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About the Benchmarking Project
Welcome to the 2019 Benchmarking Report. This year’s report once again analyzes key indicators that impact the health, economic competitiveness, and quality of life for our community. Data are benchmarked for the population of the Columbus, Ohio metropolitan area alongside comparative or ‘peer’ metropolitan areas. This year’s Benchmarking Report retains most of the features of the 2016 study, with some slight updates.

The structure of this year’s Benchmarking Report remains the same. Indicators are grouped by section under the following topic areas: Population Vitality, Economic Strength, Personal Prosperity, Lifelong Learning, and Community Wellbeing. Within these topic areas, this study explores the data that underpin our daily lives. While updated data were not available for some of the indicators retained for 2016, data are presented alongside an expanded metro list for new rankings and comparisons.

Sponsored by The Columbus Foundation, Benchmarking Central Ohio 2019 represents the seventh edition of the benchmarking project.

Methodology
Since its inception in 2005, the benchmarking project is designed to:

Benchmark against both similar and best-in-class communities. Compare Columbus with other metropolitan areas that represent both “peer communities” (similar demographics/geography) and “best-in-class” communities (having characteristics that other communities emulate).

Select indicators from a broad framework, with a focus on economic competitiveness. Identify indicators that describe characteristics of the population, economy, and quality of life that contribute to the economic competitiveness of the region.

Use easily accessible, recent data. Collect data from existing, centralized sources. The process will not include conducting new research or collecting data from individual communities. If possible, the report will use indicator data no more than three years old that can also be regularly updated.

Produce a product that is useful to a wide audience. Prepare a report that (1) is easy for a variety of users to understand, (2) can be used to guide program and policy development, (3) informs the community about how Columbus stacks up, and (4) inspires the community to act.

Provide regular updates. After the initial report, produce follow-up reports to assess progress and trends.

The Indicator Groups
As with the previous report, the indicators in Benchmarking Central Ohio 2016 are organized into five topic sections:
1. Population Vitality
2. Economic Strength
3. Personal Prosperity
4. Lifelong Learning
5. Community Wellbeing

Most indicators have returned from the 2016 report. Due to discontinuation or irregular updates of data, four indicators from the previous report were removed:

- Clean Jobs
- Festivals & Celebrations
- Traffic Congestion
- Carbon Footprint

As a result, four new indicators have been added:
- Housing Starts (3.10)
- Overdose Deaths (5.06)
- Broadband Availability (4.07)
- Access to Care (5.07)
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The Metro Areas
The Benchmarking Report compares Columbus to the same 22 metro areas as the 2016 report. Where data have been updated, the indicators apply the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) geographies defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget in 2013, as used by the Census Bureau and other federal agencies for statistical purposes. Not all metro areas were represented in the source datasets. In these cases, an “N/A” is used to indicate no available data. Most of the indicator data has been collected for the top 100 MSAs by population. Where possible, a figure for the top 100 MSAs is included for comparison purposes. In some other cases a national figure is presented.

A map of the geographies covered in this report is included for reference on page iv. On each indicator page, metro areas are colored by region, with red for Midwest, blue for South, green for West, and black for Northeast (Providence only).

About the Rankings
Each indicator page contains a bar graph that rank-orders the metro areas. Columbus is always highlighted in red. Many of the graphs display data as a percentage to enable comparisons of metro areas with different populations. For most of the indicators, 1 indicates the “highest” and “best” or otherwise the preferred condition, and 23rd indicates the “lowest” and “worst” or undesired condition. For some indicators, such as unemployment rate, poverty rate, and crime rate, a low value for the measure is the preferred condition, and accordingly, is ranked higher.

Where the Columbus MSA’s ranking is tied with another MSA, its ranking number is marked with a T. Some tied metros will not be listed alphabetically, as there was a slight difference in value between them, ranking one higher than the other(s). However, they are presented as ties based on rounding to the appropriate number of significant digits.

Columbus ranking tables are presented at the beginning of each of the five topic sections. This provides a quick way of visually scanning where the Columbus metro falls among the indicators in a given topic. Note that due to tied metros in this ranking system, the possible ranking values may not always end on a rank of 23.

It is important to acknowledge the ranking in this report within the context of each specific indicator. For data where the spread between the highest and lowest figures is small, ranking may be a less useful tool for analysis. Similarly, the trend charts show how Columbus changes over time; small changes over time may not indicate statistically significant change. Notes indicate if the metro area boundaries themselves have changed over time, which may impact the value. Data sources may use old or updated boundaries when describing the MSA. Readers should consider the geography included in each indicator and how it could impact the interpretation of the data. Trend charts depicting dollar figures are not adjusted for inflation.

Accuracy
The project team has been careful in collecting, analyzing, checking, and presenting data from a variety of sources to prepare this report. Data sources (indicated on each indicator page and listed in the Data Sources section starting on page 6-1) have been judged to be reliable, but it was not possible to authenticate all data. If careful readers of the report discover data or typographical errors, feedback and future corrections will be welcome.
# Introduction

## Benchmarking Metro Area Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>2013 MSA Geography (counties and states, principal city county highlighted in red)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Bastrop, Caldwell, Hays, <strong>Travis</strong>, Williamson, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Cabarrus, Gaston, Iredell, <strong>Lincoln</strong>, Mecklenburg, Rowan, Union, NC; Chester, Lancaster, York, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td><strong>Cook</strong>, DeKalb, DuPage, Grundy, Kane, <strong>Kendall</strong>, Lake, McHenry, Will, IL; Jasper, Lake, Newton, Porter, IN; Kenosha, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Brown, Butler, Clermont, <strong>Hamilton</strong>, Warren, OH; Boone, Bracken, Campbell, Gallatin, Grant, Kenton, Pendleton, KY; Dearborn, Ohio, Union, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Delaware, <strong>Fairfield</strong>, Franklin, Hocking, Licking, Madison, Morrow, Perry, Pickaway, Union, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Boone, Brown, Hamilton, Hancock, Hendricks, Johnson, <strong>Madison</strong>, Marion, Morgan, Putnam, Shelby, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Baker, Clay, <strong>Duval</strong>, Nassau, St. Johns, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Clark, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Bullitt, <strong>Henry</strong>, Jefferson, Oldham, Shelby, Spencer, Trimble, KY; Clark, Floyd, Harrison, Scott, Washington, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Bates, Caldwell, Cass, Clay, <strong>Clintond</strong>, Jackson, Lafayette, Platte, Ray, MO; Johnson, Leavenworth, Linn, Miami, Wyandotte, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Washington, Waukesha, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, <strong>Hennepin</strong>, Isanti, Le Sueur, Mille Lacs, Ramsey, Scott, Sherburne, Sibley, Washington, Wright, MN; Pierce, St. Croix, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Cannon, Cheatham, <strong>Davidson</strong>, Dickson, Hickman, Macon, Maury, Robertson, Rutherford, Smith, Sumner, Trousdale, Williamson, Wilson, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td><strong>Allegheny</strong>, Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Washington, Westmorland, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Clackamas, Columbia, <strong>Multnomah</strong>, Washington, Yamhill, OR; Clark, Skamania, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Bristol, MA; Bristol, Kent, Newport, <strong>Providence</strong>, Washington, RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Franklin, Johnston, <strong>Wake</strong>, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>El Dorado, Placer, <strong>Sacramento</strong>, Yolo, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Atascosa, Bexar, <strong>Bexar</strong>, Comal, Guadalupe, Kendall, Medina, Wilson, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td><strong>San Diego</strong>, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Benito, <strong>Santa Clara</strong>, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top 100 MSAs by Population, 2017
Section 1: Population Vitality

This section includes indicators of population growth, diversity, age, and households that describe the vitality of the metro area populations.

The following are the Population Vitality indicator categories:

1.01 Population Growth
1.02 Race and Ethnicity
1.03 Senior Population
1.04 Median Age
1.05 Households
1.06 Same-Sex Couples
1.07 Urban Density
In 2007 the Columbus metro was smaller by two counties and had a population of 1.7 million people, trailing Cleveland's 2 million and Cincinnati's 2.1 million. By 2017 Columbus's growth has led it to surpass Cleveland and is on track to surpass Cincinnati in the 2020's. How has the rest of the cohort's population changed between 2007 and 2017? (1.01)

Housing affordability has increased as a topic of discussion, both regionally and nationally. Between 2007 and 2017 it is estimated more than 100,000 households were added to the Columbus metro, whereas the total number of housing units grew by 89,000. How have other metros in the cohort fared in the same time period? (1.05, 3.08)
Where does Columbus rank among the 23 cohort metros in this section? This table displays Columbus's rank for each indicator, along with the top and bottom ranking metros in the cohort.

| Indicator                                | #1 (metro) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | #23 (metro) |
|------------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|------------|
| Population (% change)                    | 5.7% (Austin) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   | -0.7% (Pittsburgh) |
| Racial/Ethnic minority pop. (%)          | 68.5% (San Jose) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   | 14.7% (Pittsburgh) |
| Senior population* (%)                   | 10.5% (Austin) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 2.9% |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   | 19.5% (Pittsburgh) |
| Median age* (years)                      | 34.7 (Austin/San Antonio) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   | 43.3 (Pittsburgh) |
| Average persons per household            | 3.01 (San Jose) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   | 2.57 |   |    |    | 2.28 (Pittsburgh) |
| Same-sex couples per 1,000 unmarried partner households | 86.25 (Austin) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | 76.7 |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   | 36.32 (Jacksonville) |
| Dwelling units per acre                  | 0.834 (Chicago) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 0.281 |   | 0.178 (Las Vegas) |

- Columbus metro area
- Top tier
- Middle tier
- Bottom tier

These indicators are ranked from highest (1) to lowest (23), except (*) ranked lowest (1) to highest (23).
Indicator 1.01: Population Growth

This indicator includes Census Bureau data on the total metro area populations in 2015 and 2017 and the percentage change in that two year time period.

Columbus continues to stand out among Midwestern metros, growing by 2.7% since 2015. Since the region’s boundaries were expanded in 2013, the population has increased by an estimated 107,000 residents.

### Total population, 2015-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Austin</td>
<td>2,000,784</td>
<td>2,115,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Orlando</td>
<td>2,391,028</td>
<td>2,509,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Raleigh</td>
<td>1,272,875</td>
<td>1,335,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Las Vegas</td>
<td>2,110,330</td>
<td>2,204,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Charlotte</td>
<td>2,424,115</td>
<td>2,525,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jacksonville</td>
<td>1,445,986</td>
<td>1,504,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nashville</td>
<td>1,829,513</td>
<td>1,903,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 San Antonio</td>
<td>2,379,054</td>
<td>2,473,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Portland</td>
<td>2,382,181</td>
<td>2,453,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Columbus</td>
<td>2,023,198</td>
<td>2,078,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sacramento</td>
<td>2,266,892</td>
<td>2,324,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Minneapolis</td>
<td>3,521,325</td>
<td>3,600,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Indianapolis</td>
<td>1,986,872</td>
<td>2,028,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kansas City</td>
<td>2,085,221</td>
<td>2,128,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 San Diego</td>
<td>3,290,044</td>
<td>3,337,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Louisville</td>
<td>1,277,992</td>
<td>1,293,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cincinnati</td>
<td>2,155,674</td>
<td>2,179,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 San Jose</td>
<td>1,977,584</td>
<td>1,998,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Providence</td>
<td>1,613,155</td>
<td>1,621,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,576,376</td>
<td>1,576,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Cleveland</td>
<td>2,062,842</td>
<td>2,058,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Chicago</td>
<td>9,557,503</td>
<td>9,533,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,349,139</td>
<td>2,333,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of population change, 2015-2017

- **Columbus** 2.7%
- **Austin** 5.7%
- **Orlando** 4.9%
- **Raleigh** 4.2%
- **Las Vegas** 4.1%
- **Charlotte** 4%
- **Jacksonville** 4%
- **Nashville** 3%
- **San Antonio** 1.3%
- **Portland** 2.6%
- **Sacramento** 2.3%
- **Minneapolis** 2.1%
- **Indianapolis** 2.1%
- **Kansas City** 1.4%
- **San Diego** 1.2%
- **Louisville** 1.1%
- **Cincinnati** 1.1%
- **San Jose** 0.5%
- **Providence** 0%
- **Milwaukee** -0.2%
- **Cleveland** -0.3%
- **Chicago** -0.7%
- **Pittsburgh** -0.7%

Note: Estimates revised upward in 2011 following official 2010 Census count.
## Indicator 1.02: Race & Ethnicity

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on racial and ethnic diversity across metro areas. These data reflect self-identification by people according to the race and ethnicity with which they most closely identify. Not all classifications are shown here; as such percentages in the data table do not total 100%.

While Columbus has become more racially and ethnically diverse, these populations are not the main drivers of the regions overall growth, with under 30% of the metro population of a racial or ethnic minority.

### Population by race and ethnicity, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>73.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast)

(1) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 1.03: Senior Population

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on the number and percentage of individuals age 65 and over.

The percentage of senior citizens in Columbus has steadily increased over time, consistent with an aging population in the United States as a whole. Many neighboring metros are aging faster however, making Columbus one of the youngest metros outside the southern and western regions of the country.

Population 65 and over, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total population age 65 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Austin</td>
<td>221,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Raleigh</td>
<td>156,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Antonio</td>
<td>315,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nashville</td>
<td>244,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Columbus</td>
<td>268,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 San Jose</td>
<td>262,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Charlotte</td>
<td>336,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Indianapolis</td>
<td>271,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Minneapolis</td>
<td>487,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 San Diego</td>
<td>454,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Chicago</td>
<td>1,348,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Kansas City</td>
<td>305,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Las Vegas</td>
<td>317,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Portland</td>
<td>353,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Orlando</td>
<td>365,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Cincinnati</td>
<td>320,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sacramento</td>
<td>348,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Milwaukee</td>
<td>239,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jacksonville</td>
<td>230,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Louisville</td>
<td>201,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Providence</td>
<td>270,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cleveland</td>
<td>371,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>454,911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(1) ranked from lowest to highest
This indicator includes American Community Survey data on the median age of area populations, as well as of their racial and ethnic populations. The median age is expressed in years and divides populations into two groups, with half the population younger than the median and the other half older.

Following from a relatively small senior population, continued migration to Columbus has resulted in a steady median age for the metro over time, making it one of the youngest in the cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African-American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Austin</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 San Antonio</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Diego</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Columbus</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nashville</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Indianapolis</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Raleigh</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Minneapolis</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 San Jose</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Orlando</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kansas City</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sacramento</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Las Vegas</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Chicago</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Charlotte</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Cincinnati</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Milwaukee</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Portland</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jacksonville</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Louisville</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Providence</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cleveland</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(4) ranked from lowest to highest
## Indicator 1.05: Households

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on the number and type of households in metro areas. A household is defined as an occupied housing unit, and households are categorized into types based on characteristics of the primary householder and his, her, or their relationship with others in the household. Not all types are represented here, so percentages do not add up to 100%. Average household size is calculated by dividing the total number of households in an area by the total number of households.

The rankings for average household size are fairly similar to that of Racial and Ethnic diversity (1.02), with more diverse metros in the south and west estimated to have larger household sizes.

### Number and percentage of households by type, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total households</th>
<th>Married couples</th>
<th>Women w/ children (no spouse present)</th>
<th>Persons living alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Jose</strong></td>
<td>651,006</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Antonio</strong></td>
<td>810,473</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego</strong></td>
<td>1,126,419</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orlando</strong></td>
<td>875,259</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Las Vegas</strong></td>
<td>781,796</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacramento</strong></td>
<td>829,772</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Austin</strong></td>
<td>755,333</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chicago</strong></td>
<td>3,488,312</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raleigh</strong></td>
<td>493,879</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charlotte</strong></td>
<td>944,261</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacksonville</strong></td>
<td>560,169</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nashville</strong></td>
<td>717,370</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portland</strong></td>
<td>935,722</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indianapolis</strong></td>
<td>773,361</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td>788,946</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minneapolis</strong></td>
<td>1,376,557</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas City</strong></td>
<td>829,475</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louisville</strong></td>
<td>502,581</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cincinnati</strong></td>
<td>852,639</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providence</strong></td>
<td>627,318</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milwaukee</strong></td>
<td>625,495</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleveland</strong></td>
<td>862,586</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittsburgh</strong></td>
<td>996,798</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average persons per household, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Average persons per household</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>2.57 (T-14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey*
Indicator 1.06: Same-Sex Couples

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on same-sex partner households. This indicator has been modified from the 2016 Benchmarking report; as same-sex marriage has become recognized throughout the country but not delineated in marriage estimates, the scope of the data analyzed has changed to unmarried partner households.

Although the data have changed somewhat, the presence of same-sex couples in Columbus remains strong, ranking third highest in the cohort and highest among Midwestern metros.

### Unmarried same-sex households by sex, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Male couples</th>
<th>Female couples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Austin</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>2,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 San Antonio</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>1,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 <strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,241</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,385</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indianapolis</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Portland</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>2,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Raleigh</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Minneapolis</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>2,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cleveland</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Chicago</td>
<td>7,514</td>
<td>3,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Louisville</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Charlotte</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Las Vegas</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kansas City</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 San Diego</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>2,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 San Jose</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sacramento</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Providence</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Orlando</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Milwaukee</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Nashville</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jacksonville</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(3) ranked from highest to lowest

---

### Same-sex couples per 1,000 unmarried partner households, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>86.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>80.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>76.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>66.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>66.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>61.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>59.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>58.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>57.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>53.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>52.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>52.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>48.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>47.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>46.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>45.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>44.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>43.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>37.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>37.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>37.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>36.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Trend data in 2016 and 2017 may not reflect the full estimate of same-sex couples, following the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2015 decision overturning the Defense of Marriage Act.
Indicator 1.07: Urban Density

This indicator includes data providing multiple perspectives on urban density. First, data from the Center for Neighborhood Technology uses the number of road intersections per square mile to describe the extent a region’s road network permits (or restricts) the movement of vehicles or people. Second, American Community Survey data includes persons per square mile and dwelling units per acre to describe regional population and residential density.

Columbus’s growth has brought greater population density in Franklin County, rising from about 2,200 persons per square mile in 2010 to over 2,400 in 2017. The suburban and rural nature of the metro’s other nine counties however, keep overall density low.

Intersection and population density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Intersections per sq mi, 2018</th>
<th>Persons per sq mi, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

Columbus Trends: Dwelling units per acre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dwelling units per acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0.281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Intersection density</th>
<th>Population density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) ranked from highest to lowest
Section 2: Economic Strength

This section includes indicators of industries & innovation, business growth, business size & ownership, productivity, employment, and workforce that describe the strength of metro area economies.

The following are the Economic Strength indicator categories:

2.01 Industry Sector Employment
2.02 High Tech Industries
2.03 Entrepreneurship
2.04 Small Business Firms
2.05 Small Business Startups
2.06 Minority Business Ownership
2.07 Women’s Business Ownership
2.08 Income & Wages
2.09 Occupations
2.10 Workforce
2.11 Unemployment
2.12 Brain Gain
Economic Strength Section Highlights

Columbus has long been characterized by a diversified economy, never having to rely upon employment in one particular sector such as manufacturing or government as conditions fluctuate. The metro’s population growth and changing national trends over the last 10 years are highlighted in a changing labor force, with four sectors regionally showing considerable change in this time period. How do changes in Columbus’s labor market compare to the country as a whole? (2.01)

Columbus MSA 10 year change

United States 10 year change

Columbus has remained relatively unchanged in the presence of small businesses in the regional economy, which has been low compared to other cohort metros. While educational attainment is one among several factors driving innovation and entrepreneurship, Columbus does not appear to be at a disadvantage to its peers in the rate of adults with a college education (2.04, 4.02)
## Economic Strength Rankings

Where does Columbus rank among the 23 cohort metros in this section? This table displays Columbus’s rank for each indicator, along with the top and bottom ranking metros in the cohort.

| Indicator (41 metro) | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  | 22  | Indicator (#23 metro) |
|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Professional & business services employment (%) | 20.7% (San Jose) | 16.6% | 12.6% (Providence) |
| Transportation & utilities employment (%) | 7.7% (Louisville) | 5.1% | 1.4% (San Jose) |
| High-tech GDP location quotient | 4.46 (San Jose) | 0.72 | 0.44 (Las Vegas) |
| Business ownership (%) | 11.9% (San Diego) | 7.6% | 6.9% (Milwaukee) |
| Very small business firms (%) | 69% (San Diego) | 57.6% | 53.1 (Pittsburgh) |
| Very small establishment births per 1,000 establishments | 111.1 (Las Vegas) | 64.3 | 47.2 (Pittsburgh) |
| Minority business ownership (%) | 52.6% (San Antonio) | 19% | 8.8% (Pittsburgh) |
| Female business ownership (%) | 40.1% (Jacksonville) | 36.6% | 32.2% (Pittsburgh) |
| Adjusted per capita income | $44,343 (San Jose) | $32,887 | $24,343 (San Antonio) |
| Management, business, science & arts occupations (%) | 52.7% (San Jose) | 42% | 28% (Las Vegas) |
| Prime working age population (%) | 49.6% (Austin) | 46% | 41.4% (Cleveland) |
| Unemployment rate* | 2.9% (Nashville) | 4.1% | 5.7% (Cleveland) |
| New residents age 25+ with a graduate degree (%) | 38.7% (San Jose) | 23.3% | 8.7% (Las Vegas) |

Columbus metro area

Top tier

Middle tier

Bottom tier

These indicators are ranked from highest (1) to lowest (23), except (*) ranked lowest (1) to highest (23).
Indicator 2.01: Industry Sector Employment (1 of 2)

This indicator includes data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on the distribution of employment by industry. The BLS uses the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) to group similar establishments into industry sectors.

Percentage of total employment by industry sector, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Education &amp; Health Services</th>
<th>Financial Activities</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Raleigh</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kansas City</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Orlando</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chicago</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Austin</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Charlotte</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Columbus</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Nashville</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Milwaukee</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 San Diego</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Indianapolis</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Portland</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jacksonville</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Cincinnati</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Minneapolis</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cleveland</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Las Vegas</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sacramento</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Louisville</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 San Antonio</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Providence</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast


Percentage Professional & Business Services employment, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(¹) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 2.01: Industry Sector Employment (2 of 2)

This indicator includes data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on the distribution of employment by industry. The BLS uses the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) to group similar establishments into industry sectors.

Columbus maintains a high standing among cohort metros for the percentage of transportation & utilities employment. As distribution and warehousing centers have grown in visibility throughout the region, related employment continues to maintain a presence.

### Percentage of total employment by industry sector, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Retail Trade</th>
<th>Wholesale Trade</th>
<th>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>6.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast


(4) ranked from highest to lowest

### Percentage Transportation & Utilities employment, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States</th>
<th>3.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(4) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 2.02: High Tech Industries

This indicator provides two perspectives on high tech industries. First, BLS data is included on information technology (IT) occupations, including computer, information systems, and database occupations. Second, the Milken Institute’s High-Tech GDP location quotient (LQ) measures the extent to which a metro area’s high tech concentration is above or below the U.S. concentration, which equals 1.0.

Despite Columbus’s LQ placing it in the lower third of the cohort, the metro’s share of IT occupations is tied for 8th highest among the group. While Columbus’s large employers, such as Nationwide Insurance or Chase, demand tech talent to fill IT jobs, their core business of finance and insurance may not contribute as much to high tech GDP.

IT Occupations, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total IT Occupations</th>
<th>IT occupations as percentage of all occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>133,530</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Portland</td>
<td>42,710</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Raleigh</td>
<td>31,080</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Austin</td>
<td>55,100</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 San Diego</td>
<td>49,980</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Indianapolis</td>
<td>29,690</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Minneapolis</td>
<td>75,130</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>34,880</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kansas City</td>
<td>42,650</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sacramento</td>
<td>31,830</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 San Antonio</td>
<td>24,680</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Orlando</td>
<td>29,740</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Charlotte</td>
<td>46,690</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cincinnati</td>
<td>30,750</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Chicago</td>
<td>115,520</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Providence</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>41,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jacksonville</td>
<td>16,290</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Milwaukee</td>
<td>24,730</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Cleveland</td>
<td>29,450</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Nashville</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Louisville</td>
<td>13,640</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Las Vegas</td>
<td>13,340</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics; Milken Institute, Best Performing Cities

High Tech GDP Location Quotient, 2017

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

(T-17) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 2.03: Entrepreneurship

This indicator uses American Community Survey data on self-employment. Workers are considered business owners if they report being self-employed in their own business, with distinctions between incorporated and non-incorporated businesses.

The rate of self-employed workers in Columbus has receded since the late 2000’s recession, from 8.8% in 2007 to 7.6% in 2017.

### Business owners age 16 and older by incorporation, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total self-employed in own not incorporated business</th>
<th>Total self-employed in own incorporated business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>125,328</td>
<td>66,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>82,050</td>
<td>55,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>76,737</td>
<td>43,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>75,371</td>
<td>29,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>80,356</td>
<td>31,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>58,254</td>
<td>60,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>34,106</td>
<td>32,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>68,348</td>
<td>31,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>63,875</td>
<td>45,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>57,529</td>
<td>35,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>60,077</td>
<td>29,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>89,799</td>
<td>77,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>198,273</td>
<td>184,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>55,984</td>
<td>27,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>44,062</td>
<td>34,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>29,185</td>
<td>24,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>53,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,752</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>55,770</td>
<td>32,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>41,665</td>
<td>21,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>26,961</td>
<td>20,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>50,798</td>
<td>30,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>45,341</td>
<td>29,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>33,464</td>
<td>21,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rate of business ownership, 2017*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Ranked from highest to lowest
**Indicator 2.04: Small Business Firms**

This indicator uses Bureau of the Census data on small employer firms, distinguished by firm size. A “small business firm” is defined as an employer firm with fewer than 500 employees, whereas a “very small firm” is defined as one with fewer than 20 employees. Note that Columbus metro trend data is partially based on 2003 boundaries up to 2012.

Columbus has consistently ranked at or near the bottom of very small firms’ presence in the overall economy, dating back to earlier Benchmarking reports in the mid-2000s.

**Small business firms and their employment by firm size, 2014-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Small firm employment as percentage of total employment</th>
<th>Small firms as percentage of all firms</th>
<th>Very small firm employment as percentage of total employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>28.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Indicator 2.05: Small Business Startups

This indicator uses Bureau of the Census data on business establishment births. An establishment “birth” is defined as a business with zero employment in the first quarter of the initial year and positive employment in the first quarter of the subsequent year. An establishment differs from an employer firm in that it represents a physical location where business is conducted, and a firm may include one or more establishments. Note that Columbus metro trend data is partially based on 2003 boundaries up to 2012.

The rate of business creation has slowed recently with an improving economy and existing firms being more attractive to the workforce. Columbus is no different and its position is relatively unchanged within the cohort from the last Benchmarking report.

### New business establishments and establishment births, 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total number of new establishments</th>
<th>Establishment births per 1k establishments</th>
<th>New very small establishments (&lt;20 employees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Las Vegas</td>
<td>5,242</td>
<td>142.5</td>
<td>4,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Orlando</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>134.1</td>
<td>5,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Austin</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>4,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Diego</td>
<td>8,384</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>6,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Jacksonville</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>2,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 San Jose</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>3,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sacramento</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>3,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Portland</td>
<td>6,498</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>5,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Raleigh</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>2,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Charlotte</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>113.8</td>
<td>4,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kansas City</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>3,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Chicago</td>
<td>21,796</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>17,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 San Antonio</td>
<td>4,511</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>3,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Minneapolis</td>
<td>8,027</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>6,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nashville</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>2,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Providence</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>2,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Indianapolis</td>
<td>4,181</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>2,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,576</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,411</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Louisville</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Milwaukee</td>
<td>2,857</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>2,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Cincinnati</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>2,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cleveland</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>4,262</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>2,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast


### Columbus Trends: Very small establishment births per 1k establishments

- 2009-2010: 59.5
- 2010-2011: 65.8
- 2011-2012: 71.9
- 2013-2014: 60.7
- 2014-2015: 64.3

Top 10:
- Las Vegas: 107.9
- Orlando: 100.3
- Austin: 98.0
- San Diego: 93.9
- Jacksonville: 92.0
- San Jose: 90.0
- Sacramento: 88.8
- Portland: 88.5
- Raleigh: 84.9
- Kansas City: 83.7
- Chicago: 82.5
- San Antonio: 79.2
- Minneapolis: 76.5
- Nashville: 76.4
- Providence: 71.3
- Indianapolis: 68.3
- Columbus: 64.3 (18)
- Louisville: 61.7
- Milwaukee: 61.2
- Cincinnati: 57.9
- Cleveland: 55.4
- Pittsburgh: 53.1

(Number) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 2.06: Minority Business Ownership

This indicator includes Census Bureau data on minority business ownership, defined as firms whose sole proprietor, or at least 51% of the ownership, is Black or African-American, Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, or Hispanic/Latino. These data are unchanged from the 2016 report, with recalculations to reflect the current 100 largest metro areas. Note these data are based on 2003 metro boundaries.

### Number of businesses by race and ethnicity of owner, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of Hispanic-owned businesses</th>
<th>Number of racial minority-owned businesses (non-Hispanic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Antonio</td>
<td>81,126</td>
<td>96,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 San Jose</td>
<td>23,913</td>
<td>84,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Orlando</td>
<td>61,157</td>
<td>103,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Las Vegas</td>
<td>28,630</td>
<td>62,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 San Diego</td>
<td>62,753</td>
<td>106,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Chicago</td>
<td>89,523</td>
<td>293,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sacramento</td>
<td>18,194</td>
<td>55,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jacksonville</td>
<td>7,343</td>
<td>33,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Austin</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>52,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Charlotte</td>
<td>11,610</td>
<td>53,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Raleigh</td>
<td>5,868</td>
<td>27,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Milwaukee</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>23,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cleveland</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>34,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>3,599</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,781</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Indianapolis</td>
<td>4,873</td>
<td>26,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Nashville</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>25,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Kansas City</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>25,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Portland</td>
<td>9,149</td>
<td>29,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Cincinnati</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>22,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Louisville</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>13,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Providence</td>
<td>9,494</td>
<td>18,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Minneapolis</td>
<td>7,189</td>
<td>40,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>14,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minority-owned businesses as a percentage of all businesses, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Survey of Business Owners

(© ranked from highest to lowest)
Indicator 2.07: Women’s Business Ownership

This indicator includes Census Bureau data on minority business ownership, defined as firms whose sole proprietor, or at least 51% of the ownership, is a woman. These data are unchanged from the 2016 report, with recalculation to reflect the current 100 largest metro areas. Note these data are based on 2003 metro area boundaries.

### Number of women-owned businesses, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of businesses owned by women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>44,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>91,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>62,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>340,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>77,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>73,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>60,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>68,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>57,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>105,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,239</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>61,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>63,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>38,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>63,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>40,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>58,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>109,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>54,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>33,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>55,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>42,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>54,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Women-owned businesses as a percentage of all businesses, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percentage of women-owned businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.6%</strong> (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Survey of Business Owners

(#) ranked from highest to lowest
**Indicator 2.08: Income & Wages**

This indicator includes data from the American Community Survey and BLS to compare median hourly wages and per capita income across metro areas. Per capita income is an average obtained by dividing aggregate income by the total population of an area; it does not reflect income distribution. Here per capita income is adjusted via the Cost of Living Index to reflect cost of living in the Columbus metro. This results in a lower per capita income than the estimate for locations with a high cost of living, such as San Jose or Chicago.

### Median hourly wage and per capita income, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Median hourly wage (unadjusted $)</th>
<th>Per capita income (unadjusted $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$27.66</td>
<td>$51,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>$18.56</td>
<td>$37,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>$21.26</td>
<td>$39,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>$18.47</td>
<td>$34,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>$18.52</td>
<td>$36,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.38</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>$18.18</td>
<td>$33,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>$17.67</td>
<td>$33,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$18.12</td>
<td>$34,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>$17.68</td>
<td>$32,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>$18.59</td>
<td>$33,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>$18.04</td>
<td>$32,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
<td>$31,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>$16.78</td>
<td>$31,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$18.43</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>$15.52</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$19.67</td>
<td>$36,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>$16.54</td>
<td>$29,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$20.15</td>
<td>$33,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>$19.01</td>
<td>$34,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$20.41</td>
<td>$36,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$20.15</td>
<td>$36,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>$16.65</td>
<td>$27,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Per capita income adjusted for Columbus’ cost of living, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Per capita income (adjusted for Columbus’ cost of living)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$34,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>$33,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>$33,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>$33,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>$32,887 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>$32,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>$31,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>$31,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$31,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>$31,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>$30,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>$30,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>$29,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>$28,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$26,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>$26,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$25,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>$25,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$25,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>$25,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$17,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$16,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>$17,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast


(1) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 2.09: Occupations

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on the distribution of jobs in five selected major occupational categories. Occupations describe a set of activities or tasks that employees are paid to perform. Management, business, science, and arts occupations highlighted in the graph are commonly known as white-collar or professional occupations, which tend to require higher levels of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Sales &amp; Office</th>
<th>Natural resources, construction, maint.</th>
<th>Production, transportation, material moving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Raleigh</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Austin</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Minneapolis</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Portland</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>16.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 San Diego</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kansas City</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sacramento</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cincinnati</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Indianapolis</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Milwaukee</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cleveland</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Charlotte</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Nashville</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Chicago</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Providence</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jacksonville</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Orlando</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 San Antonio</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Louisville</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Las Vegas</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(6) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 2.10: Workforce

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on population of working age. The entry to exit ratio compares a metro area’s ages 15 to 24 population to its ages 55 to 64 population, with a higher (>1) ratio indicating a greater percentage of younger people. The workforce participation rate is the proportion of the population in the labor force, which includes persons employed or unemployed and looking for work. The ages 25 to 34 age bracket represents the “young professionals” population segment of a metro area. The population percentage of prime working age includes all persons ages 22 to 54.

Workforce entry and exit ratio and participation rate, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Workforce entry to exit population ratio</th>
<th>Workforce participation rate (ages 16-64)</th>
<th>Percentage of population ages 25-34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Austin</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 San Jose</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Raleigh</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Diego</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Portland</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nashville</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Orlando</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>1.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Las Vegas</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Charlotte</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Chicago</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Minneapolis</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 San Antonio</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Indianapolis</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Kansas City</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jacksonville</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sacramento</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Louisville</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Milwaukee</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Providence</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Cincinnati</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Cleveland</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(T-8) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 2.11: Unemployment

This indicator includes BLS data on employment and unemployment as an annual average for the previous year. A person is considered unemployed if he, she, or they are willing and able to work for pay but unable to find work, thus still in the labor force. The percentage of these persons in the labor force represents the unemployment rate.

### Number in civilian workforce and unemployed, 2017 average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number in the workforce</th>
<th>Number unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nashville</td>
<td>1,005,655</td>
<td>25,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Austin</td>
<td>1,149,397</td>
<td>34,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,984,759</td>
<td>58,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indianapolis</td>
<td>1,042,731</td>
<td>31,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 San Jose</td>
<td>1,060,367</td>
<td>32,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Milwaukee</td>
<td>827,761</td>
<td>27,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 San Antonio</td>
<td>1,158,967</td>
<td>39,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kansas City</td>
<td>1,121,041</td>
<td>40,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Orlando</td>
<td>1,299,512</td>
<td>47,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jacksonville</td>
<td>761,571</td>
<td>29,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Portland</td>
<td>1,300,364</td>
<td>46,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Raleigh</td>
<td>694,574</td>
<td>26,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 San Diego</td>
<td>1,573,912</td>
<td>58,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>1,074,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,202</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Louisville</td>
<td>658,865</td>
<td>27,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Charlotte</td>
<td>1,311,955</td>
<td>53,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,110,279</td>
<td>44,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Providence</td>
<td>677,845</td>
<td>27,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Sacramento</td>
<td>1,072,845</td>
<td>44,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Chicago</td>
<td>4,887,412</td>
<td>213,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1,208,762</td>
<td>59,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Las Vegas</td>
<td>1,066,716</td>
<td>54,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Cleveland</td>
<td>1,029,479</td>
<td>56,679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regions:** Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast


(*) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 2.12: Brain Gain

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on the educational attainment of persons age 25 and older who moved to a metro area from a different state or abroad in the previous year.

Nearly 29,000 adults from outside Ohio were estimated to have moved to the Columbus metro in 2017. Over half hold a Bachelor’s degree or higher, reflecting opportunity in more skilled positions that may not all be filled by regional college graduates.

### Level of education among new residents age 25+, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percent without a HS diploma</th>
<th>Percent with HS diploma or GED only</th>
<th>Percent with a Bachelor’s degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage new residents age 25+ with a graduate degree, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>23.3% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

(8) ranked from highest to lowest
This section includes indicators of income, economic equity, homeownership, and housing affordability that describe the prosperity of residents of the metro areas.

The following are the Personal Prosperity indicator categories:

| 3.01   | Household Income       |
| 3.02   | Income Gap             |
| 3.03   | Pay Equality           |
| 3.04   | Poverty                |
| 3.05   | Low Income Population  |
| 3.06   | Income Supports        |
| 3.07   | Earned Income Tax Credit |
| 3.08   | Foreclosures           |
| 3.09   | Homeownership          |
| 3.10   | Housing Starts         |
| 3.11   | Housing & Transportation Costs |
Personal Prosperity Section Highlights

Columbus has made strides in narrowing the gap between high and low earners (3.02)

Among the 10 fastest growing metros in the cohort, Columbus lags in issuing building permits for new housing units (3.10, 1.01)

Compared to other fast growing metros, Columbus has faced difficulty lowering its poverty rate over the course of this decade compared to its peers. (3.04)
Personal Prosperity Ranking

Where does Columbus rank among the 23 cohort metros in this section? This table displays Columbus's rank for each indicator, along with the top and bottom ranking metros in the cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (1 metro)</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Top tier</th>
<th>Middle tier</th>
<th>Bottom tier</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Top tier</th>
<th>Middle tier</th>
<th>Bottom tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$117,474 (San Jose)</td>
<td>$63,764 (Cleveland)</td>
<td>$52,489 (Cleveland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income gap ratio *</td>
<td>3.08 (Nashville, Raleigh)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.41 (Providence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay ratio, women to men cents per $1</td>
<td>89.4 (San Diego)</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>71.6 (San Jose)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in poverty* (%)</td>
<td>7.3% (San Jose)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14.8% (Cleveland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons below 200% of poverty* (%)</td>
<td>17.9% (San Jose)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>35.5% (Orlando)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households receiving public assistance (%)</td>
<td>5.7% (San Jose)</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>15.9% (Providence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax returns claiming EITC (%)</td>
<td>24% (Orlando)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.1% (San Jose)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosures headed to auction* (%)</td>
<td>11% (Cleveland)</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>59.7% (San Antonio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership (%)</td>
<td>70.2% (Minneapolis)</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>53.5% (San Diego)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits issued per 1,000 housing units</td>
<td>32.2 (Austin)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.9 (Providence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H+T Affordability Index*</td>
<td>45% (Minneapolis)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58% (Orlando)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Columbus metro area

These indicators are ranked from highest (1) to lowest (23), except (*) ranked lowest (1) to highest (23).
Indicator 3.01: Household Income

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on median household income for metro populations as a whole and selected racial and ethnic populations. Median household income splits all households in a metro into two halves: half earn below the median and half earn above. Household incomes are derived from numerous sources including wages & salary; interest; dividends; Social Security; Supplemental Security Income; other cash assistance payments; and any other sources of income received regularly, such as unemployment compensation, child support, or alimony.

Median household income by race & ethnicity, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino (any race)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$116,268</td>
<td>$79,090</td>
<td>$141,922</td>
<td>$74,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>$81,950</td>
<td>$39,746</td>
<td>$76,945</td>
<td>$54,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$77,484</td>
<td>$46,866</td>
<td>$95,631</td>
<td>$57,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>$77,683</td>
<td>$53,443</td>
<td>$90,093</td>
<td>$58,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>$81,581</td>
<td>$53,943</td>
<td>$99,882</td>
<td>$47,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$72,952</td>
<td>$39,557</td>
<td>$85,115</td>
<td>$54,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$77,972</td>
<td>$39,067</td>
<td>$87,226</td>
<td>$54,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$72,820</td>
<td>$46,709</td>
<td>$74,254</td>
<td>$56,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>$69,395</td>
<td>$39,803</td>
<td>$74,904</td>
<td>$37,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>$68,089</td>
<td>$49,294</td>
<td>$79,364</td>
<td>$49,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>$69,985</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,898</strong></td>
<td><strong>$74,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,965</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>$70,394</td>
<td>$36,976</td>
<td>$70,794</td>
<td>$48,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>$67,575</td>
<td>$35,039</td>
<td>$80,845</td>
<td>$53,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>$67,848</td>
<td>$45,526</td>
<td>$90,781</td>
<td>$48,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>$65,533</td>
<td>$35,868</td>
<td>$69,837</td>
<td>$45,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>$69,057</td>
<td>$29,013</td>
<td>$67,171</td>
<td>$41,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>$64,122</td>
<td>$39,214</td>
<td>$74,328</td>
<td>$53,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$61,505</td>
<td>$30,552</td>
<td>$78,799</td>
<td>$49,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>$61,304</td>
<td>$37,757</td>
<td>$70,326</td>
<td>$46,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>$61,798</td>
<td>$39,941</td>
<td>$64,279</td>
<td>$50,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>$58,995</td>
<td>$46,814</td>
<td>$70,847</td>
<td>$48,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>$58,064</td>
<td>$41,731</td>
<td>$69,948</td>
<td>$44,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$61,608</td>
<td>$29,661</td>
<td>$65,851</td>
<td>$31,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(1) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 3.02: Income Gap

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on household income distribution and the gap between those in the highest quintile (top 20%, or 80th percentile) and lowest quintile (bottom 20%, or 20th percentile). The income gap ratio is the difference between the highest and lowest quintiles, divided by the lowest quintile. A higher ratio indicates a greater wealth disparity between the highest and lowest earning households.

Columbus has made progress in narrowing the income gap in recent years, but more work is left to be done. Based on 2015 research from the Martin Prosperity Institute, the region has high levels of segregation along lines of household income, educational attainment, and occupation class.

Household incomes at 20th and 80th percentiles, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Income level, 20th percentile</th>
<th>Income level, 80th percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nashville</td>
<td>$29,528</td>
<td>$120,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Raleigh</td>
<td>$33,671</td>
<td>$137,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Minneapolis</td>
<td>$34,948</td>
<td>$143,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Austin</td>
<td>$33,673</td>
<td>$141,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Las Vegas</td>
<td>$25,685</td>
<td>$108,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jacksonville</td>
<td>$25,837</td>
<td>$110,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kansas City</td>
<td>$28,413</td>
<td>$121,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Portland</td>
<td>$31,307</td>
<td>$134,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>$27,083</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120,271</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Louisville</td>
<td>$24,896</td>
<td>$111,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Indianapolis</td>
<td>$25,850</td>
<td>$117,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Charlotte</td>
<td>$26,426</td>
<td>$121,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Orlando</td>
<td>$23,773</td>
<td>$110,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cincinnati</td>
<td>$25,892</td>
<td>$120,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 San Diego</td>
<td>$31,929</td>
<td>$149,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 San Antonio</td>
<td>$23,773</td>
<td>$112,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sacramento</td>
<td>$27,562</td>
<td>$132,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Milwaukee</td>
<td>$24,462</td>
<td>$117,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$23,543</td>
<td>$115,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 San Jose</td>
<td>$45,835</td>
<td>$226,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Chicago</td>
<td>$27,296</td>
<td>$136,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cleveland</td>
<td>$21,076</td>
<td>$107,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Providence</td>
<td>$23,830</td>
<td>$128,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

Columbus Trends: Income gap ratio, 80th and 20th percentile

Income gap ratio, 80th and 20th percentiles, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Income gap ratio</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(###) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 3.03: Pay Equality

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on disparities in median income between men and women working full-time, year-round (FTYR). It compares women’s pay equality with that of men for the same amount of work in terms of cents on the dollar. Also included are median earnings for all female workers, including those working part-time or not year-round.

Similar to overall pay equality, Columbus has also made progress in closing the gender pay gap recently, having the most parity among Midwest metros in the cohort. As the south and west continue to lead the way in this category however, more work could be made.

Women’s median earnings, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Median earnings for all workers who are women</th>
<th>Median earnings for FTYR workers who are women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$31,499</td>
<td>$47,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>$26,819</td>
<td>$37,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>$29,479</td>
<td>$37,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$31,660</td>
<td>$47,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>$32,922</td>
<td>$47,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>$31,111</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,415</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>$25,477</td>
<td>$35,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>$28,334</td>
<td>$39,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>$31,123</td>
<td>$47,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>$35,460</td>
<td>$50,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>$31,004</td>
<td>$43,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>$30,436</td>
<td>$40,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>$30,564</td>
<td>$42,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>$30,260</td>
<td>$41,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$31,467</td>
<td>$46,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>$31,398</td>
<td>$41,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>$29,351</td>
<td>$39,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>$30,738</td>
<td>$41,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$28,804</td>
<td>$41,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$31,184</td>
<td>$46,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$29,649</td>
<td>$41,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>$34,036</td>
<td>$45,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$40,122</td>
<td>$61,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pay ratio, women to men, cents per $1, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Pay ratio, women to men, cents per $1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>85.1 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(6) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 3.04: Poverty

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on poverty rates for total metro area populations and selected racial and ethnic groups. The poverty rate is the percentage of a population in households living below the federal poverty level (FPL), as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau.

While Columbus has made some progress reducing the racial and ethnic disparities in poverty, it has struggled to reduce its overall poverty rate. This is dependent on multiple factors, from continued population growth to broader economic changes as well as access to housing and resources. How the region addresses short and long-term solutions will be important in future years.

Percentage of the total population below poverty level, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino (any race)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(T-16)
**Indicator 3.05: Low Income Population**

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on persons living in households with incomes below 200% of the FPL, a common threshold for identifying low-income households. Eligibility for some public assistance programs is capped at 200% FPL, and households living between 100% and 200% of the FPL can fall below the poverty line with one unexpected expense.

Compared to the last Benchmarking report’s 2015 data, about 6% fewer individuals are below the 200% threshold in Columbus. This represents an improvement but a smaller rate of change than the majority of the cohort, potentially raising questions about upward mobility in the metro.

### Population living below 200% FPL, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Population for whom poverty status is determined</th>
<th>Population in households with incomes below 200% FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>1,968,281</td>
<td>352,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3,541,902</td>
<td>722,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>2,075,485</td>
<td>513,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>1,311,431</td>
<td>324,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2,416,359</td>
<td>606,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>2,093,648</td>
<td>528,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,274,436</td>
<td>596,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>1,866,893</td>
<td>495,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>1,563,712</td>
<td>416,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>2,129,686</td>
<td>569,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>9,377,896</td>
<td>2,586,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>3,256,674</td>
<td>904,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>2,022,554</strong></td>
<td><strong>565,700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1,266,860</td>
<td>360,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>1,985,375</td>
<td>570,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>2,489,929</td>
<td>730,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2,291,340</td>
<td>674,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,545,491</td>
<td>455,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>1,476,247</td>
<td>451,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>2,016,558</td>
<td>624,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>2,174,635</td>
<td>712,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>2,429,570</td>
<td>857,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>2,465,956</td>
<td>874,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

**Regions:** Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

(®) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 3.06: Income Supports

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on households that received government income supports in the previous 12 months. These include Supplemental Security Income (SSI), cash public assistance payments from state or local governments, or food stamps/Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits.

Households receiving SSI, cash assistance, and food stamps/SNAP, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>SSI</th>
<th>Cash public assistance</th>
<th>Food stamps/SNAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>30,935</td>
<td>13,806</td>
<td>30,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Austin</td>
<td>19,561</td>
<td>9,111</td>
<td>50,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Raleigh</td>
<td>17,296</td>
<td>4,082</td>
<td>36,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kansas City</td>
<td>29,775</td>
<td>14,815</td>
<td>61,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 San Diego</td>
<td>53,339</td>
<td>25,048</td>
<td>82,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Minneapolis</td>
<td>58,306</td>
<td>45,460</td>
<td>99,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Indianapolis</td>
<td>34,367</td>
<td>8,962</td>
<td>66,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nashville</td>
<td>31,589</td>
<td>10,404</td>
<td>62,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Charlotte</td>
<td>37,043</td>
<td>13,167</td>
<td>91,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sacramento</td>
<td>52,858</td>
<td>30,080</td>
<td>78,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cincinnati</td>
<td>47,148</td>
<td>21,185</td>
<td>84,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Louisville</td>
<td>27,480</td>
<td>7,452</td>
<td>52,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 San Antonio</td>
<td>44,854</td>
<td>11,970</td>
<td>92,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Columbus</td>
<td>46,383</td>
<td>19,206</td>
<td>88,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Chicago</td>
<td>154,410</td>
<td>70,387</td>
<td>423,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Milwaukee</td>
<td>36,103</td>
<td>10,715</td>
<td>77,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Portland</td>
<td>40,933</td>
<td>31,340</td>
<td>117,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>55,468</td>
<td>28,995</td>
<td>129,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Las Vegas</td>
<td>32,666</td>
<td>20,778</td>
<td>102,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jacksonville</td>
<td>26,779</td>
<td>12,949</td>
<td>73,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Orlando</td>
<td>36,503</td>
<td>20,729</td>
<td>121,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cleveland</td>
<td>53,155</td>
<td>25,176</td>
<td>122,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Providence</td>
<td>46,802</td>
<td>24,545</td>
<td>94,307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of households receiving cash public assistance or food stamps/SNAP, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 100</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>11.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

Regions: Red=Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

(##) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 3.07: Earned Income Tax Credit

This indicator includes data from the Brookings Institution and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) on tax returns claiming the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The EITC is a federal income tax credit for low-income workers reducing the amount of tax an individual owes and may be returned in the form of a refund. Note that Columbus trend data for 2012 and earlier are based on 2003 MSA boundaries.

Total number of tax returns, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total number of tax returns</th>
<th>Tax returns claiming EITC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>1,117,700</td>
<td>268,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>1,057,600</td>
<td>232,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>682,090</td>
<td>140,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>957,920</td>
<td>189,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1,081,420</td>
<td>212,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>794,890</td>
<td>149,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>600,430</td>
<td>111,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>682,090</td>
<td>140,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>957,920</td>
<td>189,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1,081,420</td>
<td>212,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>794,890</td>
<td>149,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>600,430</td>
<td>111,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>964,490</td>
<td>160,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1,034,780</td>
<td>171,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>999,130</td>
<td>164,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>4,608,660</td>
<td>739,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,531,220</td>
<td>243,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,029,540</td>
<td>163,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>789,140</td>
<td>121,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>569,440</td>
<td>85,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>767,170</td>
<td>115,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>982,620</td>
<td>147,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>977,490</td>
<td>128,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1,118,280</td>
<td>145,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1,190,990</td>
<td>150,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,751,440</td>
<td>202,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>924,540</td>
<td>93,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columbus Trends: Percentage of tax returns claiming the EITC

Percentage of tax returns claiming the EITC, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 100</th>
<th>Percentage of tax returns claiming the EITC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: Brookings Institute, IRS

(#) ranked highest to lowest
Indicator 3.08: Foreclosures

This indicator includes data from Attom Data on foreclosure activity. This indicator has been modified from the 2016 report, no trend data are available.

Housing units in foreclosure, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total foreclosures</th>
<th>Foreclosures as a percent of all housing units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>21,984</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>11,547</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>11,154</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>82,388</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>12,591</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>14,972</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>9,733</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>11,085</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>5,034</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>6,429</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>9,169</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>7,127</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>5,907</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>2,991</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>6,791</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of units in foreclosure heading to auction, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Foreclosures as a percent of all housing units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3.09: Homeownership

This indicator includes American Community Survey data on homeownership. A housing unit is considered owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit, and includes both units with a mortgage and units fully paid off.

In past Benchmarking reports Columbus has typically been in the lower half of the cohort for homeownership rates. The region’s percentage has not returned to pre-recession levels, with 2017’s 61.8% well below the 65.3% rate in 2007. As regional population grows, inventories of for sale homes remain tight, and preferences in owning compared to renting continue to evolve, implications of these data for regional prosperity may warrant reconsideration in future years.

Owner-occupied housing units, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total occupied housing units</th>
<th>Total owner-occupied housing units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,376,557</td>
<td>966,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>996,798</td>
<td>696,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Raleigh</td>
<td>493,879</td>
<td>330,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Louisville</td>
<td>502,581</td>
<td>335,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cincinnati</td>
<td>852,639</td>
<td>562,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Charlotte</td>
<td>944,261</td>
<td>619,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Indianapolis</td>
<td>773,361</td>
<td>506,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nashville</td>
<td>717,370</td>
<td>466,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kansas City</td>
<td>829,475</td>
<td>535,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Cleveland</td>
<td>862,586</td>
<td>555,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Chicago</td>
<td>3,488,312</td>
<td>2,245,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jacksonville</td>
<td>560,169</td>
<td>356,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 San Antonio</td>
<td>810,473</td>
<td>512,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Portland</td>
<td>935,722</td>
<td>591,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Providence</td>
<td>627,318</td>
<td>388,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Columbus</td>
<td>788,946</td>
<td>487,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Orlando</td>
<td>875,259</td>
<td>529,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sacramento</td>
<td>829,772</td>
<td>499,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Milwaukee</td>
<td>625,495</td>
<td>373,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Austin</td>
<td>755,333</td>
<td>435,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 San Jose</td>
<td>651,006</td>
<td>372,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Las Vegas</td>
<td>781,796</td>
<td>423,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 San Diego</td>
<td>1,126,419</td>
<td>602,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Columbus Trends: Percentage of owner-occupied housing units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(16) ranked highest to lowest
Indicator 3.10: Housing Starts

This indicator includes Census Bureau data on new housing unit permits. As metro populations and households change, the type of housing stock that accommodates them may need to be built, such as multifamily apartments for persons living alone or single family homes for larger households. This indicator returns after last being featured in the 2011 Benchmarking report.

As the fastest growing metro in the Midwest, Columbus is not building new housing at the same rate as similarly growing areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of housing permits issued</th>
<th>Percent permits issued to multifamily units</th>
<th>Total housing units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>828,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>534,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>20,631</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>779,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>22,869</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>1,028,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>12,959</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>644,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>19,065</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>1,033,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>15,983</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>992,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>14,073</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>899,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>12,516</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>893,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>8,539</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>690,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>9,851</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>909,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>860,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>9,503</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>901,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>1,447,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>556,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>8,892</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>861,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>10,441</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>1,214,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>932,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>22,132</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>3,843,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>678,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>4,328</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>1,126,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>962,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>703,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Survey of Building Permits, American Community Survey

(#) ranked highest to lowest
**Indicator 3.11: Housing & Transportation Costs**

This indicator includes data on housing and transportation costs from the Center for Neighborhood Technology. Traditional definitions of affordability include housing costs but not transportation costs. The H+T Affordability Index was designed to measure true affordability by adding both together as a percentage of household income, with housing costs based on American Community Survey estimates and transportation costs based on motor vehicle ownership and use, transit use, and costs associated with those variables. Due to rounding, bar chart figures may differ slightly from data in the table.

### Housing & Transportation Affordability, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Housing costs as a percentage of median household income</th>
<th>Transportation costs as a percentage of median household income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orlando</strong></td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for Neighborhood Technology, H+T Affordability Index

### Columbus Trends: Housing & Transportation Affordability Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing &amp; Transportation Affordability Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

(?) ranked lowest to highest
Section 4: Lifelong Learning

This section includes indicators of literacy, school engagement, educational attainment, and access to research and learning that describe the educational resources of metro areas.

The following are the Lifelong Learning indicator categories:

4.01 High School Attendance
4.02 Educational Attainment
4.03 Pre-K Enrollment
4.04 School Lunch Assistance
4.05 Libraries
4.06 Research Universities
4.07 Broadband Availability
Compared to peer metros, pre-K enrollment in Columbus has tumbled since 2011 (4.03)

Among Midwestern metros, Columbus households are less likely to be lacking in internet access (4.07)

Six metros stand out in awarding doctoral degrees—does it lead to a more educated population? (4.02, 4.06)
Lifelong Learning Ranking

Where does Columbus rank among the 23 cohort metros in this section? This table displays Columbus’s rank for each indicator, along with the top and bottom ranking metros in the cohort.

| Indicator (Y1 metro)                                      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | Indicator (Y23 metro) |
| Status dropout rate* (%)                                 | 1.7% (Sacramento) |   |   |   |   | 2.6% |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 6% (Indianapolis) |
| Population 25+ with a graduate degree (%)                | 25% (San Jose)   |   |   |   |   | 13.9% |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 8.5% (Las Vegas) |
| Children 3-4 enrolled in school (%)                      | 57.6% (San Jose) |   |   |   |   | 40.7% |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 35.7% (Las Vegas) |
| K-12 students eligible for FRPL* (%)                    | 36.1% (Minneapolis) |   |   |   |   | 40.6% |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 61.5% (Orlando)** |
| Public library visits per capita                         | 8.92 (Cleveland) |   |   |   |   | 6.04 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 2.88 (Charlotte) |
| Research doctorates granted per 100,000 population       | 43.8 (Austin)   |   |   |   |   | 35 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 (Kansas City)** |
| Households without internet access* (%)                  | 7.5% (San Jose)  |   |   |   |   | 12.2% |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 17.7% (Cleveland) |

Middle tier

Top tier

Columbus metro area

These indicators are ranked from highest (1) to lowest (23), except (*) ranked lowest (1) to highest (23). (***) denotes ranked 22nd, data missing for one metro in the cohort.
Indicator 4.01: High School Attendance

This indicator includes data from the American Community Survey on high school attendance. It measures the percentage of teens age 16 to 19 that are neither currently enrolled in school nor hold a high school diploma, known as the status dropout rate. Also measured is the idle teen rate, or the percentage of 16 to 19-year-olds who are neither in school nor the labor force. These teens may or may not also be high school dropouts.

Idle teens, ages 16 to 19, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percentage of population ages 16-19 not in school &amp; not in labor force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sacramento</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 San Jose</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nashville</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Diego</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Portland</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>3.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cincinnati</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Louisville</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Chicago</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Minneapolis</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Kansas City</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Orlando</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Milwaukee</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Providence</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Raleigh</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cleveland</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 San Antonio</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Charlotte</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Austin</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Las Vegas</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Jacksonville</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Indianapolis</td>
<td><strong>4.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

Status dropout rate, ages 16 to 19, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percentage of population ages 16-19 not in school &amp; not in labor force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sacramento</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 San Jose</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nashville</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Diego</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Portland</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>2.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cincinnati</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Louisville</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Chicago</td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Minneapolis</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Kansas City</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Orlando</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Milwaukee</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Providence</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Raleigh</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cleveland</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 San Antonio</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Charlotte</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Austin</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Las Vegas</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Jacksonville</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Indianapolis</td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(Ranked from lowest to highest)
Indicator 4.02: Educational Attainment

This indicator includes data from the American Community Survey on the educational attainment of the entire adult population (ages 25 years and up) in a given region.

Despite concentrations of employment in knowledge-intensive industries and four-year colleges, Columbus’s ranking for adults with college degrees slipped slightly from the last Benchmarking report. This may be attributed to continued population growth, but may also invite questions about the state of opportunities in the region.

Educational attainment, population 25 years and older, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percent without a HS diploma</th>
<th>Percent with a HS diploma only</th>
<th>Percent with a bachelor’s degree or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Raleigh</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Austin</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Portland</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 San Diego</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Minneapolis</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Chicago</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kansas City</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Indianapolis</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>8.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Cincinnati</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Milwaukee</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nashville</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Providence</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Cleveland</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Louisville</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Charlotte</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sacramento</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jacksonville</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Orlando</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 San Antonio</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Las Vegas</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of population 25 years and older with a graduate degree, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 100</th>
<th>12.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(1) ranked from highest to lowest
**Indicator 4.03: Pre-K Enrollment**

This indicator includes data from the American Community Survey on school enrollment of children ages 3 and 4, including the type of school (public or private). A limitation of the data is it does not represent all nursery and preschool enrollment, as these institutions include children outside the 3 to 4 age range.

Within Columbus, school enrollment in this age group has been on the decline as the decade has progressed. Ranked 21st at 40.7%, this is the metro’s lowest rank in the cohort yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of children ages 3-4 enrolled in public school</th>
<th>Number of children ages 3-4 enrolled in private school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>9,797</td>
<td>19,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>13,202</td>
<td>13,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Diego</td>
<td>23,551</td>
<td>23,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chicago</td>
<td>74,006</td>
<td>53,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Kansas City</td>
<td>17,328</td>
<td>13,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Portland</td>
<td>12,221</td>
<td>18,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Austin</td>
<td>14,026</td>
<td>14,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Milwaukee</td>
<td>13,576</td>
<td>6,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Minneapolis</td>
<td>29,861</td>
<td>18,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Orlando</td>
<td>16,370</td>
<td>13,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sacramento</td>
<td>18,512</td>
<td>9,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Raleigh</td>
<td>8,273</td>
<td>8,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Providence</td>
<td>8,042</td>
<td>7,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cincinnati</td>
<td>13,629</td>
<td>12,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Cleveland</td>
<td>10,892</td>
<td>9,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Indianapolis</td>
<td>14,730</td>
<td>9,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Nashville</td>
<td>10,447</td>
<td>11,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jackson ville</td>
<td>8,358</td>
<td>7,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Charlotte</td>
<td>14,680</td>
<td>14,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 San Antonio</td>
<td>20,084</td>
<td>10,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>13,827</strong> <strong>9,572</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Louisville</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>7,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Las Vegas</td>
<td>12,227</td>
<td>8,353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

This indicator provides the number of children ages 3-4 enrolled in public and private schools for various metro areas. The table shows the enrollment numbers for each city, with Columbus ranked 21st in enrollment percentage. The infographic illustrates the trend over the years, with a notable decline in enrollment rates. The source of the data is the American Community Survey.
Indicator 4.04: School Lunch Assistance

This indicator includes data from the National Center for Education Statistics on all K-12 students that are eligible for free or reduced price lunch (FRPL).

While fluctuating from year to year, most metros in the cohort have trended toward an increase in FRPL eligibility from the beginning of the current decade. Columbus is not an exception, but its proportion has remained low compared to other Benchmarking metros throughout.

### K-12 students eligible for free and reduced price lunch, 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of K-12 Students eligible for free lunch</th>
<th>Number of K-12 students eligible for reduced price lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Minneapolis</td>
<td>168,941</td>
<td>37,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Raleigh</td>
<td>69,168</td>
<td>9,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Jose</td>
<td>88,805</td>
<td>19,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Milwaukee</td>
<td>84,856</td>
<td>7,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>112,859</td>
<td>9,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 <strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td>122,866</td>
<td>11,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Portland</td>
<td>124,473</td>
<td>22,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kansas City</td>
<td>128,478</td>
<td>21,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cincinnati</td>
<td>124,490</td>
<td>12,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jacksonville</td>
<td>76,949</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cleveland</td>
<td>115,999</td>
<td>9,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Austin</td>
<td>135,107</td>
<td>21,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 <strong>Indianapolis</strong></td>
<td>136,898</td>
<td>21,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nashville</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sacramento</td>
<td>153,942</td>
<td>30,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Chicago</td>
<td>730,933</td>
<td>43,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Charlotte</td>
<td>189,325</td>
<td>16,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 San Diego</td>
<td>207,593</td>
<td>49,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Louisville</td>
<td>92,466</td>
<td>9,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 San Antonio</td>
<td>238,280</td>
<td>24,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Las Vegas</td>
<td>182,284</td>
<td>30,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Orlando</td>
<td>173,908</td>
<td>22,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Providence</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data

### Percentage of K-12 students eligible for FRPL, 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) ranked lowest to highest

### Columbus Trends: Percentage of K-12 students eligible for FRPL

- **2011-12**: 40.1%
- **2012-13**: 40.9%
- **2013-14**: 39.9%
- **2014-15**: 41.8%
- **2015-16**: 40.6%

Region: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

This indicator includes data from the National Center for Education Statistics on all K-12 students that are eligible for free or reduced price lunch (FRPL). While fluctuating from year to year, most metros in the cohort have trended toward an increase in FRPL eligibility from the beginning of the current decade. Columbus is not an exception, but its proportion has remained low compared to other Benchmarking metros throughout.
**Indicator 4.05: Libraries**

This indicator includes data from the Institute of Museum and Library Services on public library statistics. A public library is a library accessible to residents and generally funded from public sources.

Throughout the decade Columbus and many other cohort metros have trended toward a decrease in library visits per capita, but with a greater array of digital services have trended upward in total registered borrowers and annual circulation. Columbus has often ranked high among Benchmarking metros in this area, ranking third in visits per capita and fifth in total circulation in 2016.

### Circulation, attendance, library cards, and visits, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total annual circulation (thousands)</th>
<th>Total annual program attendance (thousands)</th>
<th>Total registered borrowers (thousands)</th>
<th>Total annual library visits (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cleveland</td>
<td>43,189</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>18,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 San Jose</td>
<td>26,819</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 <strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,553</strong></td>
<td><strong>797</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,368</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cincinnati</td>
<td>37,906</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>12,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Chicago</td>
<td>89,430</td>
<td>4,134</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>54,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Portland</td>
<td>41,710</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>12,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Milwaukee</td>
<td>14,383</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>8,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kansas City</td>
<td>21,982</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>10,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Providence</td>
<td>9,388</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>7,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>14,241</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>10,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 San Diego</td>
<td>21,571</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>15,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Indianapolis</td>
<td>26,189</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>9,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Minneapolis</td>
<td>36,263</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>15,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Louisville</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Orlando</td>
<td>17,306</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>8,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jacksonville</td>
<td>8,397</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>5,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Las Vegas</td>
<td>16,439</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nashville</td>
<td>10,169</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>6,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Sacramento</td>
<td>13,123</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>7,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Austin</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>6,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Raleigh</td>
<td>10,886</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 San Antonio</td>
<td>9,747</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>7,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Charlotte</td>
<td>12,115</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>7,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual public library visits per capita, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 100</th>
<th>4.32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: Institute for Museum and Library Services, Public Libraries in the United States Survey

(3) ranked highest to lowest
Indicator 4.06: Research Universities

This indicator includes data from the National Science Foundation on doctorate-granting institutions. It measures the annual number of research doctoral degrees (excluding professional doctoral degrees, such as those in medicine and law) awarded at regional colleges and universities.

Columbus ranks in a class apart from the other Benchmarking metros in granting doctorates, joining five other metros characterized by either land grant public institutions (Ohio State in Columbus, North Carolina State in Raleigh, University of Minnesota in Minneapolis), flagship public universities (University of Texas at Austin), or private schools strongly rooted in scientific research (Carnegie Mellon in Pittsburgh, Stanford near San Jose).

### Research degrees and research universities, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of institutions granting research doctoral degrees</th>
<th>Number of research doctoral degrees awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Austin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 San Jose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Minneapolis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Raleigh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Columbus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>716</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Providence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sacramento</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 San Diego</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nashville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Milwaukee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Chicago</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cincinnati</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Louisville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Cleveland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Orlando</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 San Antonio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Las Vegas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Portland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Charlotte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Indianapolis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Kansas City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Jacksonville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red=Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: National Science Foundation, Survey of Earned Doctorates

### Columbus Trends: Research doctoral degrees per 100,000 population

![Graph showing Columbus Trends: Research doctoral degrees per 100,000 population, 2012-2016](image)

### Research doctoral degrees awarded per 100,000 population, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Research doctoral degrees awarded per 100,000 population, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 100</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>35.0 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) ranked highest to lowest
Indicator 4.07: Broadband Availability

This indicator includes data from the American Community Survey on internet availability in households. As more educational, healthcare, and employment resources move to online formats, the “digital divide” among households with reliable internet access and those that do not becomes a salient issue. Households with a cellular data plan can only access the internet on a mobile device, and would need a school or library to access a computer or laptop. Households with non-broadband subscriptions, such as dial-up, are also measured.

Households with limited internet subscriptions, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percent with internet via cellular data plan only</th>
<th>Percent with non-broadband internet subscription (dial-up, DSL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Raleigh</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Diego</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Portland</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Austin</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Columbus</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Orlando</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Charlotte</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cincinnati</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kansas City</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nashville</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Chicago</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Jacksonville</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Providence</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Indianapolis</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Las Vegas</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Louisville</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 San Antonio</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Milwaukee</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Cleveland</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

Columbus Trends: Households without an internet subscription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(®) ranked from lowest to highest
Section 5: Community Wellbeing

This section includes indicators of health, safety, civic life, transportation, environmental quality, and cultural opportunities that describe the wellbeing of the metro areas.

The following are the Community Wellbeing indicator categories:

5.01 Local Foods
5.02 Obesity
5.03 Diabetes
5.04 Asthma
5.05 Infant Mortality
5.06 Overdose Deaths
5.07 Access to Care
5.08 Charitable Giving
5.09 Volunteering
5.10 Women in Political Leadership
5.11 Women in Corporate Leadership
5.12 Crime
5.13 Road Safety
5.14 Commute Time
5.15 Commute Mode
5.16 Walking & Biking
5.17 Public Transportation
5.18 Air Travel
5.19 Air Quality
Community Wellbeing Section Highlights

In metros with comparable urban density, commute modes and traffic fatalities vary considerably. (1.08, 5.13, 5.15)

Commute modes can impact health, with alternate modes such as walking or biking contributing to less sedentary lifestyles. How do obesity rates and alternate commute mode use interact? (5.02, 5.15)

The Columbus metro has made strides reducing its violent crime rate* this decade (5.12)

*rates are displayed per 100,000 population
Where does Columbus rank among the 23 cohort metros in this section? This table displays Columbus’s rank for each indicator, along with the top and bottom ranking metros in the cohort.

These indicators are ranked from highest (1) to lowest (23), except (*) ranked lowest (1) to highest (23). (***) denotes ranked lower than 23rd, data missing for at least one metro in the cohort.
## Indicator 5.01: Local Foods

This indicator includes data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Food Environment Atlas on farms and farmers’ markets. The percentage of local farms selling goods directly to final consumers—whether at rural farm stands or farmers’ markets—is a measure of sustainability in local food economies.

Both the total number of farms in Columbus and the percentage selling locally rank in the middle of the cohort, a ranking virtually unchanged from the 2007 data.

### Local farms with direct sales to final consumers, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total number of local farms</th>
<th>Number of local farms with direct sales to final consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>10,838</td>
<td>2,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>5,076</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>7,048</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>5,732</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>13,251</td>
<td>1,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,198</strong></td>
<td><strong>814</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>6,841</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>9,242</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>7,328</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>6,205</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>8,819</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>12,757</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>13,301</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>14,598</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food Environment Atlas

### Percentage of local farms with direct sales to final consumers, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

(12) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 5.02: Obesity

This indicator includes data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s survey on the percentage of adults reporting a Body Mass Index (BMI) of 25.0 or greater. BMI is calculated as weight (in kilograms) divided by height (in meters) squared. A BMI of 25.0 to 25.9 indicates the individual is overweight, and a BMI of 30.0 or greater indicates obesity.

Since the data from 2012 benchmarked in the 2016 report, Columbus’s obesity percentage has gone down slightly, improving its ranking in the cohort as many metros have seen an increase.

Percentage adults who are overweight or obese (BMI 25.0 or higher), 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percent adults overweight or obese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sacramento</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Minneapolis</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Portland</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Providence</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Orlando</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jacksonville</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Raleigh</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Austin</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kansas City</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cleveland</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Chicago</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Columbus</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Milwaukee</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nashville</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Charlotte</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Indianapolis</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Cincinnati</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Louisville</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 San Antonio</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Las Vegas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A San Diego</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = Not Available

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System

Percentage of adults who are obese (BMI 30 or greater), 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(#) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 5.03: Diabetes

This indicator includes data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s survey on the percentage of adults reporting that they have ever been diagnosed with diabetes.

Adults ever diagnosed with prediabetes or gestational diabetes, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percent of adults ever diagnosed with prediabetes</th>
<th>Percent of adults ever diagnosed with gestational prediabetes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Las Vegas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A San Diego</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast
Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System

Columbus Trends: Percentage of adults ever diagnosed with Type 1 or 2 diabetes

Percentage of adults ever diagnosed with Type 1 or 2 diabetes, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T-9) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 5.04: Asthma

This indicator includes data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s survey on the percentage of adults reporting they have ever had Asthma, as diagnosed by a physician.

### Percentage of adults that have ever been diagnosed with asthma, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percent of adults ever diagnosed with asthma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Orlando</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Jacksonville</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Antonio</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Minneapolis</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Charlotte</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cleveland</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Austin</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cincinnati</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Milwaukee</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Chicago</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Kansas City</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Portland</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>13.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Raleigh</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Indianapolis</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Providence</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Sacramento</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Louisville</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Nashville</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Las Vegas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A San Diego</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Columbus Trends: Percentage of adults currently diagnosed with asthma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of adults currently diagnosed with asthma, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Percent of adults currently diagnosed with asthma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>9.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regions:** Red = Midwest; Blue = South; Green = West; Black = Northeast

**Source:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System

(1) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 5.05: Infant Mortality

This indicator includes data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s survey on the deaths of children under one year of age. Linked birth and death records are tied to the county of the mother’s residence rather than the county of an infant’s birth or death. The CDC only reports county-level infant death data for counties with populations larger than 250,000. For that reason, this indicator has been modified from the 2016 Benchmarking report to reflect only the principal county in each cohort metro (e.g., Franklin County for Columbus, Clark County for Las Vegas, etc.).

Rankings somewhat fall along geographic lines, with Western counties observing much lower rates compared to Midwestern counties.

Infant deaths per 1,000 live births by mother’s race, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 San Diego</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Austin</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sacramento</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Las Vegas</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Portland</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Raleigh</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Minneapolis</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kansas City</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Louisville</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 San Antonio</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>13.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Charlotte</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Orlando</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Chicago</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Providence</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>8.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Nashville</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>5.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Indianapolis</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jacksonville</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Milwaukee</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>13.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cincinnati</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>14.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Cleveland</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System

Columbus Trends: Infant deaths per 1,000 live births

Infant deaths per 1,000 live births, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td><strong>7.94</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 5.06: Overdose Deaths

This indicator includes data from the Centers for Disease Control and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation on deaths from drug overdose over a three year period from 2014-2016. Deaths are measured to include both legal prescription medication and illegal substances, such as heroin. This indicator is new to the Benchmarking Report.

A limitation of this indicator is the time range - rates nationwide have been increasing since 2016, so the dataset may not show the full extent of the problem today. In the three year time period however, Columbus’s 20 deaths per 100,000 residents is in the middle of the cohort but higher than the national average. Higher death rates in neighboring metros such as Indianapolis, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh demonstrate the regional impact of the opioid epidemic.

### Total deaths from drug overdose, 2014-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total deaths from drug overdose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Jose</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Austin</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Antonio</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Raleigh</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Orlando</td>
<td>1,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Portland</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 San Diego</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kansas City</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Chicago</td>
<td>4,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Charlotte</td>
<td>1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sacramento</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Columbus</td>
<td>1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Las Vegas</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nashville</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Indianapolis</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jacksonville</td>
<td>1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Louisville</td>
<td>1,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Cleveland</td>
<td>1,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Providence</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Cincinnati</td>
<td>2,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overdose deaths per 100,000 population, 2014-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Overdose deaths per 100,000 population, 2014-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>20 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast
Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation County Health Rankings
(排名 from lowest to highest)
Indicator 5.07: Access to Care

This indicator includes data on the availability of medical professionals and health insurance coverage. First, data from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and the American Community Survey analyzed the ratio of metro area population to one practicing primary care physician, dentist, and mental health provider. Second, data from the American Community Survey on the percentage of the population with no health insurance coverage is measured. This indicator is new to the Benchmarking report.

The rankings tend to reflect states that have or have not expanded Medicaid; metros in non-expansion states like Texas, North Carolina, and Florida see higher rates of uninsured persons.

Ratio of population to one medical professional, by provider type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Primary care providers</th>
<th>Dentists</th>
<th>Mental health providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red=Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation County Health Rankings; U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

(1) ranked from lowest to highest
**Indicator 5.08: Charitable Giving**

This indicator includes data from the Chronicle of Philanthropy on charitable giving. The giving ratio is defined as charitable contributions as a percentage of adjusted gross income. Giving per itemizer is an average charitable contribution, analyzed among Americans earning at least $50,000 and itemize charitable contributions on their tax returns. The total charitable contribution represents total giving in billions of dollars. This indicator has been modified from the 2016 Benchmarking report.

### Charitable contributions and giving ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Giving Ratio</th>
<th>Giving per itemizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Chicago</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$5,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> San Jose</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>$14,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Minneapolis</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>$4,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> San Diego</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$4,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Charlotte</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>$6,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Portland</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>$4,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Austin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$6,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Kansas City</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>$5,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Nashville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$7,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> San Antonio</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>$6,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> Cincinnati</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$4,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Indianapolis</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>$5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$4,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> Sacramento</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>$3,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> Cleveland</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> Columbus</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,189</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong> Las Vegas</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$6,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong> Raleigh</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$5,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong> Milwaukee</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>$4,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong> Orlando</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>$5,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong> Jacksonville</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>$7,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong> Louisville</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>$4,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong> Providence</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$2,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: Chronicle of Philanthropy, How America Gives

### Total charitable giving in billions, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total Giving in Billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$5,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$6,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>$2,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$2,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>$1,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>$1,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>$1,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>$1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>$1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>$1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>$1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>$1,058</strong> (T-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>$1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>$978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>$930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>$926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>$701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>$578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 5.09: Volunteering

This indicator includes data from the Corporation for National & Community Service’s Volunteering and Civic Life in America program. The data are based on responses to the Current Population Survey’s Volunteer Supplement. The overall volunteer rate is the percentage of adults who reported they had performed unpaid volunteer activities at any point during the 12-month period preceding the survey.

Volunteer average annual hours and retention rates, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Average annual volunteer hours per resident</th>
<th>Volunteer retention rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Minneapolis</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Milwaukee</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Jose</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Portland</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Kansas City</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Indianapolis</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Austin</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Columbus</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacksonville</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Cincinnati</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 San Antonio</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nashville</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Chicago</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Raleigh</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sacramento</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Providence</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Orlando</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Las Vegas</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall volunteer rate, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Volunteer rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>26.3% (T-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: Corporation for National and Community Service, Volunteering and Civic Life in America

(*) ranked from highest to lowest
**Indicator 5.10: Women in Political Leadership**

This indicator includes data from the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Rutgers University’s Center for American Women and Politics, and individual city websites on the number of major public officials who are women. For local governments, major public officials include members of city council for the principal city of the metro area and mayors of cities and towns with a population of 100,000 or higher.

Since 2016 the Columbus City Council has included three women, and Rep. Joyce Beatty has represented part of the metro since 2013.

---

**Major public officials who are women, by office, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Senators</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
<th>City Council (primary urban area)</th>
<th>Mayors (Cities &gt;/= 100k population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Columbus Trends: Percentage of major public officials who are women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Percentage of major public officials who are women, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Senators</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>City Council (primary urban area)</th>
<th>Mayors (Cities &gt;/= 100k population)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: Various, see Data Sources in appendix

(%) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 5.11: Women in Corporate Leadership

This indicator includes data from 2020 Women on Boards on women serving on the boards of directors of Fortune 1,000 companies headquartered within a metro area. Data are compiled in two year intervals.

Fortune 1,000 corporation board members, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total board members</th>
<th>Total board members who are women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 Women on Boards, 2020 Gender Diversity Directory

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Two Year Trends: Fortune 1,000 board members who are women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columbus Trends: Fortune 1,000 board members who are women

Percentage Fortune 1,000 board members who are women, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 5.12: Crime

This indicator includes data from the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR) on violent and property crime. The UCR defines violent crimes as those involving force or threat of force, including criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Property crimes include the offenses of burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. The UCR is a voluntary reporting program and Charlotte, Kansas City, and Raleigh did not participate in 2016.

When considering the entire region Columbus has one of the lower violent crime rates in the cohort, and lower than the combined rate of the 100 largest metros. However, its property crime rate is fifth highest in the cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of property crimes</th>
<th>Property crimes per 100k population</th>
<th>Number of violent crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cincinnati</td>
<td>54,312</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>5,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Portland</td>
<td>66,937</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>6,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Jose</td>
<td>43,340</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>5,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 <strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,162</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,911</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,585</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Minneapolis</td>
<td>82,192</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>10,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>40,207</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>6,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Providence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Austin</td>
<td>52,484</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>6,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 San Diego</td>
<td>61,371</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>10,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sacramento</td>
<td>54,595</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>9,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Louisville</td>
<td>42,026</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>5,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Chicago</td>
<td>192,468</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>41,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cleveland</td>
<td>42,264</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>8,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacksonville</td>
<td>42,653</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>7,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Orlando</td>
<td>72,038</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>12,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 San Antonio</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>4,082</td>
<td>12,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nashville</td>
<td>46,171</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>11,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Milwaukee</td>
<td>42,858</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>10,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Indianapolis</td>
<td>57,721</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>13,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Las Vegas</td>
<td>58,811</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>16,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Charlotte</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Kansas City</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A Raleigh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reporting Program, Crime in the United States

(4) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 5.13: Road Safety

This indicator includes data from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration on fatalities resulting from a motor vehicle traffic accident. A fatality is counted when a motorist’s, pedestrian’s, or bicyclist’s death occurs within 30 days of a crash involving at least one motor vehicle in transport.

Since the last Benchmarking report, the traffic fatality rate has increased in every metro in the cohort. In Columbus, the total number of traffic fatalities in 2016 was 44% higher than in 2014, with much of this increase coming from motorists.

**Total, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic fatalities, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Total traffic fatalities</th>
<th>Pedestrians as a percentage of all traffic fatalities</th>
<th>Bicyclists as a percentage of all traffic fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Minneapolis</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chicago</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Providence</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Jose</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cleveland</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Portland</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Milwaukee</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cincinnati</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 San Diego</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 <strong>Columbus</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Indianapolis</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kansas City</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Raleigh</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Las Vegas</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Charlotte</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Austin</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nashville</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Sacramento</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 San Antonio</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Orlando</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Louisville</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jacksonville</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Fatality Accident Reporting System (#) ranked from lowest to highest

**Columbus Trends: Traffic fatalities per 100,000 population**

- **Traffic fatalities per 100,000 population, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 100 Metro Area</th>
<th>Traffic fatalities per 100,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>11.1 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5.14: Commute Time

This indicator includes data from the American Community Survey on travel to work times. Commute time is reported for two groups: persons traveling alone by car (excluding taxicabs), and persons traveling by public transportation (bus or trolley bus, streetcar or trolley car, subway or elevated railway, or ferryboat). The percentage of workers commuting 25 minutes or longer is reported for all workers 16 years and older, regardless of commute mode.

Although the percentage of workers with longer commutes in Columbus has steadily gone up, average commute time by traveling alone has barely changed since 2011. In the same time, average commute time by public transportation has gone up by nearly 10 minutes.

Average commute time by mode, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Average commute time by traveling alone (min.)</th>
<th>Average commute time by public transportation (min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

(4) ranked from lowest to highest
Indicator 5.15: Commute Mode

This indicator includes data from the American Community Survey on the usual mode of transportation to work for commuters age 16 and over. Alternative commute modes include all means of transportation except driving alone by car, truck, or van. Not all commute modes are included in the data table, as such percentages do not equal 100%.

Alternate commute modes have gone down in Columbus since the last Benchmarking report, with fewer commuters going by public transit or walking. As such, the metro has one of the highest rates in the cohort of commuters driving alone.

Alternative commute modes for workers age 16 and over, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Carpooling to work</th>
<th>Public transit to work</th>
<th>Biking to work</th>
<th>Working from home</th>
<th>Walking to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chicago</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Portland</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 San Jose</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Diego</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Austin</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sacramento</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Minneapolis</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Las Vegas</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Orlando</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 San Antonio</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Raleigh</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Providence</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacksonville</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Charlotte</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Nashville</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Milwaukee</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Louisville</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Cleveland</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Columbus</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Indianapolis</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Kansas City</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
Indicator 5.16: Walking & Biking

This indicator includes data from WalkScore on bicycle and pedestrian accessibility. Bike Score measures ease of cycling based on bicycle infrastructure, hills, road connectivity, and destinations. Walk Score measures walkability on a scale from 0 to 100 based on the presence of sidewalk infrastructure and walking distance to amenities such as retail, schools, and parks. This indicator has been modified from the 2016 Benchmarking report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Bike Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: Walk Score

(13) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 5.17: Public Transportation

This indicator includes data from the American Public Transportation Association on the frequency of public transit use. Unlinked passenger trips are defined as the number of passengers who board public transportation vehicles, with passengers counted each time they board a vehicle regardless of the number used to travel from origin to destination. Data are for urban areas within metro areas.

In Columbus the total number of unlinked trips increased from the 2016 Benchmarking report, but with an expanded urban area population not all taking public transit the trips per capita has gone down. Note the data do not reflect recent updates, such as COTA’s 2017 system redesign.

### Metro area population and unlinked passenger trips, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Urban area population</th>
<th>Unlinked passenger trips (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chicago</td>
<td>9,557,503</td>
<td>630.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Portland</td>
<td>2,382,181</td>
<td>114.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Las Vegas</td>
<td>2,110,330</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Diego</td>
<td>3,290,044</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,349,139</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Minneapolis</td>
<td>3,521,325</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,576,376</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cleveland</td>
<td>2,062,842</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 San Jose</td>
<td>1,977,584</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Austin</td>
<td>2,000,784</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 San Antonio</td>
<td>2,379,054</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sacramento</td>
<td>2,266,892</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Orlando</td>
<td>2,391,028</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Providence</td>
<td>1,613,155</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Louisville</td>
<td>1,277,992</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Charlotte</td>
<td>2,424,115</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Columbus</td>
<td><strong>2,023,198</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Cincinnati</td>
<td>2,155,674</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jacksonville</td>
<td>1,445,986</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Kansas City</td>
<td>2,085,221</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Raleigh</td>
<td>1,272,875</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Nashville</td>
<td>1,829,513</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Indianapolis</td>
<td>1,986,872</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: American Public Transportation Association, Public Transportation Fact Book

Unlinked passenger trips per capita, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Unlinked passenger trips per capita (2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td><strong>9.6</strong> (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(17) ranked from highest to lowest
## Indicator 5.18: Air Travel

This indicator includes data from the U.S. Department of Transportation on air travel from area airports. Average daily weekday departures are measured, as airlines tend to reduce weekend departures at most airports. These data, along with daily enplaned passengers and seats per departure, are based on annual averages. This indicator has been modified from the 2016 Benchmarking report.

Columbus's lower average departures can be attributed to John Glenn and Rickenbacker International Airports not being airline hubs, a concentration of a given airline's passenger traffic and flight operations, or a focus city, where an airline operate multiple point-to-point routes. Despite not having either designation, the Columbus metro is still one of the 40 most traveled regions in the country in terms of average daily departures.

### Passenger boardings and flight data, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of nonstop destinations</th>
<th>Average daily enplaned passengers</th>
<th>Average seats per departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chicago</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>134,056</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Charlotte</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>60,536</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Minneapolis</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>49,305</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Las Vegas</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>63,849</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Orlando</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>63,205</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 San Diego</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31,873</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Portland</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25,930</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nashville</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20,107</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Raleigh</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15,974</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 San Jose</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17,936</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Austin</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19,818</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kansas City</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15,844</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cincinnati</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10,888</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Cleveland</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12,475</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sacramento</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15,460</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Indianapolis</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12,254</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Columbus</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10,753</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 San Antonio</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12,519</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Milwaukee</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9,412</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Jacksonville</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7,636</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Louisville</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,776</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Providence</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5,613</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, T-100 Onboard Data

### Average daily weekday departures, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Departures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>146 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue=South; Green=West; Black=Northeast

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, T-100 Onboard Data

(†) ranked from highest to lowest
Indicator 5.19: Air Quality

This indicator includes data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Air Quality Index (AQI). The AQI is used to report the level of pollution in the air, including ground-level ozone, particulate pollution carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen dioxide. An AQI between 0 and 50 is considered good air quality. A value between 101 and 150 is unhealthy for “sensitive groups” such as people with lung disease, older adults, and children. An AQI greater than 150 is considered unhealthy for everyone.

Columbus’s good air quality has steadily climbed over the last five years, allowing it to take the number one ranking in the cohort.

Number of days with unhealthy air quality, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Number of days with unhealthy air quality for sensitive groups</th>
<th>Number of days with unhealthy air quality for everyone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Columbus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jacksonville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Orlando</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Portland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Milwaukee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Austin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 San Antonio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Providence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Raleigh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nashville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 San Jose</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Louisville</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Charlotte</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Kansas City</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Indianapolis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Minneapolis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Cincinnati</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Chicago</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Las Vegas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Sacramento</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 San Diego</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions: Red= Midwest; Blue= South; Green= West; Black= Northeast

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Air Quality Index Report

Columbus Trends: Number of days with good air quality

Number of days with good air quality (AQI 0-50), 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) ranked from highest to lowest
The following are the web addresses for the data sources used in this report:

1.01 Population Growth
http://www.census.gov/popest/

1.02 – 1.06
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

1.07 Urban Density
Center for Neighborhood Technology, H+T Affordability Index
http://htaindex.cnt.org/
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

2.01 Industry Sector Employment
http://www.bls.gov/sae/home.htm

2.02 High Tech Industries
http://www.bls.gov/oes/home.htm
Milken Institute, Best-Performing Cities

2.03 Entrepreneurship
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

2.04 Small Business Firms & 2.05 Small Business Startups
https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/susb.html

2.06 Minority Business Ownership & 2.07 Women's Business Ownership
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Survey of Business Owners
http://www.census.gov/econ/sbo/

2.08 Income and Wages
Council for Community and Economic Research, Cost of Living Index
http://www.coli.org/
http://www.bls.gov/oes/home.htm
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

2.09 Occupations & 2.10 Workforce
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

2.12 Unemployment
http://www.bls.gov/lau/home.htm

2.13 – 3.06
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

3.07 Earned Income Tax Credit
Brookings Institution, Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) interactive and resources
http://www.brookings.edu/research/interactives/eitc

3.08 Foreclosures
Attom Data Solutions
https://www.attomdata.com/data/

3.09 Homeownership
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

3.10 Housing Starts
U.S. Census Bureau, Building Permits Survey
https://www.census.gov/construction/bps/
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/
Data Sources

The following are the web addresses for the data sources used in this report:

3.11 Housing and Transportation Costs
Center for Neighborhood Technology, H+T Affordability Index
http://htaindex.cnt.org/

4.01 – 4.03
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

4.04 School Lunch Assistance
U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, Elementary/Secondary Information System
http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi/

4.05 Libraries
Institute for Museum and Library Services, Public Libraries in the United States Survey
http://www.imls.gov/research/public_libraries_in_the_united_states_survey.aspx

4.06 Research Universities
National Science Foundation, Survey of Earned Doctorates: 2014

4.07 Broadband Availability
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

5.01 Local Foods

5.02 - 5.04
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office of Surveillance, Epidemiology, and Laboratory Services, Public Health Surveillance Program, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, Selected Metropolitan/Micropolitan Area Risk Trends
http://www.cdc.gov/brfss/

5.05 Infant Mortality
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System, Linked Birth and Infant Death Data
http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/linked.htm

5.06 Overdose Deaths
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, County Health Rankings
http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/

5.07 Access to Care
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, County Health Rankings
http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/

5.08 Charitable Giving
The Chronicle of Philanthropy, “How America Gives” (Interactive Tool)
https://www.philanthropy.com/interactives/how-america-gives#search

5.09 Volunteering
Corporation for National and Community Service, Volunteering and Civic Life in America
http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/

5.10 Women in Political Leadership
Rutgers University, Center for American Women and Politics
http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/

U.S. House of Representatives, Directory of Representatives
http://www.house.gov/representatives/

U.S. Senate
https://www.senate.gov/

City councils:
Austin, TX
http://www.austintexas.gov/government
Charlotte, NC
http://charlottenc.gov/CityCouncil/Pages/Default.aspx
Chicago, IL
Cincinnati, OH
http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/council/council-members/
Cleveland, OH
http://www.clevelandcitycouncil.org/council-members
Columbus, OH
https://www.columbus.gov/council/members/
Indianapolis, IN
The following are the web addresses for the data sources used in this report:

Indianapolis, IN

Jacksonville, FL
http://downtownjacksonville.org/Media/Contact_Jacksonville_City_Council.aspx

Kansas City, MO
http://kcmo.gov/city-officials/city-council-members/

Las Vegas, NV

Louisville, KY
https://louisvilleky.gov/government/metro-council/districts-1-26

Milwaukee, WI
http://city.milwaukee.gov/CommonCouncil#.WAZm648rKUk

Minneapolis, MN
http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/council/

Nashville, TN
http://www.nashville.gov/Metro-Council/Metro-Council-Members.aspx

Orlando, FL
http://www.cityoforlando.net/council/

Pittsburgh, PA
http://www.pittsburghpa.gov/council/

Portland, OR
http://www.portlandoregon.gov/25999

Providence, RI
http://council.providenceri.com/members

Raleigh, NC
http://www.raleighnc.gov/government/content/BoardsCommissions/Articles/CityCouncil.html

San Antonio, TX
https://www.sanantonio.gov/council

San Diego, CA
https://www.sandiego.gov/citycouncil

San Jose, CA

Sacramento, CA
http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Mayor-Council

San Francisco, CA
https://www.sanfrancisco.gov/council

San Francisco, CA
https://www.sanfrancisco.gov/citycouncil

5.11 Women in Corporate Leadership
2020 Women on Boards, 2020 Gender Diversity Directory
http://www.2020wob.com/companies/

5.12 Crime
U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Uniform Crime Reporting Program, Crime in the United States
http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr

5.13 Road Safety
U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration,
Fatality Analysis Reporting System

5.14 Commute Time & 5.15 Commute Mode
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey
http://factfinder2.census.gov/

5.16 Walking and Biking
Walk Score, City and Neighborhood Walkability Rankings
http://www.walkscore.com/rankings/cities/

5.17 Public Transportation
American Public Transportation Association, Public Transportation Fact Book
http://www.apta.com/resources/statistics/Pages/transitstats.aspx

5.18 Air Travel
U.S. Department of Transportation, Research and Innovation Technology Administration,
Bureau of Transportation Statistics, TranStats, Data Elements

5.19 Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards,
Air Quality Analysis Group, AirData, Air Quality Index Report
https://www.epa.gov/outdoor-air-quality-data