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The Research Question?

What is a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and why are there multiple MSAs in the Northeast Ohio region?
What is a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)?

1. Core area containing a substantial population nucleus

2. Joined together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with the core area (high work-commuting relationship)

- Delineation criteria and standards are developed by the US Census Bureau and the US Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
- Data used: Decennial Census and American Community Survey (ACS)
MSA (Counties)
Cleveland (5)
Akron (2)
Canton (2)
Youngstown (3)
Mansfield (1)

- Strictly follow county boundaries
UZAs
Cleveland
Lorain-Elyria
Akron
Canton
Youngstown
Mansfield

- Represent high levels of population and employment density
- Do not follow political boundaries
- Are the basis of the formation of MSAs
How are MSAs used?

- Census Bureau releases demographic and socioeconomic data at the MSA geography
- Research Reports by Academic, Government, and Non-Profit Institutions
- Site selection for Economic Development
  - MSA data is part of the first impression for business site selectors and other researchers
  - Workforce and economic related data - college-educated, workers in industries/occupations, supply-chain businesses
- Worldwide and National COMPARISONS and RANKINGS of Metro Areas
- Important that MSA represents the entire economic area of a region
## Peer MSA Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>Population*</th>
<th>Population* Rank</th>
<th>Employment^</th>
<th>Employment^ Rank</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Square Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,324,743</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,479,848</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>2,106,541</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,370,011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>2,057,009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,331,464</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>2,048,703</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,318,788</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>704,845</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>429,591</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>538,952</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>285,175</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>398,655</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>221,971</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2018 Census Estimate

^2017 BEA Estimate
History of Northeast Ohio MSAs

- MSAs were created in 1950

- Cleveland and other Northeast Ohio MSAs grew organically from 1950-1993 due to urban sprawl and longer commuting patterns (inter-county)

- In 2003, the OMB drastically changed the MSA delineation criteria, resulting in the Northeast Ohio MSAs changing dramatically
How was an MSA formed prior to 2000?

- Initial Unit of Analysis = Major City above 50,000 Population
- Major City → “Central” County
- “Outlying” Counties or MSAs added based on 2 criteria
  - Similar “Economic Character” – population/employment densities
  - Variable commuting threshold = 15% to 50%
How did MSA criteria change after 2000?

- Initial Unit of Analysis = **Urbanized Area (UZA)** above 50,000 Population

- **Urbanized Area** “Central” County or Counties
  - If a county has multiple UZAs within it, county is assigned to the UZA that has most population within the county

- “Outlying” Counties or MSAs Added based on 1 criterion
  - Standardized and Strict commute threshold = 25%
  - “Economic Character” criterion dropped
“Central” Counties of the Northeast Ohio MSAs

- Lorain County qualifies as its own MSA, but instead gets added into the Cleveland MSA as an “outlying” county based on the commuting data.
Lorain County added as “Outlying” County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENCE</th>
<th>WORKPLACE</th>
<th>COMMUTERS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County</td>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>42,170</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medina County</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geauga County</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LORAIN COUNTY TO CENTRAL COUNTIES COMMUTE TOTAL
45,215
33.6%

LORAIN COUNTY TO ALL WORKPLACES COMMUTE TOTAL
134,535
100.0%

Source: ACS 2006-2010
Ashtabula does not meet 25% threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENCE</th>
<th>WORKPLACE</th>
<th>COMMUTERS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula County</td>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>5,295</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geauga County</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medina County</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASHTABULA COUNTY TO CENTRAL COUNTIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>COMMUTE TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,055</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASHTABULA COUNTY TO ALL WORKPLACES</strong></td>
<td><strong>COMMUTE TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ACS 2006-2010
Northeast Ohio MSAs and UZAs

MSA (Counties)
Cleveland (5)
Akron (2)
Canton (2)
Youngstown (3)
Mansfield (1)
Central Ohio MSAs and UZAs

MSA (Counties)
Columbus (10)
Springfield (1)
Dayton (3)
How can Northeast Ohio be more accurately represented in the context of the MSA?

### Current criteria and 7 scenarios analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Commute Threshold %</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Expanded Urbanized Area?</th>
<th>No. of Central Counties of MSA</th>
<th>Total Counties of MSA</th>
<th>Total Population* of MSA</th>
<th>Increase in Counties</th>
<th>Increase in Population*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current/Base</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,057,009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,859,347</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>802,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>LODES</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,154,502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,160,509</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,103,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>LODES</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,859,347</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>802,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,540,760</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,483,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>LODES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,373,969</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,316,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>LODES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,578,394</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,521,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US Census - 2018 estimate

Highlight indicates a criteria or data modification.
### Scenario 2 - Using Census LODES Data = 6 counties

**Additional Counties**

**Ashtabula**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Total Counties of MSA</th>
<th>Total Population* of MSA</th>
<th>Increase in Counties</th>
<th>Increase in Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current/Base</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,057,009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,154,502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US Census - 2018 estimate
Scenario 3 - Merging of contiguous UZAs

- 8 “Central” counties due to merged UZA
Scenario 3 - Merging of contiguous UZAs = 9 counties

Additional Counties
Portage
Summit
Stark
Carroll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Total Counties of MSA</th>
<th>Total Population* of MSA</th>
<th>Increase in Counties</th>
<th>Increase in Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current/Base</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,057,009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,160,509</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,103,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US Census - 2018 estimate
## Scenario 3 Comparison with Peer MSAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>Population*</th>
<th>Population Rank</th>
<th>Employment^</th>
<th>Employment Rank</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Square Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>3,160,509</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,983,026</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,324,743</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,479,848</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>2,106,541</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,370,011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleveland</strong></td>
<td>2,057,009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td><strong>4,331,464</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>2,017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>2,048,703</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,318,788</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>704,845</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>429,591</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>398,655</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>221,971</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario 3 is Merging the Contiguous Urbanized Areas (Results in Cleveland MSA + Akron MSA + Canton MSA)

*2018 Census Estimate

^2017 BEA Estimate
Detailed Research Report & Appendix
POLL QUESTION
The Problem

How to simplify complex concepts and make dense research more user friendly for elected officials and the public.
How do we simplify everything?

Complex concepts

- MSA vs UZA
- Central vs Outlying Counties
- Commuting patterns

Dense research

- Historical content
- 8 Scenarios
- 100 page Appendix
  - Maps
  - Tables
  - Data
The Solution

Use a well-themed story map centered around a graphical and easy to understand concept combining the report and appendix into one interactive experience.
Molecule Concept
Molecule Concept

NEO MSA
Molecule Concept

COLUMBUS MSA

Diagram showing the counties of COLUMBUS MSA:
- Pickaway County
- Union County
- Hocking County
- Perry County
- Delaware County
- Franklin County
- Fairfield County
- Morrow County
- Madison County
- Newark Urbanized Area (UZA)
- Licking County
Anatomy of the Northeast Ohio (NEO)

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA):
Past, Present, and Future

The Northeast Ohio (NEO) Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) have consistently changed over time since their creation.

Continue scrolling to learn more about their history, their current composition and our potential future as outlined in the 8 Scenarios contained in the content below.

Tables, graphics & interactive maps will appear in the right pane to help guide you through the story of the Northeast Ohio MSA.

What is a Metropolitan

- Simple css code
- Hosting site locally
- Using graphics
**Molecule Theme**

**Anatomy of the Northeast Ohio (NEO) Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA): Past, Present, and Future**

Despite these stark differences, MSAs and UZAs are connected in a major way. UZAs that meet a certain size are used as the starting point to form MSAs.

**Atom Analogy for an MSA.**

The UZA of a region is the core of a MSA, much like protons are at the core of an atom.

Counties that have the most overlap with the UZA are then assigned to the MSA. These are deemed “Central” counties and can be thought of as the neutrons that, along with the protons (UZA), join together to form the nucleus of an atom.

Additional counties, known as “Outlying” counties, are then added into the MSA based on their work commuting patterns with the “Central” counties. These “Outlying” counties of a MSA are like the electrons of the atom, and the work commute is like the atomic force that holds the entire atom together.

The larger the nucleus of the atom, the more electrons the atom will possess due to its greater atomic force. The same idea goes for
Combined Report & Appendix
Anatomy of the Northeast Ohio (NEO) Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA): Past, Present, and Future

However, around the lead up to the 2000 Census, the OMB significantly changed the MSA delineation standards resulting in many MSAs throughout the country changing dramatically, including the Cleveland MSA.

Click the “play” button on the map to the right to see the composition of the NEO MSA change over time.

This table displays the numerical changes in the county composition of the MSAs of Northeast Ohio from 1950 to 2013.

How Did the MSA Delineation Criteria Change from 1950 to 2013?

MSA Delineation Criteria 1950-1993

From the 1950s to the early 1990s, MSAs were delineated based on a relatively constant set of standards:

1. A MSA would originate with a city having a population of 50,000 or more, and the county in which this city was located would become known as the “central county”.

2. Then any contiguous counties that met criteria centered on workforce integration and metropolitan character would be included into the MSA. By 1990, the criteria had evolved into
Host as much locally to enable custom code enhancements or customization based on language understanding

Utilize as much of ESRI Products for Developing, ArcGIS Online, Web App Builder, etc

Embed hosted customized links within Story Map Builder
Appendix combined within the story map

Anatomy of the Northeast Ohio (NEO) Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA):
Past, Present, and Future

1. The county in which the city was located would become known as the “central county”.
2. Then any contiguous counties that met criteria centered on workforce integration and metropolitan character would be included into the MSA. By 1990, the criteria had evolved into workforce commuting thresholds ranging from 15% to 50%, and varying thresholds for at least 4 different measures of metropolitan character, such as population and employment density. For example, if a neighboring county has a similar level of population and/or employment density with the designated central county of that area, it would be added into the MSA.
3. Levels of commuting and metropolitan character in the 1990 definition were fluid in nature, with higher levels of commuting requiring lower levels of metropolitan character similarity and vice versa.

The Cleveland MSA consisted of only Cuyahoga and Lake counties, with Lorain and Summit counties being their own separate MSAs.
Appendix combined within the story map

Anatomy of the Northeast Ohio (NEO) Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA): Past, Present, and Future

Scenario 2:
How Would the NEO MSA Change if the Commuting Threshold is Decreased from 25% to 15%?

A change from 25% to 15% is not a new idea with regards to the formation of an MSA, as it was the threshold applied to many MSAs prior to 2003. Prior to 2003, MSAs had different commuting threshold values, based on their level of similarity in metropolitan character. When the metropolitan character criteria was dropped in the post-2000 delineation standards, all MSAs thresholds were equalized to 25%.

If the commuting threshold was decreased from 25% to 15% for 2023, the Northeast Ohio MSA would most likely expand to 8 counties: Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina, Summit, Portage and Ashtabula. This 8 county composition would be identical to the 1993 Cleveland-Akron MSA.

Summit and Portage, measured as a group since they qualify as their own MSA, would have approximately a 17% commuting share with...
• ArcGIS Online account hosting dozens of tables, charts, and graphs
### Combined Report & Appendix

- ArcGIS Online account hosting dozens of tables, charts, and graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENCE</th>
<th>WORKPLACE</th>
<th>COMMUTERS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portage &amp; Summit counties</td>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>47,280</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medina County</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geauga County</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORTAGE &amp; SUMMIT COUNTIES TO CENTRAL COUNTIES</th>
<th>COMMUTE TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58,905</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORTAGE &amp; SUMMIT COUNTIES TO ALL WORKPLACES</th>
<th>COMMUTE TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>334,696</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ACS 2012-2016
Combined Report & Appendix

- Easy to compare maps

**Anatomy of the Northeast Ohio (NEO) Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA): Past, Present, and Future**

When examining the other three MSAs and their associated UZAs, it most notably shows that these UZAs do not have any large, neighboring UZAs to compete with for central counties being assigned to them. In addition, the lack of large, neighboring UZAs allows these MSAs to be assigned many outlying counties without any significant competition.

**Pittsburgh Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)**
Click for map of the MSAs of Southwest Pennsylvania Metropolitan Statistical Area 2013

**Columbus Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)**
Click for map of the MSAs Central Ohio Metropolitan Statistical Area 2013

**Indianapolis Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)**
Click for map of the MSAs Central Indiana Metropolitan Statistical Area 2013

The Columbus MSA and associated Columbus UZA are a good example of this phenomenon. The central counties (shown in light blue and without hash-marks) assigned to the Columbus MSA are Franklin, Delaware, and Fairfield, due to the fact that the Columbus UZA is the dominant UZA of those counties. The only other UZA that is in geographic proximity to the Columbus UZA is the Newark UZA; located primarily in Licking County. Similar to Lorain County in the Cleveland MSA, Licking County does qualify as its own MSA due to...
NEO MSA

Story Map Tour
The Outcome

Benefits of both a static report and story map:

- **Technical report for Regional Planners and Data Experts**
  - More in-depth research
  - Citations
  - Appendix for reference
  - Printable maps

- **Interactive web-based executive summary to reach a broader audience**
  - High-level concepts
  - Custom graphics to enhance the story
  - Interactive maps
  - Appendix as integrated content
Questions/Comments?