THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS Kansas Center for Community Economic Development Policy Research Institute TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

### Economic Trends Update: Jewell County

Prepared by

Luke Middleton Research Economist

August 2001

Report No. 57

### Genna M. Hurd

Co-Director, KCCED

**Steven Maynard-Moody** 

Interim Director, Policy Research Institute

### Foreword

The Kansas Center for Community Economic Development (KCCED) is a joint center of the Policy Research Institute at the University of Kansas and the Kansas Center for Rural Initiatives at Kansas State University. Its purpose is to enhance economic development efforts by bringing university expertise to rural Kansas.

KCCED is funded by a grant from the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The statements, findings, and conclusions of this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Government, the University of Kansas, or any other individual or organization.

### **Table of Contents**

Introduction	1
Population	2
Table 1 Population Totals, Growth Rates, Rank & Share, Jewell County and Kansas	5
Table 2 Population Growth Rates (percent): 1970 - 2000	6
Figure 1a Rates of Population Change Jewell and Comparative Counties 1970 – 2000	7
Figure 1b Rates of Population Change Jewell County, Kansas and U.S. 1970 – 2000	7
Table 3 Population by Age, Jewell County and Kansas, 1990-2000	8
Table 3a Population by Age as Percent of Total, Jewell County and Kansas, 1990-2000	8
Figure 2 Population by Age as Percent of Total Population, Jewell County, 1980-2000	9
Table 4 Population by Hispanic Origin, Jewell County and Kansas, 1980-2000	10
Table 4a Population by Hispanic Origin as Percent of Total, Jewell and Kansas	10
Table 5 Net Migration: 1970 - 1999	11
Table 6 Population of Top-ranking Kansas Counties	12
Map 1 Percent Population Change 1980 – 1990	13
Map 2 Percent Population Change 1990 – 2000	14
Map 3 Percent Net Migration 1990 - 1999	15
Employment	16
Table 7 Employment Growth Rates 1990 - 2000, Jewell, Comparative Counties, Kansas	19
Figure 3 Employment Growth Rates 1990 - 2000, Jewell County and Kansas	19
Figure 3a Employment Growth Rates 1990 - 2000, Jewell and Comparative Counties	20
Table 8 Number of Firms, by Number of Employees 1988 - 1998	21
Table 8a Percentage Distribution of Firms, by Number of Employees 1988 - 1998	21
Table 9 Employment Levels by Industry 1993 - 1998	22
Figure 4 Percent Change in Employment by Selected Industries 1993 - 1998	23
Table 9a Employment Percent Share by Industry 1993 - 1998	24
Table 9b Labor Market Summary 1998 - 1999	25
Map 4 Labor Force Participation: 1990	26
Map 5 County Unemployment Rates: 1999	27
Earnings and Income	28
Table 10 Average Wage per Job 1988 - 1998	29
Figure 5 Average Wage per Job: Jewell, Kansas, and U.S. 1988 - 1998	30
Figure 5a Average Wage per Job: Jewell and Comparative Counties 1988 - 1998	30
Table 11 Per Capita Personal Income 1980 - 1999	31
Figure 5b Per Capita Personal Income 1980 - 1999	32
Map 6 Per Capita Personal Income: 1999	33
Retail	34
Table 12 Taxable Retail Sales and Growth Rates 1989 - 1999	35
Figure 6 Taxable Retail Sales Growth Rates 1990 - 1999	36
Map 7 County Trade Pull Factors, 2000	37
Agriculture	38
Table 13 Total Value of Field Crops 1995 - 1998	39
Table 14 Total Value of Livestock and Poultry 1995 - 1998	39
Education	40
Table 15 Educational Attainment of Persons over 25: 1990	41
I able 16 High School Graduates and Drop-Outs, Jewell County and Kansas, 1990-1999	42
Conclusion	43

### **Economic Trends Update: Jewell County**

### Introduction

The following report is an objective look at several key economic trends occurring in Jewell County over the last few decades. We look at variables categorized under the following areas:

- population,
- employment,
- earnings and income,
- retail trade,
- agriculture, and
- education.

Throughout the report, Jewell County's performance is compared with the performance of the state of Kansas and other Comparative Counties.<sup>1</sup> It is by no means a comprehensive analysis of economic trends facing Jewell County but rather an overview of some key economic and demographic variables.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Comparative counties" or "Selected counties" used for comparison in this report are Cloud, Lincoln, Mitchell, Osborne, Republic, Smith and Washington counties.

### POPULATION

In every community population size and economic activity are closely related. The size of population is directly related to employment opportunities within the area, wage differentials between regions, and a community's overall economic and social conditions. Growing communities are more likely to adapt successfully to a changing economic environment than areas with constant or decreasing population. New residents in a community mean additional consumers, taxpayers, and suppliers of labor. Without population growth, communities face problems of a tightening labor market, lack of new customers for businesses, a shrinking tax base, and an overall decline in economic activity. Generally, areas of population growth are also areas of economic growth, whereas areas of population loss suffered previous economic decline and restructuring.

Characteristics of the region's population are regarded as indicators of economic conditions and economic potential of this region. Past and projected population changes indicate economic trends in the community and can be compared to other counties, as well as the statewide and national averages.

Another characteristic of the economic potential of the region is migration of the population. Migration is linked to job opportunities and demand as well as wage differentials between regions. Counties with low rates of job creation and low wages will face higher worker mobility due to the lack of opportunity, or a "pull" phenomenon by urban areas with higher wages, better job opportunities, and a perceived better quality of life. Age and education also determine regional migration. Generally, the population aged 18 to 45 is the most mobile age group. The effect of education on migration is reflected by the movement of well-educated workers toward better job matches for themselves and their spouses and their attempts to raise their income levels by migrating to areas with employment opportunities.

The following section consists of population tables, figures, and maps, which together illustrate population totals, population growth rates, population by age groups, percent net migration, and population rankings.

### **Population: Key Findings**

 The population of Jewell County has declined every decade for a hundred years. Between 1980 and 1990 Jewell County's population decreased by 18.9 percent, while the growth rate of Kansas was a positive 4.8 percent and that of the U.S. a positive 9.8 percent. In the decade of the 1990's Jewell's population slip was somewhat lesser, with total losses at -10.8 percent. This was the smallest percentage drop of any decade since 1930. This indicates Jewell County may be nearing a stable number beyond which it is difficult to decrease further. (Table 1 and 2, Figure 1b)

- All of the comparative counties also experienced population declines during the last three decades, although Jewell County fared the worst among them. Republic and Smith counties seem to have had population losses of quite nearly the same degree as Jewell County since 1970. Lincoln and Mitchell counties fared the best of the comparative counties, though they are certainly also struggling with retaining citizens. (Table 2 and Figure 1a)
- The largest age group segment in Jewell County in 2000 was made up of people in the 45 to 64 year-old range, a change from the way things were during the 1990 census. At that time, the largest age group was the 65 and over crowd. They made up 24.7 percent of the population in 1990 while only 22.5 percent were in the 45 to 64 group. In 2000 the number of people aged 45 to 64 had increased to 26.3 percent. In absolute numbers, that was the only group to see an increase in the last decade. These observations illustrate the effect of the aging baby-boom generation. (Table 3 and 3a and Figure 2)
- Census race data from 2000 can not be directly compared to data from previous years, due to a change in reporting which now allows people to select more than one race. In 2000, 28 people in Jewell County indicated they belonged to more than one race. Therefore, the 2000 Census data figures for individual races would probably be slightly higher if the old categorization had been used. Nevertheless, the new data is still useful for indicating trends. (Tables 4 and 4a)
- The population of Jewell County has become marginally more racially diverse over time. Although whites still make up the vast majority of the population (98 percent in 2000), their numbers have been decreasing. The race group which has seen the most growth has been the Hispanic segment, which approached one percent of total population in 2000. (Tables 4 and 4a)
- Each decade since the 1960's Jewell County's net migration has been negative. Net migration is calculated as the change in population less the difference between births and deaths. A negative net migration indicates that more people have moved out of the county than have moved in. Between 1990 and 1999 Jewell County's net migration was slightly negative at -254 people, or about 6 percent of total population. Compared to previous decades that decrease wasn't so bad. Jewell county lost a net number of 985 people in the 1960's, 681 people in the 1970's, and 879 in the 1980's. Net migration in Kansas from 1990 to 1999 was a positive 1.8 percent. It was the first time in four decades that the state of Kansas had a positive net migration. (Table 5 and Map 3)
- Jewell County moved from being the 52nd most populated county in Kansas in 1940 to being 73rd in 1980, 76th in 1990, and 79th in 2000. (Table 6, Jewell County not shown.)
- In 1990 the ten-year population growth rate in Jewell County was the worst of any county in Kansas. In other words, no other county in Kansas lost as big of a percent

of their population between 1980 and 1990 as did Jewell (-18.0 percent, Map1.) Between 1990 and 2000, however, six other Kansas counties had populations which decreased more than Jewell's –10.4 percent. (Map 2)

	Jewell C	ounty	Kansa	IS	Jewell County	
	Population	Growth	Population	Growth	Rank in	Share
<u>Year</u>	Total	Rate	Total	Rate	State	(%)
1890	19,349		1,428,108		26	1.4
1900	19,420	0.4	1,470,495	3.0	28	1.3
1910	18,148	-6.5	1,690,949	15.0	34	1.1
1920	16,240	-10.5	1,769,257	4.6	36	0.9
1930	14,462	-10.9	1,880,999	6.3	43	0.8
1940	11,970	-17.2	1,801,028	-4.3	52	0.7
1950	9,698	-19.0	1,905,299	5.8	58	0.5
1960	7,217	-25.6	2,178,611	14.3	68	0.3
1970	6,099	-15.5	2,249,071	3.2	70	0.3
1980	5,241	-14.1	2,364,236	5.1	73	0.2
1990	4,251	-18.9	2,477,588	4.8	76	0.2
1991*	4,115	-3.2	2,495,209	0.7	77	0.2
1992*	4,053	-1.5	2,526,042	1.2	77	0.2
1993*	3,980	-1.8	2,547,605	0.9	79	0.2
1994*	3,931	-1.2	2,569,118	0.8	80	0.2
1995*	3,979	1.2	2,586,942	0.7	79	0.2
1996*	3,988	0.2	2,598,266	0.4	79	0.2
1997*	3,937	-1.3	2,616,339	0.7	80	0.2
1998*	3,873	-1.6	2,638,667	0.9	80	0.1
1999*	3,787	-2.2	2,654,052	0.6	80	0.1
2000	3,791	0.1	2,688,418	1.3	79	0.1

Table 1
Population Totals, Growth Rates, Rank & Share
Jewell County and Kansas

\* Estimates

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Vol..1; "Census of Population, 1960: Number of Inhabitants; 1980 Census of Population," Vol.1, Chapter A, Part 18; "1990 Census of Population and Housing" Floerchinger, Teresa D., "Kansas Population Projections 1990-2030," Kansas Division of the Budget, September 1992; Population Estimates, and Population Distribution Branches, U.S. Bureau of the Census. Calculations: PRI.

# Table 2Population Growth RatesJewell County, Comparative Counties, Kansas, and United States1970-2000

Year	<u>1970-1980</u>	<u>1980-1990</u>	<u>1990-2000</u>
Jewell	-14.1	-18.9	-10.8
Cloud	-7.2	-11.8	-6.8
Lincoln	-9.5	-11.9	-2.1
Mitchell	1.3	-11.3	-3.8
Osborne	-7.1	-18.3	-8.5
Republic	-10.9	-14.4	-10.0
Smith	-12.0	-14.6	-10.7
Washington	-7.6	-17.2	-8.3
Kansas	5.1	4.8	8.5
United States	11.4	9.8	8.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "1980 Census of Population," PC90-1-A; "1990 Decennial Census"; "2000 Decennial Census." Calculations: PRI.







Population by Selected Age Groups Jewell County and Kansas 1990-2000									
	Age:	<u>0-4</u>	<u>5-17</u>	<u>18-24</u>	<u>25-44</u>	<u>45-64</u>	65 and over		
Jewell	1990 2000	258 173	756 659	190 168	1,018 814	958 994	1,051 983		
Kansas1990189,988472,267255,195776,430443,8773422000188,708524,285275,592769,204574,400356									

Table 3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Table 3a Population by Selected Age Groups as Percent of Total Jewell County and Kansas 1990-2000							
	Age:	<u>0-4</u>	<u>5-17</u>	<u>18-24</u>	<u>25-44</u>	<u>45-64</u>	<u>65 and over</u>
Jewell	1990	6.1 %	17.8 %	4.5 %	23.9 %	22.5 %	24.7 %
	2000	4.6	17.4	4.4	21.5	26.2	25.9
Kansas	1990	7.7	19.1	10.3	31.3	17.9	13.8
	2000	7.0	19.5	10.3	28.6	21.4	13.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Figure 2 Population by Age Group as Percent of Total Population Jewell County 1990-2000



## Table 4Population by Hispanic OriginJewell County and Kansas1980-2000

				White		Total	Total		2 or More
	Year	Total	Total	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	Black	Hispanic	Others	Races
Jewell	1980	5,241	5,219	n/a	n/a	4	3	15	
	1990	4,251	4,233	8	4,229	S	8	17	
	2000 *	3,791	3,745	22	3,723	S	27	18	28
Kansas	1980	2,364,236	2,168,221	n/a	n/a	126,127	63,339	69,331	
	1990	2,477,588	2,233,897	40,016	2,193,881	143,076	93,670	102,512	
	2000 *	2,688,418	2,313,944	79,947	2,233,997	154,198	188,252	163,780	56,496

\* 2000 race data is not comparable to previous years due to changes in reporting. See text for more.

S - data suppressed.

Numbers do not always add up to totals since data was taken from separate Census forms.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

#### Table 4a Population by Hispanic Origin as Percent of Total Jewell County and Kansas 1980-2000

			White			Total	2 or More		
	Year	Total	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	Black	Hispanic	Others	Races	
Jewell	1980	99.6%	n/a	n/a	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%		
	1990	99.6	0.2	99.5	S	0.2	0.4		
	2000 *	98.8	0.6	98.2	S	0.7	0.5	0.7	
Kansas	1980	91.7%	n/a	n/a	5.3%	2.7%	2.9%		
	1990	90.2	1.6	88.5	5.8	3.8	4.1		
	2000 *	86.1	3.0	83.1	5.7	7.0	6.1	2.1	

\* 2000 race data is not comparable to previous years due to changes in reporting. See text for more.

S - data suppressed.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

### Table 5 Net Migration 1970-1999

	Jewell County								
PopulationBirths -Net ***% NetYearPopulationChangeBirthsDeathsDeathsMigrationMigration									
1970*	6,099	-14,799	n/a	n/a	-13,814	-985	-4.7		
1980*	5,241	-858	n/a	n/a	-177	-681	-11.2		
1990*	4,251	-990	628	739	-111	-879	-16.8		
1999**	3,787	-464	327	537	-210	-254	-6.0		

<u>Kansas</u>

<u>Year</u>	<b>Population</b>	Population <u>Change</u>	<u>Births</u>	<u>Deaths</u>	Births - <u>Deaths</u>	Net *** <u>Migration</u>	% Net <u>Migration</u>
1970*	2,249,071	70,460	409,189	219,067	190,122	-119,662	-5.5
1980*	2,364,236	115,165	355,861	218,713	137,148	-21,983	-1.0
1990*	2,477,588	113,352	397,215	220,466	176,749	-63,397	-2.7
1999**	2,654,052	176,464	348,226	215,686	132,540	43,924	1.8

n/a: not available

\* Decade ending

\*\* Population estimate

\*\*\* Net migration = Population change - (births-deaths)

Source: Population Totals: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Census of Population, 1970: Number of Inhabitants; 1980 Census of Population," Vol.1, Chapter A, Part 18; "1990 Census of Population and Housing;" Population Estimates U.S. Bureau of the Census. Calculations: PRI.

					(	····,					
Rk	1940	Рор.	Rk	1980	Рор.	Rk	1990	Рор.	Rk	2000	Pop.
1	Wyandotte	145	1	Sedgwick	367	1	Sedgwick	404	1	Sedgwick	453
2	Sedgwick	143	2	Johnson	270	2	Johnson	355	2	Johnson	451
3	Shawnee	91	3	Wyandotte	172	3	Wyandotte	162	3	Shawnee	170
4	Reno	52	4	Shawnee	155	4	Shawnee	161	4	Wyandotte	158
5	Montgomery	49	5	Douglas	68	5	Douglas	82	5	Douglas	100
6	Crawford	45	6	Reno	65	6	Riley	67	6	Leavenworth	69
7	Leavenworth	41	7	Riley	64	7	Leavenworth	64	7	Reno	65
8	Cowley	38	8	Leavenworth	55	8	Reno	62	8	Riley	63
9	Johnson	33	9	Saline	49	9	Butler	51	9	Butler	59
10	Butler	32	10	Butler	45	10	Saline	49	10	Saline	54
11	Labette	30	11	Montgomery	42	11	Montgomery	39	11	Finney	41
12	Cherokee	30	12	Crawford	38	12	Cowley	37	12	Crawford	38
13	Saline	30	13	Cowley	37	13	Crawford	36	13	Cowley	36
14	Lyon	26	14	Lyon	35	14	Lyon	35	14	Montgomery	36
15	Sumner	26	15	Barton	31	15	Finney	33	15	Lyon	36
16	Douglas	25	16	Harvey	31	16	Harvey	31	16	Harvey	33
17	Barton	25	17	Geary	30	17	Geary	30	17	Ford	32
18	McPherson	24	18	McPherson	27	18	Barton	29	18	McPherson	30
19	Dickinson	23	19	Ellis	26	19	Ford	27	19	Miami	28
20	Atchison	22	20	Labette	26	20	McPherson	27	20	Barton	28
52	Jewell	12	73	Jewell	5	76	Jewell	4	79	Jewell	4

Table 6Population of Top Ranking Kansas Counties(Thousands)

\* Population Projection

Source: University of Kansas, Policy Research Institute, "Kansas Statistical Abstract," 1992-1993, "Population of Kansas Counties, 1890-1980; U.S. Bureau of the Census, "1990 Census of Population and Housing." Floerchinger, Teresa D., "Kansas Population Projections, 1990-2030, "Kansas Division of the Budget, September, 1992. Calculations: PRI.

Map 1	
<b>Percent Population Change:</b>	1980 - 1990

Cheyenn -11.8	e Raw -17	lins 1	Decatur -10.8	Norton -11.1	Phillips -11.0	Smith -14.6	Jewell -18.9	Republic -14.4	Washin -17.2	gton Ma -{	rshall .5	Nemaha -6.8	Brown -6.9	Donipha -12.2	
-10.7	Tho -2.	mas 3	Sheridan -14.1	Graham -11.3	Rooks -13.8	Osborne -18.3	Mitchell -11.3	Cloud -11.8	_ Clay 6.6	Riley 5.7	Pottawat 9.1	omie Ja	ckson 1.0 Jet	tchison -8.0	Leavenworth 17.4 Wyandotte
Wallace -11.0	Logan -11.4		Gove -13.3	Trego	Ellis	Russell	Lincoln -11.9	Ottawa -5.6	Dickins	Gear 00 2.0	/	paunsee	4 Shawnee 3.9	.6 Douglas	Johnson
Greeley	Wichita	Scott	Lane	Ness	Pueb	Barton	Ellsworth -0.8	Saline 0.8	-6.0	Mor 3.	ris 1	Lyon	Osage -0.5	20.9 Franklin -0.3	31.4 Miami 8.5
-3.8	-9.3	-8.5	-3.9	-10.3	-14.9 Pawnee	-6.3	Rice -10.8	McPherson 1.5	Marion -4.7	CI	ase 3.7	-1.1	Coffey -10.3	Anderson	Linn
Hamilton -5.0	Kearny 17.2	Finney 38.8	Grav	Hodgeman -4.1	-6.3 Edwards	Stafford -5.8	Reno -4.0	Harve 1.6	y [	Butler 12.9	Gre	enwood 0.5	Woodson	Allen	Bourbon
Stanton -0.3	Grant 2.6	Haskel 1.9	5.0	Ford 12.9	-11.3 Kiowa -9,5	Pratt -5.6	Kingman -7.5	Sedgy 10.0	wick				-10.5 Wilson -15.2	-6.5 Neosho -10.2	Crawford
Morton 0.8	Stevens 6.6	Seward 9.8	Meade -11.3	Clark -7.0	Comanche -9.4	Barber -10.3	Harper -8.4	Sumner 3.7		Cowley 0.2	Elk -1 Ch -1	5.1 autauqua 2.1	Montgom. -8.2	Labette -7.7	Cherokee -4.2

Source: Policy Research Institute, The University of Kansas: data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

-

13

Map 2 Percent Population Change: 1990-2000

Cheyenr -1.9	ne F	Rawlins -12.4	Decatur -13.4	Norton 0.6	Phillips -8.4	Smith -10.1	Jewell -10.4	Republic -9.8	Washington -7.9	Marshal -6.0	I Nemah 2.7	a Brown -3.7	Doniph 1.6	an
Sherman -2.3	1	Thomas -1.2	Sheridan -7.8	Graham -16.3	Rooks -5.3	Osborne -8.4	Mitchell -3.5	Cloud -6.5	Clay Ri -3.4 -6	iley Pott 5.5 12.	awatomie Ja 7 1	ackson 10.0 Je	Atchison -0.8 efferson 15.6	Leavenworth 6.2 Wyandotte -2.4
Wallace -3.5	Log -1.	jan 2	Gove -5.2	Trego -9.8	Ellis 6.0	Russell -5.4	Lincoln -1.4	Ottawa 10.2 Saline	Dickinson 2.2	eary 8.2	Wabaunsee 4.7	Shawnee 5.3	Douglas	Johnson
Greeley -13.1	Wichita -7.7	a Scott -2.8	Lane -8.6	Ness -13.8	Rush -7.2	Barton -3.7	Ellsworth -0.8	8.6 McPherson	Marion	Morris -1.6	Lyon 3.5	Osage 9.5	Franklin 12.3	20.3 Miami 20.3
Hamilton 12.1	Kearny 13.1	/ Finne 22.3	ey	Hodgeman -4.0	Pawnee -3.9	Stafford -10.0	Rice 2.0 Reno	8.1 Harvey	3.7	1.2		Coffey 5.5	Anderson 4.3	Linn 15.9
Stanton			Gray 9.5	Ford 18.2	Edwards -8.7	Pratt	3.9	5.8 Sedgw	Butler 17.2 vick		Greenwood -2.1	Woodson -8.1	Allen -1.7	Bourbon 3.0
3.3	10.2	Haske 11.2	Meade	Clark	Kiowa -9.8	-0.2	Kingman 4.5				Elk -1.9	Wilson 0.9	Neosho -0.2	Crawford 7.6
Norton 0.5	Stevens 8.0	Sewar 20.5	rd 9.5	-1.1	Comanche -14.3	– Barber -9.5	Harper -7.9	United Summer	-1.8	ÿ	Chautauqua -0.5	Montgomer -6.5	y Labette -3.3	Cherokee 6.1

Source: Policy Research Institute, The University of Kansas: data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Map 3 Percent Net Migration: 1990 - 1999

Cheyen 3.8	ne Ra -	wlins 3.8	Decatur -10.1	Norton -2.1	Phillips -5.4	Smith -2.4	Jewell -6.0	Republic -0.2	Washing -3.7	ton Marsha -2.5	II Nemah -1.1	a Brown -0.8	Doniph -3.3	an
Sherman -7.7	n Tł	iomas 7.8	Sheridar -10.4	Graham -8.0	Rooks -4.1	Osborne 0.2	Mitchell 0.3	Cloud -3.1	Clay 1.3	Riley Pot -15.9 11	ttawatomie J .7	ackson 2.6 1	tchison -1.8 fferson 2.0	Leavenworth 5.9 Wyandotte -13.2
Wallace -4.5	Loga -3.0	n	Gove -6.5	Trego -5.9	Ellis -2.3	Russell -0.5	Lincoln -1.7	Ottawa 7.7	Dickinson 3.7	Geary -35.3	Wabaunsee -2.3	Shawnee 1.5	Douglas	Johnson
Greeley -7.6	Wichita -12.0	Scott -8.8	Lane -8.8	Ness -7.8	Rush -7.2	Barton -4.9	Ellsworth 0.0	-0.8 McPherson	Marion	Morris -0.2	Lyon -8.6	Osage 12.0	13.4 Franklin 10.8	14.2 Miami 12.1
Hamilton -0.6	Kearny -6.0	Finney -5.2	/	Hodgeman	Pawnee -3.5	Stafford	Rice -2.9	4.4	8.2	Chase -6.1		Coffey 4.1	Anderson 6.1	Linn 16.2
Stanton			Gray -2.8	Ford -4.0	Edwards -8.8	Pratt	-0.2	Harvey 8.0 Sedgw 2 7	y But 19 vick	tler 9.1	Greenwood 6.1	Woodson 1.0	Allen -1.0	Bourbon 0.8
-14.2	-1.9	Haskel	Meade	Clark	Kiowa -9.4	-2.0	Kingman 5.0	Sumner	Co	wley	Elk 9.5	Wilson 3.5	Neosho -2.0	Crawford 2.0
-5.4	-0.7	-8.0	0.8	2.0	Comanche -7.1	-6.6	Harper -6.6	3.6	-1	.7	Chautauqua 3.9	Montgomery -4.5	/ Labette -3.0	Cherokee 4.4

Source: Policy Research Institute, The University of Kansas: data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

### EMPLOYMENT

Economic vitality of every community is reflected in the employment situation. This section compares the key employment measurements such as labor force size, job creation rate, and unemployment in the Jewell County area with its comparative counties and the state of Kansas.

The number of people who are either working or willing to work determines the size of the labor force. This number is influenced not only by the size of population but also by the perceptions of individuals that suitable job opportunities exist within the community. Diverse healthy economies tend to offer the widest variety of job opportunities and thereby attract a large number of job seekers, which increases the size of the labor force.

The unemployment level reflects the amount of economic activity within an area and how well the local market is able to match the supply and demand for labor.

Job creation rates (net change in average annual employment) reflect the growth in employment levels and the range of employment opportunities. As some jobs are lost in a community due to changing economic circumstances, they may be replaced by new jobs. Net job creation reflects the net gain or net loss in jobs over a given period of time.

Place of work data compared to the place of residence data provide the insight of the employment opportunities within the area.

The following data include tables, maps, and graphs on employment growth rates, number of firms by number of employees, percentage distribution of firms by number of employees, employment levels by industry, labor force participation, unemployment rates, and job growth.

### **Employment: Key Findings**

- Between 1990 and 2000 the average annual employment in Jewell County (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis data by place of work) fell from 2,044 employees in 1990 to 1,942 in 2000. All of the decline occurred in the second half of the decade. Employment actually increased 3 percent from 1990 to 1995, but dropped 7.8 percent from 1995 to 2000. (Table 7 and Figure 3)
- Employment in the comparative counties saw a similar trend in the 1990's. Most of them had employment increase slightly from 1990 to 1995; Osborne County's employment grew the most at 3.2 percent. From 1995 to 2000, however, the majority of the comparative counties saw declines. In this case, Osborne County again led the pack, with a decrease in employment of 11.8 percent. (Table 7, Figures 3 and 3a)

- The number of firms located in Jewell County increased 17 percent between 1988 and 1998, compared to a 12.6 percent increase for the state of Kansas over the same time period. (Table 8)
- The percentage distribution patterns of firms by the number of employees are more skewed to smaller firms in Jewell County than in the state as a whole (Table 8a). The vast majority of firms in Jewell County are small companies with less than 20 employees. Between 1988 and 1998 their number increased from 99 to 115. The percentage of medium-sized companies (up to one hundred employees) increased from four to six in the same time period. As of 1998 Jewell County did not have any firms employing 100 workers or more (Tables 8 and 8a). This data indicates the importance of small businesses to the local economy.
- Total industry-level employment for Jewell County stayed steady from 1993 to 1998, increasing only two jobs, or 0.1 percent. This is compared to a 13.5 percent growth rate for the state of Kansas during the same period of time (Table 9).
- From 1993 to 1998, farm employment, the largest employment sector in Jewell County, declined 12 percent, a loss of 95 jobs in five years. Farm employment also fell for the state, though not as much at only one percent. (Table 9)
- Other sectors which saw declines in Jewel County were Services (-2.5 percent) and Transportation (-4.2 percent.) Agricultural Services, Mining and Manufacturing also saw decreased employment, but final numbers are not available. When a sector gets to small enough information regarding it is suppressed by the Bureau of Economic Analysis for confidentiality reasons. (Table 9 and Figure 4)
- Three categories saw employment increases in Jewell County from 1993 to 1995: Construction gained 15 jobs, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate gained 28, and the Government Sector grew by 46 workers. (Table 9 and Figure 4).
- In 1998, Farming employed more people than any other sector in Jewell, with a 30.2 percent share of total employment. However, this percentage had decreased somewhat from 34.3 percent in 1993. Government was the second largest employer at 23.2 percent of the total. Following that were Services (12 percent) and Retail Trade (13 percent). The other industry sectors all employed less than ten percent each of the total. (Table 9a)
- Recent wage and salary employment estimates based on the place of work data show that employment of all industries in Jewell County fell 6.3 percent from 1998 to 1999. Employment estimates for the state of Kansas show a 1.3 percent increase from 1998 to 1999 (Table 9b).
- Place of residence data for Jewell County actually indicates a 0.2 percent increase in employment between 1998 and 1999. These figures are from the Kansas

Department of Human Resources, and as the name suggests, are based on the place of residence of individuals rather than their place of work. At the same time the civilian labor force fell by 0.9 percent, leading to a nearly 41 percent decrease in unemployment. (Table 9b)

- Comparing place of residence data and place of work data can indicate commuting trends. Table 9b shows that the number of jobs (place of work data) in Jewell County in 1999 was 1,103 less than the number of people employed in Jewell County in 1999 (place of residence data.) This could indicate that 1,103 people, or 54 percent of the number of employed people in Jewell County, commuted to a job outside of the county.
- The unemployment rate in Jewell County decreased from 2.7 percent in 1998 to a very low 1.6 percent in 1999. These rates are extremely low, but do not necessarily reflect wonderful conditions. As is often the case with rural communities, the very low unemployment rate indicates merely that most people who have not been able to find jobs have moved away, until the few left are simply those who can still be gainfully employed. (Table 9b and Map 5)
- In the state of Kansas total employment (place of residence data) increased by two percent between 1998 and 1999. A much smaller increase in the civilian labor force resulted in a 20.4 percent decrease in the number of unemployed. (Table 9b)
- The labor force participation rate is the percentage of population aged 16 and over that is in the labor force. The labor force participation rate in 1990 for Jewell County was 59.7 percent (Map 4). While relatively decent compared to other counties in Kansas, the participation rate was still somewhat lower than Kansas' rate of 65.4 percent and the U.S. rate of 64.4 percent (1990 U.S. Census.)

# Table 7Employment Growth RatesJewell County, Comparative Counties, Kansas, and United StatesPlace of Residence Data1990-2000

	Average /	Annual Employ	ment	% Employr	nent Growth
	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1990-1995</u>	<u>1995-2000</u>
Jewell	2,044	2,106	1,942	3.0 %	-7.8 <b>%</b>
Cloud	5,212	5,068	4,749	-2.8	-6.3
Lincoln	1,736	1,719	1,734	-1.0	0.9
Mitchell	3,384	3,476	3,774	2.7	8.6
Osborne	2,379	2,454	2,164	3.2	-11.8
Republic	3,162	3,156	2,866	-0.2	-9.2
Smith	2,399	2,420	2,265	0.9	-6.4
Washington	3,398	3,437	3,205	1.1	-6.8
Kansas	1,219,000	1,278,500	1,359,000	4.9	6.3

Source: Kansas Department of Human Resources.





		Jewell		Kansas					
<u>Employees</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>% Change</u>			
1 19	99	115	16.2 %	58,081	64,030	10.2 %			
20 99	4	6	50.0	6,604	8,401	27.2			
100 499	0	0		958	1,441	50.4			
500+	0	0		93	147	58.1			
Total	103	121	17.5	65,736	74,019	12.6			

### Table 8 Number of Firms, by Number of Employees Jewell County and Kansas 1988-1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "County Business Patterns," 1988 and 1998; Policy Research Institute.

## Table 8aPercentage Distribution of Firms, by Number of EmployeesJewell County and Kansas1988-1998

	Jew	ell	Kansas				
Employees	<u>1988</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1998</u>			
0 - 19	96.1 %	95.0 %	88.4 %	86.5 %			
20 - 99	3.9	5.0	10.0	11.3			
100 - 499	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.9			
500+	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2			

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "County Business Patterns," 1988 and 1998; Policy Research Institute. Due to numbers being rounded up, percentages may not equal 100%.

### Table 9 Employment Levels by Industry Jewell County and Kansas Place of Work Data 1993-1998

	Jewell				Kansas				
<u>Industry</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>% Change</u>	
Ag. Services	73	S	n/a	n/a %	17,039	21,159	4,120	24.2 <b>%</b>	
Mining	14	S	n/a	n/a	28,274	20,491	-7,783	-27.5	
Construction	73	88	15	20.5	69,834	90,576	20,742	29.7	
Manufacturing	14	S	n/a	n/a	187,914	219,402	31,488	16.8	
Transportation	72	69	-3	-4.2	75,247	84,832	9,585	12.7	
Wholesale Trade	91	91	0	0.0	74,037	82,421	8,384	11.3	
Retail Trade	299	299	0	0.0	251,571	298,627	47,056	18.7	
Finance, Insur., Real Est.	102	130	28	27.5	95,702	107,350	11,648	12.2	
Services	283	276	-7	-2.5	387,242	467,121	79,879	20.6	
Gov't. and Gov't. Services	487	533	46	9.4	268,035	270,802	2,767	1.0	
Subtotal Non-Farm	1,508	1,605	97	6.4	1,454,895	1,662,781	207,886	14.3	
Farm Employment	788	693	-95	-12.1	81,070	80,231	-839	-1.0	
Total Employment	2,296	2,298	2	0.1	1,535,965	1,743,012	207,047	13.5	

S - Data suppressed by BEA for confidentiality reasons. N/A - not applicable.

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System (REIS).

Figure 4 Percent Change in Employment by Industry 1993-1998



Economic Trends Update: Jewell County

### Table 9a Employment Percent Share by Industry Jewell County and Kansas Place of Work Data 1993-1998

	Jewell			Kansas			
<u>Industry</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Change</u>	
Ag. Services	3.2	S	n/a %	1.1	1.2	0.1 %	
Mining	0.6	S	n/a	1.8	1.2	-0.7	
Construction	3.2	3.8	0.6	4.5	5.2	0.6	
Manufacturing	0.6	S	n/a	12.2	12.6	0.4	
Transportation	3.1	3.0	-0.1	4.9	4.9	0.0	
Wholesale Trade	4.0	4.0	0.0	4.8	4.7	-0.1	
Retail Trade	13.0	13.0	0.0	16.4	17.1	0.8	
Finance, Insur., Real Est.	4.4	5.7	1.2	6.2	6.2	-0.1	
Services	12.3	12.0	-0.3	25.2	26.8	1.6	
Gov't. and Gov't. Services	21.2	23.2	2.0	17.5	15.5	-1.9	
Subtotal Non-Farm	65.7	64.7	-1.0	94.7	95.4	0.7	
Farm Employment	34.3	30.2	-4.2	5.3	4.6	-0.7	

S - Data suppressed by BEA for confidentiality reasons. N/A - not applicable.

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System (REIS).

### Table 9bLabor Market Summary1998-1999

	J		Kansas	
Place of Residence Data	1998	1999	% Change	% Change
	<u>Average</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>1998-99</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
Civilian labor force	2,094	2,075	-0.9	1.1
Employment	2,037	2,042	0.2	2.0
Unemployment	57	33	-42.1	-20.4
Unemployment rate	2.7	1.5	-44.4	-21.1
Place of Work Data Wage and Salary Employment All industries	1,002	939	-6.3	1.3
Goods producing industries	58	37	-36.2	0.2
Construction and mining	21	15	-28.6	4.1
Manufacturing	S	S	n/a	-1.2
Service producing industries	925	889	-3.9	1.6
Transportation & Public utilities	35	31	-11.4	7.4
Wholesale & Retail Trade	247	233	-5.7	0.9
Finance, Insurance, & Real estate	81	78	-3.7	1.1
Services	57	47	-17.5	1.2
Government	505	500	-1.0	1.4

S- Data suppressed by KDHR for confidentiality reasons. N/A- not applicable

Source: Kansas Department of Human Resources, Labor Market Information Services. Developed in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Map 4 Labor Force Participation: 1990

Cheyen 57.3	ne R	awlins 51.3	Decatur 52.3	Norton 58.2	Phillips 59.3	Smith 58.2	Jewell 59.7	Republic 59.2	Washington 59.1	n Marsha 58.4	II Nemah 63.7	a Brown 59.3	Doniph 59.3	an
Shermar 63.7	n Ti	nomas 57.9	Sheridan 63.5	Graham 61.1	Rooks 59.4	Osborne 60.5	Mitchell 59.7	- Cloud 59.1	Clay F 60.5 7	Riley Pot 70.4 68	tawatomie Ja .2	Ackson 64.2 Je	tchison 61.3 fferson 8.0	Leavenworth 60.5 Wyandotte 64.1
Wallace 64.4	Loga 64.	ın I	Gove 58.3	Trego 60.2	Ellis 69.5	Russell 57.2	Lincoln 60.8	- Ottawa 61.2	Dickinson 52.6	Seary 72.2	Wabaunsee 64.7	68.2	Douglas	Johnson
Greeley 69.1	Wichita 62.4	Scott 64.7	Lane 60.1	Ness 62.4	Rush 58.3	Barton 65.5	Ellsworth 53.5	59.1 McPherson	Marion	Morris 60.2	Lyon 67.3	Osage 61.0	65.3 Franklin 65.5	75.3 Miami 64.1
Hamilton 64.7	Kearny	Finney	,	Hodgeman	Pawnee 60.2	Stafford	Rice 59.4	67.3	59.4	Chase 57.5		Coffey 64.3	Anderson 59.8	Linn 52.8
		14.0	Gray 65.8	Ford 68.8	Edwards 60.8	57.3	Reno 62.6	Harvey 65.7 Sedgw	/ Butle 55.9 /ick	r	Greenwood 54.5	Woodson 57.4	Allen 61.2	Bourbon 57.1
Stanton 65.9	Grant 72.1	Haskell 40.3	Meade	Clark	Kiowa 60.0	63.7	Kingman 60.0	70.5	Quit		Elk 52.7	Wilson 56.2	Neosho 61.2	Crawford 57.5
Morton 53.0	Stevens 55.5	Seward 70.1	54.4	64.6	Comanche 59.5	агрег 60.8	Harper 58.5	62.7	61.7	ey	Chautauqua 48.1	Montgomery 59.0	Labette 61.6	Cherokee 57.7

Source: 1990 U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Kansas: 65.4%

Cheyenne Rawlins Decatur Phillips Brown Norton Nemaha Marshall Republic Smith Jewell Washington 1.5 2.4 6.7 1.9 1.3 2.4 1.7 1.5 1.7 2.5 2.3 1.3 Doniphan< 4.7 Atchison Sherman Cloud Thomas Leavenworth Sheridan Graham 3.8 Rooks Osborne Mitchell Rilev Jackson Clay 2.7 Pottawatomie 2.8 1.5 1.6 3.2 1.5 2.1 2.4 1.8 2.9 2.8 1.6 2.1 Jefferson Wyandotte 3 5.4 Ottawa Shawnee Lincoln Wallace 2.4 Logan Gove Trego Ellis 3.1 Russell Dickinson 1.8 1.6 1.7 1.6 2.8 Gearv Wabaunsee 2.2 2.9 2.8 Douglas Johnson 5.9 3 Saline 3.2 1.9 Osage Ellsworth 2.5 Morris 4 2 Miami 2.7 Franklin Greeley Wichita Scott Lyon Lane Ness Rush Barton 2.7 3.2 2.6 2.3 1.5 3.1 2.8 2.2 2.4 3 McPherson Marion Chase Rice 2 2.2 Coffey Anderson Linn 3.3 3.3 4.3 Pawnee 6.3 4.4 Hamilton Kearny Finney Hodgeman 1.9 Stafford 1.2 2.3 2.5 1.8 2.3 Harvey Reno Greenwood Bourbon 3 2.6 Butler Woodson Allen Gray 4.6 Edwards 4.1 2.9 5 4.5 1.7 Ford 2.2 Sedgwick 1.9 Pratt 3.4 Stanton Grant Haskell Wilson Neosho Kiowa 2.1 Kingman Crawford 1.9 3.5 1.9 4 2.9 1.6 2.9 3.2 Elk 3.7 Meade Clark Cowley Barber Morton Sumner Stevens Seward 1.9 Montgomery Labette 1.5 Cherokee Comanche 2.2 Harper 3.7 2.1 3.2 2 2.7 4.4 3.9 Chautauqua 4.1 2.8 1.2 4.6

Map 5 County Unemployment Rates: 1999

*Note:* Employment data are based on an individual's place of residence.

Source: Policy Research Institute, The University of Kansas, "Kansas Statistical Abstract, 2000" using data from Kansas Labor Force Estimates Annual Average, 1999. Kansas Department of Human Resources, Labor Market Information Services, developed in cooperation with U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

### **Earnings and Income**

The economic base of the community is determined by the income of the community's residents. Higher average wages may indicate a greater number of jobs in high growth, high performance businesses. Low wage growth may indicate a higher concentration of stable or declining industries.

This report looks at two major components of earnings and income: average wage per job and per capita personal income. Average wage per job reflects the productivity of local labor and the performance of local businesses. Per capita personal income indicates the relative wealth of the area compared to the state. As the productivity of business and industry increases, personal per capita income also rises.

### Earnings and Income: Key Findings

- In 1998 the average wage per job in Jewell County was \$16,056. That was \$10,194 less than the average wage for the state of Kansas and \$15,243 less than the national average (Table 10, Figure 5).
- Jewell's average wage per job compared somewhat better to the selected counties in 1998. It was higher than the average wage per job in Lincoln, Osborne, Smith and Washington counties, though the biggest difference among that group was only \$1,842. Cloud, Mitchell, and Republic counties all had average wages higher than Jewell's. At \$20,116 the average wage per job in Mitchell County was the highest of the group, and \$4,060 higher than Jewell. (Table 10 and Figure 5a)
- In the five year period between 1988 and 1993 the average wage per job in Jewell County increased 22.4 percent, the highest percentage increase of any of the comparative counties or the state of Kansas. Between 1993 and 1998 the average wage per job increased only 17 percent, which was about average. (Table 10)
- Per capita personal income in Jewell County in 1999 grew slower than the state's rate, and at \$22,750 was still behind the state's average of \$26,705 per year (Table 11). However, this difference is not so drastic as the difference in average wage per job. Historical data show that while per capita income in Jewell County has always been lower than the state average, the gap seems to have remained mostly the same since the late 1980's. (Figure 5b)
- In 1999 per capita personal income for Jewell County was in the mid range of levels seen in the comparative counties. Mitchell County had the highest per capita income of the group at \$24,466. (Map 6)

## Table 10Average Wage Per JobJewell County, Comparative Counties, Kansas and U.S.1988-1998

	Averag	e Wage per Job	(Dollars)	% Growth		
	<u>1988</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>88-93</u>	<u>93-98</u>	
Jewell	11,218	13,726	16,056	22.4	17.0	
Cloud	13,423	15,513	17,750	15.6	14.4	
Lincoln	11,508	12,873	14,214	11.9	10.4	
Mitchell	13,360	15,900	20,116	19.0	26.5	
Osborne	11,731	13,318	15,789	13.5	18.6	
Republic	12,733	14,156	16,838	11.2	18.9	
Smith	11,448	12,931	16,002	13.0	23.7	
Washington	10,870	12,220	14,500	12.4	18.7	
Kansas	18,545	21,899	26,250	18.1	19.9	
United States	21,527	25,888	31,299	20.3	20.9	

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System (1969-1998), Regional Economic Profile, Table CA30.





1980-1999								
Inco	me (\$)	Growth	Rates					
Jewell	Kansas	Jewell	Kansas					
6,980	10,038							
6,764	11,248	-3.1 %	12.1 <b>%</b>					
9,970	11,989	47.4	6.6					
11,507	12,373	15.4	3.2					
11,903	13,602	0.0	9.9					
12,199	14,330	2.5	5.4					
14,126	14,904	15.8	4.0					
14,403	15,583	2.0	4.6					
13,832	16,331	-4.0	4.8					
14,086	17,093	1.8	4.7					
17,795	18,182	26.3	6.4					
15,207	18,832	-14.5	3.6					
17,734	19,955	16.6	6.0					
17,227	20,510	-2.9	2.8					
19,182	21,352	11.3	4.1					
19,220	21,889	0.2	2.5					
22,303	23,121	16.0	5.6					
20,928	24,358	-6.2	5.4					
22,590	25,606	7.9	5.1					
22,754	26,705	0.7	4.3					
	Incor Jewell 6,980 6,764 9,970 11,507 11,903 12,199 14,126 14,403 13,832 14,086 17,795 15,207 17,734 17,227 19,182 19,220 22,303 20,928 22,590 22,754	1980-1999Income (\$)JewellKansas $6,980$ $10,038$ $6,764$ $11,248$ $9,970$ $11,989$ $11,507$ $12,373$ $11,903$ $13,602$ $12,199$ $14,330$ $14,126$ $14,904$ $14,403$ $15,583$ $13,832$ $16,331$ $14,086$ $17,093$ $17,795$ $18,182$ $15,207$ $18,832$ $17,734$ $19,955$ $17,227$ $20,510$ $19,182$ $21,352$ $19,220$ $21,889$ $22,303$ $23,121$ $20,928$ $24,358$ $22,590$ $25,606$ $22,754$ $26,705$	1980-1999Income (\$)GrowthJewellKansasJewell $6,980$ $10,038$ Jewell $6,764$ $11,248$ $-3.1$ % $9,970$ $11,989$ $47.4$ $11,507$ $12,373$ $15.4$ $11,903$ $13,602$ $0.0$ $12,199$ $14,330$ $2.5$ $14,126$ $14,904$ $15.8$ $14,403$ $15,583$ $2.0$ $13,832$ $16,331$ $-4.0$ $14,086$ $17,093$ $1.8$ $17,795$ $18,182$ $26.3$ $15,207$ $18,832$ $-14.5$ $17,734$ $19,955$ $16.6$ $17,227$ $20,510$ $-2.9$ $19,182$ $21,352$ $11.3$ $19,220$ $21,889$ $0.2$ $22,303$ $23,121$ $16.0$ $20,928$ $24,358$ $-6.2$ $22,590$ $25,606$ $7.9$ $22,754$ $26,705$ $0.7$					

### Table 11 Per Capita Personal Income Jewell County and Kansas 1980-1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System (1969-1999), County Summary, Table CA13.



Map 6 Per Capita Personal Income: 1999

Cheyenı 23,944	ne R	Rawlins 24,294	Decatur 25,349	Norton 23,848	Phillips 24,811	Smith 23,195	Jewell 22,754	Republic 21,218	Washing 19,913	ton Marsha 25,691	II Nemah 24,61	Brown 2 21,425	5 Doniph 22,10	han 5
Sherman 27,473	Т	<sup>-</sup> homas 25,709	Sheridan 30,930	Graham 23,367	Rooks 21,600	Osborne 20,849	Mitchell 24,466	Cloud 21,563	Clay 23,059	Riley Pot 22,045 20	tawatomie J ,970	ackson 22,886 Je	Atchison 19,780 efferson 22.824	Leavenworth 20,712 Wyandotte 20,292
Wallace 24,436	Log 23,	an ,709	Gove 28,310	Trego 20,296	Ellis 24,669	Russell 22,363	Lincoln 20,629	Ottawa 21,789	Dickinson 21,216	Geary 21.795	Wabaunsee 22,678	Shawnee 26,394	Douglas	Johnson
Greeley 30,124	Wichita 35,786	Scott 30.387	Lane	Ness	Rush	Barton	Ellsworth 22,157	28,624		Morris 19,748	Lyon 22.388	Osage 19,836	21,658 Franklin 21,193	41,557 Miami 23,578
Hamilton	Kearny	/ Finney	23,233	Hodgeman	21,326 Pawnee 23.638	22,400	Rice 21,588	– McPherson 24,914	Marion 18,459	Chase 26,579		Coffey 21,416	Anderson 17,569	Linn 18,462
33,738	25,672	2 21,826	Gray 27,873	24,313 Ford	Edwards 28,024	25,009	Reno 23,888	Harvey 25,04 Sedgw	/ 1 Bu 24	tler 4,157	Greenwood 19,302	Woodson 17,985	Allen 20,302	Bourbon 21,268
Stanton 33,228	Grant 21,557	Haskell 37,282		23,224	Kiowa 23,666	Pratt 23,637	Kingman 20,862	27,44	2		Elk	Wilson 19,308	Neosho 21,617	Crawford 22,088
lorton 22,639	Stevens 28,141	Seward 23,229	28,107	Clark 25,062	Comanche 21,872	Barber 20,438	Harper 23,021	Sumner 24,038	Co 20	wley 0,536	Chautauqua 18,443	Montgomer 20,226	y Labette 19,701	Cherokee 18,630

Source: Policy Research Institute, The University of Kansas, using data from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System, Table CA5, May 2000.

-

### RETAIL

Retail trade is an important part of a community's business environment as well as source of revenues for the local governments. Retail trade is affected by a number of factors; for example, past decisions by investors, business managers, taxpayers, and policy makers contribute to a business climate which either promotes or inhibits the productivity of local businesses and therefore affects decisions about growth and expansion. Other contributing factors include the level of competition, the availability of suppliers and supporting industries, the cost of labor, and taxation and regulation within the community. Some types of establishments will thrive in an environment in which other firms cannot operate profitably.

The following section contains a table and a figure, outlining the retail sales growth rates.

### **Retail: Key Findings**

- Taxable retail sales in Jewell County stood at \$9.1 million dollars in 1999, the latest year for which data is available. Retail sales growth rates were fairly erratic throughout the last decade, making it difficult to see any trend. Indeed, retail sales were nearly exactly the same amount in 1989 as they were in 1999. This compares to a decade growth rate for the state of 57 percent. (Table 12)
- For most of the 1990's the taxable retail sales growth rates in Jewell County have been less than those seen statewide. Figure 6 illustrates this trend. (Table 12 and Figure 6)
- Jewell County's trade pull factor in 2000 was a very low 0.28, in fact, this was the third lowest number in the state. A trade pull factor of less than one means the county lost more retail activity to other counties than it was able to 'pull in'. All of the comparative counties had pull factors of less than one, though none so low as Jewell's. No doubt many residents of these counties travel to Salina or perhaps Nebraska to shop, making it difficult for them to retain much in the way of retail dollars. (Map 7)

	Jewo	ell	Kansas				
Year	Nominal Sales (\$Millions)	Growth Rate (%)	Nominal Sales (\$Millions)	Growth Rate (%)			
1989	92		18 034 4				
1990	9.9	7.6 %	18,723.3	3.8 %			
1991	9.8	-1.0	19,988.0	6.8			
1992	9.3	-5.1	21,421.3	7.2			
1993	9.3	0.0	23,154.4	8.1			
1994	9.5	2.2	24,979.0	7.9			
1995	9.1	-4.2	24,289.1	-2.8			
1996	9.8	7.7	25,401.5	4.6			
1997	9.2	-6.1	26,788.9	5.5			
1998	9.2	0.0	28,505.9	6.4			
1999	9.1	-1.1	29,380.6	3.1			

### Table 12 Taxable Retail Sales and Growth Rates Jewell County and Kansas 1989-1999

Note: Data from 1994 to 1999 are not comparable to 1987-1993 data.

Source: Kansas Department of Revenue, State Sales Tax Collections by County Classification. Calculations, 1987-1993, CEDBR, W. Frank Barton School of Business, Wichita State University; 1994-1999, PRI, University of Kansas.



Economic Trends Update: Jewell County

Map 7 County Trade Pull Factors: 2000

Cheyen 0.51	ne Ra 0.	wlins 38	Decatur 0.40	Norton 0.73	Phillips 0.62	Smith 0.50	Jewell 0.28	Republic 0.51	Washingto 0.40	on Marshal 0.67	I Nemah 0.63	a Brown 0.53	Doniph 0.39	an
Shermar 1.16	1. Th	omas 13	Sheridan 0.58	Graham 0.65	Rooks 0.61	Osborne 0.53	Mitchell 0.82	Cloud 0.83	Clay 0.63	Riley Pott 0.66 1.2	awatomie Ja 0	ackson 0.61 Je	Atchison 0.55 efferson 0.30	Leavenworth 0.52 Wyandott 0.73
Wallace 0.55	Loga 0.81	n	Gove 0.71	Trego 0.56	Ellis 1.28	Russell 0.65	Lincoln 0.42	Ottawa 0.33 Saline	Dickinson 0.64	Geary 0.79	Wabaunsee 0.25	Shawnee 1.27 Osage	Douglas 0.93	Johnson 1.56
Greeley 0.47	Wichita 0.49	Scott 0.81	Lane 0.38	Ness 0.73	Rush 0.33	Barton 1.02	0.61	1.40 McPherson 0.88	Marion 0.46	Chase	Lyon 0.94	0.41	Franklin 0.76	Miami 0.66
Hamilton 0.61	Kearny 0.31	Finney 1.16	Grav	Hodgeman 0.40	Pawnee 0.59	Stafford 0.33	0.45 Reno 1.06	Harvey 0.76	/ Butle	0.39	Greenwood	0.62 Woodson	Allen	0.45 Bourbon
Stanton 0.43	Grant 0.87	Haskell 0.38	0.53	Ford 1.09	Edwards 0.35 Kiowa 0.50	Pratt 1.01	Kingman 0.44	Sedgw 1.22		-	0.39	0.33 Wilson 0.43	0.66 Neosho 0.90	Crawford 0.83
lorton 0.60	Stevens 0.56	Seward 1.30	Meade 0.41	Clark 0.32	Comanche 0.48	Barber 0.65	Harper 0.65	Sumner 0.44	Cow 0.68	ley }	0.39 Chautauqua 0.26	Montgomer 0.79	y Labette 0.70	Cherokee 0.40

Note: County Trade Pull Factor (CTPF) = County per capita sales tax collections divided by Kansas per capita sales tax collections. Population data used to compute per capita sales includes institutionalized population.

Source: "County Trade Pull Factors Annual Report for Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000," by David Darling and Sharon Combes, K-State Research and Extension, Department of Agricultural Economics.

### AGRICULTURE

The economic well-being of Jewell County has historically been tied to the agriculture/farming sectors. This section looks at the level of activity in agriculture and examines how the character of this industry is changing in the county.

The agriculture section contains two tables on the total value of field crops and the total value of livestock and poultry.

### Agriculture: Key Findings

- Nearly every comparative county as well as the state as a whole saw sharp declines in the value of field crops in 1997 and 1998. In Jewell County, after reaching a high of \$48.4 million in 1996, the value of field crops fell 13.2 percent in 1997 and another one percent in 1998, bringing the value down to \$41.6 million. That value was less than what it was for the county in 1995. The county with the highest valued crops in 1998 was Washington County at \$49.3 million, followed by Republic County at \$37.2 million. The county with the lowest value of field crops in 1998 was Lincoln County at \$30.1 million. (Table 13)
- The total value of livestock and poultry in Jewell County in 1998 was only \$14.4 million, a decrease of almost 20 percent from 1995. All of Jewell's livestock value decline happened in 1998. The year before the value had reached a high of \$22.2 million. Most of the other comparative counties saw significant declines in 1998 as well. (Table 14)

	Total	Value of C	rops (\$Mill	ions)	Percent Change						
	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>95-96</u>	<u>96-97</u>	<u>97-98</u>	<u>95-98</u>			
Jewell	46.2	48.4	42.0	41.6	4.8 %	-13.2 %	-1.0 %	-10.0 %			
Cloud	45.6	48.9	48.2	36.8	7.2	-1.4	-23.7	-19.3			
Lincoln	26.0	25.8	32.7	30.1	-0.8	26.7	-8.0	15.8			
Mitchell	46.0	52.2	52.0	43.2	13.5	-0.4	-16.9	-6.1			
Osborne	36.2	33.4	40.4	32.6	-7.7	21.0	-19.3	-9.9			
Republic	59.3	68.3	59.1	48.4	15.2	-13.5	-18.1	-18.4			
Smith	46.3	52.6	43.0	37.2	13.6	-18.3	-13.5	-19.7			
Washington	46.8	58.3	51.1	49.3	24.6	-12.3	-3.5	5.3			
Kansas	3,525.9	4,154.6	4,474.9	3,594.3	17.8	7.7	-19.7	1.9			

### Table 13 Total Value of Field Crops Jewell County, Comparative Counties, and Kansas 1995-1998

Values do not include any government program payments. Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding

Source: Kansas Agricultural Statistics, "Kansas Farm Facts"; Kansas County Profile Report, KCCED, The University of Kansas; Calculations: KCCED; National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2000

## Table 14Total Value of Livestock and PoultryJewell County, Comparative Counties, and Kansas1995-1998

	Total Va	lue of Live (\$Mill	stock and ions)	Poultry	Percent Change					
	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>95-96</u>	<u>96-97</u>	<u>97-98</u>	<u>95-98</u>		
Jewell	17.9	19.9	22.2	14.4	11.2 %	11.6 %	-35.1 %	-19.6 %		
Cloud	9.2	8.9	9.5	10.3	-3.3	6.7	8.4	12.0		
Lincoln	14.6	12.9	13.9	10.7	-11.6	7.8	-23.0	-26.7		
Mitchell	20.6	21.1	21.7	20.3	2.4	2.8	-6.5	-1.5		
Osborne	13.7	12.9	13.5	12.2	-5.8	4.7	-9.6	-10.9		
Republic	22.1	21.3	22.0	17.5	-3.6	3.3	-20.5	-20.8		
Smith	18.9	18.5	17.8	16.1	-2.1	-3.8	-9.6	-14.8		
Washington	36.6	40.1	41.6	33.2	9.6	3.7	-20.2	-9.3		
Kansas	2,678.1	2,629.0	2,806.4	2,670.4	-1.8	6.8	-4.8	-0.3		

Values do not include any government program payments.

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding

Source: Kansas Agricultural Statistics, "Kansas Farm Facts"; Kansas County Profile Report, KCCED, The University of Kansas; Calculations: KCCED; National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2000

### **EDUCATION**

The educational level of residents is likely to influence the well being of the whole community. Communities able to provide a higher skilled workforce are more likely to benefit from new developing industries. Residents who have a good educational background will be more employable and able to command higher salaries. Employers will benefit as well because they will most likely experience lower turnover and training costs. On the other hand, individuals with lower education levels have a harder time finding jobs that can supply a living wage and may be more likely to use social services.

### **Education: Key Findings**

- As with many rural communities, Jewell County has a higher percentage of high school graduates than the state of Kansas, but a lower percentage of college graduates. In 1990, the last year for which data is available, 41 percent of the population in Jewell County had obtained their high school diploma, compared to only 33 percent for the state of Kansas. However, the percentage of people in Jewell County who held either bachelor's or graduate's degrees was about half the percentage seen in the state as a whole. (Table 15)
- In 1990, 60.4 percent of the over-25 population in Jewell County had no higher than a high school education, compared to 51.6 percent of the over-25 population in Kansas. (Table 15)
- Jewell County graduated roughly 50 high school students on average each year from 1990 to 1999. The number of high school drop-outs each of those years fluctuated from a low of zero to a high of five. (Table 16)
- High school drop-outs as a percent of graduates in Jewell County averaged about three percent a year from 1990 to 1998. The average rate for Kansas was 23.6 percent. This indicates the quality of Jewell County's education system. (Table 16)

## Table 15Educational Attainment of Persons over 25As a Percentage of the Population of Persons over 25Jewell County and Kansas, 1990

	Completed Less Than 9th Grade	9-12th Grade <u>No Diploma</u>	High School <u>Diploma</u>	Some <u>College</u>	Associate <u>Degree</u>	Bachelor's <u>Degree</u>	Graduate <u>Degree</u>	Pop. <u>Over 25</u>
Jewell	265	323	1,250	665	195	261	96	3,045
Kansas	120,951	172,321	514,177	342,964	85,146	221,016	109,361	1,561,417
As a Perce	ent of Populati	ion of Persons	over 25:					
Jewell	8.7%	10.6%	41.1%	21.8%	6.4%	8.6%	3.2%	
Kansas	7.7%	11.0%	32.9%	22.0%	5.5%	14.2%	7.0%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990.

## Table 16High School Graduates and Drop-OutsJewell County and Kansas1990-1999

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>				
Jewell														
Grads	49	47	37	48	38	49	55	48	70	60				
Drops	0	1	1	2	0	0	5	4	2	n/a				
Kansas														
Grads	25,367	24,414	24,129	24,720	25,319	26,125	25,786	26,648	27,856	28,543				
Drops	4,995	5,738	5,651	6,490	6,698	6,422	6,420	6,042	5,802	n/a				
High schoo	High school drop-outs as percent of graduates													
Jewell	0.0%	2.1%	2.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	8.3%	2.9%					
Kansas	19.7%	23.5%	23.4%	26.3%	26.5%	24.6%	24.9%	22.7%	20.8%					

n/a: Data not available

Grads: High school graduates, year ending:

Drops: High school dropouts, year ending:

Source: Kansas State Department of Education

### CONCLUSION

Economic data is an important tool of the community economic development process because it gives community members a better view of the current facts and trends in different areas of economic and demographic performance of the community. However, numbers alone are not enough. The data must be analyzed and interpreted, taking into account the intuition of those within the community as to what the trends really mean. In other words, economic data serve as the foundation for analysis which concludes: 1) what is happening in the community relative to other regions over time, and 2) what potential impacts or consequences can be inferred from the data. A simplified look at the previous data would conclude the following:

Population in Jewell County has been declining since the beginning of the century. Population analyses of Kansas counties have indicated that many rural counties have seen their populations decline to a low number, usually around 4,000 residents, and from there a period of long term, relative stability is experienced. Jewell County seems to have been a part of this trend. The extremely low unemployment rates in the county also fit this pattern: they indicate very few new jobs are available, and only those residents able to work have remained. At some time population will decline to the level of jobs that must remain, and then stabilize. If this point has not yet been reached in Jewell County, it is near.

The number of firms in Jewell County increased slightly over the last decade or so, however, at the same time total employment decreased. This would suggest that while some small number of new firms have begun, they employ very few people, and of the firms that already existed, they have downsized their number of employees. It is also interesting to note that quite likely nearly half of the employed people who live in Jewell County commute out of the county to work. This indicates that much of Jewell County's fortune is tied to the fortunes of the surrounding communities.

Jewell County is primarily an agricultural community. Farming employs the most people there, and the majority of the other jobs are auxiliary to that function. As long as agriculture remains a viable activity, population and employment conditions similar to the current levels will likely be maintained. However, those levels will continue to be correlated to the relative prosperity of farming activity unless the county develops additional and self-supporting employment bases.