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## COUNTY EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES IN NORTH CAROLINA: FOURTH QUARTER 2007

## Durham County has highest wage and fastest wage growth

In the fourth quarter of 2007, the average weekly wage in Durham County increased by 7.2 percent, the largest advance among North Carolina’s nine counties with 75,000 or more jobs as measured by 2006 annual average employment. Cumberland County's 6.0 -percent wage growth was the second fastest in the State according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. Durham County also had the highest average weekly wage level in North Carolina at $\$ 1,151$, followed by Mecklenburg County at $\$ 1,000$. (See table 1.) Regional Commissioner Janet S. Rankin noted that nationally, average weekly wages grew at a 4.2-percent pace, averaging $\$ 898$ in the fourth quarter of 2007.

Among the nine largest counties in North Carolina, employment was highest in Mecklenburg $(578,600)$, followed by Wake $(459,800)$ in December 2007. Employment was lowest in Catawaba County $(88,400)$. Eight of the nine counties recorded employment growth from December 2006 to December 2007. In fact, six of these counties had employment growth at least double the national increase of 0.8 percent. In contrast, Catawba County's employment declined 1.5 percent from December 2006 to December 2007.

## Large County Average Weekly Wages

Durham $(\$ 1,151)$ and Mecklenburg $(\$ 1,000)$ were the only large North Carolina counties that registered a weekly wage above the U.S. average, ranking $25^{\text {th }}$ and $58^{\text {th }}$, respectively, among the 328 largest counties in the nation. Wake County's $\$ 893$ weekly wage was only $\$ 5$ below the nationwide average and ranked $110^{\text {th }}$. The remaining six counties had weekly wages that placed them in the bottom half of the rankings—Forsyth ( $\left.\$ 803,185^{\text {th }}\right)$, Guilford ( $\left.\$ 781,216^{\text {th }}\right)$, New Hanover ( $\left.\$ 736,263^{\text {rd }}\right)$, Buncombe ( $\$ 712,285^{\text {th }}$ ), Catawba ( $\$ 687,300^{\text {th }}$ ), and Cumberland ( $\$ 675$, $\left.308^{\text {th }}\right)$.

Across the country, average weekly wages were higher than the national average in 106 of the largest 328 U.S. counties. New York., N.Y., held the top position among the highest-paid large counties with an average weekly wage of $\$ 1,862$. Santa Clara, Calif., was second with an
average weekly wage of $\$ 1,700$, followed by Fairfield, Conn. $(\$ 1,575)$, Suffolk, Mass. $(\$ 1,546)$, and San Francisco, Calif. $(\$ 1,529)$.

There were 222 counties with an average weekly wage below the national average in the fourth quarter of 2007. The lowest average weekly wage was reported in Cameron County, Texas (\$555), followed by the counties of Hidalgo, Texas (\$562), Horry, S.C. (\$582), Webb, Texas (\$590), and Yakima, Wash. (\$596).

## Wage Changes in Large Counties

Three counties in North Carolina exceeded the national increase in wages of 4.2 percent from the fourth quarter of 2006 to the fourth quarter of 2007 and ranked in the top 100 in wage growth among the nation's 328 largest counties-Durham ( 7.2 percent, $16^{\text {th }}$ ), Cumberland ( 6.0 percent, $33^{\text {rd }}$ ), and New Hanover ( 4.7 percent, $94^{\text {th }}$ ). The remaining six counties had wage growth placing them in the bottom half of the rankings-Buncombe ( 3.5 percent, $172^{\text {nd }}$ ), Mecklenburg ( 3.1 percent, 207 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ), Wake ( 3.0 percent, $219^{\text {th }}$ ), Catawba ( 2.4 percent, $254^{\text {th }}$ ), Forsyth ( 2.2 percent, $264^{\text {th }}$ ), and Guilford (1.8 percent, $278^{\text {th }}$ ).

Among the largest counties in the United States, Pulaski County, Ark., led the nation in wage growth with an increase of 26.2 percent from the fourth quarter of 2006. Williamson County, Texas, ranked second with a 16.5-percent gain, followed by the counties of Lake, Ill. (15.6 percent), Douglas Colo. (12.6 percent), and Westmoreland, Pa. (9.8 percent).

Eight counties experienced over-the-year declines in average weekly wages.
Rockingham, N.H., experienced the largest decrease in wages ( -12.4 percent), followed by the counties of Trumbull, Ohio (-7.2 percent), Sedgwick, Kan. (-4.1 percent), Lake, Fla. (-3.9 percent), and Montgomery, Ohio (-2.4 percent).

## Average Wages in North Carolina's Smaller Counties

Ninety of the 91 smaller counties in North Carolina, those with employment below 75,000 , had average weekly wages below the national level of $\$ 898$. The exception was Orange County, which reported an average weekly that matched the nationwide average. Washington County reported the lowest average weekly wage at $\$ 465$ in the fourth quarter of 2007. (See table 2.)

When all 100 counties in North Carolina were considered, 3 counties in the State reported average weekly wages under $\$ 500$, 79 had wages in the $\$ 501$ to $\$ 700$ range, and 16 had wages from $\$ 701$ to $\$ 900$. The two remaining counties, Durham and Mecklenburg, had average weekly wages of $\$ 1,000$ or more.

## State Average Weekly Wages

At the state level, the average weekly wage in North Carolina was $\$ 777$, nearly 15 percent below the national average, ranking $31^{\text {st }}$ among the 50 states and the District of Columbia. (See table 2.) North Carolina’s average weekly wage was lower than neighboring

Virginia's (\$921, $11^{\text {th }}$ ), Georgia's ( $\$ 835,21^{\text {st }}$ ), and Tennessee's ( $\$ 813,24^{\text {th }}$ ), but higher than South Carolina's (\$716, 43 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ ).

Nationwide, five states and the District of Columbia had average weekly wages exceeding $\$ 1,000$ : the District of Columbia ( $\$ 1,506$ ), New York $(\$ 1,152)$, Connecticut $(\$ 1,149)$, Massachusetts (\$1,133), New Jersey (\$1,092), and California (\$1,035). Average weekly wages in this group were at least 15 percent above the national average. At the other end of the scale, three states reported wages at least 25 percent below the national average: Montana (\$659), Mississippi (\$654), and South Dakota (\$647). (See table 3.)

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 cover 137.0 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 (see Technical Note below) and may not match the data contained on the Bureau's Web site.

## Additional statistics and other information

An annual bulletin, Employment and Wages, features comprehensive information by detailed industry on establishments, employment, and wages for the nation and all states. The 2006 edition of this bulletin contains selected data produced by Business Employment Dynamics (BED) on job gains and losses, as well as selected data from the first quarter 2007 version of this news release. As with the 2005 edition, this edition includes the data on a CD for enhanced access and usability with the printed booklet containing selected graphic representation of QCEW data; the data tables themselves are published exclusively in electronic formats as PDF. The 2006 bulletin is available in a PDF on the BLS Web site at http://www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn06.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 Atlanta Information Office at (404) 893-4222. Customers in the Miami area can reach us at (305) 358-2305. This release is available in text and PDF format on the Atlanta BLS Web site at www.bls.gov/ro4/home.htm.

## TECHNICAL NOTE

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 9 largest counties in North Carolina, fourth quarter 2007(2)

| Area | Employment |  | Average Weekly Wage (3) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { December } \\ 2007 \\ \text { (thousands) } \end{gathered}$ | Percent change, December $2006-07(5)$ | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level (4) | Percent change, fourth quarter 2006-07 (5) | National ranking by percent change (4) |
| United States (6) | 137,027.3 | 0.8 | \$898 | -- | 4.2 | -- |
| North Carolina | 4,127.7 | 1.5 | 777 | 31 | 3.5 | 36 |
| Buncombe, N.C. | 118.8 | 2.3 | 712 | 285 | 3.5 | 172 |
| Catawba, N.C. | 88.4 | -1.5 | 687 | 300 | 2.4 | 254 |
| Cumberland, N.C. | 120.6 | 1.8 | 675 | 308 | 6.0 | 33 |
| Durham, N.C. | 186.8 | 1.6 | 1,151 | 25 | 7.2 | 16 |
| Forsyth, N.C. | 189.8 | 1.1 | 803 | 185 | 2.2 | 264 |
| Guilford, N.C. | 286.3 | 0.7 | 781 | 216 | 1.8 | 278 |
| Mecklenburg, N.C. | 578.6 | 2.7 | 1,000 | 58 | 3.1 | 207 |
| New Hanover, N.C. | 106.3 | 2.1 | 736 | 263 | 4.7 | 94 |
| Wake, N.C. | 459.8 | 3.9 | 893 | 110 | 3.0 | 219 |

(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) Ranking does not include the county of San Juan, Puerto Rico.
(5) Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications.
(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) empoyment and wages in the United States and all of the counties in North Carolina, fourth quarter 2007(2)

| Area | Employment December 2007 | Average weekly wage (3) | Area | Employment December 2007 | Average weekly wage (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alamance County | 61,240 | \$656 | Johnston County | 44,895 | \$665 |
| Alexander County | 10,291 | 570 | Jones County | 1,642 | 596 |
| Alleghany County | 3,978 | 480 | Lee County | 27,605 | 726 |
| Anson County | 8,109 | 618 | Lenoir County | 28,096 | 620 |
| Ashe County | 8,200 | 567 | Lincoln County | 22,643 | 628 |
| Avery County | 7,419 | 522 | Macon County | 11,921 | 579 |
| Beaufort County | 17,950 | 579 | Madison County | 4,277 | 509 |
| Bertie County | 7,085 | 527 | Martin County | 8,853 | 579 |
| Bladen County | 13,542 | 558 | McDowell County | 16,659 | 573 |
| Brunswick County | 27,628 | 625 | Mecklenburg County | 578,615 | 1000 |
| Buncombe County | 118,752 | 712 | Mitchell County | 5,555 | 557 |
| Burke County | 32,946 | 634 | Montgomery County | 10,016 | 581 |
| Cabarrus County | 69,299 | 742 | Moore County | 32,421 | 662 |
| Caldwell County | 27,115 | 612 | Nash County | 43,466 | 658 |
| Camden County | 2,226 | 778 | New Hanover County | 106,314 | 736 |
| Carteret County | 22,879 | 557 | Northampton County | 6,017 | 562 |
| Caswell County | 3,224 | 560 | Onslow County | 45,976 | 541 |
| Catawba County | 88,388 | 687 | Orange County | 62,956 | 898 |
| Chatham County | 17,348 | 634 | Pamlico County | 3,057 | 531 |
| Cherokee County | 8,400 | 564 | Pasquotank County | 18,242 | 625 |
| Chowan County | 5,615 | 616 | Pender County | 10,537 | 574 |
| Clay County | 2,260 | 529 | Perquimans County | 2,103 | 523 |
| Cleveland County | 34,824 | 647 | Person County | 11,053 | 644 |
| Columbus County | 17,505 | 599 | Pitt County | 74,016 | 693 |
| Craven County | 43,551 | 753 | Polk County | 5,218 | 569 |
| Cumberland County | 120,649 | 675 | Randolph County | 49,829 | 614 |
| Currituck County | 5,186 | 591 | Richmond County | 15,115 | 531 |
| Dare County | 17,648 | 588 | Robeson County | 43,805 | 553 |
| Davidson County | 44,159 | 623 | Rockingham County | 30,153 | 616 |
| Davie County | 11,137 | 604 | Rowan County | 49,075 | 727 |
| Duplin County | 20,687 | 570 | Rutherford County | 23,465 | 562 |
| Durham County | 186,815 | 1151 | Sampson County | 20,059 | 644 |
| Edgecombe County | 21,051 | 725 | Scotland County | 14,184 | 589 |
| Forsyth County | 189,784 | 803 | Stanly County | 19,808 | 602 |
| Franklin County | 12,079 | 694 | Stokes County | 7,391 | 542 |
| Gaston County | 71,324 | 686 | Surry County | 31,421 | 581 |
| Gates County | 1,571 | 551 | Swain County | 7,624 | 564 |
| Graham County | 2,952 | 493 | Transylvania County | 9,345 | 610 |
| Granville County | 20,049 | 722 | Tyrrell County | 1,037 | 505 |
| Greene County | 4,575 | 568 | Union County | 59,398 | 726 |
| Guilford County | 286,294 | 781 | Vance County | 16,582 | 579 |
| Halifax County | 18,161 | 567 | Wake County | 459,763 | 893 |
| Harnett County | 24,811 | 593 | Warren County | 3,652 | 517 |
| Haywood County | 17,571 | 627 | Washington County | 3,574 | 465 |
| Henderson County | 36,808 | 664 | Watauga County | 22,839 | 598 |
| Hertford County | 9,787 | 606 | Wayne County | 46,004 | 619 |
| Hoke County | 8,807 | 529 | Wilkes County | 23,618 | 580 |
| Hyde County | 1,815 | 518 | Wilson County | 41,065 | 719 |
| Iredell County | 67,850 | 738 | Yadkin County | 9,667 | 566 |
| Jackson County | 14,581 | 609 | Yancey County | 4,095 | 531 |

(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.

Table 3. Covered (1) employment and wages by state, fourth quarter 2007(2)

| State | Employment |  | Average weekly wage (3) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { December } \\ & 2007 \\ & \text { (thousands) } \end{aligned}$ | Percent change, December 2006-07 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, fourth quarter 2006-07 | National ranking by percent change |
| United States (4) | 137,027.3 | 0.8 | \$898 | - | 4.2 | - |
| Alabama | 1,971.0 | 1.2 | 762 | 33 | 3.3 | 39 |
| Alaska | 299.4 | 1.0 | 877 | 16 | 4.9 | 15 |
| Arizona | 2,693.3 | -0.1 | 827 | 22 | 2.6 | 46 |
| Arkansas | 1,187.6 | 0.7 | 712 | 44 | 9.2 | 1 |
| California | 15,794.7 | 0.8 | 1,035 | 6 | 4.8 | 18 |
| Colorado | 2,329.9 | 2.0 | 927 | 9 | 5.7 | 7 |
| Connecticut | 1,717.8 | 0.7 | 1,149 | 3 | 4.5 | 26 |
| Delaware | 428.8 | 0.3 | 926 | 10 | 3.3 | 39 |
| District of Columbia | 681.6 | 0.7 | 1,506 | 1 | 5.8 | 6 |
| Florida | 8,024.3 | -1.3 | 810 | 25 | 2.8 | 43 |
| Georgia | 4,111.5 | 0.6 | 835 | 21 | 2.8 | 43 |
| Hawaii | 637.2 | 0.7 | 793 | 28 | 4.1 | 29 |
| Idaho | 660.2 | 1.7 | 686 | 47 | 2.1 | 50 |
| Illinois | 5,933.0 | 0.6 | 975 | 8 | 5.1 | 13 |
| Indiana | 2,929.1 | 0.1 | 745 | 35 | 3.0 | 42 |
| lowa | 1,498.5 | 0.7 | 732 | 39 | 4.9 | 15 |
| Kansas | 1,372.7 | 1.2 | 745 | 35 | 2.6 | 46 |
| Kentucky | 1,830.5 | 0.8 | 732 | 39 | 3.4 | 38 |
| Louisiana | 1,903.1 | 2.3 | 783 | 29 | 4.7 | 20 |
| Maine | 608.8 | 0.8 | 707 | 45 | 4.1 | 29 |
| Maryland | 2,580.1 | 0.4 | 986 | 7 | 4.7 | 20 |
| Massachusetts | 3,270.9 | 0.7 | 1,133 | 4 | 5.4 | 8 |
| Michigan | 4,194.9 | -1.2 | 873 | 17 | 2.5 | 49 |
| Minnesota | 2,708.7 | 0.8 | 883 | 15 | 5.1 | 13 |
| Mississippi | 1,148.9 | 0.7 | 654 | 50 | 3.8 | 34 |
| Missouri | 2,746.2 | 0.3 | 780 | 30 | 5.3 | 11 |
| Montana | 440.4 | 2.1 | 659 | 49 | 5.4 | 8 |
| Nebraska | 925.2 | 1.3 | 723 | 41 | 5.2 | 12 |
| Nevada | 1,290.8 | 0.4 | 872 | 19 | 6.7 | 4 |
| New Hampshire | 638.8 | 0.3 | 914 | 12 | -0.3 | 51 |
| New Jersey | 4,027.4 | 0.2 | 1,092 | 5 | 3.5 | 36 |
| New Mexico | 831.7 | 1.1 | 738 | 38 | 4.8 | 18 |
| New York | 8,762.7 | 1.4 | 1,152 | 2 | 4.2 | 27 |
| North Carolina | 4,127.7 | 1.5 | 777 | 31 | 3.5 | 36 |
| North Dakota | 347.7 | 2.0 | 690 | 46 | 7.3 | 2 |
| Ohio | 5,336.8 | -0.2 | 795 | 27 | 2.8 | 43 |
| Oklahoma | 1,556.1 | 1.3 | 721 | 42 | 6.2 | 5 |
| Oregon | 1,740.5 | 0.9 | 798 | 26 | 4.6 | 22 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,712.8 | 0.5 | 873 | 17 | 4.2 | 27 |
| Rhode Island | 480.9 | -1.5 | 838 | 20 | 2.6 | 46 |
| South Carolina | 1,904.0 | 1.0 | 716 | 43 | 4.1 | 29 |
| South Dakota | 393.5 | 1.7 | 647 | 51 | 5.4 | 8 |
| Tennessee | 2,790.3 | 0.9 | 813 | 24 | 4.0 | 33 |
| Texas | 10,460.8 | 3.0 | 911 | 13 | 4.6 | 22 |
| Utah | 1,241.8 | 2.8 | 758 | 34 | 4.6 | 22 |
| Vermont | 309.1 | -0.2 | 743 | 37 | 4.9 | 15 |
| Virginia | 3,709.0 | 0.7 | 921 | 11 | 3.8 | 34 |
| Washington | 2,936.0 | 2.6 | 885 | 14 | 4.6 | 22 |
| West Virginia | 716.8 | 0.4 | 683 | 48 | 4.1 | 29 |
| Wisconsin | 2,803.9 | 0.3 | 769 | 32 | 3.1 | 41 |
| Wyoming | 279.6 | 3.0 | 815 | 23 | 7.1 | 3 |
| Puerto Rico | 1,055.2 | -1.4 | 517 | (5) | 4.4 | (5) |
| Virgin Islands | 46.0 | 0.6 | 738 | (5) | 3.9 | (5) |

[^0] 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.
(5) Data not included in the national ranking.


[^0]:    (1) Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal

