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## Letter From The <br> Executive Director

For over 25 years, the State of Poverty in Ohio Report has taken a deep look at poverty in our state. The challenges of poverty ebb and flow with the availability of jobs, access to transportation, affordable housing, and other factors like addiction-which we featured in last year's report and remains a factor in Ohio. Through research and careful analysis, we have brought to light obstacles that low-income families face each day. Though its appearance has changed over the years, the purpose and value of this report has remained the same: to allow communities, our member agencies, elected officials, government entities and others gain a deeper understanding of poverty so that together we can make positive strides to alleviate its causes and effects so all Ohioans can thrive.

As a network, we believe Ohioans strive to be self-sufficient-meaning they can meet their basic needs without any government or other outside assistance. By reducing obstacles, we can make a positive impact on their journey. To do that we must know and understand why these factors create challenges so we can get to the root of the issues. Knowledge is the first step to change, and this report is a continuing evaluation of that process.

As our research progressed this year, we found strong correlations between access to transportation, affordable housing, and income opportunities. We found that Ohio counties with more affordable housing options have fewer opportunities for living-wage employment and transportation. And, counties with more access to transportation and jobs, have fewer affordable housing options. These factors have left families to make difficult and life-changing choices: move or stay where the jobs are, where the transportation is, or where housing is available. We believe Ohioans shouldn't have to choose which obstacle to conquer and that they can overcome whatever is standing in the way of reaching their fullest potential.

Every day, the Community Action Network sees successes. Parents improve their skillsets and secure employment, children gain higher levels of academic achievement through education supports, and families secure affordable housing and meet basic needs. I encourage all who read this report to ask questions, share ideas, and join our network to create solutions that work for Ohioans.

Sincerely,


Philip E. Cole

## Executive Director

Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies

## Defining Poverty

Since the 1960s, the most commonly-used definition of poverty in the United States has been the Federal Poverty Level (FPL), which calculates a threshold based on family size and annual income. If a household is below the FPL threshold, they are experiencing poverty according to this definition. Since 2012, Ohio's poverty rate has slightly declined, from 16 percent to 14 percent; however, the way FPL measures poverty is not without flaws. In attempts to establish better ways to measure poverty, several formulas have been developed with different definitions and guidelines. It is important to consider these approaches in order to have a more comprehensive understanding of the scope and experience of poverty.



The number of Americans at or below the poverty line

The Federal Poverty Measure (FPM) and Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM) were both established by the U.S. Census Bureau. The FPM is calculated based on a minimum food budget, while the SPM considers food along with housing, utilities, and other needs while also considering the value of government benefits as income. Neither measure adequately captures the necessary economic components, let alone the experience of poverty. Both are absolute in nature and neither is responsive to economic growth, changes in living standards, or taxes.

Area Median Income is a measure relating specifically to housing and is used by the U.S Department of Housing \& Urban Development to establish thresholds for housing assistance. This household-level measure establishes a midpoint for all incomes in an area; a household below $80 \%$ of the AMI is considered lower income, below $50 \%$ is considered very low income and below $30 \%$ is considered extremely low income

All of the varying federal poverty measures yield data that are significantly different from each other. As an example, in a recent report for the United Nations, it was indicated that 18.5 million Americans live in extreme poverty, while U.S. officials responded that figure was closer to 250,000 Americans.' The FPL, FPM, and SPM data vary by as much as 30 percent. Furthermore, none of the federal- and state-level measures inherently capture what poverty looks like at the local level. Poverty-level wages in an urban region may not stretch as far, while less-measurable factors such as lack of public transportation may have a more significant impact in rural regions.

The current federal measures also cannot adequately capture the experience of episodic poverty and instead presume a steady source of income across a year. In situations of episodic unemployment, temporary work, or reliance upon commission-based, tip-based, or "gig economy" work, income can fluctuate widely, resulting in episodic poverty. A recent survey finding that four in 10 Americans would not be able to cover an unexpected $\$ 400$ expense out of pocket speaks to the tenuous nature of household finances for many people.

## Measures such as the Self-Sufficiency Standard can do a better job of incorporating other factors into the equation

Measures such as the Self-Sufficiency Standard can do a better job of incorporating other factors into the equation. Families have different needs based on their composition, and simply considering the standard factor of family size cannot capture the needs of everyone in the home. The number of adults and children, their ages and care needs, and other factors are considered in the Self-Sufficiency Standard. In addition, location and the local cost of living are also factored into the calculation of the necessary income to provide all of a family's basic needs without assistance. The Self-Sufficiency Standard tool is available on OACAA's website at http://oacaa.org/self-sufficiency-calculator/. er

ten Americans


## would not be able to cover an unexpected $\$ 400$ expense out of pocket



## Income

A number of economic indicators show positive signs for both Ohio and the nation at large While Ohio's unemployment rate has continuously been higher than the national unemployment rate since 2015, the state recently had one of the lowest monthly rates over the past decade at 4.5 percent. ${ }^{2}$ Ohio also has had strong job growth of 2.1 percent, which even managed to eclipse the national rate in $2018 .^{3}$

Unfortunately, Ohio's low unemployment and high job growth have not led to increased wages for Ohioans. Despite worker productivity increasing by two-thirds since 1979, wages have only increased by 3.8 percent after adjusting for inflation. In fact, the bottom 10th percentile of wage earners actually make seven cents per hour less than they did in 1979, after adjusting for inflation. ${ }^{4}$


The bottom 10th percentile of wage earners actually make seven cents per hour less than they did in 1979


Six of the top ten most common occupations in Ohio have a median wage low enough that a family of three would qualify for food assistance even though they are working full-time

While the overall mean annual wage in Ohio is $\$ 48,220$, not all households are so fortunate. Six of the top ten most common occupations in Ohio have a median wage low enough that a family of three would qualify for food assistance even though they are working full-time. To put this in perspective, these six fields employ one of out of every ten workers in Ohio. ${ }^{5}$ Not only do workers earn low wages in these fields, but they are often offered only part-time hours and lack benefits. Individuals frequently have no other choice but to work multiple part-time jobs in an effort to earn the income of one full-time job while still lacking benefits such as healthcare or sick time.

Income inequality is notable in Ohio, which ranks 29th out of 50 states. The average annua income of the top one percent is 18.6 times greater than that of the remaining 99 percent. The income gap is typically higher in urban areas, such as Hamilton County which is nearly 30 percent different, and lower in rural areas such as Morgan County which is about eight percent different. ${ }^{6}$ A household in the top one percent makes in 10 days-a pay period, for many workers-what a family of four at the poverty threshold makes in an entire year.

In addition to wage changes largely leaving the lowest-income segments behind, Ohio's tax structure also increasingly affects the poorest segments of society. In 2003, the bottom fifth of wage earners paid 10.9 percent of their income to Ohio taxes; the top one percent only paid 6.7 percent of their income to Ohio taxes. In 2018, the bottom fifth paid 12.3 percent of their income in state and local taxes, while those in the top one percent only paid 6.5 percent.? Lower-income Ohioans are working harder, being more productive, and are still making less money while paying more taxes.

## A household in the top

 one percent makes in 10 days, what a family offour at the poverty threshold makes in an entire year

## Lower-income Ohioans are working harder, being more productive, and are still making less money while paying more taxes



## Transportation

Transportation is a critical issue for people experiencing poverty. Getting to both food and work require transportation, whether public or private. And concepts like food deserts ${ }^{8}$ and job hubs ${ }^{9}$ which are defined by geographical distance to grocery stores and work, are real concerns for Ohioans in all areas of the state.

Employment statistics have suggested that nearly half of Ohio's workforce commute outside their county of residence..$^{00}$ This is significant because many public transit services are city- or county-based and do not cross into other cities or counties causing employees to be dependent on private transportation options. Across Ohio, commute times average 24 minutes, one-way." This is not the case, however, when employees rely on public transportation as their means to get to work. In the Cincinnati area, for example, only 10 percent of jobs can be accessed by public transit in less than an hour, and in outlying counties of northeast Ohio, less than 10 percent of regional jobs can be accessed in less than 90 minutes.12,13

Areas with limited access to affordable and nutritious food.
Areas where econominc cativity and employment opportunities are concentrated.
2017 American Commit Needs Study, Pinal Report, January 2015. Ohio Department of Transportation
 tation-in-northeast-ohio.aspx



With few exceptions, Ohioans depend on affordable transportation options to get to work, the grocery store, school, church, doctor's appointments, or to complete other daily living tasks. With about a third of Ohio counties having no access at all to public transportation, nearly a million people-predominantly in rural regions of the state, several of which also have the highest poverty rates-are dependent on private means such as owning a car. Nearly 400,000 Ohio households had no vehicle available to them, and over 1.5 million only had access to one vehicle-meaning they are just one breakdown or repair job away from having no options.

About a third of Ohio counties, nearly a million people, have no access at all to public transportation

## Affordable Housing

Affordable housing is traditionally defined as housing costs, including utilities, that are below 30 percent of a household's income. As discussed earlier in this report, Area Median Income is a measure used by HUD to establish thresholds for housing assistance. Households who spend more than 30 percent of their income are considered cost-burdened. Nearly half of Ohio's renters and one-fifth of homeowners are cost-burdened. Additionally, one in every four renting households is severely cost-burdened-meaning they spend at least half of their income on housing. ${ }^{14}$

Fair market rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Ohio is $\$ 793$ dollars. In order to reasonably afford this housing, a worker must make $\$ 15.25$ per hour. However, the average renter wage in Ohio is just $\$ 13.32$ an hour, indicating that, on average, renters cannot afford a two-bedroom apartment in Ohio.

The average wage for a renter in Ohio is \$1.93/hour less than the minimum needed to afford rent for a two-bedroom apartment

For minimum wage workers, the outlook is bleaker. A minimum wage worker would need to work 57 hours per week to afford a one-bedroom residence, or 74 hours per week to afford a two-bedroom residence..$^{15}$ In fact, when looking at county-level estimates, in all but five of Ohio's 88 counties, a household needs to have more than one full-time mean renter wage to afford a two-bedroom residence.



A minimum wage worker would need to work 57 hours per week to afford a one-bedroom residence, or 74 hours per week to afford a two-bedroom residence

## The Intersection of Income, Housing, and Transportation

Wages, transportation, and housing all intersect to affect the experience of people in poverty. Among moderate-income Ohioans, on average 62 percent of their income is devoted to housing and transportation alone. ${ }^{16}$ Having to spend such a significant portion of their income on these two essentials leaves relatively little for anything else. Simply stated, the costs of housing and transportation take up a large amount of resources in lower-income households resulting in financial challenges.

When it is difficult to find a job with good wages near where you live, there are two options: commute or move. One requires reliable and efficient transportation, the other requires affordable housing

The nine counties in Ohio with the greatest number of jobs-which are predominantly urban areas-are also the nine counties with the largest shortages of affordable rental units for extremely low-income renters. ${ }^{17,18}$ In other words, the places people are most likely find work are also the places they are least likely to be able to live.

Without reliable transportation, whether public or private, it can be difficult to find and secure any employment, much less employment that requires a long commute. And without affordable housing, the cost of basic needs and transportation can be too overwhelming to maintain.


## Appendix

Table 1.
Federal poverty level thresholds by household size and number of children, 2017

| Household size | Number of related children under age 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| One person, under age 65 | \$12,752 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age 65 and over | \$11,756 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two people, under age 65 | \$16,414 | 16,895 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age 65 and over | \$14,816 | \$16,831 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Three people | \$19,173 | \$19,730 | \$19,749 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Four people | \$25,283 | \$25,696 | \$24,858 | \$24,944 |  |  |  |  |
| Five people | \$30,490 | \$30,933 | \$29,986 | \$29,253 | \$28,805 |  |  |  |
| Six people | \$35,069 | \$35,208 | \$34,482 | \$33,787 | \$32,753 | \$32,40 |  |  |
| Seven people | \$40,351 | \$40,603 | \$39,734 | \$39,29 | \$38,001 | \$36,685 | \$35,242 |  |
| Eight people | \$45,129 | \$45,528 | \$44,708 | \$43,990 | \$42,971 | \$41,678 | \$40,332 | \$39,990 |
| Nine people or more | \$54,287 | \$54,550 | \$53,825 | \$53,216 | \$42,216 | \$50,840 | \$49,595 | \$49,287 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
The U.S. Census Bureau calculates the federal poverty level (FPL) thresholds and estimates annually for the previous year, based on number of adults and numberof reated children under 18
-The FPL is based on the cash resources shared by related individuals in a household

Table 2.
Comparison between the Official and Supplemental Poverty Measures

|  | Official poverty measure | Supplemental poverty measure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measurement Units | Families and unrelated individuals | All related individuals who live at the same address and any co-resident unrelated children who are cared for by the family (such as foster children) and any co-habiters and their relatives |
| Poverty Threshold | 3 times the cost of a minimum food diet | Mean of the 30th and 36th percentile of expenditures on food, clothing, shelter, and utilities of consumer units with exactly 2 children, multiplied by 1.2 |
| Threshold Adjustments | Vary by family size, composition, and age of householder | Geographic adjustments for differences in housing costs by tenure and a 3 -parameter equivalence scale for family size and composition |
| Updating Thresholds | Consumer Price Index | 5 -year moving average of expenditures on food, clothing, shetter, and utilities |
| Resource Measure | Gross pre-tax cash income | Sum of cash income; plus noncash benefits that families can use to meet their food, clothing, shelter, and utilities needs; plus tax credits; minus taxes, work expenses, out-of-pocket medical expenses, and child support paid to another household |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
-The official measure does not account for differences in housing costs in different parts of the country
The supplemental measure considers govermment assistance and necessary expenses to establish a more accurate amount of resources available

Table 3.
Chronic and episodic poverty rates, United States, 2005-2007 and 2009-2011

|  | $2005-2007$ | $2009-2011$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of population in poverty every month in a 36-month period (chronic poverty rate) | $3.0 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Percentage of population in poverty for at least 2 consecutive months in a 36-month period (episodic poverty rate) | $27.1 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | Source: U. S. Census Bureau, Suvey of Income and Program Participation

 - Using a monthly poverty threshold as opposed to an annual one allows for a deeper understanding of the duration of poverty
-The episodic poverty rate (31.6\%) in $2009-2011$ was twice as high as the U.S.'s official annual poverty rate in 201
Episodic poverty rates capture the many people who filter in and out of poverty, unlike the overall annual poverty rate

Table 4.
Items included in the Self-Sufficiency Standard, Ohio

| Cost | What is included in each budget item |
| :---: | :---: |
| Housing | Yes: Rent, utilities, and property taxes |
|  | No: Cable, internet, or telephone services (telephone service is included under miscellaneous costs) |
| Child care | Yes: Full-time family day care for infants, full-time center care for preschoolers, and before and after school care for school-age children |
|  | No: Atter school programs for teenagers, extracurricular activities, babysititing when not at work |
| Food | Yes: Groceries |
|  | No: Take-out, fast-food, restaurant meals, or alcoholic beverages |
| Transportation | Yes: car ownership cost (per adult)-insurance, gasoline (including gasoline taxess), oil, registration, repairs, monthly payments-or public transportation when adequate (assuming only commuting to and from work and day care plus a weekly shopping trip) |
|  | No: Non-essential travel or vacations |
| Health care | Yes: Employer-sponsored heath insurance and out-of-pocket costs |
|  | No: Heath savings account, gym memberships, individual heath insurance |
| Taxes | Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credits, payroll taxes, and state and local sales taxes |
|  | No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees or other taxes (property taxes and gasoline taxes are included under housing and transportation costs, respectively) |
| Miscellaneous | Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, nonprescription medicines, cleaning products, household items, personal hygiene items, and telephone service |
|  | No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gitts, savings, emergencies, debt repayment (including student loans), or education |

Source: University of Wastington, Center for Women's Welfare, Self-Sufficiency Standard for Ohio
-The Self-Sufficiency Standard is a measure that identifies the minimum amount of income a given household needs to adequately meet basic needs without receiving any additional public or private assistance
It only provides the minimum to meet daily needs and does not include any allowance for savings, college tuition, debt payments, or emergencies
See 2015 self-sufficiency brief for details on Noble and Warren Counties: http://oacaa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/OH15_SSS_Brief_120815.pdf

Table 5.
Monthly expenses and self-sufficiency wages, sample counties, 2018

|  | Coshocton County (low) | Tuscarawas County (middle) | Warren County (high) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monthly expenses |  |  |  |
| Housing | \$634 | \$643 | \$958 |
| Child care | \$491 | \$716 | \$1,014 |
| Food | \$696 | \$782 | \$812 |
| Transportation | \$482 | \$482 | \$535 |
| Health Care | \$473 | \$475 | \$462 |
| Miscellaneous | \$278 | \$310 | \$378 |
| Taxes | \$352 | \$487 | \$793 |
| Self-sufficiency wages |  |  |  |
| Hourly wage per working adult | \$8.30 | \$9.88 | \$13.31 |
| Monthly household income | \$2,923 | \$3,478 | \$4,685 |
| Annual household income | \$35,078 | \$41,730 | \$56,220 |
| Minimum wage and poverty threshold (for comparison) |  |  |  |
| 2018 Ohio Minimum Wage (hourly) | \$8.30 | \$8.30 | \$8.30 |
| Does not work | 166,802 | 65,551 | 39.3\% |

Sources: University of Wassington, Center for Women's Welfare, Self-Sufficiency Standard for Oni;; Ohio Department of Commerce: U.S. Census Bureau
Notes: Figures represent the monthy expenses and self.sufficiency wages for family of two adults and two school-age children. These are not average or median amounts earned, but the


-The Self-Sufficiency Standard calculates the full costs of basic needs without help from public subsidies or informal assistance
-The measure takes into account an area's cost of living to determine the minimum amount of income needed to meet basic needs
-A family of two adults and two school-ge children in Ohio needs an annual household income of at least $144 \%$ FPL to be self-sufficient (Coshocton)
-The hourly minimum wage in Ohio provides annual wages near self-sufficiency for Ohio counties on the low end of the cost range, but for counties with a
The hourly minimum wage in ohio provides annual wages near self-sufficiency for Ohio counties
higher cost of living, the minimum wage is not tigh enough for a family to maintain self-sufficiency

Table 6.
Asset poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2002-2011

|  | 2002 | 2004 | 2006 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Onio | $22.0 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $26.3 \%$ | $23.7 \%$ |
| United States | $25.2 \%$ | $22.4 \%$ | $22.4 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $26.0 \%$ | $25.4 \%$ |

Source: Corporation for Enterpise Development, Assets \& Opportunity Scorecard; data was not collected every year
-Asset poverty is a measure of the financial cushion needed to withstand a financial crisis (i.e. medical emergency, job loss, etc,
One out of every four households in Ohio does not have enough combined assets to cover three months' living expenses at the FPL threshold

Table 7.
Liquid asset poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2006-2011

|  | 2006 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ohio | $39.5 \%$ | $43.6 \%$ | $43.2 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ |
| United States | $41.4 \%$ | $43.1 \%$ | $43.5 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

- Liquid assets are those which can be easily exchanged for cash (e.g, gold, savings accounts, government bonds)
-Four out of every ten Ohio households lack the liquid assets needed to stay out of poverty for three months

Table 8.
Poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2012-2017

|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Onio | $16.3 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $14.0 \%$ |
| United States | $15.9 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ | $14.0 \%$ | $13.4 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Sureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

- Both Ohio and U.S. poverty rates have decreased since 2011; the gap between the Ohio and U.S. poverty rates is $0.6 \%$

Table 9.
Change in poverty, Ohio, 2012-2017

|  | 2012 | 2017 | Change 2012 to 2017 | \% Change 2012 to 2017 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Poplation for whom poverty status is determined | $11,227,482$ | $11,3007,72$ | 102, | 102,280 |
| Persons below the poverty level | $1,824,628$ | $1,582,931$ | $-241,697$ | $-13 \%$ |

[^0]-Onio's population is growing and fewer people (241,697) are in poverty in 2016 than were in poverty in 2011

Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties







Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  | Athens | Auglaize | Belmont | Brown | Butler |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Population and population change }}{\text { Total }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 66,597 | 45,778 | 68.029 | 43,576 | 380,604 |
| Percentage minority population, 2017 | 10.6\% | 4.1\% | 7.2\% | 3.5\% | 18.8\% |
| Population change, 2012-2017 | 2,007 | -15 | -1,671 | -718 | 10,172 |
| Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | 3.1\% | 0.0\% | -2.4\% | -1.6\% | 2.7\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population in poverty, 2017 | 16,259 | 3,936 | 7.114 | 7,219 | 39,242 |
| Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 28.8\% | 8.7\% | 11.1\% | 16.9\% | 10.7\% |
| Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 28.5\% | 11.5\% | 17.2\% | 22.6\% | 13.1\% |
| Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 12.9\% | 7.0\% | 9.1\% | 10.1\% | 5.5\% |
| White (hon-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 28.3\% | 8.8\% | 13.5\% | 17.2\% | 11.2\% |
| Black/Afican American poverty rate, 2017 | 53.9\% | N | 32.3\% | N | 22.4\% 3 |
| Asian poverty rate, 2017 | 43.9\% | , | N | N | 17.2\% |
| Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 43.2\% | 30.8\% | N | N | 31.0\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Families in poverty, 2017 | 2.146 | 921 | 1,652 | 1.724 | 8,006 |
| Family poverty rate, 2017 | 17.3\% | 7.2\% | 9.4\% | 13.9\% | 8.5\% |
| Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 13.0\% | 3.9\% | 5.3\% | 6.0\% | 5.2\% |
| Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 56.1\% | 378\% | 45.6\% | 61.3\% | 37.9\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of population below $50 \% \mathrm{FPL}, 2017$ | 17.9\% | 3.8\% | 5.9\% | 8.3\% | $6.5 \%$ |
| Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 49.4\% | 25.3\% | 33.4\% | 37.4\% | 277\% |
| Median household income, 2017 | 42,955 | 6,336 | 52,221 | 48,207 | 64,026 |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 8.4\% | 11.3\% | 13.7\% | 7.2\% | 5.4\% |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 38.7\% | 22.7\% | 23.7\% | 25.2\% | 39.8\% |
| Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 24.4\% | 16.9\% | 22.9\% | 22.3\% | 18.6\% |
| Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 5.4\% | 5.2\% | 7.3\% | 5.4\% | 7.4\% |
| Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 44.\% | 33.\% | 43.4\% | 50.8\% | 34.7\% |
| Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 13.6\% | 6.0\% | 11.7\% | 12.6\% | 8.7\% |
| Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 23.4\% | 16.2\% | 25.4\% | 30.1\% | 23.4\% |
| Percentage of population with no heath insurance, 2017 | 6.9\% | 4.3\% | 7.1\% | 8.3\% | 6.8\% |
| Unemployment rate, 2017 | $6.1 \%$ | 3.7\% | 6.3\% | 5.7\% | 4.4\% |
| Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 13.0\% | 3.9\% | 8.1\% | 9.4\% | 3.7\% |
| Percentage of renters cost-urdened, 2017 | 58.1\% | 36.7\% | 42.3\% | 45.0\% | 46.8\% |
| Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 19.6\% | 15.2\% | 13.7\% | 22.1\% | 18.3\% |




 quintile of the national income distribution at that time
data incluce applications at trationan schools only

Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  |  | Carroll | Champaign | Clark | Clermont | Clinton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ation and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Total population, 2017 | 27,385 | 38,840 | 134,557 | 204,21 | 42,009 |
| 1 | Percentage minority population, 2017 | 4.0\% | 6.7\% | 15.8\% | 6.4\% | 6.5\% |
| 1 | Population change, 2012-2017 | -1,155 | -721 | -2,558 | 4.774 | 206 |
| 1 | Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | -4.0\% | -1.8\% | -1.9\% | 2.4\% | 0.5\% |
| dividual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Population in poverty, 2017 | 3,518 | 4,90 | 20,082 | 17,597 | 5,314 |
| 2 | Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 13.0\% | 11.0\% | 15.4\% | 8.7\% | 13.0\% |
| 2 | Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 19.9\% | 16.7\% | 22.0\% | 12.2\% | 20.0\% |
| 3 | Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 7.5\% | 5.2\% | 77\% | 6.8\% | 7.2\% |
| 3 | White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 14.2\% | 10.8\% | 14.8\% | 9.6\% | 14.1\% |
| 3 | Black/Aficican American poverty rate, 2017 | N | N | 29.4\% | 16.0\% | 19.0\% |
| 3 | Asian poverty rate, 2017 | N | N | 7.8\% | 2.8\% | N |
| 3 | Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | N | 30.4\% | 28.2\% | 15.8\% | 24.7\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Families in poverty, 2017 | 851 | 892 | 4.349 | 3.749 | 1.242 |
| 3 | Family poverty rate, 2017 | 10.9\% | 8.3\% | 12.\% | 6.9\% | 11.2\% |
| 3 | Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 201 | 10.8\% | 6.3\% | 7.9\% | 4.5\% | 6.4\% |
| 3 | Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 58.4\% | 35.1\% | 40.0\% | 32.6\% | 46.7\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | $5.1 \%$ | 4.7\% | 7.9\% | 4.4\% | 6.9\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population below 200\% fPL, 2017 | 35.1\% | 29.5\% | 38.3\% | 24.5\% | 36.0\% |
| 2 | Median household income, 2017 | 51,296 | 54,335 | 47,654 | 66,193 | 50,794 |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 8.9\% | 5.0\% | 4.8\% | 9.1\% | 7.3\% |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 35.7\% | 36.3\% | 42.3\% | 37.2\% | 36.6\% |
| 5 | Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 21.9\% | 18.9\% | 22.7\% | 17.6\% | 21.5\% |
| 5 | Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 4.2\% | 5.7\% | 4.3\% | 7.6\% | 4.7\% |
| 6 | Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 47.\% | 35.9\% | 38.4\% | 33.8\% | 41.2\% |
| ${ }^{7}$ | Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 9.8\% | 9.3\% | 12.6\% | 6.6\% | 13.7\% |
|  | Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 23.1\% | 217\% | 32.7\% | 19.6\% | 27.9\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 11.5\% | 6.1\% | 7.3\% | 5.9\% | 7.4\% |
| 9 | Unemployment rate, 2017 | 5.9\% | 4.2\% | 4.8\% | 4.4\% | 5.4\% |
| 10 | Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 8.6\% | 77\% | 8.4\% | 3.1\% | 12.0\% |
| 3 | Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 37.3\% | 39.8\% | 473\% | 42.9\% | 44.9\% |
| 3 | Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 177\% | 1991\% | 17.9\% | 18.1\% | 20.4\% |







Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  |  | Columbiana | Coshocton | Crawford | Cuyahoga | Darke |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ation and population change | 103077 | 54 | 41746 | 124854 | 51536 |
| 1 | Percentage mino 2 ity population, 2017 | 5.9\% | ${ }^{\text {30,544 }}$ | 4.6\% | 40.8\% | 30\% |
| 1 | Population change, 2012-2017 | -3,508 | -276 | -1,032 | -17.696 | -972 |
| 1 | Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | -1.9\% | -1.4\% | -2.4\% | -0.7\% | -.3.3\% |
| dividual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Population in poverty, 2017 | 14,948 | 5,665 | 6,357 | 221,287 | 4,693 |
| 2 | Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 15.1\% | 15.7\% | 15.5\% | 18.1\% | 9.2\% |
| 2 | Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 23.7\% | 23.9\% | 25.3\% | 27.1\% | 12.5\% |
| 3 | Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 7.3\% | 77\% | 10.5\% | 10.7\% | 5.2\% |
| 3 | White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 14.5\% | 14.9\% | 15.9\% | 10.8\% | 11.2\% |
| 3 | BlackAffican American poverty rate, 2017 | 53.6\% | N | N | 33.4\% | N |
| 3 | Asian poverty rate, 2017 | N | N | N | 14.2\% | N |
| 3 | Hispaniclatitio (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 25.1\% | N | 7.9\% | 28.6\% | 27.6\% |
| $y$ poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Families in poverty, 2017 | 3,65 | 931 | 1.401 | 42,654 | 1,091 |
| 3 | Family poverty rate, 2017 | 111\% | 9.6\% | 12.1\% | 14.0\% | 7.6\% |
| 3 | Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 7.2\% | 10.2\% | 8.5\% | 7.1\% | 6.8\% |
| 3 | Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 478\% | 42.4\% | 54.5\% | 44.1\% | 37.6\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 6.9\% | 5.8\% | 7.6\% | 8.7\% | 4.6\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 37.6\% | 40.9\% | 38.6\% | 36.3\% | 32.9\% |
| 2 | Median household income, 2017 | 43,123 | 44,471 | 45,395 | 46,918 | 53,954 |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 6.5\% | 3.5\% | 7.9\% | 3.9\% | 12.3\% |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth 1980-2012 | 29.9\% | 40.3\% | 34.5\% | 39.9\% | 23.3\% |
| 5 | Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 23.2\% | 22.0\% | 22.6\% | 21.2\% | 19.5\% |
| ${ }^{5}$ | Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 5.1\% | 1.8\% | 3.8\% | 7.4\% | 4.\% |
|  | Percentage of public school students $k-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 45.7\% | 51.4\% | 49.9\% | 34.3\% | 34.3\% |
| 7 | Percentage of population receiving SNAP | 14.8\% | 16.5\% | 14.1\% | 17.3\% | 6.4\% |
| 8 | Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 28.6\% | 31.2\% | 30.3\% | 31.5\% | 19.9\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 8.7\% | 12.9\% | 7.3\% | 7.0\% | 6.6\% |
| 9 | Unemployment rate, 2017 | 6.0\% | 6.8\% | 5.7\% | 5.9\% | 4.2\% |
| 10 | Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 11.9\% | 13.3\% | 10.5\% | 8.7\% | 6.0\% |
| 3 | Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 45.5\% | $40.1 \%$ | 39.2\% | 50.4\% | 413\% |
| 3 | Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 16.1\% | 18.1\% | 17.0\% | 23.0\% | 15.9\% |




 quintile of the national income distribution att that time
data in incuce applications at tratitional schools only

Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  | Defiance | Delaware | Erie | Fairield | Fayette |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Total population, 2017 | 38,156 | 200,464 | 74.817 | 154,733 | 28,752 |
| Percentage minority population, 2017 | 13.4\% | 14.7\% | 16.6\% | 13.8\% | 7.4\% |
| Population change, 2012-2017 | -641 | 19,316 | -1,587 | 7.461 | -2 |
| Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | -1.7\% | 10.7\% | -2.1\% | 5.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population in poverty, 2017 | 3,547 | 9,502 | 9,065 | 13,614 | 4,370 |
| Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 9.5\% | 4.8\% | 12.4\% | 9.0\% | 15.6\% |
| Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 14.5\% | 5.3\% | 18.2\% | 12.3\% | 24.3\% |
| Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 5.1\% | 4.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.9\% | 6.7\% |
| 3 White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 10.4\% | 4.9\% | 10.5\% | 9.5\% | 16.5\% |
| 3 BlackAffican American poverty rate, 2017 | 31.3\% | 10.7\% | 30.8\% | 1.6\% | 22.0\% |
| 3 Asian poverty rate, 2017 | N | 1.3\% | N | 9.1\% | , |
| 3 Hispanic/Latino ( (f any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 13.8\% | 15.3\% | 32.5\% | 17.0\% | 45.9\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Families in poverty, 2017 | 882 | 1,758 | 1.869 | 2,890 | 1.081 |
| 3 Family poverty rate, 2017 | 8.3\% | 3.4\% | 9.4\% | 7.2\% | 13.5\% |
| Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 4.5\% | 2.1\% | 4.0\% | 3.7\% | 8.7\% |
| Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 48.8\% | 19.6\% | 43.8\% | 34.9\% | 45.2\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of population below $50 \% \mathrm{FPL}, 2017$ | 3.8\% | 2.3\% | 5.8\% | 4.0\% | 8.4\% |
| Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 27.0\% | 12.3\% | 29.9\% | 26.0\% | 38.3\% |
| 2 Median household income, 2017 | 59,538 | 107,676 | 54,849 | 67,276 | 46,067 |
| $4 \quad$ Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 11.8\% | 7.5\% | 5.8\% | 6.0\% | 2.5\% |
| $4 \quad$ Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 27.1\% | 27.4\% | 37.3\% | 34.6\% | 51.3\% |
| Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 19.5\% | 13.2\% | 20.0\% | 17.4\% | 22.9\% |
| Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 4.9\% | 8.7\% | 6.0\% | 7.0\% | 6.0\% |
| Percentage of public school students K-12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 38.5\% | 12.4\% | 34.0\% | 33.9\% | 46.0\% |
| Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 11.9\% | 7.8\% | 15.4\% |
| Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 22.0\% | 8.1\% | 24.2\% | 21.9\% | 33.4\% |
| Percentage of population with no heath insurance, 2017 | 6.9\% | 4.0\% | 6.9\% | 5.7\% | 8.7\% |
| 9 Unemployment rate, 2017 | 4.9\% | 3.5\% | 6.2\% | 4.3\% | 4.2\% |
| 10 Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 7.7\% | 2.0\% | 7.4\% | 6.8\% | 14.1\% |
| Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 39.3\% | 39.7\% | 43.3\% | 48.1\% | 45.2\% |
| Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 15.4\% | 19.4\% | 17.\% | 18.6\% | 19.6\% |

 (




Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  | Frankin | Fulton | Gallia | Geauga | Greene |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total population, 2017 | 1,291,981 | 42,289 | 29,973 | 93,918 | 166,752 |
| Percentage minority population, 2017 | 36.0\% | 1.0\% | 6.6\% | 4.5\% | 16.1\% |
| Population change, 2012-2017 | 93,373 | -35 | -896 | 142 | 2.446 |
| Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | 7.8\% | -0.1\% | -2.9\% | 0.2\% | 1.5\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population in poverty, 2017 | 201,260 | 3,430 | 5.528 | 5,933 | 15,587 |
| Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 16.0\% | 8.2\% | 19.0\% | 6.4\% | 9.8\% |
| Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 22.5\% | 10.9\% | 27.2\% | 7.2\% | 11.7\% |
| Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 8.9\% | 5.7\% | 14.5\% | 5.2\% | 6.4\% |
| White (noo-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 11.5\% | 9.3\% | 20.1\% | 6.2\% | 10.9\% |
| BlackAffican American poverty rate, 2017 | 29.9\% | N | 33.4\% | 21.9\% | 24.8\% |
| Asian poverty rate, 2017 | 17.1\% | N | N | 7.5\% | 12.1\% |
| Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 29.0\% | 23.7\% | N | 8.9\% | 13.3\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Families in poverty, 2017 | 35,276 | 938 | 1,236 | 1,129 | 3,660 |
| Family poverty rate, 2017 | 12.1\% | 7.8\% | 15.7\% | 4.3\% | 8.6\% |
| Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 7.4\% | 6.0\% | 15.6\% | 3.0\% | 5.3\% |
| Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 39.5\% | 39.5\% | 617\% | 31.3\% | 44.6\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of population below $50 \% \mathrm{FPL}, 2017$ | 7.8\% | 4.4\% | 6.4\% | 2.5\% | 6.3\% |
| Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 337\% | 26.5\% | 40.6\% | 20.2\% | 25.3\% |
| Median household income, 2017 | 59,214 | 59,214 | 43,49 | 82,744 | 68,040 |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 3.6\% | 11.4\% | 6.3\% | 10.0\% | 4.8\% |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 41.8\% | 22.9\% | 377\% | 18.9\% | 38.8\% |
| Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 19.6\% | 17.9\% | 24.6\% | 16.2\% | 18.6\% |
| Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 6.7\% | 7.2\% | 5.2\% | 5.8\% | 8.0\% |
| Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 35.1\% | 33.2\% | 56.4\% | 16.1\% | 24.8\% |
| Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 12.6\% | 7.0\% | 22.6\% | 3.1\% | 6.8\% |
| Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 27.1\% | 17.5\% | 36.1\% | 9.0\% | 18.0\% |
| Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 9.0\% | 4.9\% | 111\% | 10.3\% | 5.6\% |
| Unemployment rate, 2017 | 4.0\% | 4.9\% | 6.7\% | 4.8\% | 4.3\% |
| Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 6.4\% | 5.3\% | 14.3\% | 2.9\% | 3.6\% |
| Percentage of renters cost-urdened, 2017 | 45.6\% | 42.1\% | 42.7\% | 40.6\% | 42.3\% |
| Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 20.7\% | 16.0\% | 18.9\% | 20.9\% | 16.6 |
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Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

 (




Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  | Henry | Highland | Hocking | Holmes | Huron |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total population, 2017 | 27,185 | 42,971 | 28,474 | 43,957 | 58,494 |
| Percentage minority population, 2017 | 9.9\% | 2.1\% | 3.5\% | 4.8\% | 10.1\% |
| Population change, 2012-2017 | -623 | 18 | -828 | 832 | -666 |
| Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | -2.2\% | 0.0\% | -2.8\% | 1.9\% | -1.1\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population in poverty, 2017 | 2,94 | 7,134 | 4,074 | 3,885 | 8,555 |
| Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 8.2\% | 16.8\% | 14.5\% | 9.0\% | 14.8\% |
| Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 111.\% | 25.4\% | 22.1\% | 13.6\% | 23.8\% |
| Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 6.9\% | 11.6\% | 7.3\% | 12.1\% | 7.7\% |
| White (hon-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 8.4\% | 21.3\% | 13.9\% | 11.8\% | 14.0\% |
| Black/Afican American poverty rate, 2017 | N | 21.9\% | N | N | 32.9\% |
| Asian poverty rate, 2017 | N | N | N | N | N |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Families in poverty, 2017 | 453 | 1,790 | 804 | 929 | 1.695 |
| Family poverty rate, 2017 | 5.8\% | $16.1 \%$ | 10.4\% | 9.1\% | 10.8\% |
| Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 3.5\% | 15.6\% | 6.2\% | 10.2\% | 7.6\% |
| Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 29.8\% | 51.0\% | 41.2\% | N | 45.6\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 4.3\% | 9.5\% | 6.3\% | 3.5\% | 6.6\% |
| Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 24.6\% | 41.6\% | 34.6\% | 32.3\% | 35.6\% |
| Median household income, 2017 | 57,678 | 43,840 | 48,397 | 61,593 | 48,244 |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 12.2\% | 14.1\% | 7.6\% | 10.0\% | 7.2\% |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 12.2\% | 30.4\% | 39.1\% | 17.9\% | 29.3\% |
| Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 18.6\% | 24.5\% | 22.1\% | 18.7\% | 20.8\% |
| Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 7.4\% | 3.4\% | 4.0\% | 3.0\% | 4.8\% |
| Percentage of public school students K-12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 31.5\% | 46.8\% | 51.6\% | 33.7\% | 43.2\% |
| Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 5.6\% | 15.4\% | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 12.6\% |
| Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 16.3\% | 33.7\% | 34.5\% | 10.0\% | 26.3\% |
| Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 4.5\% | 9.5\% | 8.5\% | 40.2\% | 8.4\% |
| 9 Unemployment rate, 2017 | 5.2\% | 6.0\% | 5.4\% | 3.6\% | 6.5\% |
| 10 Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 5.1\% | 15.1\% | 16.1\% | 4.3\% | 8.8\% |
| Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 35.9\% | 49.2\% | 36.0\% | 35.8\% | 42.2\% |
| Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 17.3\% | 23.3\% | 197 | 177\% | 19.9\% |
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Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  |  | Jackson | Jefferson | Knox | Lake | Lawrence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | lation and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total population, 2017 | 32,449 | 66,359 | 61,261 | 230,17 | 60,249 |
| 1 | Percentage minority population, 2017 | 4.0\% | 9.6\% | 4.5\% | 11.6\% | $5.4 \%$ |
| 1 | Population change, 2012-2017 | -427 | -2,166 | 521 | 632 | -1,890 |
| 1 | Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | -1.3\% | -3.2\% | 0.9\% | 0.3\% | -3.0\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Population in poverty, 2017 | 5,707 | 11,251 | 6,165 | 19,693 | 11,563 |
| 2 | Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 17.9\% | 17.6\% | 10.7\% | 8.7\% | 19.5\% |
| 2 | Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 26.4\% | 26.2\% | 16.2\% | 12.4\% | 26.9\% |
| 3 | Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 12.7\% | 8.4\% | 8.4\% | 6.1\% | $1.4 \%$ |
| 3 | White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 20.1\% | 15.9\% | 13.3\% | 7.4\% | 18.4\% |
| 3 | Black/African American poverty rate, 2017 | N | 36.0\% | N | 26.5\% | 26.5\% |
| 3 | Asian poverty rate, 2017 | N | N | N | 8.0\% | N |
| 3 | Hispaniclatitino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | N | 54.4\% | 19.9\% | 17.8\% | 8.7\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Families in poverty, 2017 | 1.302 | 2,96 | 1.556 | 3.408 | 2,300 |
| 3 | Family poverty rate, 2017 | 14.6\% | 12.5\% | 10.2\% | 5.5\% | 14.6\% |
| 3 | Married couples with related chidren in their care. poverty rate, 2017 | 12.\% | 77\% | 5.6\% | 4.1\% | 8.8\% |
| 3 | Single women with related children in their care poverty rate, 2017 | 51.0\% | 51.3\% | 54.9\% | 26.9\% | 48.5\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 10.6\% | 8.5\% | 6.3\% | 3.9\% | 7.2\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 45.4\% | 37.\%\% | 31.6\% | 23.4\% | 40.9\% |
| 2 | Median household income, 2017 | 44,671 | 43,520 | 52,061 | 60,521 | 43,108 |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 1.9\% | 6.6\% | 9.4\% | 10.0\% | 5.7\% |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 371\% | 34.7\% | 20.6\% | 27.5\% | 35.1\% |
| 5 | Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 27.1\% | 24.5\% | 20.8\% | 17.0\% | 22.9\% |
| 5 | Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 4.6\% | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 7.7\% | 4.4\% |
| 6 | Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 49.8\% | 58.0\% | 38.5\% | 28.8\% | 49.5\% |
| 7 | Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 18.9\% | 19.9\% | 9.1\% | 7.0\% | 19.7\% |
| 8 | Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 37.1\% | 32.5\% | 22.9\% | 16.0\% | 35.6\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 9.7\% | 7.0\% | 10.1\% | 5.8\% | 7.8\% |
| 9 | Unemployment rate, 2017 | 7.1\% | 7.3\% | 4.5\% | 5.2\% | 5.8\% |
| 10 | Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 18.5\% | 13.6\% | 77\% | 3.4\% | 18.6\% |
| 3 | Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 47.2\% | 43.5\% | 43.9\% | 46.4\% | 44.8\% |
| 3 | Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 20.0\% | 16.0\% | 20.1\% | 20.2\% | 19.2\% |







Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  | Licking | Logan | Lorain | Lucas | Madison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\overline{\text { Population and population change }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 173,448 | 45,325 | 307,924 | 430,887 | 44,036 |
| Percentage minority population, 2017 | 9.6\% | 6.6\% | 217\% | 31.2\% | 11.76 |
| Population change, 2012-2017 | 5.880 | -84 | 6,287 | $-5,786$ | 1,054 |
| Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | 3.5\% | -0.2\% | 2.1\% | -1.3\% | 2.5\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population in poverty, 2017 | 15,130 | 4,951 | 40,404 | 75,376 | 3.743 |
| Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 8.9\% | 11.1\% | 13.5\% | 17.9\% | 9.6\% |
| Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 12.4\% | 16.7\% | 20.1\% | 25.6\% | 13.1\% |
| Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 6.2\% | 6.8\% | 7.1\% | 9.5\% | 5.0\% |
| White (hon-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 11.4\% | 13.1\% | 10.9\% | 13.7\% | 9.6\% |
| Black/Afican American poverty rate, 2017 | 12.\% | 19.6\% | 34.5\% | 37.2\% | 40.4\% |
| Asian poverty rate, 2017 | 2.3\% | N | 20.6\% | 23.4\% | N |
| Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 17.4\% | 35.8\% | 25.8\% | 29.1\% | 19.0\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Families in poverty, 2017 | 3,746 | 1,321 | 8.015 | 16,493 | 801 |
| Family poverty rate, 2017 | 8.3\% | 10.3\% | 10.0\% | 15.4\% | 77\% |
| Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 6.2\% | 9.4\% | 4.9\% | 9.1\% | 5.5\% |
| Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 38.7\% | 44.8\% | 43.4\% | 46.7\% | 412\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 5.0\% | 7.5\% | 6.3\% | 9.2\% | 5.4 |
| Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 28.4\% | 314\% | 29.3\% | 39.0\% | 25.0\% |
| Median household income, 2017 | 62,658 | 54,782 | 55,443 | 47,562 | 69,937 |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 6.7\% | 6.5\% | 5.0\% | 4.4\% | 9.7\% |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 33.5\% | 30.9\% | 38.4\% | 44.4\% | 35.5\% |
| Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 19.7\% | 20.1\% | 20.2\% | 22.1\% | 18.4\% |
| Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 6.3\% | 6.6\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% | 6.8\% |
| Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 36.0\% | 42.6\% | 30.2\% | 36.0\% | 29.9\% |
| Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 7.8\% | 11.4\% | 11.8\% | 17.6\% | 8.9\% |
| Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 22.6\% | 22.2\% | 23.1\% | 34.3\% | 18.9\% |
| Percentage of population with no heath insurance, 2017 | 7.4\% | 9.3\% | 5.9\% | 7.3\% | 77\% |
| Unemployment rate, 2017 | 4.2\% | 4.1\% | 6.2\% | 5.9\% | 3.8\% |
| Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 6.1\% | 9.1\% | 6.3\% | 9.1\% | 8.4\% |
| Percentage of renters cost-urdened, 2017 | 46.9\% | 40.4\% | 51.8\% | 48.7\% | 33.4\% |
| Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 18.0\% | 18.3\% | 18.6\% | 20.8\% | 18.4\% |
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Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued







Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  |  | Miam | Monro | Montgomery | Morgan | Morro |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | lation and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total population, 2017 | 105,122 | 13,946 | 531,542 | 14,709 | 34,994 |
| 1 | Percentage minority population, 2017 | 7.6\% | 2.9\% | $29.1 \%$ | 7.9\% | 4.0\% |
| 1 | Population change, 2012-2017 | 2,214 | -567 | 2,626 | -234 | 163 |
| 1 | Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | 2.2\% | -3.9\% | -0.5\% | -1.6\% | 0.5\% |
| idual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Population in povert, 2017 | 9,387 | 2,080 | 81,984 | 2,961 | 3,849 |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ | Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 9.0\% | 15.2\% | 15.9\% | 20.5\% | 11.2\% |
| 2 | Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 12.0\% | 24.2\% | 23.0\% | 27.3\% | 17.9\% |
| 3 | Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 7.0\% | 7.3\% | 8.6\% | 13.6\% | 5.7\% |
| 3 | White (hon-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 9.4\% | 19.7\% | 13.3\% | 20.8\% | 9.7\% |
| 3 | Black/Afican American poverty rate, 2017 | 17.9\% | N | 32.8\% | 29.0\% | N |
| 3 | Asian poverty rate, 2017 | 2.0\% | N | 11.4\% | N | N |
| 3 | Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 29.1\% | N | 32.6\% | N | N |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Families in poverty, 2017 | 1,971 | 604 | 18,942 | 746 | 58 |
| 3 | Family poverty rate, 2017 | 7.3\% | 14.3\% | 14.\% | 17.4\% | 6.3\% |
| 3 | Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 5.5\% | 14.4\% | 8.7\% | 17.8\% | 6.4\% |
| 3 | Single women with related children in their care poverty rate, 2017 | 35.8\% | 53.4\% | 46.0\% | N | 22.3\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 3.9\% | 9.7\% | 8.3\% | 8.6\% | 3.6\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 29.2\% | 39.3\% | 37.2\% | 46.3\% | 29.1\% |
| 2 | Median household income, 2017 | 60,800 | 44,868 | 48,039 | 41,375 | 55,466 |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 4.4\% | 16.4\% | 3.5\% | 7.0\% | 8.3\% |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 30.2\% | 29.1\% | 40.9\% | 28.1\% | 25.0\% |
| 5 | Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 18.8\% | 29.1\% | 22.0\% | 25.3\% | 18.9\% |
| 5 | Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 5.5\% | 4.4\% | 6.2\% | 6.3\% | 7.2\% |
| 6 | Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 32.4\% | 54.0\% | 37.\% | NA* | 40.9\% |
| 7 | Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 6.7\% | 3.2\% | 12.9\% | 15.6\% | 9.2\% |
| 8 | Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 19.1\% | 27.1\% | 29.3\% | 31.2\% | 24.8\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 6.4\% | 10.2\% | 8.0\% | 9.9\% | 6.2\% |
| 9 | Unemployment rate, 2017 | 4.2\% | 8.5\% | 4.9\% | 6.8\% | 4.9\% |
| 10 | Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 5.2\% | 11.2\% | 5.5\% | 18.2\% | 8.8\% |
| 3 | Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 39.1\% | 50.8\% | 48.4\% | 46.1\% | 44.8\% |
| 3 | Percentage of owners cost-urdeened, 2017 | 16.9\% | 15.4\% | 20.8\% | 18.4\% | 19.3\% |




 and
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Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  |  | Muskingum | Noble | Ottawa | Paulding | Perry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | lation and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total population, 2017 | 86,49 | 14.406 | 40,657 | 18,845 | 36,024 |
| 1 | Percentage minority population, 2017 | 8.4\% | 4.8\% | 77\% | 7.4\% | 3.3\% |
| 1 | Population change, 2012-2017 | 361 | -244 | -583 | -405 | 42 |
| 1 | Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | 0.4\% | -1.7\% | -1.4\% | -2.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Population in poverty, 2017 | 12.470 | 1,893 | 3,561 | 1,902 | 5,585 |
| 2 | Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 14.8\% | 16.2\% | 8.9\% | 10.2\% | 15.7\% |
| 2 | Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 21.5\% | 19.8\% | 12.9\% | 15.\% | 24.9\% |
| 3 | Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 8.6\% | 7.9\% | 4.7\% | 7.4\% | 12.3\% |
| 3 | White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 15.2\% | 12.9\% | 9.8\% | 10.3\% | 18.7\% |
| 3 | Black/African American poverty rate, 2017 | 25.0\% | N | N | N | N |
| 3 | Asian poverty rate, 2017 | N | N | N | N | N |
| 3 | Hispaniclatitino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 20.4\% | N | 20.1\% | 10.1\% | N |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Families in poverty, 2017 | 2,901 | 305 | 769 | 388 | 1.468 |
| 3 | Family poverty rate, 2017 | 12.9\% | 9.0\% | 6.5\% | 7.4\% | 14.6\% |
| 3 | Married couples with related chidren in their care. poverty rate, 2017 | 77\% | 13.3\% | 3.6\% | 4.9\% | 10.2\% |
| ${ }^{3}$ | Single women with related children in their care poverty rate, 2017 | 48.3\% | N | 47.2\% | N | 52.0\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 77\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% | 5.1\% | 8.6\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 38.4\% | 35.0\% | 27.1\% | 30.9\% | 42.2\% |
| 2 | Median household income, 2017 | 44,884 | 44,835 | 55,968 | 52,534 | 51,702 |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 6.3\% | 18.4\% | 11.2\% | 14.6\% | 8.3\% |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 33.9\% | 16.3\% | 18.7\% | 14.6\% | 31.4\% |
| 5 | Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 22.8\% | 22.4\% | 20.5\% | 18.5\% | 23.9\% |
| 5 | Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 5.5\% | 4.0\% | 6.8\% | 5.6\% | 5.3\% |
| 6 | Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 40.1\% | 48.4\% | 35.8\% | 40.2\% | 37.9\% |
| 7 | Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 19.3\% | 8.7\% | 7.8\% | 0.0\% | 17.6\% |
| 8 | Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 34.0\% | 21.1\% | 18.3\% | 22.4\% | 31.8\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 7.3\% | 5.6\% | 5.7\% | 7.0\% | 7.8\% |
| 9 | Unemployment rate, 2017 | 5.7\% | 7.2\% | 6.7\% | 4.4\% | 6.0\% |
| 10 | Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 13.2\% | 9.9\% | 5.\% | 10.3\% | 16.2\% |
| 3 | Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 49.6\% | 38.6\% | 43.1\% | 36.5 | 49.9\% |
| 3 | Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 18.5\% | 18.5\% | 17.1\% | 16.2\% | 19.6\% |







Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  | Pickaway | Pike | Portage | Preble | Putnam |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total population, 2017 | 57,830 | 28,270 | 162,277 | 41,120 | 33,878 |
| Percentage minority population, 2017 | 7.3\% | 4.7\% | 10.4\% | 3.6\% | 7.5\% |
| Population change, 2012-2017 | 1.603 | -226 | 927 | -690 | -313 |
| Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | 2.9\% | -0.8\% | 0.6\% | -1.7\% | -0.9\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population in poverty, 2017 | 6,355 | 5.536 | 18,263 | 4.017 | 2,46 |
| Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 12.0\% | 20.0\% | 11.8\% | 9.9\% | 6.4\% |
| Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 16.6\% | 30.5\% | 13.9\% | 13.9\% | 7.3\% |
| Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 8.8\% | 1.0\% | 5.3\% | 6.4\% | 6.1\% |
| White (hoo-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 11.9\% | 19.8\% | 12.7\% | 12.3\% | 6.8\% |
| Black/Afican American poverty rate, 2017 | N | N | 37.8\% | N | N |
| Asian poverty rate, 2017 | N | N | 277\% | N | N |
| Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 10.6\% | N | 26.2\% | N | 18.8\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Families in poverty, 2017 | 1,256 | 1,080 | 3,677 | ${ }^{1,007}$ | 579 |
| Family poverty rate, 2017 | 8.9\% | 14.4\% | 9.3\% | 8.8\% | 5.9\% |
| Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 7.4\% | 9.3\% | 4.7\% | 5.7\% | 3.3\% |
| Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 34.0\% | 34.4\% | 48.0\% | 413\% | 44.2\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 5.4\% | 8.8\% | 6.6\% | 4.5\% | 2.4\% |
| Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 277\% | 43.6\% | 30.2\% | 31.6\% | 22.9\% |
| Median household income, 2017 | 62,445 | 43,499 | 59,490 | 52,300 | 62,944 |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 3.3\% | 4.4\% | 8.4\% | 10.6\% | 9.5\% |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 45.8\% | 38.6\% | 29.6\% | 29.2\% | 9.5\% |
| Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 19.0\% | 24.7\% | 20.2\% | 20.1\% | 15.9\% |
| Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 7.0\% | 4.2\% | 7.1\% | 4.8\% | 6.4\% |
| Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 32.1\% | 58.1\% | 30.7\% | 38.9\% | 22.7\% |
| Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 10.5\% | 24.1\% | 7.9\% | 9.6\% | 5.6\% |
| Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 22.2\% | 40.8\% | 18.5\% | 24.0\% | 13.6\% |
| Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 7.7\% | 10.3\% | 6.5\% | 6.9\% | 3.3\% |
| 9 Unemployment rate, 2017 | 4.6\% | 6.9\% | 5.0\% | 4.5\% | 3.6\% |
| 10 Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 8.7\% | 24.2\% | 5.8\% | 6.9\% | 5.2\% |
| Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 38.9\% | 50.4\% | 52.9\% | 43.2\% | 38.1\% |
| Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 18.5\% | 177\% | 20.2\% | 18.9\% | 12.2\% |





Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  |  | kichland | Ross | Sandusky | siot | Senec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | lation and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total population, 2017 | 12,.589 | 7,7313 | 59,195 | 75,929 | 55,243 |
| 1 | Percentage minority population, 2017 | 14.2\% | 10.5\% | 15.6\% | 6.6\% | 10.1\% |
| 1 | Population change, 2012-2017 | -2,036 | -42 | -1,259 | $-2,675$ | -841 |
| 1 | Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | -1.7\% | -0.1\% | -2.1\% | -3.4\% | 1.5\% |
| dual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Population in poverty, 2017 | 15,169 | 11,584 | 6,477 | 15,481 | 7.146 |
| 2 | Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 13.4\% | 16.3\% | 111\% | 21.4\% | 13.6\% |
| 2 | Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 20.4\% | 23.2\% | 15.6\% | 30.2\% | 173\% |
| 3 | Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 8.5\% | 8.5\% | 8.0\% | 11.9\% | 7.5\% |
| 3 | White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 13.7\% | 17.3\% | 1.9\% | 23.9\% | 13.4\% |
| 3 | Black/Aftican American poverty rate, 2017 | 35.6\% | 40.3\% | 33.5\% | 26.6\% | 57.9\% |
| 3 | Asian poverty rate, 2017 | 4.9\% | , | N | , | N |
| 3 | HispaniclLatino (of any face) poverty rate, 2017 | 30.4\% | 23.2\% | 18.1\% | 32.3\% | 18.4\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Families in poverty, 2017 | 3,425 | 2,640 | 1,715 | 3,386 | 1,634 |
| 3 | Family poverty rate, 2017 | 11.3\% | 13.2\% | 10.9\% | 17.8\% | 11.4\% |
| 3 | Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 8.4\% | 7.8\% | 4.1\% | 14.6\% | 6.9\% |
| ${ }^{3}$ | Single women with related children in their care poverty rate, 2017 | 43.2\% | 47.8\% | 43.9\% | 60.6\% | 54.5\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 7.3\% | ${ }^{7.2 \%}$ | 6.2\% | 11.0\% | 7.1 |
| 3 | Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 38.0\% | 38.6\% | 32.2\% | 44.5\% | 33.2\% |
| 2 | Median household income, 2017 | 47,141 | 50,387 | 53,058 | 41,843 | 47805 |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 5.3\% | 5.1\% | 0.4\% | 9.0\% | 7.5\% |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 36.1\% | 36.5\% | 30.6\% | 38.2\% | 33.2\% |
| 5 | Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 22.6\% | 22.9\% | 19.3\% | 25.7\% | 21.4\% |
| 5 | Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 5.7\% | 5.3\% | 6.2\% | 6.2\% | 6.2\% |
| ${ }^{6}$ | Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 49.2\% | 46.4\% | 41.5\% | 45.9\% | 42.4\% |
| 7 | Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 15.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.5\% | 24.9\% | 11.2\% |
| 8 | Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 28.4\% | 32.7\% | 22.2\% | 38.2\% | 22.5\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 9.5\% | 7.9\% | 7.0\% | 7.5\% | 5.9\% |
| 9 | Unemployment rate, 2017 | 5.5\% | 5.1\% | 4.7\% | 7.1\% | 4.8\% |
| 10 | Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 9.9\% | 16.6\% | 6.8\% | 22.5\% | 6.3\% |
| 3 | Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 45.2\% | 50.9\% | 40.7\% | 51.8\% | 40.9\% |
| 3 | Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 19.0\% | 19.0\% | 16.8\% | 19.6\% | 15.0\% |







Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  |  | Shelby | Stark | Summ | Trumbu | Tuscarawas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Iation and population change |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total population, 2017 | 48,759 | 372,542 | 54,228 | 200,380 | 92,297 |
| 1 | Percentage minority population, 2017 | 7.0\% | 13.5\% | 22.9\% | 12.8\% | 5.4\% |
| 1 | Population change, 2012-2017 | -350 | $-2,321$ | 512 | -6,802 | -116 |
| 1 | Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | -0.7\% | -0.6\% | 0.1\% | -3.3\% | -0.1\% |
| dual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Population in poverty, 2017 | 3,897 | 51,852 | 68,434 | 30,109 | 11.589 |
| 2 | Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 8.1\% | 14.3\% | 12.9\% | 15.4\% | 12.8\% |
| 2 | Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 11.7\% | 22.3\% | 18.7\% | 24.1\% | 17.4\% |
| 3 | Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 6.2\% | 7.3\% | 6.9\% | 7.1\% | 8.6\% |
| 3 | White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 8.3\% | 11.5\% | 10.0\% | 14.6\% | 13.0\% |
| 3 | BlackAfrican American poverty rate, 2017 | 26.0\% | 35.0\% | 31.0\% | 39.1\% | 46.2\% |
| 3 | Asian poverty rate, 2017 | N | 8.4\% | 12.6\% | 26.9\% | N |
| 3 | HispaniclLatino (of any face) poverty rate, 2017 | 8.1\% | 26.4\% | 16.8\% | 29.7\% | 25.6\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Families in poverty, 2017 | 900 | 10,182 | ${ }^{13,737}$ | 7,247 | 2,548 |
| 3 | Family poverty rate, 2017 | 6.8\% | 10.2\% | 9.9\% | 13.1\% | 10.4\% |
| 3 | Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 3.2\% | 5.6\% | 4.2\% | 7.0\% | 8.3\% |
| 3 | Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 32.4\% | 46.8\% | 411\% | 54.6\% | 45.9\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | 3.8\% | 5.9\% | 6.2\% | 8.0\% | 4.9\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 26.5\% | 32.6\% | 311\% | $36.4 \%$ | 35.0\% |
| 2 | Median household income, 2017 | 60,148 | 51,214 | 55,531 | 46,340 | 51,408 |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 9.5\% | 5.0\% | 5.8\% | 6.3\% | 8.3\% |
| 4 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 26.3\% | 37.6\% | 40.3\% | 34.2\% | 26.1\% |
| 5 | Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 17.6\% | 20.8\% | 19.9\% | 24.4\% | 20.7\% |
| 5 | Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 6.7\% | 6.4\% | 7.0\% | 5.4\% | 5.2\% |
| ${ }^{6}$ | Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 32.5\% | 33.3\% | 27.\% | 42.8\% | 40.4\% |
| 7 | Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 6.9\% | 12.0\% | 10.8 | 14.3\% | 10.8\% |
| 8 | Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 18.3\% | 25.3\% | 25.5\% | 29.8\% | 22.8\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 4.5\% | 6.5\% | 6.8\% | 8.3\% | 9.7\% |
| 9 | Unemployment rate, 2017 | $4.1 \%$ | 5.2\% | $5.1 \%$ | 7.2\% | 5.0\% |
| 10 | Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 7.8\% | 6.9\% | 6.4\% | 7.4\% | 7.2\% |
| 3 | Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 34.2\% | 43.8\% | 479\% | 48.3\% | 43.5\% |
| 3 | Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 15.9\% | 178\% | 19.5\% | 17.0\% | 17.3\% |






Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  | Union | Van Wert | Vinton | Warren | Washington |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Population and population change }}{\text { Total Popultion } 2017}$ |  | 282 | 13092 | 228882 | 6041 |
| Percentage minority population, 2017 | 10.0\% | 5.9\% | ${ }^{3,4 \%}$ | 13.6\% | 4.9\% |
| Population change, 2012-2017 | 4.017 | -401 | -129 | 11.627 | -1,006 |
| Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | 7.6\% | -1.4\% | -1.0\% | 5.4\% | -1.6\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population in poverty, 2017 | 2.780 | 3,47 | 2.566 | 10,548 | 8.560 |
| Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 5.2\% | 11.4\% | 19.8\% | 4.7\% | 14.6\% |
| Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 5.9\% | 13.7\% | 29.0\% | 5.6\% | 20.8\% |
| Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 8.4\% | 6.5\% | 10.2\% | 3.9\% | 8.7\% |
| White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 6.9\% | 12.\% | 21.0\% | 5.0\% | 15.1\% |
| BlackAffican American poverty rate, 2017 | 26.1\% | N | N | 7.6\% | 29.4\% |
| Asian poverty rate, 2017 | 2.3\% | N | N | $4.1 \%$ | N |
| Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 2.3\% | 30.6\% | N | $6.1 \%$ | 30.0\% |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Families in poverty, 2017 | 667 | 678 | 512 | 2,240 | 1,772 |
| Family poverty rate, 2017 | 4.7\% | 8.3\% | 14.9\% | 3.7\% | 10.7\% |
| Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 14.7\% | 2.\% | 8.7\% |
| Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 25.2\% | 43.8\% | N | 26.1\% | 47.2\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of population below 50\% FPL, 2017 | $3.1 \%$ | 6.1\% | 9.9\% | 2.4\% | 6.3\% |
| Percentage of population below $200 \%$ FPL, 2017 | 20.2\% | 35.6\% | 42.8\% | 15.1\% | 34.6\% |
| 2 Median household income, 2017 | 86,609 | 49,120 | 40,927 | 85,532 | 46,417 |
| 4 Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 10.2\% | 4.7\% | 10.9\% | 9.6\% | 10.2\% |
| Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980-2012 | 347\% | 34.9\% | 25.5\% | 29.4\% | 30.9\% |
| Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 15.7\% | 18.9\% | 25.9\% | 14.7\% | 22.4\% |
| Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 7.5\% | 3.0\% | 4.4\% | 8.8\% | 5\% |
| Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 24.1\% | 40.1\% | NA* | 15.2\% | 45.8\% |
| Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 4.3\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 12.2\% |
| Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 12.6\% | 20.0\% | 41.3\% | 11.8\% | 25.1\% |
| Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 5.3\% | 7.4\% | 8.9\% | 4.4\% | 8.2\% |
| Unemployment rate, 2017 | 3.7\% | 4.0\% | 6.8\% | $4.1 \%$ | 6.2\% |
| 10 Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 5.2\% | 8.3\% | 23.6\% | 2.1\% | 9.7\% |
| Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 35.9\% | 42.7\% | 59.7\% | 35.8\% | 45.3\% |
| Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 22.3\% | 15.2\% | 21.6\% | 17.6\% | 15.7\% |




 aincuce applications at traditional schools only

Table 10.
Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

|  |  | Wayne | Williams | Wood | Wyandot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lution and population change | 116.038 | 36784 | 130492 | 22.029 |
| $\frac{1}{1}$ | Percentage minority population, 2017 | 6.2\% | 7.4\% | 10,7\% | 4.9\% |
| 1 | Population change, 2012-2017 | 1.062 | . 732 | 2.089 | -509 |
| 1 | Percentage population change, 2012-2017 | 0.9\% | -2.0\% | 1.6\% | -2.3\% |
| Individual poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Population in poverty, 2017 | 14.456 | 3,830 | 13,328 | 1.912 |
| 2 | Overall poverty rate, 2017 | 12.9\% | 10.7\% | 10.8\% | 8.8\% |
| 2 | Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2017 | 17.4\% | 13.9\% | 9.5\% | 10.5\% |
| 3 | Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2017 | 6.4\% | 7.7\% | 6.0\% | 10.3\% |
| 3 | White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2017 | 12.6\% | 13.2\% | 12.4\% | 11.4\% |
| 3 | Black/Afican American poverty rate, 2017 | 33.0\% | N | 36.9\% | N |
| 3 | Asian poverty rate, 2017 | 5.7\% | N | 11.\% | N |
| 3 | Hispanic/ Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2017 | 30.0\% | 18.2\% | 21.0\%3.5\% |  |
| Family poverty rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Families in poverty, 2017 | 2,866 | 901 | 2,014 | 439 |
| 3 | Family poverty rate, 2017 | 9.4\% | 9.2\% | 6.4\% | 7.2 |
| ${ }^{3}$ | Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 7.7\% | 8.2\% | 4.8\% | 4.9\% |
| 3 | Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2017 | 44.4\% | 43.8\% | 34.7\% | 30.6\% |
| Other measures of economic need |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Percentage of population below $50 \% \mathrm{FPL}, 2017$ | $5.1 \%$ | 6.0\% | 6.9\% | 4.2\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population below $200 \%$ fPL, 2017 | 32.4\% | $36.4 \%$ | 28.5\% | 32.7\% |
| 2 | Median household income, 2017 | 56,172 | 50,347 | 61,74 | 47,527 |
| 44 | Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980-2012 | 7.\% | 9.4\% | 9.1\% | 11.8\% |
|  | Probability a child raised in the bottom fith stayed in the bottom fift 1980-2012 | 25.2\% | 22.4\% | 26.8\% | 11.8\% |
| 5 | Child food insecurity rate, 2016 | 19.3\% | 20.6\% | 16.5\% | 17.2\% |
| 5 | Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance, 2016 | 3.5\% | 3.7\% | 7.3\% | 4.5\% |
| ${ }^{6}$ | Percentage of public school students $\mathrm{K}-12$, free or reduced-price lunch, 2017 | 38.6\% | 41.4\% | 28.6\% | 30.6\% |
| 7 | Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2017 | 8.5\% | 9.7\% | 5.0\% | 7.1\% |
| 8 | Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017 | 18.8\% | 22.6\% | 13.5\% | 18.3\% |
| 3 | Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2017 | 12.8\% | 5.0\% | 5.1\% | 6.5\% |
| 9 | Unemployment rate, 2017 | 3.9\% | 4.4\% | 4.4\% | 3.7\% |
| 10 | Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2017 | 6.5\% | 5.6\% | 3.3\% | 7.6\% |
| 3 | Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2017 | 41.8\% | 44.6\% | 46.6\% | 29.8\% |
| 3 | Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2017 | 177\% | 16.2\% | 177\% | 17.0\% |




 quinitio of the national income isistriution at that tim
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Table 11.
Change in 200\% Federal Poverty Level, Ohio and counties, 2000 to 2017

| 2000 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  | Change 2000-2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geography | Population | Population below 200\% FPL | Percent below 200\% FPL | Population | Population below 200\% FPL | Percent below $200 \%$ FPL | Raw Change |
| Ohio | 11,046,987 | 2,919,858 | 26.4\% | 11,289,61 | 3,673,407 | 32.5\% | 6.1\% |
| Adams | 27,002 | 11,422 | 42.3\% | 27,484 | 13,628 | 49.6\% | 7.3\% |
| Allen | 102,300 | 31,03 | 30.4\% | 100,283 | 35,374 | 35.3\% | 4.9\% |
| Ashland | 50,238 | 13,315 | 26.5\% | 50,941 | 16,931 | 33.2\% | 6.7\% |
| Ashtabula | 100,870 | 32,803 | 32.5\% | 95,196 | 40,912 | 43.0\% | 10.5\% |
| Athens | 53,844 | 25,513 | 47.4\% | 55,811 | 27,584 | 49.4\% | 2.0\% |
| Auglaize | 45,636 | 9,263 | 20.3\% | 45,15 | 11.633 | 25.8\% | 5.5\% |
| Belmont | 66,997 | 24,728 | 36.9\% | 64,843 | 21,672 | 33.4\% | -3.5\% |
| Brown | 4,684 | 13,185 | 31.6\% | 43,022 | 16,093 | 37.4\% | 5.8\% |
| Butler | 321,387 | 68,274 | 21.2\% | 363,257 | 100,524 | 277\% | 6.4\% |
| Carroll | 28,404 | 9,054 | 31.9\% | 27,405 | 9,612 | 35.1\% | 3.2\% |
| Champaign | 38,096 | 8,940 | 23.5\% | 38,088 | 11,226 | 29.5\% | 6.0\% |
| Clark | 141,106 | 37,904 | 26.9\% | 132,134 | 50,640 | 38.3\% | 11.5\% |
| Clermont | 176,027 | 34,425 | 19.6\% | 200,346 | 49,043 | 24.5\% | 4.9\% |
| Clinton | 39,397 | 9,878 | 25.1\% | 40,526 | 14,609 | 36.0\% | 11.0\% |
| Columbiana | 108,138 | 35,283 | 32.6\% | 100,743 | 37,830 | 37.\% | 4.9\% |
| Coshocton | 36,240 | 11,579 | 32.0\% | 36,133 | 14,763 | 40.9\% | 8.9\% |
| Crawford | 46,296 | 14,069 | 30.4\% | 41,51 | 16,018 | 38.6\% | 8.2\% |
| Cuyahoga | 1,365,658 | 397,268 | 29.1\% | 1,230,956 | 447,443 | 36.3\% | 7.3\% |
| Darke | 52,534 | 13,752 | 26.2\% | 51,089 | 16,806 | 32.9\% | 6.7\% |
| Defiance | 38,723 | 7,573 | 19.6\% | 37,514 | 10,45 | 27.0\% | 7.5\% |
| Delaware | 107,078 | 11,895 | 11.1\% | 190,41 | 23,442 | 12.3\% | 1.2\% |
| Erie | 77,628 | 17,993 | 23.2\% | 74,219 | 22,224 | 29.9\% | 6.8\% |
| Fairfield | 119,747 | 23,068 | 19.3\% | 148,545 | 38,695 | 26.0\% | 6.8\% |
| Fayette | 27,822 | 8.122 | 29.2\% | 28,005 | 10,738 | 38.3\% | 9.2\% |
| Frankin | 1,045,966 | 273,900 | 26.2\% | 1,223,993 | 412,395 | 33.7\% | 7.5\% |
| Fulton | 41,597 | 8,384 | 20.2\% | 41,73 | 11,064 | 26.5\% | 6.4\% |
| Gallia | 30,069 | 12,278 | 40.8\% | 29,364 | 11,994 | 40.6\% | -0.3\% |
| Geauga | 89,980 | 14,404 | 16.0\% | 93,031 | 18,792 | 20.2\% | 4.2\% |
| Greene | 140,103 | 29,478 | 21.0\% | 155,84 | 39,470 | 25.3\% | 4.3\% |
| Guersey | 40,79 | 16,658 | 41.5\% | 38,809 | 15,877 | 40.9\% | -0.5\% |
| Hamiton | 826,628 | 214,755 | 26.0\% | 791,027 | 265,613 | 33.6\% | 7.6\% |
| Hancock | 69,451 | 15,23 | 21.8\% | 73,093 | 21,716 | 29.7\% | 7.9\% |
| Hardin | 29,825 | 9,503 | 31.9\% | 29,208 | 10,825 | 37.1\% | 5.2\% |
| Harrison | 15,551 | 5,772 | 37.1\% | 15,07 | 5,438 | 36.0\% | -1.1\% |
| Henry | 28.649 | 6,254 | 21.8\% | 26,943 | 6,640 | 24.6\% | 2.8\% |
| Highland | 40,286 | 13,362 | 33.2\% | 42,354 | 17,605 | 41.6\% | 8.4\% |
| Hocking | 27,447 | 9,068 | 33.0\% | 27.823 | 9.633 | 34.6\% | 1.6 |
| Holmes | 37,953 | 15,95 | 40.0\% | 42,882 | 13,871 | 32.3\% | -7.7\% |
| Huron | 58,652 | 15,44 | 26.3\% | 57.822 | 20,590 | 35.6\% | 9.3\% |
| Jackson | 32,103 | 12,532 | 39.0\% | 32,108 | 14,584 | 45.4\% | 6.4\% |
| Jefferson | 71,820 | 25,03 | 35.0\% | 64,873 | 24,364 | 37.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Knox | 50,963 | 15,027 | 29.5\% | 57,533 | 18,56 | 31.\% | 2.1\% |
| Lake | 224,680 | 36,556 | 16.3\% | 226,389 | 52,943 | 23.4\% | 7.1\% |
| Lawrence | 61,639 | 25,968 | 42.1\% | 60,49 | 24,611 | 40.9\% | -1.2\% |
| Licking | 141726 | 31,863 | 22.5\% | 166,495 | 47,282 | 28.4\% | 5.9\% |
| Logan | 45,208 | 10,974 | 24.3\% | 44,684 | 14,038 | 31.4\% | 7.1\% |
| Lorain | 275,784 | 64,023 | 23.2\% | 296,057 | 86,629 | 29.3\% | 6.0\% |
| Lucas | 446,417 | 135,038 | 30.2\% | 423,275 | 164,927 | 39.0\% | 8.7\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau data 2000; U.S. Census Bureau American Community Surey, 2013 -2017


Table 11.
Change in 200\% Federal Poverty Level, Ohio and counties, 2000 to 2017

| 2000 |  |  |  |  | 2017 |  | Change 2000-2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geography | Population | Population below 200\% FPL | Percent below 200\% FPL | Population | Population below 200\% FPL | Percent below 200\% FPL | Raw Change |
| Madison | 35,612 | 8,55 | 22.9\% | 38,471 | 9,618 | 25.0\% | 2.1\% |
| Mahoning | 250,542 | 77,925 | 311\% | 224,710 | 85,785 | 38.2\% | 7.1\% |
| Marion | 61,415 | 16,780 | 27.3\% | 59,446 | 23,215 | $39.1 \%$ | 11.7\% |
| Medina | 149,347 | 21,430 | 14.3\% | 174,745 | 30,769 | 17.6\% | 3.3\% |
| Meigs | 22,768 | 10,189 | 44.8\% | 23,002 | 10,322 | 44.9\% | 0.1\% |
| Mercer | 40,359 | 8,503 | 211\% | 40,213 | 9,632 | 24.0\% | 2.9\% |
| Miami | 97,256 | 21,045 | 21.6\% | 102,781 | 29,966 | 29.2\% | 7.5\% |
| Monroe | 14,995 | 5,700 | 38.0\% | 14,055 | 5,520 | 39.3\% | 1.3\% |
| Montgomery | 542,982 | 145,454 | 26.8\% | 515,805 | 191,773 | 37.2\% | 10.4\% |
| Morgan | 14,614 | 6,315 | 43.2\% | 14,451 | 6,692 | 46.3\% | 3.1\% |
| Morrow | 31,172 | 8,119 | 26.0\% | 34,520 | 10,041 | $29.1 \%$ | 3.0\% |
| Muskingum | 81,903 | 26,560 | 32.4\% | 83,570 | 32,093 | 38.4\% | 6.0\% |
| Noble | 11.829 | 4,236 | 35.8\% | 11,977 | 4,166 | 35.0\% | -0.9\% |
| Ottawa | 40,239 | 7.919 | 19.7\% | 40,229 | 10,888 | 27.1\% | 7.4\% |
| Paulding | 20,156 | 5,234 | 26.0\% | 18,783 | 5,801 | 30.9\% | 4.9\% |
| Perry | 33,741 | 11,570 | 34.3\% | 35,555 | 15,007 | 42.2\% | 7.9\% |
| Pickaway | 46,174 | 12,065 | 26.1\% | 52,093 | 14,428 | 277\% | 1.6\% |
| Pike | 27,226 | 11,211 | 41.2\% | 27,763 | 12,04 | 43.6\% | 2.4\% |
| Portage | 144,317 | 34,49 | 23.7\% | 154,907 | 46,797 | 30.2\% | 6.5\% |
| Preble | 41,755 | 9,394 | 22.5\% | 40,596 | 12,846 | 31.6\% | 9.1\% |
| Putnam | 34,353 | 6.715 | 19.5\% | 33,688 | 7.728 | 22.9\% | 3.4\% |
| Richland | 122,277 | 36,372 | 29.7\% | 113,627 | 43,224 | 38.0\% | 8.3\% |
| Ross | 67,870 | 21,422 | 31.6\% | 71,020 | 27,423 | 38.6\% | 7.0\% |
| Sandusky | 60,823 | 14,556 | 23.9\% | 58,345 | 18,761 | 32.2\% | 8.2\% |
| Scioto | 75,683 | 32,219 | 42.6\% | 72,911 | 32,454 | 44.5\% | 1.9\% |
| Seneca | 57,264 | 16,02 | 28.1\% | 52,490 | 17,434 | 33.2\% | 5.1\% |
| Shelby | 46,961 | 9,938 | 21.2\% | 48,191 | 12,758 | 26.5\% | 5.3\% |
| Stark | 368,573 | 95,337 | 25.9\% | 364,660 | 119,020 | 32.6\% | 6.8\% |
| Summit | 533,162 | 130,220 | 24.4\% | 532,372 | 165,678 | 311\% | 6.7\% |
| Trumbull | 220,572 | 62,432 | 28.3\% | 199,476 | 72,703 | 36.4\% | 8.1\% |
| Tuscarawas | 89,481 | 27,490 | 30.7\% | 91,32 | 31,906 | 35.0\% | 4.3\% |
| Union | 38,511 | 6,359 | 16.5\% | 51,313 | 10,360 | 20.2\% | 3.7\% |
| Van Wert | 29,168 | 6,853 | 23.5\% | 27,887 | 9,921 | 35.6\% | 12.1\% |
| Vinton | 12,643 | 5,409 | 42.8\% | 13,024 | 5,579 | 42.8\% | 0.1\% |
| Warren | 152,000 | 20,637 | 13.6\% | 216,399 | 32,632 | 15.1\% | 1.5\% |
| Washington | 61,383 | 20,328 | 33.1\% | 58,995 | 20,405 | 34.6\% | 1.5\% |
| Wayne | 108,474 | 27,855 | 25.7\% | 12,016 | 36,298 | 32.4\% | 6.7\% |
| Williams | 37,996 | 9,57 | 24.1\% | 35,743 | 13,001 | 36.4\% | 12.3\% |
| Wood | 113,406 | 26,012 | 22.9\% | 122,541 | 34,970 | 28.5\% | 5.6\% |
| Wyandot | 22,457 | 5.420 | 24.1\% | 21,998 | 7,127 | 32.7\% | 8.6\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau data 2000; u. .S. Census Bureau American Community Surve, 2013 -2017


Table 12.
Change in 200\% Federal Poverty Level, Ohio and counties, 2000 to 2017


Source. U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates
Younger children have consistently experienced higher rates of poverty than older children, and higher rates than adults
The poverty rate for children under age 6 is $23.2 \%$ compared to $16.6 \%$ for middle and high school age kids in Ohio

Table 13.
Child food insecurity, Ohio and the United States, 2016

|  | Population under age 18, 2016 | Number of children experiencing food insecurity | Child food insecurity rate | Food insecure children likely eligible for any federal food assistance | Food insecure children likely ineligible for any federal food assistance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ohio | 2,605,74 | 528,960 | 20.3\% | 66.0\% | 34.0\% |
| United States | 73,804,906 | 12,938,000 | 17.5\% | 80.0\% | 20.0\% |




The child food insecurity rate in Ohio remains higher than the child food insecurity rate for the country as a whole
Food insecure chidren in Ohio are also less ikely to be eligible for federal food assistance than children in the U.S. in general ( $33 \%$ compared to $20 \%$ )

Table 14.
Income to poverty ratio by age group, Ohio, 2017

| Geography | Under age 6 |  | Under age 18 |  | Ages 18 to 64 |  | Age 65 and over |  | Total all ages <br> Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | \% | Count | \% | cunt | \% | Count | \% |  |
| Total | 809,305 |  | 2,558,32 |  | 6,993,724 |  | 1,815,545 |  | $\frac{11,287,401}{\mathbf{N 1 7 2 , 7 1 2}^{2}}$ |
| Below 50\% FPL | 94,639 | 11.7\% | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 513,238 \\ \hline 1,043,121 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 9.2\% |  | 6.2\% | 47,088 | 2.6\% |  |
| Below 100\% FPL | $\begin{array}{r} 18774,42 \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 23.2\% |  | 20.1\% |  | $\frac{13.4 \%}{28.6 \%}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 144,0,024 \\ \hline 50952 \end{array}$ | $\frac{2.9 \%}{28.19}$ | $1,582,931$ |
| Below 200\% FPL |  | 44.8\% |  | 40.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-veer estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table 15.

Income to poverty ratio by age group, Ohio, 2017

|  | White (non-Hispanic) |  | Black/African-American |  | Asian |  | Mixed race |  | Hispanic/Latino (of any race) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geography | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count |
| Total | 8,971,954 |  | 1,375,348 |  | 252,439 |  | 328,262 |  | 423,405 |
| In poverty | 960,351 | 10.7\% | 395,660 | 28.8\% | 36,113 | 14.3\% | 87,323 | 26.6\% | 113301 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-vear estimates
Black or African American residents have the highest poverty rate at $28.8 \%$
The poverty rate among Asian Ohioans is closest to non-Hispanic Whites, at 14.3\%

Table 16.
Poverty by race/ethnicity and age, Ohio, 2017

| Persons in poverty | Total | White (non-Hispanic) | Black/African-American | Asian | Mixed race | Hispanic/Latin (of any race) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All age groups | 1,582,931 | 960,351 | 395,660 | 36,113 | 87,323 | 113,301 |
| Under age 6 | 187442 | 88.868 | 56,885 | 3,71 | 23,720 | 19,676 |
| Under age 18 | 513,238 | 251,738 | 153,859 | 7,231 | 56,481 | 53,361 |
| Ages 18 to 64 | 925,669 | 599,206 | 216,332 | 26,034 | 28,881 | 55,543 |
| Age 65 and older | 144,024 | 109,407 | 25,469 | 2.848 | 1.961 | 4,397 |
| Poverty rates | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| All age groups | 14.0\% | 10.7\% | 28.8\% | 14.3\% | 26.6\% | 26.8\% |
| Under age 6 | 23.2\% | 15.7\% | 477\% | 15.2\% | 39.5\% | 38.5\% |
| Under age 18 | 20.1\% | 13.8\% | 42.1\% | 12.8\% | 33.5\% | 34.3\% |
| Ages 18 to 64 | 13.4\% | 10.9\% | 25.5\% | 14.9\% | 19.7\% | 22.7\% |
| Age 65 and older | 7.7\% | 6.6\% | 15.6\% | 13.4\% | 14.5\% | 18.7\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1.year estimates
Among Asian Ohioans, adults age 18 to 64 have a higher poverty rate (14.9\%) than children under age 18 (12.8\%)
Ad 65 and older have the lowest povery rate in every racial/thic group excent Asian Ohioans

Table 17.
Poverty by family type, Ohio, 2017

|  | Married couples with no relatedchildren in their care |  | Married couples with related children in their care |  | Single men with related children in their care |  | Single women with related children in their care |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count |
| Total | 1,316,181 |  | 820,62 |  | 126,85 |  | 37,2 |
| In poverty | 37,625 | 2.9\% | 46,778 | 5.7\% | 23,691 | 18.7\% | 149,736 |

[^1]- As expected, married couples with no children have the lowest poverty rate of any family structure (2.9\%)

Single women with children under 18 have a poverty rate over twice that of single men with children under 18 ( $39.7 \%$ and $18.7 \%$ respectively)

Table 18.
Poverty by race/ethnicity of householder and family type, Ohio, 2017

| Families in poverty | Total | White (non-Hispanic) | Black/African-American | Asian | Mixed race | Hispanic/Latino (of any race) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All families | 289,955 | 177,370 | 77,385 | 6,033 | 8.533 | 20,74 |
| Married couples with no related children in their care | 37,625 | 30,85 | 4,209 | 1,708 | 789 | 583 |
| Married couples with related children in their care | 46,778 | 30,785 | 6,135 | 2,721 | 954 | 6,050 |
| Single men with related children in their care | 23,691 | 14,376 | 6,72 | 427 | 1,336 | 1,885 |
| Single women with related children in their care | 149,736 | 81,913 | 52,135 | 930 | 5,033 | 11,112 |
| $\frac{\text { Poverty rates }}{\text { All families }}$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Married couples with no related children in their care | 2.9\% | 2.5\% | 5.9\% | 8.0\% | 7.3\% | 3.4\% |
| Married couples with related children in their care | 5.7\% | 4.4\% | 12.4\% | 9.1\% | 7.6\% | 19.8\% |
| Single men with related children in their care | 18.7\% | 25.3\% | 30.2\% | 33.9\% | 20.7\% | 27.4\% |
| Single women with related children in their care | 39.7\% | 35.8\% | 45.2\% | 30.0\% | 447\% | 50.3\% |

- Poverty rates for Asian single mother households are the lowest at $30.0 \%$ (compared to other single woman with related children under 18 households) -Hispanic/Lation families have the highest overall poverty rates, and over half of Hispanic/Latino households with single women with related children in thei care fall below the poverty line (50.3\%

Table 19.
Poverty by employment type, Ohio, 2017

|  | Worked full-time, year-round |  | Worked part-ime or part-year |  | Unemployed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | \% | Count | \% |  |
| Total persons age 16 and older | 3,913,871 |  | 2,558,078 |  | 3,011,613 |
| In poverty | 97,919 | 2.5\% | 388,21 | 18.0\% | 628,857 |

[^2]The poverty rate among people employed part-time or part-year is over seven times higher than the poverty rate among peoople working full-time year round

Table 20.
Poverty by number of wage-earners, work experience, and family type, Ohio, 2017

|  | Total families | Families in poverty | Poverty rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Married couple | 2,136,801 | 84,403 | 3.9\% |
| Both work, full or part time | 1,183,775 | 15,700 | 1.3\% |
| One spouse work | 576,637 | 36,007 | 6.2\% |
| Neither work | 376,389 | 32,696 | 8.7\% |
| Single male householder | 228,915 | 34,224 | 15.0\% |
| Works full time | 137,022 | 6,366 | 4.6\% |
| Works part time | 40,556 | 12,920 | 31.9\% |
| Does not work | 51,337 | 14,938 | 29.1\% |
| Single female householder | 585,454 | 171,328 | 29.3\% |
| Works full time | 268,782 | 30,653 | 11.4\% |
| Works part time | 149,870 | 75,124 | 50.1\% |
| Does not work | 166,802 | 65,551 | 39.3\% |

-There are twice as many single female housenolders in poverty than married couple families in poverty ( 171,328 compared to 84,403 ) although there are over
three and a half times as many married couple families than there are single female householders three and a half times as many married couple families than there are single female householders

Table 21.
Poverty by educational attainment, Ohio, 2017


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates
Poverty rates decrease as educational attainment increases
More than one quarter of Ohioans without a high school diploma or equivalency live in poverty

Table 22.
Seniors living in poverty by sex, Ohio, 2017

|  | Female, 65 and older |  | Male, 65 and older |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total, age } 65 \text { and older } \\ & \hline \text { Count } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | \% | Count | \% |  |
| Total seniors | 953,163 |  | 773,001 |  | 1,726,164 |
| In poverty | 92,165 | 8.8\% | 51,859 | 6.3\% | 144,024 |

[^3]- The poverty rate for women age 65 and older is $40 \%$ higher than the poverty rate for men of the same age

Table 23.
Supply of Rental Units Affordable and Available to Low-Income Renters by Income, 2017
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\hline \text { Income threshold } \\ \begin{array}{l|c|c|c|c}\text { Renter-occupied } \\ \text { households }\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c}\text { Affordable and available } \\ \text { (ental units }\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c}\text { Surplus (Shortage of affordable below } 30 \% \text { AMI } \\ \text { and available rental units) }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Affordable and available units } \\ \text { per 100 renter households }\end{array}\right]$

- For the lowest-income renter households in Ohio, there are only 42 affordable and available rental units for every 100 households.

Table 24.
Mode of commuting, 2017

|  | Drive alone |  | Carpool |  | Public transportation |  | Walked |  | Taxi, motorcycle, bike, other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count |
| Total | 4,552,200 | 83.7\% | 417,349 | 7.7\% | 79,572 | 1.5\% | 96,465 | 1.8\% | 65,232 |
| In poverty | 245,012 | 69.7\% | 42,893 | 12.2\% | 18,414 | 5.2\% | 21,231 | 6.0\% | 10,724 |

- Those below the poverty level were over three times as likely to use public transit or walk to their jobs.


[^0]:    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Surey 1-year estimate

[^1]:    Source: U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey 1-vear estimates

[^2]:    Source: U.S. Census Brrau, Amercan Community Survey-year estimate

[^3]:    Source: U.s. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-vear estimates

