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## County Employment and Wages in Vermont

Third Quarter 2007
The average weekly wage in Chittenden County was $\$ 812$ in the third quarter of 2007, 4.2 percent higher than it was one year earlier, according to the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. Regional Commissioner Denis McSweeney noted that Chittenden's average weekly wage was $\$ 6$ below the national level of $\$ 818$ and that its wage growth was similar to the nationwide increase of 4.3 percent. (See table 1.) Chittenden was the only large county in Vermont--that is, it had 75,000 or more jobs as measured by 2006 annual average employment.

Nationally, there were 328 large counties of which 215 had average weekly wages below the U.S. average. Chittenden County's wage level ranked $118^{\text {th }}$ and its wage growth, $110^{\text {th }}$, both of which placed the County in the top half of the national rankings.

Employment in Chittenden County, at 95,800 in September 2007, fell 0.4 percent over the year. Nationwide, employment grew at a 0.9-percent pace from September 2006. Among the 328 large counties, employment rose in 217 of the large counties from September a year ago and declined in 86 counties.

Wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 13 counties in Vermont with employment below 75,000 . None of these counties registered average weekly wages above that for the nation in the third quarter of 2007. Grand Isle County reported the lowest wage level in the State at $\$ 502$; it also employed the fewest workers, 1,256 . (See table 2.)

When all 14 counties in Vermont were considered, 4 had wages below \$600, 8 had wages ranging from $\$ 600$ to $\$ 699$, and 2 had earnings of $\$ 700$ or more-Chittenden and Washington. (See table 2.)

## Large County Average Weekly Wages

Average weekly wages were higher than the national average in 112 of the 328 largest counties in the United States. Santa Clara, Calif., held the top position with an average weekly wage of $\$ 1,585$. New York County, N.Y., was second with an average wage of $\$ 1,544$, followed by Washington, D.C. $(\$ 1,376)$, Arlington, Va. $(\$ 1,364)$, and San Mateo, Calif. $(\$ 1,322)$.

At the other end of the spectrum, Cameron County, Texas, reported the lowest average weekly wage (\$518) in the nation, followed by the counties of Hidalgo, Texas (\$529), Horry, S.C. (\$536), Webb, Texas (\$548), and Yakima, Wash. (\$568).

Over the year, the national average weekly wage rose by 4.3 percent. Among the largest counties, Clayton, Ga., led the nation in growth in wage growth with an increase of 23.9 percent
from the third quarter of 2006. Muscogee, Ga., was second with growth of 12.1 percent, followed by the counties of Santa Clara, Calif. (11.8 percent), Rock Island, Ill. (11.5 percent), and Davidson, Tenn. ( 9.1 percent). The high average weekly wage growth rate for Clayton County was due to increases in wage disbursements in the trade, transportation, and utilities supersector during the quarter.

Ten large counties experienced over-the-year declines in average weekly wages. The five largest decreases in wages occurred in Trumbull, Ohio (-10.6 percent), Vanderburgh, Ind. (6.1 percent), Genesee, Mich. (-4.0 percent), Saginaw, Mich. (-3.1 percent), and Montgomery, Ohio (-3.0 percent).

## State Average Weekly Wages

Vermont had an average weekly wage of $\$ 699$ in the third quarter of 2007, $\$ 119$ below that for the nation, ranking it $35^{\text {th }}$ among the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The five highest wage levels in the United States were all on the east coast - the District of Columbia $(\$ 1,376)$, Connecticut $(\$ 1,021)$, New York $(\$ 1,009)$, Massachusetts $(\$ 1,002)$, and New Jersey (\$965).

Average weekly wages in Vermont rose 4.0 percent over the year, tying it with Illinois and West Virginia for the $32^{\text {nd }}$ highest increase in the nation. Washington experienced wage growth of 6.7 percent from the third quarter of 2006 to the third quarter of 2007, higher than any other state. Connecticut was a very close second with a 6.6 -percent wage increase. Rounding out the top five were New York (6.1 percent), North Dakota ( 5.8 percent), and Massachusetts, Nevada, Oklahoma, and Utah ( 5.5 percent each). Only Rhode Island experienced a decline in wages over the year (-0.1 percent).

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 reports submitted by every employer subject to unemployment insurance (UI) laws. The 9.0 million employer reports cover 136.2 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. The result then is 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 http://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 the national 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 representations of QCEW data; the data tables themselves will be published exclusively in electronic formats as PDFs. Employment and Wages Annual Averages, 2006 is available for sale from the United States Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents. On-line ordering information is available at http://bookstore.gpo.gov/. The 2006 bulletin is available in a
portable document format (pdf) on the BLS Web Site at http://www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn06.htm.

QCEW-based news releases issued by other regional offices have been placed at one convenient BLS Web site location, http://www.bls.gov/cew/cewregional.htm.

Information in this release will be made available to sensory impaired individuals upon request. Voice phone: 617-565-2072; Federal Relay Services: 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 Boston Information Office at 617-565-2327 from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. ET.

## TECHNICAL NOTE

QCEW data are the sums of individual establishment records reflecting the number of establishments that exist in a county or industry at a point in time. For this reason, county and industry data are not designed to be used as a time series.

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. The potential differences result from several causes. Differences between BLS and state published data may be due to the 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 largest county

| Area | Employment |  | Average Weekly Wage (3) |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | September <br> 2007 <br> (thousands) | Percent <br> change, third <br> quarter 2006- <br> $07(5)$ | Average <br> weekly <br> wage | National <br> ranking by <br> level (4) | Percent <br> change, third <br> quarter 2006- <br> $07(5)$ | National <br> ranking by <br> percent <br> change (4) |
| United States (6) | $136,246.9$ | 0.9 | $\$ 818$ | -- | 4.3 | -- |
| Vermont | 305.2 | -0.2 | 699 | 35 | 4.0 | 32 |
| Chittenden | 95.8 | -0.4 | 812 | 118 | 4.2 | 110 |

(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.

Table 2. Covered ${ }^{1}$ employment and wages in the United States and all of the counties in Vermont, third quarter $200{ }^{2}$

| Area | Employment September <br> 2007 | Average Weekly Wage $^{3}$ <br> United States $^{4}$ <br> Vermont$\sqrt{136,246,900}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Addison | 305,200 |  |
| Bennington | 14,808 | $\$ 818$ |
| Caledonia | 18,586 | 699 |
| Chittenden | 11,993 | 659 |
| Essex | 95,800 | 657 |
| Franklin | 1,349 | 605 |
| Grand Isle | 16,343 | 812 |
| Lamiolle | 1,256 | 558 |
| Orange | 10,848 | 643 |
| Orleans | 8,100 | 502 |
| Rutland | 10,145 | 566 |
| Washington | 29,577 | 585 |
| Windham | 32,926 | 568 |
| Windsor | 22,263 | 646 |
|  | 23,968 | 727 |
|  |  | 668 |

${ }^{1}$ 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.

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

| State | Employment |  | Average weekly wage (3) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { September } \\ 2007 \\ \text { (thousands) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Percent change, third quarter 2006-07 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, third quarter 2006-07 | National ranking by percent change |
| United States (4) | 136,246.9 | 0.9 | \$818 | - | 4.3 | - |
| Alabama | 1,959.0 | 1.1 | 707 | 32 | 3.7 | 37 |
| Alaska | 327.3 | 0.7 | 840 | 13 | 5.4 | 9 |
| Arizona | 2,644.9 | 0.5 | 783 | 20 | 4.1 | 25 |
| Arkansas | 1,184.5 | 0.3 | 629 | 46 | 4.1 | 25 |
| California | 15,755.0 | 0.7 | 932 | 6 | 4.5 | 18 |
| Colorado | 2,314.3 | 2.4 | 844 | 12 | 3.2 | 42 |
| Connecticut | 1,696.9 | 1.0 | 1,021 | 2 | 6.6 | 2 |
| Delaware | 425.2 | 0.1 | 860 | 10 | 1.2 | 50 |
| District of Columbia | 679.0 | 0.6 | 1,376 | 1 | 5.3 | 12 |
| Florida | 7,879.9 | -0.9 | 741 | 26 | 4.1 | 25 |
| Georgia | 4,089.4 | 1.2 | 782 | 21 | 4.1 | 25 |
| Hawaii | 624.4 | 0.3 | 760 | 22 | 5.4 | 9 |
| Idaho | 675.5 | 2.2 | 634 | 45 | 3.4 | 41 |
| Illinois | 5,917.6 | 0.6 | 866 | 9 | 4.0 | 32 |
| Indiana | 2,937.4 | 0.5 | 702 | 34 | 2.2 | 49 |
| lowa | 1,494.5 | 0.9 | 668 | 40 | 4.2 | 22 |
| Kansas | 1,368.7 | 1.7 | 680 | 38 | 2.7 | 46 |
| Kentucky | 1,814.3 | 1.0 | 676 | 39 | 3.0 | 44 |
| Louisiana | 1,880.8 | 2.7 | 716 | 31 | 4.5 | 18 |
| Maine | 615.3 | 0.7 | 660 | 44 | 3.9 | 35 |
| Maryland | 2,563.7 | 0.7 | 892 | 7 | 4.1 | 25 |
| Massachusetts | 3,261.0 | 1.0 | 1,002 | 4 | 5.5 | 5 |
| Michigan | 4,218.2 | -1.4 | 808 | 16 | 2.4 | 48 |
| Minnesota | 2,713.3 | 0.9 | 822 | 15 | 4.6 | 16 |
| Mississippi | 1,142.2 | 0.6 | 607 | 50 | 3.8 | 36 |
| Missouri | 2,746.7 | 0.8 | 719 | 29 | 4.2 | 22 |
| Montana | 446.1 | 2.7 | 608 | 49 | 4.6 | 16 |
| Nebraska | 922.7 | 1.7 | 666 | 41 | 5.4 | 9 |
| Nevada | 1,286.4 | -0.1 | 792 | 19 | 5.5 | 5 |
| New Hampshire | 637.2 | 0.3 | 799 | 18 | 3.2 | 42 |
| New Jersey | 3,985.2 | 0.1 | 965 | 5 | 3.7 | 37 |
| New Mexico | 830.4 | 0.8 | 682 | 37 | 4.1 | 25 |
| New York | 8,585.3 | 1.3 | 1,009 | 3 | 6.1 | 3 |
| North Carolina | 4,104.1 | 2.4 | 719 | 29 | 3.5 | 40 |
| North Dakota | 347.4 | 1.5 | 621 | 48 | 5.8 | 4 |
| Ohio | 5,331.9 | -0.2 | 745 | 25 | 2.8 | 45 |
| Oklahoma | 1,548.2 | 1.8 | 666 | 41 | 5.5 | 5 |
| Oregon | 1,751.7 | 1.2 | 750 | 24 | 4.2 | 22 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,673.4 | 0.5 | 802 | 17 | 4.4 | 20 |
| Rhode Island | 486.1 | -1.0 | 759 | 23 | -0.1 | 51 |
| South Carolina | 1,904.7 | 1.7 | 664 | 43 | 3.6 | 39 |
| South Dakota | 397.5 | 2.0 | 598 | 51 | 4.7 | 15 |
| Tennessee | 2,774.4 | 0.5 | 728 | 28 | 4.3 | 21 |
| Texas | 10,304.9 | 2.9 | 825 | 14 | 5.0 | 13 |
| Utah | 1,231.6 | 3.6 | 696 | 36 | 5.5 | 5 |
| Vermont | 305.2 | -0.2 | 699 | 35 | 4.0 | 32 |
| Virginia | 3,686.6 | 1.0 | 857 | 11 | 5.0 | 13 |
| Washington | 2,976.5 | 2.1 | 878 | 8 | 6.7 | 1 |
| West Virginia | 713.8 | 0.3 | 623 | 47 | 4.0 | 32 |
| Wisconsin | 2,802.3 | -0.1 | 705 | 33 | 2.6 | 47 |
| Wyoming | 284.3 | 3.6 | 734 | 27 | 4.1 | 25 |
| Puerto Rico | 1,008.0 | -1.1 | 453 | (5) | 2.5 | (5) |
| Virgin Islands | 45.0 | 0.7 | 682 | (5) | -0.3 | (5) |

(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.
(5) Data not included in the national ranking.

