, households earning over $\$ 60,000$ made 85 percent of the county's income, and they paid 92 percent of county's total income tax. ${ }^{56}$

In Holmes County, however, there was an 18 per-

[^7]cent difference in amount of income earned versus taxes paid. Households making over \$60,000 earned 50 percent of the county's income, but they paid 68 percent of the county's total income taxes. Conversely, half of the income in the county was earned by households making under $\$ 60,000$. Though these individuals earned 50 percent of the income, they only paid 32 percent of the taxes. ${ }^{57}$

Ohio's tax burden is so high in part because of the obligatory transfer payments that go toward various expenses, such as retirement and disability, medical payments, unemployment benefits, and assistance to needy families. Since last year's State of the State, the average transfer payment per person increased in every county except Gallia, where the average transfer payment dropped $\$ 38$ from $\$ 8,287$ to $\$ 8,250$ per person. Delaware and Holmes Counties are the only counties where the average transfer payment per person is under $\$ 4,000$. Eight counties (primarily in Appalachia) have average transfer payments over $\$ 8,000$ per person. Jefferson County has the highest average transfer payment per person at $\$ 9,022$. Nearly $\$ 600$ million a year is poured into Jefferson County just in transfer payments to individuals. ${ }^{58}$

In addition to individual transfer payments, the federal government also spends a significant amount of money in each county. Federal expenditures include retirement and disability, medical programs, highway planning and construction, assistance to needy families, salaries and wages, loans, and insurance. Federal expenditures per person increased in all but five counties. Again, Holmes and Delaware received the least amount of money with federal expenditures per person in these counties totaling under $\$ 3,000$. In four counties, per person federal expenditures were over $\$ 10,000$, with almost $\$ 17,500$ per person spent in Greene County. ${ }^{59}$

## Urban Area Trends ${ }^{60}$

Columbus Area. The most prosperous area in the state is undoubtedly Franklin County and its six neighboring counties. This is due to the fact that Columbus is home to The Ohio State University and is the seat of state government. Thus, many of the other counties subsidize Columbus's economic health. All seven counties experienced population growth from 2008 to 2009. Franklin County's population growth of 14,479 far exceeded that of the other counties in the area.

In terms of jobs, government grew faster than the private sector in all counties except Delaware from 2000 to 2009. The same was true from 2008 to 2009, with government employment declining less rapidly than private-sector employment. All counties lost private-sector jobs. Delaware only lost 208 jobs, which was under 1 percent. Fairfield lost 3 percent of its private-sector jobs while Madison, Union, Franklin, and Pickaway all lost 5 percent. Licking County lost 6 percent of its private-sector jobs from 2008 to 2009. All counties except Franklin also lost a small percentage of government jobs. From 2008 to 2009, Franklin County gained 348 government jobs. In terms of job growth, the public sector out-performed the private sector in every county except Delaware.

In 2009, Franklin County's average salaries were $\$ 44,110$ in the private sector, $\$ 48,964$ in local government, $\$ 48,981$ in state government, and $\$ 64,545$ in federal government. The average private-sector yearly wage declined in Union, Delaware, Pickaway, and Licking Counties and improved slightly in Franklin, Madison, and Fairfield Counties. At the federal government level, the average yearly wage increased in all counties but Delaware and Madison. The average state government and local government salaries increased in all seven central Ohio counties.

Median household income fell rather substan-

[^8]tially in every county from $\$ 1,057$ in Union County to $\$ 5,729$ in Fairfield County. The average transfer payment per person increased in all seven counties, whereas the average federal expenditure only increased in five of the seven counties with Union and Delaware as the exceptions.

Cleveland Area. The Cleveland area has suffered greatly in the last decade. Cuyahoga County leads the state in population decline having lost over 118,000 people in the past 10 years and specifically losing 7,171 people from 2008 to 2009. In contrast over the past year, all of Cuyahoga's surrounding counties except Summit have gained population, albeit by very small amounts. While some of this can be attributed to people moving out to the suburbs, the primary driver behind the loss of population is the loss of jobs.

The greater Cleveland area has been plagued by job loss. Between 2000 and 2009, every county except Medina lost jobs. During this time Cuyahoga County lost over 120,000 jobs. From 2008 to 2009, every county in the area lost between 7 and 9 percent of private-sector jobs for a collective one-year private-sector job loss of 75,894 . While the private sector suffered enormous losses, the government grew in every county between 2000 and 2009 except in Cuyahoga. In the past year, government added more employees to its rolls in Geauga and Lorain Counties while barely trimming any workers in Medina, Portage, Summit, and Lake Counties. Cuyahoga lost 2 percent of its government workers. In all counties from 2000 to 2009 and from 2008 to 2009, government outperformed the private sector.

In 2009, the average private-sector worker earned less money than his average government employee neighbor. In Cuyahoga County, the average salaries were as follows: $\$ 45,088$ in the private sector, $\$ 47,197$ in local government, $\$ 57,523$ in state government, and $\$ 67,279$ in the federal government. Average wages in the private sector decreased in every county except Lake County, where wages increased slightly. Local

> The Cleveland area has been hit particularly hard. Cuyahoga County lost more than 120,000 jobs from 2000 to 2009.
government wages in all counties increased rather significantly from over $\$ 400$ in Lorain County up to $\$ 3,665$ in Portage County. State government salaries grew tremendously in several counties (Geauga: $\$ 7,904$, Lake: $\$ 6,287$, and Portage: $\$ 2,030)$. Medina was the only county to experience a decrease in average state salary pay. Average federal salaries decreased in three counties and rose in four counties with the Lorain average federal salary ( $-\$ 1,125$ ) decreasing the most and Geauga County increasing the greatest amount.

With the exception of Medina and Geauga Counties, all counties in the Cleveland area experienced large drops in median household income. Cuyahoga's median household income declined by $\$ 4,070$. Additionally, transfer payments per person and federal expenditures per person increased in all counties.

Cincinnati Area. Compared to most other urban areas in Ohio, greater Cincinnati has not suffered nearly as much economically. In the past ten years, all four counties in the greater Cincinnati area experienced population growth. Hamilton County grew by just 1 percent while Butler and Clermont grew roughly 10 percent and Warren grew 33 percent. In the past year, all counties grew by very small numbers with only Warren County growing above 1 percent.

From 2000 to 2009, government employment and private-sector employment increased in every county except Hamilton County where private-sector employment shrunk more than twice as much as government employment percentage-wise. In Clermont and Warren Counties, government growth far outpaced private-sector growth. One bright spot is Butler County where the private-sector actually grew twice as much as the government over the past ten years.

From 2008 to 2009, government employment decreased. However, private-sector employment decreased by an even greater percentage in each of the four counties. Hamilton and Claremont had nearly a 0 percent loss in government jobs while the private sec-
tor lost 5 percent and 7 percent, respectively. Warren County's government shrunk in terms of employees by 1 percent. However, the private sector lost 5 percent of its jobs. Butler's government employment decreased by 4 percent, but its private sector lost 7 percent of its jobs. With the job losses, government transfer payments per person increased in every county. Federal expenditures also increased in every county except Butler.

In Hamilton County, the average private-sector worker ( $\$ 49,153$ ) actually earned more than the average local and state government workers who earned $\$ 44,659$ and $\$ 48,757$, respectively. The average federal worker in Hamilton County earned $\$ 65,303$. Average salary increases across counties in the greater Cincinnati area were not consistent. Average private-sector salaries changed very little from 2008 to 2009, with Hamilton and Warren making small increases and Butler decreasing slightly. On the other hand, Clermont's average private-sector salary dropped $\$ 745$. Local government salaries rose significantly in all four counties from $\$ 952$ (Clermont) to $\$ 2,487$ (Hamilton). The average state salary decreased by $\$ 1,318$ in Hamilton County and by $\$ 413$ in Clermont County and increased by $\$ 513$ in Warren County and by \$1,774 in Butler County. Average federal salary increased in Hamilton and Clermont Counties by $\$ 473$ and $\$ 1,162$, respectively. Whereas, federal salary decreased by $\$ 829$ in Butler County and by $\$ 2,394$ in Warren County.

Median household income also dropped significantly in Hamilton, Claremont, and Warren Counties while it increased by $\$ 687$ in Butler County. Government per-person transfer payments increased in every county, and per-person federal expenditures increased in every county except Butler.

Toledo Area. From 2000 to 2009, population in the greater Toledo area was relatively stagnant with small declines or increases in all counties except for Wood, which grew nearly 4 percent. From 2008 to 2009, population in all counties declined slightly except in Wood County.

The Toledo area lost many private-sector jobs
over the past decade. Wood County fared best only losing 8 percent of its jobs. Lucas County lost 18 percent of its jobs, and Fulton County lost 23 percent of its jobs. While the private sector was suffering mightily during this time, three counties added government jobs, and Henry County only lost 40 government jobs. Fulton County, though it lost 23 percent of its privatesector jobs, gained government jobs at a 19 percent rate. From 2008 to 2009, all five counties experienced private-sector job losses ranging from 6 percent in Ottawa County to 13 percent in Fulton County. During this time, Wood County gained one government job, and the other four counties lost 1 to 3 percent of their government jobs. The private sector suffered more serious job losses than the government.

Government employees greatly out-earned their private-sector neighbors in Lucas County. The average private-sector worker only earned $\$ 38,193$ while the average government workers earned $\$ 47,530$ at the local level, $\$ 55,954$ at the state level, and $\$ 60,028$ at the federal level. Yearly private-sector wages fell notable amounts in every county but Lucas County, which experienced an increase of $\$ 424$. Local government salaries rose in every county anywhere from $\$ 746$ a year in Fulton County to $\$ 2,775$ in Wood County. State government salaries increased in every county minus Henry County. The average Fulton County and Lucas County state-government workers received pay increases of nearly $\$ 3,200$ and $\$ 7,950$, respectively. The average federal-worker pay jumped over $\$ 1,000$ in Lucas County, but it dropped significantly in Wood, Henry, and Fulton Counties. There was almost no change in Ottawa County.

The median household income fell anywhere from $\$ 1,130$ in Lucas County to $\$ 4,800$ in Henry County. Fulton County experienced an increase of $\$ 654$ in median household income. The per-person government transfer payment and the per-person federal expenditure increased in all counties.

Akron-Canton Area. From 2000 to 2009, the populations in Stark and Summit Counties changed almost 0 percent, with a minute decrease in Summit and a small increase in Stark. From 2008 to 2009, the
population remained relatively constant.
Between 2000 and 2009, government in Summit County grew 2 percent, but the private sector declined by 5 percent. In Stark County, government declined by 2 percent. However, the private sector experienced losses of 16 percent. From 2008 to 2009, both Summit and Stark lost a small number of government jobs, but the private sector in both counties lost 7 percent of its jobs.

From 2008 to 2009, private-sector wages experienced a slight decline in both counties. Average private-sector wages in Stark $(\$ 34,654)$ were much lower than they were in Summit $(\$ 40,802)$. Average local government wages increased in both counties by just over \$1,340. However, local government workers earn about $\$ 4,000$ less in Stark $(\$ 38,048)$ than they do in Summit $(\$ 42,236)$. The average state-government salaries increased \$553 in Summit and \$1,774 in Stark, both up to over $\$ 52,000$ per year. Federal salaries in both counties increased-Stark by $\$ 12$ and Summit by $\$ 558$. The average federal-employee salaries in Stark and Summit Counties are \$54,399 and \$59,620, respectively.

The median household income decreased in both counties. Summit dropped $\$ 2,486$ down to $\$ 47,042$, and Stark only dropped $\$ 319$ down to $\$ 44,363$. Government transfer payments per person and federal expenditures per person increased in both counties.

Dayton Area. Over the past ten years, Montgomery County lost 5 percent of its population. However, neighboring Greene County experienced 8 percent population growth during this time. From 2008 to 2009, Montgomery lost 2,339 citizens, Clark lost 147, and Greene gained 467 . Overall, the area is losing population.

From 2000 to 2009, government shrunk in both Montgomery and Clark Counties, but the private sector suffered even greater losses. Percentage-wise, Montgomery lost over four times the amount of pri-vate-sector jobs than it did government jobs ( 5 percent vs. 22 percent). Clark also lost many jobs both in the private sector ( 18 percent) and in government ( 9 percent). Greene County's private sector out-performed
government growing 9 percent and 7 percent, respectively. From 2008 to 2009, government out-performed the private sector in all three counties. Montgomery County experienced very little change in government employment; however, it lost 8 percent of its privatesector jobs. In Greene County, the government grew by 5 percent while the private sector shrunk by 3 percent. In Clark County, government employment decreased by 2 percent and private-sector employment decreased by 6 percent.

Average private-sector wages in Montgomery County declined $\$ 677$ from 2008 to 2009. On the contrary, they actually increased in both Greene and Clark Counties by $\$ 1,668$ and $\$ 382$. Average local government salaries increased in both Clark and Montgomery Counties, but decreased slightly in Greene. Average state salaries increased by roughly $\$ 3,500$ in both Montgomery and Clark Counties and decreased slightly in Greene County. Federal government salaries increased in all counties from $\$ 513$ in Clark County to \$1,842 in Montgomery County.

Median household income in Montgomery County declined from $\$ 45,237$ in 2008 to $\$ 41,611$ in 2009. Greene and Clark experienced similar losses. The average transfer payment per person increased by just under \$1,000 in Montgomery and Clark Counties, with Greene County not too far behind. Likewise, the average federal expenditure increased in each county ranging from $\$ 654$ to $\$ 827$.

Youngstown Area. Mahoning and Trumbull Counties lost 8 and 7 percent, respectively, of their populations from 2000 to 2009. From 2008 to 2009, both experienced less than a 1 percent decline in population.

The private sector and the government in both counties lost a large number of jobs from 2000 to 2009. In Mahoning County, the private sector lost four times the number of jobs percentage-wise as the government. Surprisingly, in Trumbull County, the government experienced a greater percentage in job loss than the private sector. However, in Trumbull County from 2008 to 2009, the government only lost 1 percent of its employees while the private sector lost

12 percent. Similarly, from 2008 to 2009, Mahoning County lost almost 0 percent of its government jobs, but lost 6 percent of its private-sector jobs.

In Mahoning and Trumbull Counties, government employees made far more than their private-sector neighbors. In Mahoning County, the average private sector salary increased slightly to $\$ 31,452$ in 2009. Local government salary increased almost $\$ 1,000$ to $\$ 37,796$. The average state salary decreased by nearly $\$ 900$ to $\$ 44,319$, whereas, the average federal salary increased by just over $\$ 900$. In Trumbull County, private-sector wages fell by nearly $\$ 3,000$ to $\$ 34,105$ in 2009. The average local government-employee salary increased over $\$ 1,100$ to $\$ 38,807$. The average state-government salary increased from $\$ 47,285$ to $\$ 53,409$. The average federal salary increased just over $\$ 900$ to $\$ 52,980$.

The median household income decreased in both Mahoning and Trumbull Counties to $\$ 39,339$ and $\$ 40,980$, respectively. Each county experienced an increase of over \$1,150 in average transfer payments per person. Likewise, the average federal expenditure per person increased $\$ 994$ in Mahoning County and $\$ 835$ in Trumbull County.

## Conclusion: Real Reforms Can Improve Ohio's Economic Condition

In the past 21 years, Ohio's government has grown both in terms of size and cost at a rate that the private sector can no longer adequately support. Unless real reforms are enacted, jobs will continue to leave the state, as will our best and brightest citizens who must look outside Ohio for opportunity.

Ohio, no doubt, will benefit as the national economy begins to recover. However, Ohio is poised to experience the kind of growth it did in the 1990s when it ranked 37th-best in terms of new private-sector jobs. Even if Ohio's job market grew in this decade as it did in the 1990s, the best case for a full economic recovery would not be until June 2017. More realistically speaking, this date will not come until the early-2020s. Enacting true policy reforms in Ohio can buy forward this date.

The cost of government must decrease beginning with one of the biggest driver of the cost: employee compensation. Government employees out-earn their private-sector neighbors in almost every county. Curtailing the collective bargaining rights of public workers as reflected in Senate Bill 5 is a good start, but it may not drive down the cost curve to the necessary extent. Even without taking all the other perquisites and benefits into consideration, government salaries alone top private-sector pay. This is not the grand bargain taxpayers agreed to.

In addition to salaries, the terms of Ohio's goldplated government retirement packages need to be revisited. Is it fair to private-sector taxpayers to make our public servants millionaires when they retire? Ultimately, raising the retirement age by several years and increasing the employee contribution to the pension fund by 1 or 2 percent will not solve the problems inherent with the system. These "nibbling on the margins" solutions do not solve the cost problem for taxpayers.

Ohio should follow the leads of Michigan and Illinois who moved their government employees from defined-benefit plans to defined-contribution plans. As evidenced by Democrat-led Illinois in 2011, pension reform is not a partisan issue: it is a taxpayer issue. With states facing large budget deficits, taxpayers cannot afford to be saddled with gold-plated pension obligations any longer.

In addition to reducing the financial burden of Ohio's government on over-taxed private-sector workers, Ohio needs policies that will bring jobs to the state. While JobsOhio and the Common Sense Initiative are steps in the right direction, they likely will not be enough to push Ohio into the top 15 or even top half of states for business climate rankings (46th currently).

Ohio will not recovery as quickly without becoming a Right-to-Work state. From 1990 to 2011, states that protect a worker's freedom to choose whether or not to join a union added jobs at over three times the rate of forced-unionization states like Ohio, even after the severe housing and construction busts in those
states. During this time period, Right-to-Work states grew 34 percent while forced-unionization states only grew 11 percent.

Public-sector unions drive up the cost of government at the expense of private-sector taxpayers while private-sector unions drive up the cost of doing business for private-sector employers. Until the power of unions is reduced, high taxes needed to fund the gov-
ernment will continue and businesses will continue to leave the state. The private sector loses in both cases.

Ohio can return to the great, prosperous state that it once was. However, the road to low taxes, low government costs, and high household wealth will not be paved through timid tweaks to a broken system. As Ronald Reagan said, our leaders must paint "a banner of bold colors-not pale pastels."
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## Adams County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 8 , 0 4 3}$ | Rank: $79 \quad \boldsymbol{\mathbf { 0 . 6 }}$ \% since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 2 . 6 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 , 0 4 4}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 . 5 \%}$ since 2008 (\$34,564) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 7 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: 78 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{6 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 1 \%}$ (45 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & \text { 5,031 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: $\nabla 5.1 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 1,493 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> A. $7.3 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 88 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 13.6\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 4,773 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,602 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 76 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 4,241 \end{aligned}$ | -11.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 1,612 \end{aligned}$ | 土 0.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 75 \end{gathered}$ | -1.3\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Allen County

| Population： | 104，357 | Rank： 26 『 0．4\％since 2008 マ 3．8\％since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income： | \＄39，318 | マ 11．4\％since 2008 （ $\$ 44,360$ ） |
| Median Home Value： | \＄81，800 | Rank： 62 Median State Home Value：\＄103，700 |
| Number of Businesses： | 2，150 | マ 1．7\％（37 fewer businesses）since 2007 |

Note：Figures for population，median household income，and median home value are for 2009．Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes， 2009


Per－Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 52,174 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 12.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 6,931 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { } 9.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 501 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 20\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 45,788 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 6,246 \end{aligned}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 401 \end{gathered}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 43,530 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 4.9 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 6,128 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 403 \end{gathered}$ | －0．5\％ |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Ashland County

| Population: | $\mathbf{5 5 , 0 4 4}$ | Rank: $46 \quad \mathbf{0 . 1} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\Delta 4 . 8} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 3 , 7 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 1 . 5 \%}$ since 2008 (\$43,151) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 9 0 0}$ | Rank: 32 $\quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 6 \%}$ (27 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ \text { 16,709 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: ק 9.3\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,784 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 2\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 136 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: - 20.6\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 15,148 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 2,841 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 108 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 14,237 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 2,782 \end{aligned}$ | - 2.1\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 107 \end{gathered}$ | - 0.9\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Ashtabula County



Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 30,126 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 12.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 5,002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 『.8\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 303 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 24.4 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 26,461 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 4,962 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 229 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 24,042 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 9.1 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 4,889 } \end{aligned}$ | -1.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 220 \end{gathered}$ | - 3.9\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Athens County

| Population: | 63,026 | Rank: 39 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 3 \%}$ since 2008 | - 1.3\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$30,823 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 2 . 7 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 35,301)$ |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$84,300 | Rank: 57 | Median State Hom | Value: \$103,700 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009

|  | \% of All <br> Income <br> Earned | \% of All <br> Taxes <br> Paid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earning <br> Less <br> than <br> $\$ 60,000$ | $45 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Earning <br> $\$ 60,000+$ | $55 \%$ | $71 \%$ |

Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 11,646 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 8.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 6,945 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A 2.4\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 269 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 8.9\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 12,653 \end{aligned}$ | Ch.6\% Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 7,112 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 245 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 12,391 \end{gathered}$ | V2.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 6,969 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 236 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 3.7 \%$ |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Auglaize County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 6 , 6 9 9}$ | Rank: 51 | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 1 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 0 . 2 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 8 , 7 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 4 \%}$ since 2008 (\$52,152) |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 0 , 6 0 0}$ | Rank: 42 | Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{9 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 3 \%}$ (22 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.
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Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 16,517 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 4.5\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 2,764 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -15.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 115 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 9.6\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ \text { 17,257 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 2,341 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 126 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 15,964 \end{gathered}$ | V7.5\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 2,327 \end{aligned}$ | - 0.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 128 \end{gathered}$ | -1.6\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




# Belmont County 

| Population: | $\mathbf{6 8 , 0 6 6}$ | Rank: $36 \quad \mathbf{0 0 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{3 . 1} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 , 4 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 (\$37,941) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 4 , 6 0 0}$ | Rank: $82 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 2 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 4 . 9 \%}$ (64 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 19,544 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A0.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 3,963 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { © 0.7\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 192 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 『1\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 19,573 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 3,989 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 190 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 18,701 } \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 4.5 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 3,851 \end{aligned}$ | 3.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 182 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 4.2 \%$ |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Brown County

| Population: | 44,003 | Rank: 53 - 0.2\% since 2008 | - 4.1\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$44,796 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 3 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 44,912)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$89,900 | Rank: 45 Median State Hom | Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | 781 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{2 . 6 \%}$ (21 fewer businesses) | nce 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 5,321 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { ©5.2\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,049 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { © 17\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 114 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \nabla 18.4 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 5,600 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 2,397 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 93 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 5,410 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 2,307 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 93 \end{gathered}$ | 0\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Butler County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 6 3 , 1 8 4}$ | Rank: $8 \quad \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 7} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 9 . 1 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 3 , 5 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 1 . 3 \%}$ since 2008 $(\$ 52,856)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 3 , 2 0 0}$ | Rank: $8 \quad$ Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 , 8 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 1} \%$ (188 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009

|  | \% of All <br> Income <br> Earned | \% of All <br> Taxes <br> Paid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earning <br> Less <br> than <br> $\$ 60,000$ | $32 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Earning <br> $\$ 60,000+$ | $68 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
|  |  |  |

Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 107,492 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { A 18\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 17,856 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -10\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 666 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11.3\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 126,846 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 19,635 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 591 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 118,015 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 7 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ \text { 18,840 } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 606 \end{gathered}$ | - 2.5\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Carroll County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 8 , 5 3 9}$ | Rank: $76 \quad \boldsymbol{\mathbf { 0 . 5 } \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{1 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 0 , 2 7 7}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 8 . 2} \%$ since $2008(\$ 43,889)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 9 , 7 0 0}$ | Rank: 46 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{4 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 5 \%}$ (6 more businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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## Champaign County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 9 , 7 1 3}$ | Rank: $64 \quad \mathbf{0 \%}$ since 2008 $\quad \mathbf{\Delta 2 . 1 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 9 , 5 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 4 . 8 \%}$ since 2008 $(\$ 47,225)$ |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 5 0 0}$ | Rank: 34 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{6 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 8 \%}$ (20 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 9,403 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000- 08 : <br> - 12.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 1,874 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { © } 7.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 93 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 15.1\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 8,269 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 2,008 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 79 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 7,516 \end{aligned}$ | $9.1 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,953 } \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 2.7 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 79 \end{gathered}$ | 0\% |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment


## Poverty Level




## Clark County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 3 9 , 6 7 1}$ | Rank: $21 \quad \mathbf{\nabla 0 . 1} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\nabla} \mathbf{3 . 5} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 2 , 4 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 6 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 45,480)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 0 , 5 0 0}$ | Rank: $43 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 , 2 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 4 \%}$ (33 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 50,058 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -13\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 7,286 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -7.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 706 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -1.1\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 43,539 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 6,737 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 698 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 40,894 \end{gathered}$ | 入6.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 6,590 \end{aligned}$ | - 2.2\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 715 \end{gathered}$ | 土 2.4\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Clermont County

Population: 196,364 Rank: 14 - 0.5\% since 2008 - 10.3\% since 2000
Median Household Income: $\quad \mathbf{\$ 5 7 , 8 7 7} \boldsymbol{\nabla 4 . 7} \%$ since $2008(\$ 60,735)$
Median Home Value: $\quad \$ \mathbf{1 2 2 , 9 0 0}$ Rank: 10 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 Number of Businesses: $\quad \mathbf{2 , 5 2 5} \boldsymbol{2} \%$ (52 fewer businesses) since 2007

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 42,402 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 14.5\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 6,344 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { A19\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 364 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A4.1\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 48,534 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 7,547 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 379 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 45,248 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 6.8 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 7,574 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 317 \end{gathered}$ | -16.4\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Clinton County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 3 , 0 5 8}$ | Rank: 55 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 6 . 2} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 9 , 4 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 0} \%$ since 2008 (\$49,440) |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 6 , 8 0 0}$ | Rank: 31 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{8 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 8 \%}$ (34 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 22,066 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { च 1.2\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,988 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 160 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { © 10\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 21,811 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 3,317 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 176 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 15,682 \end{gathered}$ | - 28.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 3,263 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 171 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 2.8 \%$ |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Columbiana County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 0 7 , 7 2 2}$ | Rank: $25 \quad \boldsymbol{\mathbf { 0 . 4 }}$ \% since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{3 . 9} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 , 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 (\$40,700) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 9 , 8 0 0}$ | Rank: 65 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 9 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 6 \%}$ (11 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 29,367 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \nabla 10 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 4,579 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 4.2\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 623 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 3.9\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 26,422 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 4,386 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 599 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 24,162 \end{gathered}$ | - 8.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 4,389 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 588 \end{gathered}$ | -1.8\% |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment


## Poverty Level




## Coshocton County

| Population: | 35,767 | Rank: $67 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 4 \%}$ since $2008 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{2 . 4 \%}$ since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$38,887 | - 6.2\% since 2008 ( $\$ 41,451$ ) |
| Median Home Value: | \$79,300 | Rank: 67 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | 591 | マ 3.4\% (21 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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## Crawford County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 3 , 4 0 3}$ | Rank: $54 \quad \mathbf{0 . 8 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{7 . 6} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 , 1 1 0}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 9 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 (\$42,146) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 9 , 2 0 0}$ | Rank: 68 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{8 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 9 \%}$ (8 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 15,151 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 19.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,104 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { } 5.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 101 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 17.8\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 12,224 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,993 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 83 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ \text { 11,077 } \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla$, $9.4 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,996 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 95 \end{gathered}$ | -14.5\% |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment
84.5\%


## Poverty Level




## Cuyahoga County

Population：1，275，709 Rank： 1 『 0．6\％since $2008 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{8 . 5} \%$ since 2000
Median Household Income：
Median Home Value：
\＄113，800
27，166 マ 2．7\％（763 fewer businesses）since 2007

Note：Figures for population，median household income，and median home value are for 2009．Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 714,909 \end{gathered}$ | Chg．2000－ 08 ： <br> －11．6\％ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 83,666 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 『. } 0.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 18,022 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 『6.9\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 631,666 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 83,421 \end{gathered}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 16,787 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 594,758 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 5.8 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 81,478 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 2.3 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 16,860 \end{gathered}$ | A0．4\％ |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Darke County

| Population: | $\mathbf{5 1 , 8 1 4}$ | Rank: $48 \quad \mathbf{} \mathbf{0 . 3} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\nabla} \mathbf{2 . 8} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 0 , 8 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 8 . 5} \%$ since 2008 (\$44,662) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 1 , 1 0 0}$ | Rank: 40 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 2 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 6 \%}$ (33 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 16,818 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 『 } 7.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,142 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 3.9\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 141 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 17 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 15,528 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 2,226 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 117 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 14,609 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 2,201 \end{aligned}$ | $1.1 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 117 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment



## Poverty Level

90.3\%



## Defiance County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 8 , 4 3 2}$ | Rank: $65 \quad \boldsymbol{\mathbf { 0 . 2 }}$ \% since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{2 . 7 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 5 , 2 2 9}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 8 . 8} \%$ since 2008 (\$49,614) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 6 , 8 0 0}$ | Rank: $51 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{6 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 3 \%}$ (15 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 16,434 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 10.3\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 1,979 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A 0.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 122 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - $9 \%$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 14,736 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,989 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 111 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 13,187 \end{gathered}$ | -10.5\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,961 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 118 \end{gathered}$ | -6.3\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Delaware County

Population: 168,708 Rank: 16 - 2.3\% since 2008 - 53.4\% since 2000
Median Household Income: \$84,762 $\quad \mathbf{4 . 4 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 88,645)$
Median Home Value: $\quad \$ \mathbf{1 9 0 , 4 0 0}$ Rank: 1 Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ Number of Businesses: 3,142 $\quad \mathbf{~ 1 . 3 \%}$ (40 fewer businesses) since 2007

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT
Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 30,283 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -103.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 4,571 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { A } 69.1 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 251 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-ㅇo8: } \\ & \text { 2.4\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 61,667 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 7,728 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 257 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 61,459 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 0.3 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 7,527 \end{aligned}$ | - 2.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 256 \end{gathered}$ | - 0.4\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Erie County

| Population: | $\mathbf{7 6 , 9 6 3}$ | Rank: $32 \quad \mathbf{0 . 5} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{3 . 3} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 4 , 4 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 5 . 5} \%$ since $2008(\$ 47,093)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 9 , 8 0 0}$ | Rank: $20 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 6 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 6 \%}$ (27 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009
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## Fairfield County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 4 3 , 7 1 2}$ | Rank: $20 \mathbf{\Delta 1 \%}$ since 2008 $\quad \mathbf{\Delta 1 7 . 1} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 2 , 2 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 9 . 9} \%$ since $2008(\$ 58,019)$ |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 9 , 5 0 0}$ | Rank: $5 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 , 9 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 1} \%$ (93 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 27,453 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -15.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 6,894 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A 17.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 291 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -10.7\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 31,637 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 8,125 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 260 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 30,814 \end{gathered}$ | $\checkmark$ 2.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 8,014 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 258 \end{gathered}$ | - 0.8\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Fayette County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 8 , 1 1 7}$ | Rank: $78 \quad \mathbf{0 . 3} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{1 . 1} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 , 6 1 4}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 5 . 9 \%}$ since 2008 (\$44,703) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 5 , 8 0 0}$ | Rank: $53 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 4 . 4 \%}$ (24 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 9,370 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { A.6\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 1,513 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { A } 12.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ 68 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \nabla 17.6 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 10,086 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,699 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 56 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 9,372 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 7.1 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,700 } \end{aligned}$ | $\Delta 0.1 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 56 \end{gathered}$ | 0\% |

Annual Wages by Sector


## Education Attainment

## 84.8\%



## Poverty Level

82.3\%



## Franklin County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 , 1 5 0 , 1 2 2}$ | Rank: $2 \quad \mathbf{1 1 . 3} \%$ since 2008 $\quad \mathbf{4 . 6 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 , 4 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 7 . 4 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 51,246)$ |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 6 , 2 0 0}$ | Rank: $13 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 2 , 4 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 2 \%}$ (730 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 596,584 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { च } 4.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 92,229 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { © 7.2\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 13,075 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { } 4.5 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 568,437 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 98,893 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 12,484 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 540,628 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 4.9 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 99,070 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 12,655 \end{gathered}$ | A 1.4\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



Fulton County

| Population: | 42,402 | Rank: $57 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 1 \%}$ since 2008 | - 0.8\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$52,426 | - 1.3\% since 2008 (\$51,772) |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$108,300 | Rank: 23 Median State Hom | Value: \$103,700 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 19,201 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11.9\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 2,181 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A 23.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 120 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 18.3\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ \text { 16,915 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 2,689 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 98 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ \text { 14,740 } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 2,641 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 100 \end{gathered}$ |  |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Gallia County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 0 , 6 9 4}$ | Rank: $73 \quad \mathbf{\nabla 0 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{1 . 2} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 6 , 5 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 (\$38,997) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 7 , 6 0 0}$ | Rank: 70 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 5} \%$ (28 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 9,945 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: ק 0.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 1,953 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -1.7\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 8.1\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 9,890 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 1,987 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 91 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 9,593 } \end{aligned}$ | マ 3\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & \text { 1,966 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 93 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Geauga County

| Population: | $\mathbf{9 9 , 0 6 0}$ | Rank: $29 \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 $\boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{9 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 2 , 4 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 0 . 3} \%$ since $2008(\$ 62,223)$ |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 2 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: $2 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 , 0 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 7 \%}$ (35 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 29,562 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 3.7\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 3.556 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> A11.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 165 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 23\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 30,663 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 3,967 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 127 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 27,935 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla$ 8.9\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 3,987 } \end{aligned}$ | 土 0.5\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 162 \end{gathered}$ | 土 27.6\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector



Education Attainment


## Poverty Level

92.7\%



## Greene County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 5 9 , 8 2 3}$ | Rank: $17 \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 3 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 8 . 1} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 5 , 6 1 5}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 4 . 4 \%}$ since 2008 (\$58,153) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 1 , 2 0 0}$ | Rank: $11 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 5 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 3} \%$ (52 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 41,237 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { A } 12.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 8,478 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { © } 9.1 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 11,389 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 『3.3\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 46,486 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 9,251 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ \text { 11,009 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 44,996 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 9,270 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ \text { 11,903 } \end{gathered}$ | -8.1\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Guernsey County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 0 , 0 5 4}$ | Rank: 63 | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 3} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 8} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 , 8 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 7 \%}$ since 2008 (\$37,325) |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 5 , 5 0 0}$ | Rank: $80 \quad$ Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{7 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 2 \%}$ (26 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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Hamilton County
Population: 855,062 Rank:3 $\mathbf{\Delta 0 . 2} \%$ since 2008 - $\mathbf{1 . 2} \%$ since 2000
Median Household Income: $\quad \$ 46,509 \quad$ 7.5 $\%$ since $2008(\$ 50,285)$
Median Home Value: $\quad \$ 111,400$
Number of Businesses: 18,697
Rank: 18 Median State Home Value: \$103,700
マ 2.7\% (528 fewer businesses) since 2007

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 509,821 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ \text { 9.5\% } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 46,305 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { (3.2\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 10,893 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> 14.4\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 461,503 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 44,80 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 9,319 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 438,736 \end{gathered}$ | -4.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ 44,496 \end{gathered}$ | V0.7\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 9,373 } \end{aligned}$ | - 0.6\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



Hancock County

| Population: | $\mathbf{7 4 , 5 3 8}$ | Rank: $35 \quad \mathbf{0 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{4 4 . 5 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 8 , 6 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 1 \%}$ since 2008 (\$51,823) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: $27 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 3 0 3}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 4 . 5 \%}$ (61 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 38,406 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000- 08 : A0.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 3,103 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { A } 14.4 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 202 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> $\nabla 12.9 \%$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 38,453 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 3,549 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 176 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2009 \\ 35,421 \end{array}$ | -7.9\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 3,497 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 174 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



Hardin County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 1 , 8 1 8}$ | Rank: $72 \quad \mathbf{0 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 4 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 9 , 5 9 6}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 7 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 (\$42,670) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 3 , 8 0 0}$ | Rank: 73 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{4 6 2}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 9 \%}$ (4 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 7,173 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 『 7.3\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 1,631 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { ₹ } 6.4 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 101 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { च 19.8\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 6,648 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,526 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 81 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 6,218 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,526 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 82 \end{gathered}$ |  |

## Annual Wages by Sector




Harrison County


Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 2.958 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 8.1 \% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 866 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 8\% | 2000: | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 8.5\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 2,718 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 797 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 65 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 2,524 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 7.1 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 775 \end{gathered}$ | V 2.8\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 69 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Henry County

| Population: | 28,648 | Rank: $75 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 6 \%}$ since $2008 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{1 . 9} \%$ since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$45,659 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 9 . 5 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 50,459)$ |
| Median Home Value: | \$86,800 | Rank: 51 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | 567 | マ 3.1\% (18 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 9,397 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { (2.4\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,087 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { (2.5\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 94 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { A 36.2\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 9,173 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 2,035 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 128 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 8,509 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 7.2 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 2,063 } \end{aligned}$ | A 1.4\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 78 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 39.1 \%$ |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Highland County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 2 , 1 7 8}$ | Rank: $58 \quad \mathbf{0 . 5 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 3 . 2} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 9 , 9 6 1}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 9 \%}$ since 2008 (\$43,895) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 2 , 1 0 0}$ | Rank: 61 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{7 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 5 \%}$ (20 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 9,292 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \nabla 10.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,059 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 27\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 130 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 『 13.8\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 8,297 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 2,614 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 112 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 7,649 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 2,611 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 111 \end{gathered}$ | - 0.9\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Hocking County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 8 , 9 1 2}$ | Rank: $74 \quad \mathbf{} \mathbf{0 . 2} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 2 . 4} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 , 8 4 1}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 6 . 7 \%}$ since 2008 (\$40,564) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 3 , 3 0 0}$ | Rank: $58 \quad$ Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{4 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 4 . 5 \%}$ (23 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures



## Holmes County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 1 , 8 5 4}$ | Rank: 59 | $\mathbf{\Delta 0 . 9 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 7 . 5 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 2 , 7 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 7 \%}$ since 2008 $(\$ 43,956)$ |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 7 , 7 0 0}$ | Rank: $25 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{8 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 2 \%}(29$ fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 14,381 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { © } 5.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 1,432 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { © 20.7\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ 95 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 24.2\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 15,134 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,729 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 72 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ \text { 14,507 } \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 4.1 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,659 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 72 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



Huron County


Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures



## Jackson County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 3 , 4 4 0}$ | Rank: $71 \quad \mathbf{0 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{2 . 4 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 , 3 0 7}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 7 \%}$ since 2008 (\$36,888) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 0 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: $76 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 6 \%}$ (20 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 9,746 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000- 08 : $\nabla 3.1 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & \text { 1,403 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -16.8\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 83 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 10.8\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 9,440 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,639 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 74 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 9,183 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 2.7 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,611 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 76 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment


## Poverty Level

## 79.5\%




## Jefferson County

| Population: | $\mathbf{6 7 , 6 9 1}$ | Rank: $37 \quad \mathbf{0} . \mathbf{8} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{8 . 4} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 , 0 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 0 . 9 \%}$ since 2008 (\$36,738) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 5 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: 81 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 1 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 5 \%}$ (18 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures



Knox County

| Population: | 59,637 | Rank: 44 - 0.4\% since 2008 | 9.4\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$45,374 | マ 0.8\% since 2008 ( $\$ 45,745$ ) |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$92,100 | Rank: 39 Median State Hom | Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesse | 1,185 | マ 0.3\% (4 fewer businesses) | e 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures



## Lake County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 3 6 , 7 7 5}$ | Rank: $10 \quad \mathbf{0 0 . 4 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 4 . 1 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 3 , 8 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 7 . 5} \%$ since 2008 (\$58,228) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 7 , 9 0 0}$ | Rank: $7 \quad$ Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 , 3 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 3} \%$ (126 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 89,706 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { च1.9\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ \text { 11,399 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 5.5\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 559 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \nabla 19.7 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 88,025 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 12,027 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 449 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 81,385 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 7.5 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ \text { 11,930 } \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 0.8 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 445 \end{gathered}$ | - 0.9\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Lawrence County

| Population: | $\mathbf{6 2 , 7 4 4}$ | Rank: $40 \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 1} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 0 . 7 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 6 , 7 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 1 . 1} \%$ since 2008 $(\$ 36,289)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 9 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: 77 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{6 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 4 . 2} \%$ (30 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009
$\left.\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of All } \\ \text { Income } \\ \text { Earned }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of All } \\ \text { Taxes } \\ \text { Paid }\end{array} \right\rvert\, \begin{array}{r}\text { Earning } \\ \text { Less } \\ \text { than } \\ \$ 60,000\end{array}\right)$

Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 8,875 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> A 9.4\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 3,408 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000- 08 : <br> - 12.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 163 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 17.2\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 9,711 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 2,981 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 135 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 9,227 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 5 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 2,945 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 135 \end{gathered}$ |  |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Licking County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 5 8 , 4 8 8}$ | Rank: $18 \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 8 . 9 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 1 , 0 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 1} \%$ since $2008(\$ 52,148)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 0 , 7 0 0}$ | Rank: $19 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 , 7 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 2 \%}$ (33 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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Per-Student Public School Expenditures



## Logan County

| Population: | 46,582 | Rank: 52 © 0.1\% since 2008 | - 1.3\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$45,756 | マ 7.8\% since 2008 (\$49,622) |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$88,300 | Rank: 47 Median State Home | Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | 851 | マ 3.4\% (30 fewer businesses) | nce 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 18,600 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000- 08 : <br> - 4 2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & \text { 2,192 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> A 6.4\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 162 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 8.6\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 17,821 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 2,333 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 148 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 15,794 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 2,299 } \end{aligned}$ | 1.5\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 146 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 1.4 \%$ |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Lorain County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 0 5 , 7 0 7}$ | Rank: $9 \quad \mathbf{0 0 . 4 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 7 . 4} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 8 , 4 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{V 8 . 4 \%}$ since 2008 (\$52,878) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 5 , 1 0 0}$ | Rank: $14 \quad$ Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 , 3 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 6 \%}$ (85 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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## Lucas County

Population: 463,493 Rank: $6 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 3} \%$ since $2008 \mathbf{~ 1 . 9 \%}$ since 2000
Median Household Income:
Median Home Value:
Number of Businesses:
\$40,161
マ 2.7\% since 2008 (\$41,291)
\$90,700
Rank: 41 Median State Home Value: \$103,700
7,728 $\boldsymbol{\nabla}$ 3.3\% (266 fewer businesses) since 2007

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 209,566 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 26,483 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { च2.3\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,287 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 15.3 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 184,670 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 25,867 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,937 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 171,572 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 7.1 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 25,192 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 2.6 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,909 } \end{aligned}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Madison County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 2 , 5 3 9}$ | Rank: $56 \quad \mathbf{1 1 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 5 . 8 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 , 4 6 5}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 3} \%$ since $2008(\$ 52,035)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 4 , 3 0 0}$ | Rank: $26 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 0 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 2 \%}(\mathbf{2 4}$ fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 9,954 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { A.5\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 2,971 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A 5.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 102 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 14.7\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ \text { 10,704 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 3,133 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 87 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ \text { 10,177 } \end{gathered}$ | - 4.9\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 3,089 } \end{aligned}$ | -1.4\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 87 \end{gathered}$ | 0\% |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment



## Poverty Level

90.5\%

Average \% of Total Population, 2005-2009



Mahoning County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 3 6 , 7 3 5}$ | Rank: 11 | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 8} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\nabla 8 . 1} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 9 , 3 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 9} \%$ since 2008 (\$40,508) |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 9 , 7 0 0}$ | Rank: 66 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 , 5 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 8 \%}$ (101 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate
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Marion County

| Population: | $\mathbf{6 5 , 6 5 5}$ | Rank: $38 \quad \mathbf{0 0 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 8} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 7 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 (\$38,104) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 8 , 5 0 0}$ | Rank: 69 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 0 6 6}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 5 \%}$ (5 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 22,732 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { 5.6\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 5,754 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 『1.3\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 179 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 19.6 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 21,455 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 5,680 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 144 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 19,257 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 10.2 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 5,550 } \end{aligned}$ | V 2.3\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 141 \end{gathered}$ | V 2.1\% |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment


## Poverty Level

83.5\%



## Medina County

| Population: | 174,035 | Rank: 15 ①.3\% since 2008 | - 15.2\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$65,927 | $\boldsymbol{\Delta 0 . 5 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 65,621)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$144,400 | Rank: 3 Median State Home | lue: \$103,700 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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## Poverty Level

94.1\%



Meigs County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 2 , 8 3 8}$ | Rank: $81 \quad \mathbf{4 0 . 5} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{1 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 , 3 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 2 \%}$ since 2008 (\$33,683) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 9 , 6 0 0}$ | Rank: $87 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{3 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 5 . 9} \%$ (19 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009

|  | $\%$ of All <br> Income <br> Earned | \% of All Taxes Paid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earning Less <br> than <br> $\$ 60,000$ | 51\% | 37\% |
| Earning | 49\% | 63\% |

Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 3,712 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 34.5\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 1,212 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 13.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 14.4\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 2,433 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,047 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | 2008: | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 2,354 \end{aligned}$ | - 3.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & 1,045 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 80 \end{gathered}$ | - 3.9\% |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment



## Poverty Level

81.5\%



## Mercer County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 0 , 6 6 6}$ | Rank: $62 \quad \mathbf{0 . 2} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 6} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 , 0 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 5} \%$ since 2008 (\$51,293) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 4 , 0 0 0}$ | Rank: 36 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 1 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 4 \%}$ (28 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures



Miami County

| Population: | 101,256 | Rank: 27 | © 0.1\% since 2008 | - 2.4\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$49,514 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{6 . 1 \%}$ since 2008 (\$52,735) |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$109,600 | Rank: 21 | Median State Hom | Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | 1,928 | - 0.9\% | fewer businesse | nce 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 39,889 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11.4\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 4,603 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { 8.7\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 253 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 17.4\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 35,345 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 5,004 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 209 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 32,228 \end{gathered}$ | - 8.8\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 4,987 } \end{aligned}$ | - 0.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 209 \end{gathered}$ | 0\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Monroe County



Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 3,916 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 23.4 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 875 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 10.9\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ 69 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -21.7\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 3,001 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 780 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 54 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 2,691 } \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 10.3 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 790 \end{aligned}$ | A 1.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 56 \end{gathered}$ | - 3.7\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



Montgomery County

| Population: | $\mathbf{5 3 2 , 5 6 2}$ | Rank: 5 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 4} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{4 . 7 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 , 6 1 1}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 8} \%$ since $2008(\$ 45,237)$ |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 9 0 0}$ | Rank: $32 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 8 \%}$ (290 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 268,314 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 15.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 28,607 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { © 0.6\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 6,688 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { V 24.2\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 227,244 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 28,777 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 5,068 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 209,365 \end{gathered}$ | 『 7.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 28,798 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 4,896 \end{aligned}$ | 入 3.4\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




Morgan County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 4 , 2 8 8}$ | Rank: $86 \quad \mathbf{0 . 5 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{4 . 1} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 3 , 0 8 3}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 . 8 \%}$ since 2008 (\$33,695) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 6 , 8 0 0}$ | Rank: 79 $\quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 5 \%}$ (15 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School
Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,721 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 36.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 703 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 2.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 56 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 26.8\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,722 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 687 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 41 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,698 } \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 1.4 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 671 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 45 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Morrow County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 4 , 6 4 2}$ | Rank: $69 \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 9 . 5} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 , 6 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 4 \%}$ since 2008 (\$48,312) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 7 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: $29 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{4 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 7 . 1 \%}$ (33 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 4,619 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 18.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 1,431 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A 14.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 69 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11.6\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 3,781 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,644 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 61 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 3,344 \end{aligned}$ | -11.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 1,606 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 63 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



Muskingum County

| Population: | $\mathbf{8 4 , 8 8 4}$ | Rank: $31 \quad \boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 1 \%}$ since 2008 $\quad \mathbf{0 . 4 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 , 7 4 8}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 8 . 3} \%$ since $2008(\$ 41,185)$ |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 3 , 3 0 0}$ | Rank: $58 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 6 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 4 . 2 \%}$ (73 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 36,113 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { च 20.9\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 4,661 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { — } 3.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 330 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 13.3 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 28,552 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 4,840 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 286 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 27,050 \end{gathered}$ | $5.3 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 4,822 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 280 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



Noble County


Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 ; \\ & 2,273 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000- 08 : <br> - 4.4\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 1,111 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-ㅇo8: } \\ & \text { 『 7.9\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 34 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> $\nabla 14.7 \%$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 2,172 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,023 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 29 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,963 } \end{aligned}$ | -9.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & \text { 1,009 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 27 \end{gathered}$ | - 6.9\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Ottawa County

| Population: | 40,945 | Rank: 61 『 0.1\% since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 1 \%}$ since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$50,104 | - 4.2\% since 2008 (\$52,281) |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$113,000 | Rank: 16 Median State Hom | Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | 981 | マ 2.7\% (27 fewer businesses) | since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 13,181 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11.8\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 2,054 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A 3.1\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 196 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 6.6\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 11,621 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 2,117 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 183 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 10,948 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 5.8 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 2,071 } \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 2.2 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 199 \end{gathered}$ | -8.7\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Paulding County

| Population: | 18,994 | Rank: $83 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 5 \%}$ since 2008 | マ 6.4\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$46,383 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 . 3 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 46,974)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$73,800 | Rank: 73 Median State Hom | Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | 341 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} 5.5 \%$ (20 fewer businesses) sin | nce 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 4,008 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> A 0.1\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 1,180 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 4.8\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 66 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 19.7 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 4,011 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 1,123 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 53 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 3,403 \end{aligned}$ | ק 15.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & \text { 1,099 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 54 \end{gathered}$ | -1.9\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Perry County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 5 , 3 5 9}$ | Rank: $68 \quad \mathbf{0 . 2 \%}$ since $2008 \quad \mathbf{~ 3 . 8 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 2 , 6 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 4 . 4 \%}$ since 2008 (\$40,841) |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 2 , 5 0 0}$ | Rank: 75 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 1 \%}$ (19 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 5,059 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { च19\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 1,696 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { A } 11.1 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 88 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { V21.6\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 4,097 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 1,885 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 69 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 3,904 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 4.7 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,891 } \end{aligned}$ | A 0.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 66 \end{gathered}$ |  |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Pickaway County

| Population: | $\mathbf{5 4 , 7 3 4}$ | Rank: 47 $\mathbf{\Delta 0 . 3 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 3 . 8 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 , 1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 7 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 (\$50,989) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 2 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: $17 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{9 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 8 \%}$ (17 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 12,373 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \nabla 17.4 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 4,294 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 『0.4\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 108 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { च 13.9\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 10,225 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 4,275 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 93 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 9,681 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 5.3 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 4,189 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 96 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector


Education Attainment


## Poverty Level




## Pike County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 7 , 7 2 2}$ | Rank: $80 \quad \mathbf{0 . 7 \%}$ since $2008 \quad \mathbf{0 0 . 1 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 , 9 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 4 . 9 \%}$ since 2008 (\$37,151) |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 7 7 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: 71 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{3 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 4 \%}$ (27 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 9,819 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { 『19\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 1,691 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { A. } 0.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 79 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { 『 } 6.3 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 7,958 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,705 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 74 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 7,616 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,678 } \end{aligned}$ | 1.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 75 \end{gathered}$ |  |

## Annual Wages by Sector




Portage County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 5 7 , 5 3 0}$ | Rank: $19 \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 3 . 6 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 9 , 0 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 6 . 9 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 52,725)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Rank: $9 \quad$ Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 , 7 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 8 \%}$ (22 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 41,314 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { च2.3\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ 11,038 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { A } 11.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 365 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \nabla 17.3 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 40,367 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ \text { 12,275 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 302 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2009: \\ 37,105 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ \text { 12,201 } \end{gathered}$ | - 0.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 303 \end{gathered}$ | - 0.3\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Preble County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 1 , 4 2 2}$ | Rank: $60 \quad \mathbf{0 . 5} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\nabla} \mathbf{2 . 2} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 , 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 4 . 5} \%$ since 2008 (\$49,237) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 3 , 5 0 0}$ | Rank: 37 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{7 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 7 \%}$ (20 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 9,053 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { V.3\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 1,947 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 6.7\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ 113 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { V 20.4\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 9,026 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,817 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 7,985 \end{aligned}$ | -11.5\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,841 } \end{aligned}$ | A 1.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Putnam County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 4 , 3 7 7}$ | Rank: $70 \quad \boldsymbol{\mathbf { 0 . 2 }} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{1 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 5 4 , 7 6 1}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 3 . 4} \%$ since $2008(\$ 56,708)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 3 , 3 0 0}$ | Rank: $38 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{8 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 4 \%}$ (21 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 10,517 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { V 6\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 1,848 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 『2.7\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 103 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { V 20.4\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 9,891 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,798 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 82 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 9,052 \end{aligned}$ | - 8.5\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 1,768 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 83 \end{gathered}$ | A1.2\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Richland County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 2 4 , 4 9 0}$ | Rank: $23 \quad \mathbf{0 . 5 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{3 . 4} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 9 , 7 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 7 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 (\$42,891) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 8 , 1 0 0}$ | Rank: 48 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 , 3 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ (0 more businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009

|  | \% of All Income Earned | \% of All Taxes Paid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earning Less than $\$ 60,000$ | 45\% | 30\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Earning } \\ \$ 60,000+ \end{gathered}$ | 55\% | 70\% |

Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 52,592 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -10.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 8,204 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 5.8\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 748 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 13.5\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 47,223 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 7,732 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 647 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2009 \\ 43,333 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 7,469 \end{aligned}$ | 『 3.4\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 633 \end{gathered}$ | - 2.2\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Ross County

| Population: | $\mathbf{7 5 , 9 7 2}$ | Rank: 34 | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 2} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 3 . 6 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 , 6 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 5 . 4} \%$ since 2008 (\$44,028) |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 7 , 0 0 0}$ | Rank: $50 \quad$ Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 2 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 2 \%}$ (41 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 20,992 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { } 5.8 \% \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 4,944 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: A 0.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 1,449 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 1 } 1 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 19,779 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 4,975 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 1,463 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ 18,751 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 5.2 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 4,880 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 1,520 \end{aligned}$ | - 3.9\% |

Annual Wages by Sector




## Sandusky County

| Population: | $\mathbf{6 0 , 0 7 1}$ | Rank: 42 | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 3} \%$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\nabla} \mathbf{2 . 8} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 5 , 4 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 4} \%$ since 2008 (\$47,020) |  |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 9 0 , 1 0 0}$ | Rank: 44 Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 1} \%(32$ fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 23,713 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - $4.1 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 3,368 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 4.8\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 139 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11.5\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 22,738 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 3,208 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 123 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 21,168 \end{gathered}$ | マ $6.9 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 3,047 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 121 \end{gathered}$ |  |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Scioto County

| Population: | $\mathbf{7 6 , 3 3 4}$ | Rank: $33 \quad \mathbf{0 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{3 . 6} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 2 , 4 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 9 . 9 \%}$ since 2008 (\$36,020) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 3 , 4 0 0}$ | Rank: $85 \quad$ Median State Home Value: $\$ 103,700$ |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 1 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 2 \%}$ (14 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009

|  | \% of All Income Earned | \% of All Taxes Paid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earning Less than $\$ 60,000$ | 47\% | 32\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Earning } \\ \$ 60,000+ \end{gathered}$ | 53\% | 68\% |

Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & \text { 19,637 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { च } 4.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 5,209 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-08: } \\ & \text { A 1.3\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 215 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 17.7 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 18,673 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 5,275 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 177 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ \text { 17,671 } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 5,250 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 170 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Seneca County

| Population: | $\mathbf{5 6 , 1 5 2}$ | Rank: 45 $\boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 7 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{4 . 3} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 9 , 4 8 1}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 1 . 3} \%$ since 2008 (\$44,529) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 1 , 3 0 0}$ | Rank: 63 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 , 2 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 . 5 \%}$ (19 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures



## Shelby County

| Population: | 48,990 | Rank: 49 - 0.3\% since 2008 | - 2.3\% since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income: | \$47,083 | - 9.7\% since 2008 (\$52,152) |  |
| Median Home Value: | \$97,000 | Rank:30 Median State Hom | Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | 910 | マ 2.6\% (24 fewer businesses) | nce 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ \text { 26,023 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> A $2.5 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 2,588 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -4.5\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2000: } \\ 113 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 17.7\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 26,686 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 2,704 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 93 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 22,732 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 2,631 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 94 \end{gathered}$ |  |

## Annual Wages by Sector




## Stark County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 7 9 , 4 6 6}$ | Rank: $7 \quad \boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 $\quad \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 4 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 4 , 3 6 3}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 7 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 44,682)$ |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0 , 3 0 0}$ | Rank: $28 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{7 , 3 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 2 \%}$ (165 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 156,362 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - $9.8 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 17,866 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - $2.1 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 1.396 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 19.2\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ \text { 141,055 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 18,246 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,128 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 131,429 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 6.8 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 17,822 \end{gathered}$ | V 2.3\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,111 } \end{aligned}$ | -1.5\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Summit County

| Population: | $\mathbf{5 4 2 , 4 0 5}$ | Rank: $4 \quad \boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 2 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 1} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 , 0 4 2}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 5} \%$ since 2008 (\$49,528) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 9 , 1 0 0}$ | Rank: $22 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{1 1 , 2 4 7}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \%$ (225 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 235,741 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000- 08 : <br> A 2.4\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 27,580 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { : 5.9\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,788 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: ק 28.7\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 241,364 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-09: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ \text { 29,210 } \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,987 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 224,242 \end{gathered}$ | 『7.1\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 29,136 \end{gathered}$ | V0.3\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,943 } \end{aligned}$ | - 2.2\% |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Trumbull County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 1 0 , 1 5 7}$ | Rank: $13 \quad \boldsymbol{\mathbf { 0 . 5 } \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{6 . 6} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 0 , 9 8 0}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 . 1} \%$ since $2008(\$ 41,419)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 5 , 5 0 0}$ | Rank: $55 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{3 , 4 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 1} \%$ (73 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009

$\left.$|  | \% of All <br> Income <br> Earned |
| :--- | :---: | | \% offAll |
| :---: |
| Taxes |
| Paid | \right\rvert\,

## Per-Student Public School Expenditures




Tuscarawas County
Population: $\quad 91,137$
Median Household Income:
Median Home Value:
Number of Businesses:
\$40,933
\$88,100
2,175

Rank: $30 \boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 1 \%}$ since 2008 - $\mathbf{0 . 2 \%}$ since 2000
マ 4.7\% since 2008 (\$42,959)
Rank: 48 Median State Home Value: \$103,700
$\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 8 \%}$ (17 fewer businesses) since 2007

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

Unemployment Rate


Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


| Education Attainment |  | Poverty Level <br> $82.9 \%$ | \% of Total Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



## Union County

| Population: | $\mathbf{4 8 , 9 0 3}$ | Rank: $50 \quad \mathbf{1 1 . 2 \%}$ since $2008 \quad \mathbf{1 9 . 5 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 3 , 1 2 2}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 . 6 \%}$ since $2008(\$ 64,179)$ |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 8 , 8 0 0}$ | Rank: $6 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{7 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 2 \%}$ (24 fewer businesses) since 2007 |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures


## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 20,769 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { A16\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,852 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> A 20.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 85 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> -11.8\% |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2008 \\ 24,101 \end{array}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 3,437 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 75 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 22,946 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 3,366 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 2.1 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 72 \end{gathered}$ |  |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Van Wert County

| Population： | 28，496 | Rank： $77 \boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{0 . 8 \%}$ since 2008 | マ 3．9\％since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income： | \＄42，595 | マ 8．9\％since 2008 （\＄46，734） |  |
| Median Home Value： | \＄76，000 | Rank： 72 Median State Hom | Value：\＄103，700 |
| Number of Businesses： | 469 | マ 5．6\％（28 fewer businesses） | nce 2007 |

Note：Figures for population，median household income，and median home value are for 2009．Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes， 2009


Per－Student Public School Expenditures



## Vinton County

| Population： | 13，228 | Rank： 88 ⓪．1\％since 2008 | －3．3\％since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income： | \＄34，275 | マ 0．1\％since 2008 （ $\$ 34,306$ ） |  |
| Median Home Value： | \＄64，400 | Rank： 83 Median State Home | Value：\＄103，700 |
| Number of Businesses： | 191 | マ 2．1\％（4 fewer businesses）si | nce 2007 |

Note：Figures for population，median household income，and median home value are for 2009．Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes， 2009


## Per－Student Public School Expenditures



## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 1,550 \end{aligned}$ | Chg．2000－${ }^{\prime} 08$ ： $\nabla 0.6 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 810 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { च } 7.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 『10\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,541 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 748 \end{gathered}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 27 \end{gathered}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 1,388 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 753 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 27 \end{gathered}$ | 0\％ |

Annual Wages by Sector



## Warren County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 1 0 , 7 1 2}$ | Rank: $12 \mathbf{\Delta 1 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{3 3 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 8 , 7 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 3} \%$ since 2008 (\$71,139) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 2 , 2 0 0}$ | Rank: 4 Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{3 , 2 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 0 . 6 \%}$ (21 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.
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PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT
Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 52,155 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { A 30.3\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 6,932 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { A2.2\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 316 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { (3.2\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 67,936 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 9,165 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 306 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 64,433 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 5.2 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 9,082 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla$ 0.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 304 \end{gathered}$ | - 0.7\% |
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## Washington County

| Population： | 61，048 | Rank： 41 マ 0．2\％since 2008 マ 3．5\％since 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income： | \＄41，345 | マ 1．1\％since 2008 （ $\$ 41,800$ ） |
| Median Home Value： | \＄80，400 | Rank： 64 Median State Home Value：\＄103，700 |
| Number of Businesses： | 1，396 | マ 1．8\％（25 fewer businesses）since 2007 |

Note：Figures for population，median household income，and median home value are for 2009．Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2000 \\ 21,391 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { B.4\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000: \\ & 3,124 \end{aligned}$ | Chg．2000－ 08 ： <br> $\nabla 2.5 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 269 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-00: } \\ & \text { च 20.1\% } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2008: } \\ 22,109 \end{gathered}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： | $\begin{aligned} & 2008: \\ & 3,046 \end{aligned}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 215 \end{aligned}$ | Chg．2008－＇09： |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2009 \\ 20,637 \end{array}$ | $\nabla 6.7 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 2,969 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 226 \end{gathered}$ |  |
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Wayne County

| Population: | $\mathbf{1 1 4 , 2 2 2}$ | Rank: $24 \mathbf{\Delta 0 . 1 \%}$ since 2008 | $\mathbf{\Delta 2 . 4 \%}$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 (\$48,453) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 8 , 1 0 0}$ | Rank: $24 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{2 , 4 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 2 \%}$ (49 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.
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## Williams County

| Population: | $\mathbf{3 7 , 8 1 6}$ | Rank: $66 \quad \mathbf{0 . 8 \%}$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{3 . 5} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 , 0 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 1 2 . 4} \%$ since $2008(\$ 46,904)$ |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 5 , 7 0 0}$ | Rank: $54 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{8 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{\Delta 1 . 1 \%}$ (9 more businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2000 \\ 17,444 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 16.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 2,108 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 2.6\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 113 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \nabla 21.2 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 14,548 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 2,163 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 89 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 13,060 \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla 10.2 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009: \\ & 2,111 \end{aligned}$ | V 2.4\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009: } \\ 91 \end{gathered}$ | - 2.2\% |

## Annual Wages by Sector




Wood County
Population: 125,380 Rank: 22 - 0.3\% since 2008 - 3.6\% since 2000
Median Household Income:
Median Home Value: Number of Businesses:
$\$ 120,000$
2,083 $\boldsymbol{\nabla 0 . 1 \%}$ (3 fewer businesses) since 2007

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate



Income and Taxes, 2009


Per-Student Public School Expenditures



## Poverty Level




## Wyandot County

| Population: | $\mathbf{2 2 , 3 9 4}$ | Rank: $82 \quad \boldsymbol{\mathbf { 0 . 1 }} \%$ since 2008 | $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \mathbf{2 . 2} \%$ since 2000 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median Household Income: | $\mathbf{\$ 3 9 , 7 9 2}$ | $\boldsymbol{\nabla 1 5 . 6 \%}$ since 2008 (\$47,168) |  |
| Median Home Value: | $\mathbf{\$ 8 2 , 3 0 0}$ | Rank: $60 \quad$ Median State Home Value: \$103,700 |  |
| Number of Businesses: | $\mathbf{5 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{\nabla 3 . 4 \%}$ (19 fewer businesses) since 2007 |  |

Note: Figures for population, median household income, and median home value are for 2009. Number of businesses is for 2008.

## Unemployment Rate
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## PRIVATE SECTOR AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

## Change in Employment

| Private Sector |  | Local and State |  | Federal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2000: } \\ & 8,971 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 21.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & 1,250 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chg. 2000-'08: } \\ & \text { 10\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000: \\ 78 \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2000-'08: <br> - 12.8\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & 7,069 \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2008: } \\ & \text { 1,375 } \end{aligned}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: | $\begin{gathered} 2008: \\ 68: \end{gathered}$ | Chg. 2008-'09: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & 6,205 \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla 12.2 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009: } \\ & \text { 1,349 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009: \\ 68 \end{gathered}$ |  |
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## Population Change, 2000-2009



## Median Household Income, 2009



Median Household Income, Percentage Change, 2008-2009


Private-Sector Jobs, Percentage Change, 2008-2009


## Median Home Value



## Wage Comparisons by County, Private Sector and Government Sector

Average Yearly Wages in 2009

|  | Wages |  |  |  | Sector to Private Sector |  | Private Secto Wages Are Higher |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Private | Local | State | Federal | Local to Private | State to Private | Federal to Private |
| Adams | \$28,108.08 | \$31,934.76 | \$43,398.16 | \$38,886.12 | 13.6\% | 54.4\% | 38.3\% |
| Allen | \$35,399.00 | \$37,346.92 | \$55,383.12 | \$56,622.80 | 5.5\% | 56.5\% | 60.0\% |
| Ashland | \$31,833.88 | \$35,341.80 | \$53,881.88 | \$44,123.04 | 11.0\% | 69.3\% | 38.6\% |
| Ashtabula | \$30,898.92 | \$34,875.88 | \$47,170.24 | \$50,326.12 | 12.9\% | 52.7\% | 62.9\% |
| Athens | \$26,699.92 | \$37,365.12 | \$63,524.76 | \$49,973.04 | 39.9\% | 137.9\% | 87.2\% |
| Auglaize | \$33,310.16 | \$35,225.84 | \$50,124.88 | \$47,076.12 | 5.8\% | 50.5\% | 41.3\% |
| Belmont | \$30,058.08 | \$31,737.16 | \$46,120.88 | \$47,063.12 | 5.6\% | 53.4\% | 56.6\% |
| Brown | \$29,136.12 | \$35,549.80 | \$40,596.92 | \$40,503.84 | 22.0\% | 39.3\% | 39.0\% |
| Butler | \$39,191.88 | \$43,800.12 | \$43,800.12 | \$52,812.24 | 11.8\% | 11.8\% | 34.8\% |
| Carroll | \$27,270.88 | \$29,147.04 | \$48,933.04 | \$40,916.20 | 6.9\% | 79.4\% | 50.0\% |
| Champaign | \$33,311.20 | \$35,102.08 | \$47,389.16 | \$41,382.12 | 5.4\% | 42.3\% | 24.2\% |
| Clark | \$32,709.04 | \$36,864.88 | \$51,393.16 | \$58,001.84 | 12.7\% | 57.1\% | 77.3\% |
| Clermont | \$36,453.04 | \$39,985.92 | \$36,777.00 | \$56,576.00 | 9.7\% | 0.9\% | 55.2\% |
| Clinton | \$50,029.20 | \$36,948.08 | \$50,462.88 | \$60,901.88 | -26.1\% | 0.9\% | 21.7\% |
| Columbiana | \$28,971.80 | \$33,693.92 | \$50,736.92 | \$58,017.96 | 16.3\% | 75.1\% | 100.3\% |
| Coshocton | \$32,829.16 | \$31,857.80 | \$45,989.84 | \$46,453.16 | -3.0\% | 40.1\% | 41.5\% |
| Crawford | \$29,094.00 | \$34,175.96 | \$52,616.20 | \$43,125.16 | 17.5\% | 80.8\% | 48.2\% |
| Cuyahoga | \$45,088.16 | \$47,196.76 | \$57,522.92 | \$67,279.16 | 4.7\% | 27.6\% | 49.2\% |
| Darke | \$31,429.84 | \$33,866.04 | \$44,578.04 | \$43,429.88 | 7.8\% | 41.8\% | 38.2\% |
| Defiance | \$35,167.08 | \$35,689.16 | \$51,849.20 | \$46,057.96 | 1.5\% | 47.4\% | 31.0\% |
| Delaware | \$45,756.88 | \$42,584.88 | \$52,094.12 | \$50,390.08 | -6.9\% | 13.8\% | 10.1\% |
| Erie | \$31,542.16 | \$41,229.24 | \$39,798.20 | \$60,198.84 | 30.7\% | 26.2\% | 90.9\% |
| Fairfield | \$29,425.24 | \$39,927.16 | \$46,579.00 | \$49,641.80 | 35.7\% | 58.3\% | 68.7\% |
| Fayette | \$28,531.88 | \$36,151.96 | \$45,398.08 | \$47,183.76 | 26.7\% | 59.1\% | 65.4\% |
| Franklin | \$44,110.04 | \$48,964.24 | \$48,980.88 | \$64,545.00 | 11.0\% | 11.0\% | 46.3\% |
| Fulton | \$32,137.04 | \$32,180.20 | \$53,788.80 | \$45,857.76 | 0.1\% | 67.4\% | 42.7\% |
| Gallia | \$36,713.04 | \$33,885.80 | \$28,436.20 | \$42,684.20 | -7.7\% | -22.5\% | 16.3\% |
| Geauga | \$35,505.08 | \$38,834.12 | \$48,588.80 | \$46,602.92 | 9.4\% | 36.9\% | 31.3\% |
| Greene | \$37,330.80 | \$43,912.44 | \$43,912.44 | \$81,454.88 | 17.6\% | 17.6\% | 118.2\% |
| Guernsey | \$31,970.12 | \$32,314.88 | \$49,080.20 | \$42,983.20 | 1.1\% | 53.5\% | 34.4\% |
| Hamilton | \$49,153.00 | \$44,659.16 | \$48,757.80 | \$65,303.16 | -9.1\% | -0.8\% | 32.9\% |
| Hancock | \$38,870.00 | \$35,986.08 | \$51,915.76 | \$52,327.08 | -7.4\% | 33.6\% | 34.6\% |
| Hardin | \$32,121.96 | \$29,674.84 | \$46,405.84 | \$40,708.20 | -7.6\% | 44.5\% | 26.7\% |
| Harrison | \$31,077.80 | \$26,357.24 | \$44,644.08 | \$38,140.96 | -15.2\% | 43.7\% | 22.7\% |
| Henry | \$33,858.76 | \$34,082.88 | \$45,448.00 | \$40,656.20 | 0.7\% | 34.2\% | 20.1\% |
| Highland | \$29,164.20 | \$34,079.76 | \$42,330.08 | \$45,503.12 | 16.9\% | 45.1\% | 56.0\% |
| Hocking | \$25,885.08 | \$35,796.80 | \$54,189.20 | \$42,016.00 | 38.3\% | 109.3\% | 62.3\% |
| Holmes | \$28,416.96 | \$33,449.00 | \$42,162.12 | \$42,645.20 | 17.7\% | 48.4\% | 50.1\% |
| Huron | \$33,960.16 | \$34,444.80 | \$51,732.20 | \$42,688.88 | 1.4\% | 52.3\% | 25.7\% |
| Jackson | \$28,110.16 | \$33,345.00 | \$53,766.96 | \$45,318.00 | 18.6\% | 91.3\% | 61.2\% |
| Jefferson | \$35,974.12 | \$31,255.12 | \$51,655.24 | \$50,121.24 | -13.1\% | 43.6\% | 39.3\% |
| Knox | \$35,777.04 | \$34,214.96 | \$26,430.04 | \$44,812.04 | -4.4\% | -26.1\% | 25.3\% |
| Lake | \$36,994.88 | \$40,765.92 | \$55,763.24 | \$57,682.04 | 10.2\% | 50.7\% | 55.9\% |
| Lawrence | \$26,523.12 | \$32,612.84 | \$33,730.84 | \$46,337.20 | 23.0\% | 27.2\% | 74.7\% |

## Wage Comparisons by County, Private Sector and Government Sector (continued)

Average Yearly Wages in 2009

| Difference in Wages, Government Sector to Private Sector |  | Government Sector Wages Are Higher Private Sector Wages Are Higher |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local to Private | State to Private | Federal to Private |
| 13.6\% | 58.0\% | 68.1\% |
| -9.4\% | 9.6\% | 34.7\% |
| 16.3\% | 46.8\% | 178.8\% |
| 24.4\% | 46.5\% | 57.2\% |
| 14.3\% | 49.1\% | 42.2\% |
| 20.2\% | 40.9\% | 90.7\% |
| 11.9\% | 43.6\% | 38.7\% |
| 14.2\% | 43.2\% | 65.4\% |
| 14.4\% | 69.5\% | 74.6\% |
| 10.1\% | 28.5\% | 33.1\% |
| 14.7\% | 58.4\% | 49.6\% |
| -24.5\% | 23.6\% | 17.5\% |
| 7.8\% | 44.2\% | 42.7\% |
| 3.8\% | 57.5\% | 52.3\% |
| 14.4\% | 82.6\% | 43.6\% |
| 12.3\% | 19.6\% | 56.5\% |
| 5.2\% | 46.1\% | 33.1\% |
| 9.7\% | 42.5\% | 37.4\% |
| 8.1\% | 49.0\% | 31.7\% |
| -11.1\% | 42.7\% | 21.5\% |
| 8.9\% | 46.1\% | 36.7\% |
| -13.8\% | -2.4\% | 35.0\% |
| 18.5\% | 57.2\% | 45.7\% |
| 0.2\% | 27.2\% | 28.9\% |
| 2.3\% | 64.9\% | 31.2\% |
| 18.0\% | 67.6\% | 74.0\% |
| 0.7\% | 37.6\% | 102.1\% |
| 11.6\% | 48.6\% | 44.1\% |
| 18.4\% | 58.9\% | 63.2\% |
| 11.7\% | 45.4\% | 49.8\% |
| -9.4\% | 31.9\% | 8.4\% |
| 11.1\% | 52.5\% | 58.9\% |
| 3.7\% | 28.1\% | 46.4\% |
| 13.8\% | 56.6\% | 55.3\% |
| 14.2\% | 88.8\% | 65.9\% |
| -23.7\% | -0.3\% | -16.0\% |
| 8.3\% | 62.1\% | 33.0\% |
| 6.8\% | 27.6\% | 25.3\% |
| 10.0\% | 44.1\% | 28.0\% |
| -11.1\% | 42.3\% | 37.9\% |
| 8.6\% | 30.4\% | 41.6\% |
| 3.5\% | 49.4\% | 25.7\% |
| -0.7\% | 31.5\% | 18.5\% |
| -4.4\% | 33.7\% | 25.0\% |
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