

## Highlights of State and County-to-County Commutation Data for Maryland

In 2013 just over 486,800 Maryland residents worked out of state while just over 292,500 out of state residents commuted into Maryland, leaving Maryland with a net outflow of 194,300 commuters (see [Table 1](#)). This information comes from the 2013 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics OnTheMap (LEHD-OTM)<sup>1</sup>. Compared to 2010 (see [Table 2](#)), a little over 18,600 (4.0%) more Maryland residents worked out of state while nearly 22,300 (8.2%) more out of state residents worked in Maryland (see [Table 3](#)).

### Washington, D.C. Main Destination

Washington, D.C. is the work place destination for the majority of Maryland residents who work out of state. In 2013, nearly 267,000 Maryland residents worked in Washington, D.C, 54.8 percent of all Maryland residents who work out of state. Virginia was the second most attractive destination, where over 134,600 Maryland residents worked, or 27.7 of all out of state commuters. In total, 82.5 percent of Maryland residents who work out of state work in these two localities.

The majority of workers commuting into Maryland come from Virginia (94,159), Pennsylvania (70,943) and Washington, D.C. (49,977). Combined, these three areas comprise nearly three quarters (73.5%) of all in commuters into Maryland.

The net out-commutation (the number of in-commuters minus the number of out-commuters) is highest to Washington, D.C. (-216,902) followed by Virginia (-40,482). The majority (76.1%) of the net outflow to Washington, D.C. and Virginia is from Prince George's and Montgomery counties, with Anne Arundel and Charles counties accounting for an additional 12.8 percent.

In contrast to the net out-commutation to Washington, D.C. and Virginia, Maryland is a net importer of labor from both Pennsylvania (45,765) and West Virginia (17,367). The net in-commutation from Pennsylvania is distributed to many of Maryland's counties, with Baltimore County (14,900), Washington County (11,170), Baltimore City (7,167) and Montgomery County (5,851) being the top destinations for residents of Pennsylvania. The net in-commutation from West Virginia is strongest to Washington (6,795), Montgomery (4,104), Allegany (3,961) and Frederick (3,691) counties (see [County-to-County Commutation Tables](#)).

### Net in commuting occurs in a handful of jurisdictions

The diverse economic geography found among Maryland's jurisdictions is reflected by the 2013 LEHD commutation data. [Table 4](#) summarizes the 2013 inter-jurisdictional in and out flows and net (in minus out) flows, the percent of residents working within their own jurisdiction, and the percent of jobs held by jurisdiction residents and non-residents. Net commutation in 2013 was

---

<sup>1</sup> Released in August 2015.

positive (meaning more commuters coming into a jurisdiction than residents commuting out to work to another jurisdiction) for eight jurisdictions and negative (i.e. more out commuters than in commuters) for the remaining 16 jurisdictions. The range for these net commutation totals went from a positive (net in) of 91,573 for Baltimore City to a negative (net out) of -103,630 for Prince George's County (see [Chart 1](#)). Besides Baltimore City, the jurisdictions with positive net in-commuting are, Anne Arundel and Howard Counties in the Baltimore Region, Montgomery County in the Washington Region, Washington and Allegany Counties in Western Maryland and Talbot and Wicomico Counties on the Eastern Shore. All the suburban jurisdictions around Baltimore City and Washington, D.C. have large net out-commuting totals besides Montgomery and Howard Counties. In 2010(see [Table 5](#)), Anne Arundel County had a net negative in commutations (-9,343) but in 2013 it changed to a positive 724. Compared to 2010, ten jurisdictions in Maryland had increases in net commutations, Baltimore City (15,027) had the largest increase followed by Anne Arundel County (10,067) and Howard County (5,709), whereas Baltimore County (-11,128) had the biggest decline in net commutations (see [Table 6](#)).

### **Residents Working Within Their Own Jurisdiction**

The percent of workers whose jobs are within their jurisdiction of residence shows a great variation across Maryland, from a high of 61.9 percent in Allegany County to a low of 20.9 percent for those who live and work in Caroline County (See [Table 4](#) and [Chart 2](#)). Most of the jurisdictions have less than half of their residents working within their jurisdictions. In the Baltimore and Washington Regions less than 40 percent work in the jurisdiction of their residence. For Southern Maryland a little under 30 percent work in the jurisdiction where they live, for the Upper Eastern Shore a little over 30 percent. Western Maryland is the only region where more than half (53.3%) work in the jurisdiction where they live and for the Lower Eastern Shore region it is 47.8 percent.

### **Jurisdiction Jobs Held by Jurisdiction Residents**

The percent of a jurisdiction's jobs held by its own residents also shows great variation, ranging from Garrett County's 61.1 percent to Howard County's 25.4 percent (See [Table 4](#) and [Chart 3](#)). Garrett County's high proportion of jobs held by its residents is mainly due to its remoteness from bigger cities and urbanized areas. In contrast, Howard County's low proportion is primarily the result of its prime location midway between Baltimore City and Washington, D.C., which is ideal for its residents to commute to jobs in either metropolitan area. Also, Howard County has a significant job base that attracts a lot of workers from other jurisdictions.

Baltimore City's second lowest share in Maryland of jobs held by its own residents (33.3%) is a result of large net in-commuting by suburban residents. The fact that suburban commuters hold nearly two-thirds of the total jobs in the City emphasizes the extreme importance of Baltimore City to the economic vitality of the State as a whole, and more importantly to the Baltimore Region.

## **Comparing LEHD-OTM to the American Community Survey County-to-County Commutation Data**

The American Community Survey (ACS) is another source of county-to-county commutation data. Two, five-year ACS commuting data sets have been issued, 2006-2010 and 2009-2013. These two data sets cannot be compared to each other since there are overlapping years, but it is instructive to compare the latter ACS data set to the 2013 LEHD-OTM commuting data.

One of the biggest differences between LEHD-OTM and ACS is that the ACS shows higher intra-county work trips (i.e. live and work within the same county) while the LEHD-OTM data yields higher numbers of commuters between Maryland and other states as well as between the Maryland counties. This results in the LEHD-OTM data set showing larger numbers of longer distance origin-destination commutes than the ACS data.

[Table 10](#) shows the in, out and net commutation from the 2009-2013 ACS. This ACS data set shows that statewide 52.9 percent of residents work in their own jurisdiction, a much larger share than the 39.0 percent indicated in the LEHD-OTM data set in [Table 4](#). These types of differences are also seen in the percent of jobs held by jurisdiction residents, with a much higher share seen from the ACS data (58.5%) than from the LEHD-OTM data (42.0%), since the ACS shows higher number of intra-county work trips.

A comparison of the two data sets also shows that while the LEHD-OTM data has a higher number of in and out commutes between counties and other states, the difference is greater on the inflow side and less on the outflow side. This yields a substantially smaller net outflow of commuters from the 2013 LEHD-OTM data (-194,300) compared to the 2009-2013 ACS data (-273,540). These sorts of differences are evident for most jurisdictions in Maryland and for many there is even a difference in the direction of the net commuting flow. For instance, LEHD-OTM data for Howard County shows net in-flow of nearly 14,300 workers while the ACS data set indicates that there is a net out-flow of -2,000 workers. The reasons for this difference can be seen in the examination of the county-to-county origins and destinations (see [County-to-County Commutation Tables](#)). The LEHD-OTM data shows much more large net in-flows to Howard County than the 2009-2013 ACS data from more distant commuting areas, namely, the Southern Maryland, Western Maryland and lower and upper Eastern Shore Regions. In addition, for the interaction with the Washington Region, the ACS data identifies that nearly 19,700 workers commuting into Howard County and almost 30,800 workers commuting out of Howard county to Washington Region to work, whereas LEHD-OTM the data shows that nearly 31,000 workers came to Howard County from Washington Region, while almost 37,700 went to the Washington Region from Howard County for work. This resulted in the ACS data showing a net outflow of -11,100 from Howard County to the Washington Region compared to a smaller -6,700 net outflow for the LEHD-OTM data. It shows a similar trend for out of state commutations, for example ACS data shows fewer trips to Howard County from Virginia (1,975), while, LEHD-OTM data identifies nearly 4,000 people coming to Howard County from Virginia.

Similarly for Montgomery County, the LEHD-OTM data shows an in-flow of over 254,400 workers and an out-flow of around 237,500 workers for a net in-flow of nearly 17,000 commuters while the ACS data set shows an in-flow of 175,500 and out-flow of 210,000 for a net out-flow of 34,500 commuters. For Baltimore Region, there is a net in-flow of more than 27,600 workers from Montgomery County according to the LEHD-OTM data, but the ACS CTPP data shows only a net in-flow of around 15,200. For the Eastern Shore, the LEHD-OTM data set identifies a net in-flow of more than 3,800 trips, whereas the ACS data shows a net in-flow of 657 worker trips.

The disparity in the LEHD-OTM (see [Table 4](#)) and ACS (see [Table 10](#)) data is not just limited to Washington and Montgomery Counties, but all the jurisdictions show similar trends (i.e. more inter-jurisdictional travel for LEHD-OTM data and more intra-jurisdictional travel for ACS CTPP data). The LEHD-OTM data used in the analysis was for all jobs in the jurisdiction, just to make sure the data was not skewed due to some people having part-time jobs or secondary jobs in far off places, LEHD-OTM data for only primary jobs (see [Table 7](#)) was analyzed to see any change in travel patterns. The journey-to-work data for primary jobs showed a similar pattern as the data for all jobs.

For more information, contact Alfred Sundara at [Alfred.Sundara@maryland.gov](mailto:Alfred.Sundara@maryland.gov)