



NEWS RELEASE



NEW ENGLAND INFORMATION OFFICE
Boston, Mass.

For release: Wednesday, April 25, 2012

12-786-BOS

Technical Information: (617) 565-2327 • BLSInfoBoston@bls.gov • www.bls.gov/ro1
Media Contact: (617) 565-2326 • consedine.tim@bls.gov

COUNTY EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES IN NEW HAMPSHIRE – THIRD QUARTER 2011

Employment in Rockingham County rose 1.0 percent from September 2010 to September 2011, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. Hillsborough, New Hampshire's other large county, saw an employment gain of 0.7 percent. (Large counties are defined as those with employment of 75,000 or more as measured by 2010 annual average employment.) Acting Regional Commissioner Deborah A. Brown noted that employment growth in both counties was below the 1.6-percent national average.

Nationwide, employment increased in 271 of the 322 largest U.S. counties. The largest over-the-year percentage increase in employment was recorded in Williamson, Tenn. (5.4 percent); Frederick, Md., experienced the largest over-the-year decrease (-2.6 percent).

Among New Hampshire's two large counties, employment was higher in Hillsborough County (187,100) in September 2011. Together, both large counties accounted for 52.6 percent of total employment within the state. Nationwide, the 322 largest counties made up 70.5 percent of total U.S. employment.

The average weekly wage in Rockingham rose 8.0 percent to \$889 from the third quarter of 2010 to the third quarter of 2011. While average weekly wages were higher in Hillsborough, at \$999, the over-the-year wage increase was smaller, 5.6 percent. (See table 1.) Nationally, the average weekly wage increased 5.3 percent over the year to \$916.

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

Large County Wage Changes

The 8.0-percent wage gain in Rockingham County ranked 24th among the 322 largest U.S. counties. Hillsborough's 5.6-percent wage gain ranked 101st. Nationwide, Lake, Ohio, ranked first in average weekly wage growth, with an increase of 17.1 percent in the third quarter of 2011. Santa Clara, Calif., had the second largest overall increase (11.7 percent), followed by Oklahoma, Okla. (11.5 percent). Across the country, 315 large counties experienced over-the-year increases in average weekly wages.

Of the 322 largest counties, 3 experienced declines in average weekly wages over the year. Clay, Mo., had the largest wage decline with a loss of 2.3 percent, followed by Alachua, Fla., and Leon, Fla., which saw wage declines of 0.8 and 0.1 percent, respectively.

Large County Average Weekly Wages

Hillsborough County's average weekly wage of \$999 placed 64th in the national ranking. Rockingham County's \$889 weekly wage ranked 131st and was below the U.S. average of \$916.

Among the 213 counties with average weekly wages at or below the national average, Horry, S.C. (\$561), reported the lowest wage, followed by the counties of Cameron, Texas (\$591), Hidalgo, Texas (\$602), Yakima, Wash. (\$619) and Webb, Texas (\$629).

Nationally, average weekly wages were higher than the national average in 109 of largest U.S. counties. Santa Clara, Calif., held the top position among the highest-paid large counties with an average weekly wage of \$1,857. New York, N.Y., was second with an average weekly wage of \$1,647, followed by Arlington, Va. (\$1,550), and Washington, D.C. (\$1,527).

Average Weekly Wages in New Hampshire's Smaller Counties

Seven of the eight counties in New Hampshire with employment below 75,000 had average weekly wages lower than the national average of \$916; the only exception was Strafford (\$927). Carroll reported the lowest weekly wage among the smaller counties, averaging \$595, followed by Coos at \$606, in the third quarter of 2011.

When all 10 counties in New Hampshire were considered, all but 2 had wages below the national average. Three reported average weekly wages at or below \$699, 2 reported wages from \$700 to \$799, and 2 had wages from \$800 to \$899. Three counties had wages above \$900. The lowest-paid counties were generally located in the northeastern part of the state. (See chart 1.)

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 <http://www.bls.gov/cew/>.

An annual bulletin, *Employment and Wages Annual Averages*, features comprehensive information by detailed industry on establishments, employment, and wages for the nation and all states. The 2010 edition of this bulletin, 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 news release. Tables and additional content from the 2010 Employment and Wages Annual Bulletin are now available online at www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn10.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 QCEW program, as well as other Bureau programs, contact the New England Information Office at (617) 565-2327. This release is available in PDF and HTML format on the New England BLS Web site at www.bls.gov/ro1/nhqcew.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 9.1 million employer reports cover 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 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 2 largest counties in New Hampshire, third quarter 2011 (2)

Area	Employment			Average Weekly Wage (3)			
	September 2011 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2010-11 (4)	National ranking by percent change (5)	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level (5)	Percent change, third quarter 2010-11 (4)	National ranking by percent change (5)
United States (6)	130,524.7	1.6	--	\$916	--	5.3	--
New Hampshire	613.2	0.7	--	903	17	5.6	13
Hillsborough	187.1	0.7	212	999	64	5.6	101
Rockingham	135.6	1.0	177	889	131	8.0	24

(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) 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.

Table 2. Covered¹ employment and wages in the United States and all of the counties in New Hampshire, third quarter 2011²

Area	Employment September 2011	Average Weekly Wage ³
United States ⁴	130,524,677	\$916
New Hampshire	613,247	903
Belknap	25,720	699
Carroll	20,583	595
Cheshire	32,272	754
Coos	12,977	606
Grafton	52,354	908
Hillsborough	187,080	999
Merrimack	72,338	826
Rockingham	135,629	889
Strafford	44,682	927
Sullivan	13,519	716

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 2011 (2)

State	Employment		Average weekly wage (3)			
	September 2011 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2010-11	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level	Percent change, third quarter 2010-11	National ranking by percent change
United States (4)	130,524.7	1.6	\$916	--	5.3	--
Alabama	1,823.2	0.5	803	33	3.7	48
Alaska	341.5	2.1	963	10	4.0	42
Arizona	2,391.6	2.1	860	21	4.9	27
Arkansas	1,151.0	0.4	715	47	4.5	36
California	14,686.3	1.5	1,051	6	6.8	3
Colorado	2,234.4	2.3	948	13	5.6	13
Connecticut	1,626.5	0.9	1,118	2	4.7	31
Delaware	406.1	0.2	949	12	5.4	19
District of Columbia	708.1	2.1	1,527	1	3.9	45
Florida	7,167.5	1.7	812	30	4.2	40
Georgia	3,799.6	1.3	867	20	5.3	20
Hawaii	593.6	1.2	836	23	4.0	42
Idaho	623.8	1.1	697	48	4.7	31
Illinois	5,629.1	1.6	958	11	4.6	35
Indiana	2,797.5	2.1	785	35	5.8	9
Iowa	1,466.9	1.6	760	42	5.6	13
Kansas	1,311.7	1.1	772	40	5.6	13
Kentucky	1,757.4	1.7	764	41	4.8	28
Louisiana	1,852.3	0.9	821	27	3.9	45
Maine	595.6	0.9	734	46	2.9	51
Maryland	2,497.6	1.1	1,023	7	5.9	8
Massachusetts	3,227.8	1.8	1,114	3	4.1	41
Michigan	3,920.5	2.4	876	18	4.4	37
Minnesota	2,642.8	2.5	916	15	4.8	28
Mississippi	1,081.3	0.1	681	51	4.4	37
Missouri	2,610.3	0.6	804	32	5.2	24
Montana	433.9	1.3	687	49	6.2	4
Nebraska	905.0	0.5	747	43	5.7	11
Nevada	1,122.0	1.3	845	22	3.8	47
New Hampshire	613.2	0.7	903	17	5.6	13
New Jersey	3,774.1	0.6	1,069	5	4.3	39
New Mexico	788.7	0.4	779	37	4.7	31
New York	8,511.6	1.7	1,099	4	4.0	42
North Carolina	3,863.6	1.3	809	31	5.3	20
North Dakota	390.8	6.7	820	28	12.9	1
Ohio	5,015.3	1.4	834	25	5.6	13
Oklahoma	1,518.5	1.8	785	35	8.3	2
Oregon	1,645.0	1.4	835	24	5.7	11
Pennsylvania	5,550.9	0.9	912	16	6.2	4
Rhode Island	456.8	0.3	871	19	5.3	20
South Carolina	1,789.9	1.4	746	44	4.8	28
South Dakota	398.9	1.3	684	50	3.6	49
Tennessee	2,631.4	2.1	819	29	5.3	20
Texas	10,480.4	2.7	931	14	6.2	4
Utah	1,192.9	2.9	779	37	5.1	25
Vermont	297.0	0.8	778	39	3.3	50
Virginia	3,602.5	1.6	974	9	4.7	31
Washington	2,905.4	1.7	1,011	8	6.1	7
West Virginia	710.8	1.6	742	45	5.8	9
Wisconsin	2,697.9	1.4	792	34	5.6	13
Wyoming	284.0	1.6	832	26	5.1	25
Puerto Rico	910.3	-0.2	506	(5)	1.2	(5)
Virgin Islands	42.7	-1.5	718	(5)	-5.2	(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.

Chart 1. Average weekly wages by county in New Hampshire, third quarter 2011

Average weekly wage
(U.S. average = \$916)



Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics