MIDWEST INFORMATION OFFICE
Chicago, Ill.
For release: Tuesday, January 31, 2012
General information: (312) 353-1880 • BLSInfoChicago@bls.gov • www.bls.gov/ro5
Media contact: (312) 353-1138

## County Employment and Wages In Iowa - Second Quarter 2011

The three largest counties in Iowa reported employment growth from June 2010 to June 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.) Scott County had the largest increase, up 1.7 percent, closely followed by Linn County, up 1.6 percent. Regional Commissioner Charlene Peiffer noted that these over-the-year employment increases were greater than the national rate of 0.9 percent. Employment in the remaining large county, Polk, increased 0.1 percent.

Among the three largest counties in Iowa, employment was highest in Polk County $(268,300)$ in June 2011. Collectively, Iowa's three large counties accounted for 32.7 percent of total employment within the state. Nationwide, the 322 largest counties made up 70.5 percent of total U.S. employment, which stood at 130.5 million in June 2011.

The average weekly wage in Polk County rose 3.2 percent from the second quarter of 2010 to the second quarter of 2011, the largest increase among Iowa's large counties. Polk County also had the highest average weekly wage in the state at $\$ 872$, followed by Linn ( $\$ 838$ ). (See table 1.) Nationally, the average weekly wage rose 3.0 percent over the year to $\$ 891$ in the second quarter of 2011.

Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 96 counties in Iowa with employment below 75,000 . All of these smaller counties had average weekly wages below the national average. (See table 2.)

## Large county wage changes

Only one of Iowa's large counties recorded wage growth above the national increase of 3.0 percent from the second quarter of 2010 to the second quarter of 2011. (See table 1.) As noted, Polk County experienced the state's largest average weekly wage increase of 3.2 percent, ranking $109^{\text {th }}$ among the 322 largest U.S. counties. Scott County ( 2.5 percent) placed $168^{\text {th }}$ and Linn County ( 0.8 percent) ranked 291 .

Among the 322 largest counties in the U.S., 307 had over-the-year increases in average weekly wages in the second quarter of 2011. Williamson, Texas, ranked first in average weekly wage growth with an increase of 18.0 percent. Champaign, Ill., had the largest wage decline with a loss of 3.6 percent over the year.

## Large county average weekly wages

Average weekly wages in all three large Iowa counties were below the national average of $\$ 891$ in the second quarter of 2011. As noted, Polk County (\$872) had the highest average weekly wage in the state and ranked $126^{\text {th }}$ among the 322 largest counties in the United States. Scott (\$706) reported the lowest average weekly wage and ranked $293{ }^{\text {rd }}$ nationwide.

Nationally, weekly wages were higher than average in 107 of the 322 largest U.S. counties. Santa Clara, Calif., held the top position among the highest-paid large counties with an average weekly wage of $\$ 1,743$. New York, N.Y., was second at $\$ 1,645$, followed by Arlington, Va. $(\$ 1,553)$, and Washington, D.C. $(\$ 1,541)$. Among the 215 large counties with an average weekly wage below the U.S. average in the second quarter of 2011, Horry, S.C. (\$526) reported the lowest wage.

## Average weekly wages in Iowa's smaller counties

All 96 counties in Iowa with employment below 75,000 had average weekly wages lower than the national average of $\$ 891$. Among these smaller counties, Dallas County had the highest average weekly wage at $\$ 865$ and Decatur County had the lowest at $\$ 515$. (See table 2.)

When all 99 counties in Iowa were considered, none had wages above the national average. Eight reported average weekly wages under $\$ 550$, 25 had wages from $\$ 550$ to $\$ 599$, 38 reported wages from $\$ 600$ to $\$ 649$, 13 had wages from $\$ 650$ to $\$ 699$, and 15 had wages of $\$ 700$ or more. (See chart 1.)

## Additional statistics and other information

Quarterly data for states have 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 www.bls.gov/cew/.

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 this news release. Tables and additional content from Employment and Wages Annual Averages 2010 are now available online at http://www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn10.htm.

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.

For personal assistance or further information on the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages Program, as well as other Bureau programs, contact the Midwest Information Office in Chicago at (312) 353-1880 from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. CT.

## 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 9.1 million employer reports covered 130.5 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 www.bls.gov/cew/; however, data in QCEW press releases have been revised and may not match the data contained on the BLS 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 3 largest counties in lowa, second quarter 2011 (2)

| Area | Employment |  |  | Average Weekly Wage (3) |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June <br> 2011 <br> (thousands) | Percent <br> change, June <br> $2010-11(4)$ | National <br> ranking by <br> percent <br> change (5) | Average <br> weekly <br> wage | National <br> ranking by <br> level (5) | Percent <br> change, <br> second quarter <br> 2010-11 (4) | National <br> ranking by <br> percent <br> change (5) |
| United States (6) | $130,469.9$ | 0.9 | -- | $\$ 891$ | -- | 3.0 | -- |
| lowa | $1,476.9$ | 0.7 | -- | 726 | 43 | 2.5 | 32 |
| Linn, lowa | 127.4 | 1.6 | 74 | 838 | 150 | 0.8 | 291 |
| Polk, lowa | 268.3 | 0.1 | 204 | 872 | 126 | 3.2 | 109 |
| Scott, lowa | 87.6 | 1.7 | 70 | 706 | 293 | 2.5 | 168 |

[^0]Table 2. Covered (1) employment and wages in the United States and all counties in lowa, second quarter 2011 (2)

| Area | Employment June 2011 | Average weekly wage (3) | Area | Employment June 2011 | Average weekly wage (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States (4) | 130,469,924 | \$891 |  |  |  |
| lowa | 1,476,937 | 726 | Jasper | 10,931 | \$637 |
| Adair | 2,850 | 584 | Jefferson | 6,970 | 643 |
| Adams | 1,229 | 579 | Johnson | 76,328 | 804 |
| Allamakee | 5,244 | 550 | Jones | 6,546 | 602 |
| Appanoose | 4,484 | 561 | Keokuk | 2,423 | 579 |
| Audubon | 1,900 | 565 | Kossuth | 6,597 | 634 |
| Benton | 5,674 | 600 | Lee | 16,023 | 689 |
| Black Hawk | 73,324 | 733 | Linn | 127,392 | 838 |
| Boone | 9,154 | 653 | Louisa | 3,664 | 612 |
| Bremer | 9,587 | 665 | Lucas | 3,206 | 613 |
| Buchanan | 6,467 | 578 | Lyon | 4,842 | 526 |
| Buena Vista | 10,867 | 609 | Madison | 3,847 | 597 |
| Butler | 3,701 | 596 | Mahaska | 7,936 | 628 |
| Calhoun | 3,151 | 541 | Marion | 16,522 | 710 |
| Carroll | 12,259 | 603 | Marshall | 18,448 | 681 |
| Cass | 5,995 | 588 | Mills | 4,240 | 625 |
| Cedar | 5,624 | 591 | Mitchell | 3,761 | 627 |
| Cerro Gordo | 24,791 | 668 | Monona | 2,812 | 537 |
| Cherokee | 5,507 | 600 | Monroe | 3,552 | 790 |
| Chickasaw | 4,857 | 626 | Montgomery | 4,114 | 620 |
| Clarke | 4,041 | 586 | Muscatine | 21,655 | 799 |
| Clay | 9,338 | 648 | O'Brien | 6,431 | 574 |
| Clayton | 6,905 | 600 | Osceola | 2,254 | 585 |
| Clinton | 23,056 | 641 | Page | 6,642 | 619 |
| Crawford | 7,666 | 642 | Palo Alto | 3,842 | 568 |
| Dallas | 33,715 | 865 | Plymouth | 10,770 | 700 |
| Davis | 2,002 | 557 | Pocahontas | 2,831 | 629 |
| Decatur | 2,170 | 515 | Polk | 268,321 | 872 |
| Delaware | 6,266 | 665 | Pottawattamie | 38,141 | 629 |
| Des Moines | 21,886 | 679 | Poweshiek | 9,470 | 697 |
| Dickinson | 9,562 | 548 | Ringgold | 1,472 | 550 |
| Dubuque | 55,905 | 697 | Sac | 3,386 | 572 |
| Emmet | 4,285 | 608 | Scott | 87,629 | 706 |
| Fayette | 7,344 | 543 | Shelby | 5,601 | 586 |
| Floyd | 5,539 | 637 | Sioux | 19,471 | 597 |
| Franklin | 4,142 | 711 | Story | 43,004 | 779 |
| Fremont | 2,439 | 700 | Tama | 5,006 | 584 |
| Greene | 3,171 | 712 | Taylor | 1,846 | 566 |
| Grundy | 4,190 | 663 | Union | 6,727 | 604 |
| Guthrie | 3,126 | 614 | Van Buren | 2,069 | 642 |
| Hamilton | 6,208 | 736 | Wapello | 15,800 | 642 |
| Hancock | 5,975 | 689 | Warren | 9,897 | 612 |
| Hardin | 7,439 | 627 | Washington | 8,210 | 548 |
| Harrison | 4,221 | 599 | Wayne | 1,885 | 600 |
| Henry | 9,288 | 633 | Webster | 17,797 | 673 |
| Howard | 4,143 | 613 | Winnebago | 4,660 | 575 |
| Humboldt | 3,931 | 605 | Winneshiek | 10,473 | 608 |
| Ida | 3,410 | 642 | Woodbury | 50,612 | 640 |
| lowa | 8,778 | 625 | Worth | 2,318 | 599 |
| Jackson | 6,224 | 535 | Wright | 5,533 | 670 |

(1) Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
(2) Data are preliminary.
(3) Average w eekly wages w ere calculated using unrounded data.
(4) 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, second quarter 2011 (2)

| State | Employment |  | Average weekly wage (3) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June 2011 (thousands) | Percent change, <br> June 2010-11 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, second quarter 2010-11 | National ranking by <br> percent change |
| United States (4) | 130,469.9 | 0.9 | \$891 | -- | 3.0 | -- |
| Alabama | 1,824.8 | -0.4 | 767 | 34 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Alaska | 335.9 | 1.6 | 941 | 9 | 2.6 | 27 |
| Arizona | 2,336.3 | 1.1 | 842 | 20 | 2.7 | 26 |
| Arkansas | 1,140.4 | -1.3 | 703 | 47 | 2.6 | 27 |
| California | 14,664.6 | 0.3 | 1,019 | 6 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Colorado | 2,234.7 | 1.4 | 900 | 13 | 3.4 | 16 |
| Connecticut | 1,630.2 | 0.8 | 1,116 | 3 | 3.8 | 9 |
| Delaware | 408.4 | 0.5 | 926 | 12 | 5.9 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 711.3 | 1.4 | 1,541 | 1 | 2.4 | 36 |
| Florida | 7,092.3 | 0.8 | 802 | 25 | 2.6 | 27 |
| Georgia | 3,803.1 | 1.0 | 832 | 21 | 2.5 | 32 |
| Hawaii | 590.5 | 0.7 | 799 | 26 | 2.4 | 36 |
| Idaho | 616.6 | 0.0 | 667 | 49 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Illinois | 5,633.0 | 1.0 | 939 | 10 | 3.2 | 17 |
| Indiana | 2,769.2 | 1.3 | 749 | 41 | 2.2 | 46 |
| lowa | 1,476.9 | 0.7 | 726 | 43 | 2.5 | 32 |
| Kansas | 1,313.2 | -0.1 | 754 | 40 | 2.9 | 23 |
| Kentucky | 1,751.8 | 0.9 | 760 | 38 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Louisiana | 1,844.3 | -0.1 | 794 | 28 | 3.1 | 18 |
| Maine | 593.8 | 0.3 | 712 | 46 | 1.9 | 48 |
| Maryland | 2,513.5 | 0.5 | 987 | 7 | 3.1 | 18 |
| Massachusetts | 3,230.4 | 0.9 | 1,120 | 2 | 5.6 | 3 |
| Michigan | 3,896.9 | 1.8 | 845 | 19 | 2.4 | 36 |
| Minnesota | 2,645.4 | 1.4 | 898 | 15 | 3.5 | 12 |
| Mississippi | 1,079.4 | -0.6 | 664 | 50 | 1.8 | 49 |
| Missouri | 2,617.7 | 0.3 | 774 | 31 | 1.6 | 50 |
| Montana | 434.1 | 0.5 | 681 | 48 | 3.5 | 12 |
| Nebraska | 911.6 | 0.1 | 714 | 45 | 2.4 | 36 |
| Nevada | 1,123.0 | 0.5 | 816 | 24 | 2.5 | 32 |
| New Hampshire | 615.2 | 0.4 | 888 | 16 | 2.4 | 36 |
| New Jersey | 3,836.2 | -0.3 | 1,056 | 5 | 2.6 | 27 |
| New Mexico | 788.7 | -0.5 | 763 | 37 | 2.8 | 24 |
| New York | 8,575.3 | 1.0 | 1,092 | 4 | 1.0 | 51 |
| North Carolina | 3,865.9 | 1.5 | 783 | 30 | 2.5 | 32 |
| North Dakota | 382.4 | 5.1 | 769 | 33 | 8.2 | 1 |
| Ohio | 5,009.1 | 0.9 | 795 | 27 | 2.6 | 27 |
| Oklahoma | 1,510.3 | 0.7 | 749 | 41 | 4.5 | 5 |
| Oregon | 1,637.5 | 0.7 | 819 | 22 | 4.2 | 6 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,606.5 | 1.0 | 875 | 17 | 3.1 | 18 |
| Rhode Island | 458.1 | 0.3 | 862 | 18 | 3.5 | 12 |
| South Carolina | 1,801.6 | 1.1 | 726 | 43 | 2.3 | 41 |
| South Dakota | 404.8 | 0.8 | 656 | 51 | 3.8 | 9 |
| Tennessee | 2,616.9 | 1.3 | 794 | 28 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Texas | 10,462.4 | 2.1 | 900 | 13 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Utah | 1,183.9 | 2.0 | 756 | 39 | 3.1 | 18 |
| Vermont | 297.0 | 1.0 | 773 | 32 | 2.8 | 24 |
| Virginia | 3,619.7 | 0.9 | 949 | 8 | 2.2 | 46 |
| Washington | 2,875.8 | 0.6 | 928 | 11 | 3.5 | 12 |
| West Virginia | 702.9 | 0.3 | 765 | 36 | 5.4 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | 2,712.0 | 0.9 | 767 | 34 | 3.0 | 22 |
| Wyoming | 284.7 | 1.2 | 819 | 22 | 3.7 | 11 |
| Puerto Rico | 915.1 | -1.4 | 496 | (5) | 0.6 | (5) |
| Virgin Islands | 44.1 | 0.6 | 747 | (5) | 5.5 | (5) |

(1) Includes w orkers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
(2) Data are preliminary.
(3) Average w eekly w ages w ere calculated using unrounded data.
(4) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
(5) Data not included in the national ranking.

Chart 1. Average weekly wages by county in lowa, second quarter 2011



[^0]:    (1) Includes w orkers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE)
    (2) Data are preliminary.
    (3) Average w eekly w ages w ere calculated using unrounded data.
    (4) Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications.
    (5) Ranking does not include the county of San Juan, Puerto Rico.
    (6) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

