

# **NEWS RELEASE**



# NEW ENGLAND INFORMATION OFFICE Boston, Mass.

For release: Friday, July 27, 2012

Technical Information: (617) 565-2327 • <u>BLSInfoBoston@bls.gov</u> • www.bls.gov/ro1

Media Contact: (617) 565-2326 • consedine.tim@bls.gov

## COUNTY EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES IN CONNECTICUT – FOURTH QUARTER 2011

Three of Connecticut's four large counties reported employment increases from December 2010 to December 2011, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. (Large counties are defined as those with employment of 75,000 or more as measured by 2010 annual average employment.) Regional Commissioner Deborah A. Brown noted that Fairfield County had the highest rate of employment growth, up 1.5 percent. New Haven and Hartford Counties reported employment gains of 1.0 and 0.7 percent, respectively. The state's remaining large county, New London, recorded an over-the-year decline of 1.1 percent.

Nationally, employment increased 1.4 percent from December 2010 to December 2011. The largest over-the-year percentage increase in employment was recorded in Kern, Calif., up 5.3 percent. Benton, Wash., experienced the largest over-the-year decrease in employment with a loss of 3.4 percent.

Among the four largest counties in Connecticut, employment was highest in Hartford (495,456) and lowest in New London (123,540). Along with Fairfield and New Haven, the four large counties accounted for 84.5 percent of the state's total employment in December 2011. Nationwide, the 322 largest counties accounted for 70.7 percent of total U.S. employment.

All four large counties in the state recorded decreases in average weekly wages from the fourth quarter of 2010 to the fourth quarter of 2011. Fairfield County recorded the largest decrease, down 4.6 percent. Fairfield County had the highest average weekly wage in the state at \$1,589 and ranked 7<sup>th</sup> highest among the 322 largest counties nationwide. (See table 1.) Nationally, the average weekly wage fell 1.7 percent over the year to \$955 in the fourth quarter of 2011.

Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the four counties in Connecticut with employment below 75,000. Average weekly wages in three of these smaller counties were below the national average. (See table 2.)

#### **Large County Wage Changes**

Fairfield County's wage decrease of 4.6 percent ranked 300<sup>th</sup> among the 322 largest U.S. counties. (See table 1.) New Haven and Hartford Counties' wage drops of 3.2 and 2.5 percent ranked 258<sup>th</sup> and 220<sup>th</sup>, respectively. The smaller wage decrease in New London (-0.4 percent) ranked 55<sup>th</sup>.

Nationwide, 282 of the 322 largest counties had over-the-year declines in average weekly wages from the fourth quarter of 2010. Olmsted, Minn., had the largest wage loss in the nation, down 21.3 percent.

Of the 322 largest counties, 36 experienced over-the year increases in average weekly wages. Tulsa, Okla., had the largest average weekly wage increase with a gain of 8.6 percent. Harford, Md., had the second largest increase in average weekly wages, followed by Lake, Ohio; Snohomish, Wash.; and Westmoreland, Pa.

### **Large County Average Weekly Wages**

As noted, average weekly wages in Fairfield County placed 7<sup>th</sup> among the 322 largest U.S. counties in the fourth quarter of 2011. Hartford (\$1,145, 36<sup>th</sup>) and New Haven (\$1,006, 76<sup>th</sup>) joined Fairfield with average weekly wages above the U.S. average of \$955, placing all three in the top quarter of the nationwide ranking. The average weekly wage in the remaining large county, New London, was below the national average at \$953, but still ranked in the top third nationwide at 106<sup>th</sup>.

Among the highest-paid large U.S. counties, New York, N.Y., held the top position with an average weekly wage of \$1,889. Santa Clara, Calif., was second with an average weekly wage of \$1,836, followed by Washington, D.C. (\$1,668), and Suffolk, Mass. (\$1,599).

Horry, S.C., (\$569) reported the lowest wage nationwide, followed by the counties of Cameron and Hidalgo, Texas (\$597 and \$601, respectively). Wages in the lowest-ranked county, Horry, were less than one third of the average weekly wage reported for the highest-ranked county, New York, N.Y.

### **Average Weekly Wages in Connecticut's Smaller Counties**

Three of the four counties in Connecticut with employment below 75,000—Litchfield, Windham, and Tolland counties—had average weekly wages lower than the national average of \$955, with Windham reporting the lowest, \$791. Middlesex County was the exception, with an average weekly wage of \$996. (See table 2.)

When considering all eight counties in Connecticut, three had an average weekly wage above \$1,000. With the exception of Middlesex County, average wages in the remaining counties were below the national average. (See table 2.)

#### **Additional Statistics and other Information**

QCEW data for states has been included in this release in table 3. For additional information about quarterly employment and wages data, please read the Technical Note or visit the QCEW Web site at <a href="http://www.bls.gov/cew/">http://www.bls.gov/cew/</a>.

Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online features comprehensive information by detailed industry on establishments, employment, and wages for the nation and all states. The 2010 edition of this publication, which was published in November 2011, contains selected data produced by Business Employment Dynamics (BED) on job gains and losses, as well as selected data from the first quarter 2011 version of the national news release. Tables and additional content from Employment and Wages

Annual Averages 2010 are now available online at <a href="www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn10.htm">www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn10.htm</a>. The 2011 edition of Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online will be available later in 2012.

Information in this release will be made available to sensory impaired individuals upon request. Voice phone: 202-691-5200; TDD message referral phone number: 1-800-877-8339.

This release is available in PDF and HTML format on the New England BLS Web site at www.bls.gov/ro1/ctqcew.htm.

#### TECHNICAL NOTE

Average weekly wage data by county are compiled under the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) program, also known as the ES-202 program. The data are derived from summaries of employment and total pay of workers covered by state and federal unemployment insurance (UI) legislation and provided by State Workforce Agencies (SWAs). The 9.2 million employer reports cover 131.3 million full- and part-time workers. The average weekly wage values are calculated by dividing quarterly total wages by the average of the three monthly employment levels of those covered by UI programs. The result is then divided by 13, the number of weeks in a quarter. It is to be noted, therefore, that over-the-year wage changes for geographic areas may reflect shifts in the composition of employment by industry, occupation, and such other factors as hours of work. Thus, wages may vary among counties, metropolitan areas, or states for reasons other than changes in the average wage level. Data for all states, Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), counties, and the nation are available on the BLS Web site at <a href="https://www.bls.gov/cew/">www.bls.gov/cew/</a>; however, data in QCEW press releases have been revised and may not match the data contained on the Bureau's Web site.

QCEW data are not designed as a time series. QCEW data are simply the sums of individual establishment records reflecting the number of establishments that exist in a county or industry at a point in time. Establishments can move in or out of a county or industry for a number of reasons—some reflecting economic events, others reflecting administrative changes.

The preliminary QCEW data presented in this release may differ from data released by the individual states as well as from the data presented on the BLS Web site. These potential differences result from the states' continuing receipt, review and editing of UI data over time. On the other hand, differences between data in this release and the data found on the BLS Web site are the result of adjustments made to improve over-the-year comparisons. Specifically, these adjustments account for administrative (noneconomic) changes such as a correction to a previously reported location or industry classification. Adjusting for these administrative changes allows users to more accurately assess changes of an economic nature (such as a firm moving from one county to another or changing its primary economic activity) over a 12-month period. Currently, adjusted data are available only from BLS press releases.

Table 1. Covered [1] employment and wages in the United States and the 4 largest counties in Connecticut, fourth quarter 2011 [2]

	Employment			Average Weekly Wage [3]			
Area	December 2011 (thousands)	Percent change, December 2010-11 [4]	National ranking by percent change [5]	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level [5]	Percent change, fourth quarter 2010-11 [4]	National ranking by percent change [5]
United States [6]	131,254.2	1.4		\$955		-1.7	
Connecticut	1,642.0	0.9		1,188	4	-3.1	49
Fairfield, Conn.	412.7	1.5	109	1,589	7	-4.6	300
Hartford, Conn.	495.5	0.7	191	1,145	36	-2.5	220
New Haven, Conn.	356.3	1.0	156	1,006	76	-3.2	258
New London, Conn.	123.5	-1.1	311	953	106	-0.4	55

<sup>[1]</sup> Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

Table 2. Covered[1] employment and wages in the United States and all counties in Connecticut, fourth quarter 2011[2]

Area	Employment December 2011	Average Weekly Wage [3]
United States [4]	131,254,162	\$955
Connecticut	1,642,034	1,188
Fairfield	412,652	1,589
Hartford	495,456	1,145
Litchfield	60,912	849
Middlesex	65,438	996
New Haven	356,319	1,006
New London	123,540	953
Tolland	40,913	863
Windham	38,613	791

<sup>[1]</sup> Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

<sup>[2]</sup> Data are preliminary.

<sup>[3]</sup> Average w eekly w ages w ere calculated using unrounded data.

<sup>[4]</sup> Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications.

<sup>[5]</sup> Ranking does not include the county of San Juan, Puerto Rico.

<sup>[6]</sup> Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

<sup>[2]</sup> Data are preliminary.

<sup>[3]</sup> Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.

<sup>[4]</sup> Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Table 3. Covered (1) employment and wages by state, fourth quarter 2011 (2)

Table 3. Covered (1) er	mployment and wages by state						
	Em	ployment	Average weekly wage (3)				
State	December 2011 (thousands)	Percent change, December 2010-11	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level	Percent change, fourth quarter 2010-11	National ranking by percent change	
United States (4)	131,254.2	1.4	\$955		-1.7		
Alabama	1,828.3	0.2	832	31	-0.8	14	
Alaska	311.3	1.6	982	11	-0.5	10	
Arizona	2,458.4	1.7	882	21	-1.1	17	
Arkansas	1,157.1	0.9	736	47	-1.2	19	
California	14,731.8	1.3	1,100	6	-2.7	47	
Colorado	2,250.1	2.1	975	13	-2.6	46	
Connecticut	1,642.0	0.9	1,188	4	-3.1	49	
Delaware	405.9	0.4	984	10	-1.6	26	
District of Columbia	708.0	1.3	1,668	1	-1.2	19	
Florida	7,364.1	1.4	847	29	-2.8	48	
Georgia	3,826.9	1.0	885	20	-2.2	39	
Hawaii Idaho	607.0 606.4	1.4 0.8	845 717	30 50	-1.5	23 39	
Illinois	5,635.9	1.1	1,013	8	-2.2 -2.1	35	
Indiana	2,799.2	2.0	789	41	-1.9	32	
lowa	1,464.2	1.1	793	40	-0.8	14	
Kansas	1,320.1	0.7	800	38	-1.5	23	
Kentucky	1,770.2	1.3	786	42	-1.0	16	
Louisiana	1,870.8	1.0	850	27	-1.7	28	
Maine	580.9	0.4	755	46	-1.8	30	
Maryland	2,516.4	1.1	1,058	7	-2.0	33	
Massachusetts	3,230.8	1.3	1,192	3	-2.1	35	
Michigan	3,911.8	2.4	933	18	-0.5	10	
Minnesota	2,636.4	2.1	936	16	-3.9	51	
Mississippi	1,083.8	0.3	699	51	-1.1	17	
Missouri	2,617.0	0.8	825	32	-1.7	28	
Montana	426.7	1.8	727	48	0.7	4	
Nebraska	910.5	0.8	762	45	-1.3	21	
Nevada New Hampshire	1,124.1 615.4	0.8 0.9	852 971	26 15	-3.2 -0.7	50 13	
New Jersey	3,811.6	0.9	1,138	5	-0.7 -2.1	35	
New Mexico	784.3	-0.3	799	39	-2.1	39	
New York	8,618.4	1.4	1,197	2	-1.8	30	
North Carolina	3,885.9	1.3	824	33	-2.0	33	
North Dakota	397.0	7.6	871	23	7.7	1	
Ohio	5,027.6	1.3	855	25	-1.3	21	
Oklahoma	1,530.0	1.3	817	34	2.6	2	
Oregon	1,629.8	1.2	850	27	-0.2	6	
Pennsylvania	5,595.1	0.7	936	16	-1.6	26	
Rhode Island	451.9	0.1	919	19	-2.1	35	
South Carolina	1,796.1	1.3	763	44	-1.5	23	
South Dakota	397.0	1.5	724	49	1.4	3	
Tennessee	2,654.9	2.1	858	24	-2.3	42	
Texas Utah	10,607.9 1,202.8	2.4 2.8	973 806	14 37	-0.3 -2.5	8 45	
Vermont	303.9	1.3	809	36	-2.5 -0.5	10	
Virginia	3,625.0	1.3	1,004	9	-2.4	43	
Washington	2,843.6	1.4	979	12	-0.2	6	
West Virginia	714.0	2.2	776	43	-0.3	8	
Wisconsin	2,689.6	0.7	817	34	-2.4	43	
Wyoming	276.9	2.3	876	22	0.6	5	
Puerto Rico	960.9	0.1	552	(5)	-1.1	(5)	
Virgin Islands	43.2	-4.0	772	(5)	-3.4	(5)	
(1) Includes workers covered	by Unemployme	nt Insurance (UI) and Ur	nemplovment C	ompensation fo	r Federal Employees	(UCFE) programs.	

<sup>(1)</sup> Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

<sup>(2)</sup> Data are preliminary.

<sup>(3)</sup> Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.

<sup>(4)</sup> Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

<sup>(5)</sup> Data not included in the national ranking.