WEST INFORMATION OFFICE
San Francisco, Calif.

For release: Thursday, January 26, 2012
12-137-SAN
Technical information: (415) 625-2283

- BLSinfoSF@bls.gov
- www.bls.gov/ro9

Media contact: (415) 625-2270

## County Employment and Wages in Arizona Second Quarter 2011

Employment rose 1.8 percent in Arizona's largest county, Maricopa, from June 2010 to June 2011, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. In Arizona's only other large county, Pima, employment declined 0.7 percent in the second quarter of 2011. (Large counties are defined as those with employment of 75,000 or more as measured by 2010 annual average employment.) Regional Commissioner Richard J. Holden noted that the employment increase in Maricopa County was double the rate of the nation as a whole from June a year ago. (See table 1.)

Nationally, employment grew 0.9 percent during this 12 -month period, as 215 of the 322 large counties nationwide gained jobs. Ottawa, Mich. experienced the largest percentage increase in employment in the nation, up 4.7 percent over the year. San Joaquin, Calif. had the largest employment decrease with a loss of 4.0 percent.

Employment in Maricopa County $(1,593,300)$ and Pima County $(338,100)$ in June 2011 accounted for 82.7 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 Maricopa County was $\$ 878$ in the second quarter of 2011, an increase of 2.2 percent from the second quarter of 2010. Nationally, the average weekly wage rose 3.0 percent over the year to $\$ 891$ in the second quarter of 2011. (See table 1.)

Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 13 counties in Arizona with employment below 75,000 . Average weekly wages in these counties ranged from $\$ 1,058$ to $\$ 571$ during the second quarter of 2011. (See table 2.)

## Large County Wage Changes

Pima County's 4.3-percent wage gain ranked in the top fifth nationally among large counties at $50^{\text {th }}$. Maricopa's 2.2-percent wage advance placed $196^{\text {th }}$. Of the 322 largest counties in the U.S., 307 had over-the-year increases in average weekly wages. Williamson, Tex., led the nation in average weekly wage growth with an increase of 18.0 percent from the second quarter of 2010. Middlesex, Mass., was second with a gain of 10.2 percent, followed by the counties of Hartford, Md. ( 8.8 percent), Santa Clara, Calif. ( 8.5 percent), and Butler, Pa. (7.5 percent).

Nationwide, 11 large counties recorded decreases in average weekly wages over the year, with 5 declining 1.0 percent or more. Champaign, Ill. had the largest decrease in wages with a decline of 3.6 percent from the second quarter of 2010. Smaller declines were reported in Benton, Ark. (-2.7 percent), Rutherford, Tenn. (-2.2 percent), New York, N.Y. (-1.1 percent), and Elkhart, Ind. (-1.0 percent).

## Large County Average Weekly Wages

Maricopa County's $\$ 878$ weekly wage placed in the top two-fifths of the national ranking at $118^{\text {th }}$ among the 322 largest counties in the second quarter of 2011. Conversely, Pima County's $\$ 794$ weekly wages ranked $198^{\text {th }}$ and placed in the bottom two-fifths during the same period. Nationwide 107 large counties registered weekly wages above the U.S. average of $\$ 891$ in the second quarter of 2011. 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 the counties of Arlington, Va. $(\$ 1,553)$, Washington, D.C. $(\$ 1,541)$, and Fairfield, Conn. $(\$ 1,469)$.

Two-thirds of the largest U.S. counties (215) reported weekly wages below the national average. Horry County, S.C. reported the lowest wage (\$526), followed by the counties of Hidalgo, Texas (\$571), Cameron, Texas (\$572), Yakima, Wash. (\$610), and Webb, Texas (\$616).

## Average Weekly Wages in Arizona's Smaller Counties

All but one of the 13 counties in Arizona with employment below 75,000 had average weekly wages lower than the national average of $\$ 891$. Greenlee County's average weekly wage of $\$ 1,058$ was the only county in the state with wages above the national average. (See table 2.)
When all 15 counties in Arizona were considered, Cochise, Greenlee, and Maricopa were the only counties with an average weekly wage of $\$ 800$ or more. Five counties had average weekly wages from $\$ 700$ to $\$ 799$. Six counties reported average weekly wages from $\$ 600$ to $\$ 699$, and one had wages below $\$ 600$.

## 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 http://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 the national news release. This web-only publication has replaced the print version of the annual bulletin, Employment and Wages Annual Averages. Tables and additional content from Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online, 2010 are now available online at www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn10.htm. 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.

For personal assistance or further information on the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages Program, as well as other Bureau programs, contact the West Information Office in San Francisco at 415-625-2270.

## 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 two large counties in Arizona, second quarter 2011 (2)


[^0](2) Data are preliminary.
(3) Average w eekly w ages w ere calculated using unrounded data.
(4) Percent changes w ere 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.
(7) Data do not meet BLS or State agency disclosure standards.

Table 2. Covered (1) employment and wages in the United States and all counties in Arizona, second quarter 2011 (2)

| Area | Employment June 2011 | Average Weekly Wage (3) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| United States (4) | 130469924 | $\$ 891$ |
| Arizona | 2336276 | 842 |
| Apache | 18755 | 777 |
| Cochise | 36733 | 831 |
| Coconino | 57120 | 698 |
| Gila | 13953 | 736 |
| Graham | 9113 | 692 |
| Greenlee | 3647 | 1058 |
| La Paz | 5601 | 571 |
| Maricopa | 1593270 | 878 |
| Mohave | 44708 | 645 |
| Navajo | 26085 | 681 |
| Pima | 338090 | 794 |
| Pinal | 51568 | 755 |
| Santa Cruz | 13084 | 785 |
| Yavapai | 53341 | 652 |
| Yuma | 55285 | 666 |

Footnotes
(1) Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
(2) Data are preliminary.
(3) Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
(4) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
SOURCE: Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages

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

| State | Employment |  | Average weekly wage [3] |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June 2011 (thousands) | Percent change, June 2010-11 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, second quarter 2010-11 | National ranking by 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 in Arizona, Second Quarter 2011

National Average $=\$ 891$

| $\square$ | $\$ 599$ or less |
| ---: | :--- |
| $\square$ | $\$ 600-\$ 699$ |
|  | $\$ 700-\$ 799$ |
|  | $\$ 800$ or more |




[^0]:    (1) Includes w orkers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

