

Local Area Personal Income, 1998–2000

By Jeffrey L. Newman

THE Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) has released new estimates for 2000 and revised estimates for 1998–99 of personal income for counties, metropolitan areas, and BEA economic areas (see the box “Definitions of Local Areas”). These estimates incorporate the results from the revision to the annual estimates of State personal income for 1998–99 that were released in September 2001, and they incorporate new and revised county-level source data for 1998–99.¹

This article presents the preliminary estimates of local area personal income and per capita personal income for 2000, and it describes the sources of the revisions to the estimates for 1998–99 and the effects of the revisions on the estimates for metropolitan areas. The estimates for 1998–2000 are presented in tables 1–3 at the end of this article; for the availability of additional estimates, see the box “Data Availability.”

According to the estimates for metropolitan areas for 2000:

- In the eight fastest growing metropolitan areas, the growth in personal income was at least 5.4 percent-

age points higher than the 7.0-percent growth rate of the Nation; in the eight slowest growing areas, the growth was at least 3.6 percentage points lower than the growth rate of the Nation.

- The six metropolitan areas that make up the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose consolidated metropolitan area ranked among the eight fastest growing areas, in terms of personal income, in the Nation. The other two fastest growing metropolitan areas are in eastern North Carolina, which had been affected by severe flood damage by Hurricane Floyd in 1999.
- San Jose, CA, had the fastest growth in personal income, at 21.0 percent, for the second consecutive year. Anniston, AL, had the slowest growth, at –0.2 percent.
- Per capita personal income in San Francisco, CA, was the highest, at \$57,414, or almost twice the per capita personal income for the Nation. Per capita personal income in McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX, was the lowest, at \$13,344, less than half that of the Nation.

According to the estimates for counties for 2000,

- Five of the ten fastest growing counties, in terms of personal income, with populations of at least 50,000

1. See Jeffrey L. Newman, “State Personal Income, Revised Estimates for 1998–2000,” *SURVEY OF CURRENT BUSINESS* 81 (October 2001): 99–115.

Definitions of Local Areas

Local areas are metropolitan areas, BEA economic areas, and counties.

The metropolitan areas (see table 1 at the end of the article) in all States are those defined in terms of counties and county equivalents by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Federal statistical purposes.¹

1. For the New England region, OMB’s preferred definitions of the metropolitan areas are in terms of cities and towns, but the available data for cities and towns are not sufficient to prepare estimates of personal income. BEA uses the OMB-defined New England Consolidated Metropolitan Areas, which are based on county definitions, for its New England metropolitan areas.

The list of the metropolitan areas and their constituent counties and county equivalents is available on BEA’s Web site at <www.bea.gov/bea/regional/docs/msalist.htm>.

Each BEA economic area (see table 2) consists of one or more economic nodes—usually metropolitan areas—and the surrounding counties that are economically related to the node.² The economic areas encompass all counties and county equivalents in the Nation.

The counties (see table 3) include county equivalents. For Virginia, the estimates are also presented for the larger independent cities; the estimates for the smaller independent cities are combined with the estimates for adjacent counties.

2. See Kenneth P. Johnson, “Redefinition of the BEA Economic Areas,” *SURVEY* 75 (February 1995): 75–81, or <www.bea.gov/bea/regional/articles/0295rea/maintext.htm>.

are part of the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose consolidated metropolitan area. Three of the five slowest growing counties are in Alabama.

- Per capita personal income in New York County (Manhattan), NY, was the highest, at \$90,901, or more than three times the national average. Per capita personal income in Loup County, NE, was the lowest, at \$6,606, less than a fourth of the national average.

Personal income for metropolitan areas for 2000

The San Jose, CA, metropolitan area had the fastest rate of growth in personal income in 2000. Personal income grew 21.0 percent, three times faster than the 7.0-percent growth rate of the Nation. The rapid growth reflected large increases in earnings in the following “new economy” types of industries: Business services, which includes software development, pre-packaged software, data processing services, and computer rental and leasing; industrial machinery and equipment manufacturing, which includes computer manufacturing; and electronics and other electric equipment manufacturing. Earnings in these industries were affected substantially by increases in the stock market, which peaked in March 2000.

Fastest and slowest growing areas. In 2000, the growth rates of the eight fastest growing metropolitan areas were at least 5.4 percentage points higher than the 7.0-percent growth rate of the Nation (table A). Each of the six metropolitan areas that make up the

San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose consolidated metropolitan statistical area was among the fastest growing areas. Each of these six areas has had above average growth in personal income since 1998. The fast growth in the other two areas—Rocky Mount, NC, and Greenville, NC—reflected a sharp recovery in rental income from the effects of Hurricane Floyd in 1999, when Rocky Mount was the slowest growing metropolitan area and Greenville was the fourth slowest growing metropolitan area.

The growth rates of the eight slowest growing metropolitan areas in 2000 were at least 3.6 percentage

Table A. Fastest and Slowest Growth in Personal Income for Metropolitan Areas for 2000

	Millions of dollars			Percent change ¹	
	1998	1999	2000	1998-99	1999-2000
United States	7,418,497	7,769,367	8,314,032	4.7	7.0
Fastest growing areas					
San Jose, CA.....	66,666	76,769	92,880	15.2	21.0
San Francisco, CA.....	78,465	85,983	99,425	9.6	15.6
Rocky Mount, NC.....	3,250	3,080	3,524	-5.2	14.4
Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA.....	7,686	8,398	9,610	9.3	14.4
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA.....	12,820	13,731	15,597	7.1	13.6
Greenville, NC.....	2,936	2,911	3,299	-0.9	13.3
Santa Rosa, CA.....	13,452	14,202	16,046	5.6	13.0
Oakland, CA.....	78,163	84,680	95,167	8.3	12.4
Slowest growing areas					
Anniston, AL.....	2,361	2,369	2,364	0.4	-0.2
Lake Charles, LA.....	3,988	4,054	4,166	1.7	2.8
Decatur, AL.....	3,274	3,423	3,521	4.5	2.9
Youngstown-Warren, OH.....	13,592	13,926	14,356	2.5	3.1
Flint, MI.....	10,470	10,672	11,017	1.9	3.2
Toledo, OH.....	15,919	16,490	17,011	3.6	3.2
Decatur, IL.....	2,927	3,049	3,150	4.2	3.3
New Orleans, LA.....	33,225	33,710	34,842	1.5	3.4

1. Percent changes are calculated using unrounded data.

Acknowledgments

The revised estimates of local area personal income were prepared by the Regional Economic Measurement Division under the direction of Robert L. Brown, Chief. Hugh W. Knox, Associate Director for Regional Economics, provided general guidance. The preparation of the revised estimates was a divisionwide effort.

The estimates of nonfarm wages and salaries and other labor income were prepared by the Regional Wage Branch under the supervision of Sharon C. Carnevale, Chief. Major responsibilities were assigned to Elizabeth P. Cologer, Lisa C. Ninomiya, Michael G. Pilot, John A. Rusinko, and James M. Scott. Contributing staff members were Kristin M. Chambliss, Susan P. Den Herder, Lisa B. Emerson, John D. Laffman, Lela S. Lester, Russell C. Lusher, Richard A. Lutyk, Paul K. Medzerian, Mauricio Ortiz, Michael Phillips, Adrienne T. Pilot, Curtis Roberson, Victor A. Sahadachny, Elizabeth F. Stell, and Jaime Zenzano.

The annual estimates of farm wages and salaries, other labor income, proprietors’ income, property income, transfer payments, personal contributions for social insurance, and the adjustment for residence were prepared by the Regional Income Branch under the supervision of James M. Zavrel, Chief. Major responsibilities were assigned to Charles A. Jolley, Jeffrey L. Newman, and James P. Stehle. Contributing staff members were Suet M. Boudhraa, Elaine M. Briccetti, Carrie L. Case, Daniel R. Corrin, Keren Israeli, Toan A. Ly, W. Tim McKeel, and Marianne A. Ziver.

The public use tabulations and data files were assembled and the tables were prepared by the Regional Economic Information System Branch under the supervision of Kathy A. Albetski, Chief. Major responsibilities were assigned to Gary V. Kennedy. Contributing staff members were H Steven Dolan, Michael J. Paris, Callan S. Swenson, Monique B. Tyes, and Mary C. Williams.

points lower than the growth rate of the Nation. Four of the slowest growing areas are in the Southeast region, and four are in the Great Lakes region. In Anniston, AL, which was also among the slowest growing metropolitan areas in 1999, Federal civilian and military earnings declined because of the closing of Fort McClellan. Earnings in durable goods manufacturing declined in Lake Charles, LA, Youngstown-Warren, OH, Flint, MI, Toledo, OH, Decatur, IL, and New Orleans, LA. In Decatur, AL, farm earnings and construction earnings declined.

Highest and lowest levels of per capita income. The 10 metropolitan areas with the highest per capita personal income are all located in coastal States (table B).² San Francisco, CA, at \$57,414, had the highest per capita personal income, followed by San Jose, CA, at \$55,157. In seven of these areas, the growth in population was less than the national average of 1.1 percent.

In all 10 of the metropolitan areas with the lowest per capita personal income, per capita income increased less than the national average of 5.8 percent. In seven of these areas, the growth in population was above the national average. McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX, at \$13,344, had the lowest per capita personal income.

2. Per capita personal income is the annual total personal income of residents divided by the resident population on July 1. In April 2002, the Census Bureau released July 1 population estimates for counties for 2000 and 2001, along with revised July 1 county intercensal population estimates for 1990–99, that are consistent with the April 1, 2000, decennial population counts for counties. The per capita personal income estimates for 1990–99 have been revised to incorporate the updated intercensal population counts.

Personal income for counties for 2000

In 2000, the 918 counties that have a population of at least 50,000 accounted for 89.4 percent of the personal income of the Nation. Among these counties, Edgecombe County, NC, which is part of the Rocky Mount metropolitan area, had the fastest growth in personal income, at 24.8 percent. The rapid growth was primarily due to a recovery in rental income from the effects of flood damage by Hurricane Floyd; in 1999, Edgecombe County had the largest decline in personal income, at –16.7 percent. In 2000, Calhoun County, AL, which makes up the Anniston metropolitan area, had the largest decline in personal income, at –0.2 percent.

Fastest and slowest growing counties with populations of at least 50,000. In 2000, 5 of the 10 counties with the fastest growth in personal income were in the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose consolidated metropolitan statistical area (table C). The growth rates of personal income in the 10 fastest growing counties were at least 7.4 percentage points above the national average. Only four counties—Sampson, NC, Loudoun, VA, Douglas, CO, and Alameda, CA—had growth in population that exceeded the national average of 1.1 percent. In Douglas County, both personal income and population grew at least 10.7 percent.

The growth rates in personal income in the 10 slowest growing counties were at least 4.6 percentage points below the national average. Farm earnings declined in Chaves, NM, Cullman, AL, Imperial, CA, Marshall, AL, Tuscola, MI, Washington, MS, and Crittenden, AR. Earnings in durable goods manufacturing declined in Chaves, Marshall, Washington, Crittenden,

Table B. Highest and Lowest Per Capita Personal Income for Metropolitan Areas for 2000

	Per capita personal income			Population		
	Dollars		Percent change	Thousands		Percent change ¹
	1999	2000	1999–2000	1999	2000	1999–2000
United States	27,843	29,469	5.8	279,040	282,125	1.1
Highest per capita personal income						
San Francisco, CA.....	49,830	57,414	15.2	1,726	1,732	0.4
San Jose, CA.....	45,928	55,157	20.1	1,671	1,684	0.7
New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Danbury-Waterbury, CT.....	43,806	46,542	6.2	1,697	1,708	0.6
Bergen-Passaic, NJ.....	39,239	42,726	8.9	1,368	1,374	0.4
Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ.....	39,393	42,392	7.6	1,157	1,174	1.5
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL.....	39,545	41,007	3.7	1,117	1,136	1.7
Trenton, NJ.....	37,512	40,954	9.2	348	351	0.8
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA.....	38,858	40,686	4.7	2,397	2,418	0.9
Nassau-Suffolk, NY.....	38,387	40,353	5.1	2,737	2,760	0.8
Naples, FL.....	38,916	40,121	3.1	245	254	3.7
Lowest per capita personal income						
Pine Bluff, AR.....	19,080	19,826	3.9	84	84	0.1
Provo-Orem, UT.....	18,114	19,128	5.6	362	371	2.5
Merced, CA.....	18,100	18,536	2.4	207	212	2.4
El Paso, TX.....	17,749	18,535	4.4	675	682	1.0
Auburn-Opelika, AL.....	17,901	18,484	3.3	113	115	2.3
Las Cruces, NM.....	16,705	17,321	3.7	174	175	0.7
Yuma, AZ.....	16,004	16,002	0	156	161	3.5
Laredo, TX.....	14,347	15,114	5.3	189	195	3.1
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, TX.....	14,179	14,906	5.1	330	337	2.0
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX.....	12,782	13,344	4.4	556	574	3.2

1. Percent changes are calculated using unrounded data.

and Sandusky, OH. Only Imperial County had population growth, at 1.4 percent, that exceeded the national average.

Highest and lowest levels of per capita income for all counties. In 2000, 4 of the 10 counties with the highest per capita personal income were in the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island consolidated metropolitan statistical area, and 4 were in the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose consolidated metropolitan statistical area (table D). New York County (Man-

hattan), NY, at \$90,901, had the highest per capita personal income. All 10 of these counties had per capita personal incomes that were at least 84 percent higher than the national average of \$29,469.

Of the 10 counties with the lowest per capita personal income, 5 are in Nebraska, 2 are in Mississippi, and 2 are in Texas. Loup County, NE, at \$6,606, had the lowest per capita personal income. All 10 of these counties had per capita personal incomes that were at least 60 percent lower than the national average.

Shares of personal income for 1970–2000. From 1970 to 2000, the share of the Nation's personal income that is accounted for by metropolitan counties has increased almost 2 percentage points, to 85.4 percent (table E). Most of the increase—1.7 percentage

Table D. Highest and Lowest Per Capita Personal Income for Counties for 2000

	Dollars		Percent of U.S. total		Percent change
	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999–2000
United States	27,843	29,469	100	100	5.8
Highest per capita personal income					
New York, NY.....	81,084	90,901	291	308	12.1
Pitkin, CO.....	57,371	68,761	206	233	19.9
Marin, CA.....	56,675	60,618	204	206	7.0
Loving, TX.....	48,948	60,292	176	205	23.2
San Mateo, CA.....	49,718	58,644	179	199	18.0
Fairfield, CT.....	54,807	58,254	197	198	6.3
Somerset, NJ.....	51,431	55,596	185	189	8.1
San Francisco, CA.....	47,755	55,272	172	188	15.7
Santa Clara, CA.....	45,928	55,157	165	187	20.1
Westchester, NY.....	51,290	54,277	184	184	5.8
Lowest per capita personal income					
Zavala, TX.....	11,631	11,873	42	40	2.1
Sioux, NE.....	11,666	11,760	42	40	0.8
Blaine, NE.....	11,746	11,750	42	40	0
McPherson, NE.....	9,498	10,672	34	36	12.4
Arthur, NE.....	11,838	10,553	43	36	-10.9
Jefferson, MS.....	10,254	10,528	37	36	2.7
Starr, TX.....	9,209	9,740	33	33	5.8
Issaquena, MS.....	9,766	9,679	35	33	-0.9
Ziebach, SD.....	8,779	9,183	32	31	4.6
Loup, NE.....	6,482	6,606	23	22	1.9

Table E. Relative Shares of Personal Income for Selected Years¹

	Millions of dollars			
	1970	1980	1990	2000
United States	834,455	2,313,921	4,885,525	8,314,032
U.S. metropolitan counties.....	697,793	1,921,802	4,142,480	7,103,560
Percent of United States.....	83.6	83.1	84.8	85.4
U.S. nonmetropolitan counties.....	136,662	392,119	743,045	1,210,472
Percent of United States.....	16.4	16.9	15.2	14.6

1. Relative shares of personal income are calculated using unrounded data.

points—was due to the faster growth of personal income for metropolitan counties in the 1980s, which reversed a trend of faster growth for nonmetropolitan counties in the 1970s. In the 1990s, personal income

Table C. Fastest and Slowest Growth in Personal Income for Counties with Populations of at Least 50,000 for 2000

	Personal income					Population				
	Millions of dollars			Percent change ¹		Thousands			Percent change ¹	
	1998	1999	2000	1998–99	1999–2000	1998	1999	2000	1998–99	1999–2000
United States	7,418,497	7,769,367	8,314,032	4.7	7.0	275,854	279,040	282,125	1.2	1.1
Fastest growing counties										
Edgecombe, NC.....	1,107	923	1,151	-16.7	24.8	56	56	55	-0.2	-1.8
Santa Clara, CA.....	66,666	76,769	92,880	15.2	21.0	1,659	1,671	1,684	0.8	0.7
Steuben, NY.....	2,214	2,329	2,784	5.2	19.5	99	98	99	-0.2	0.3
Sampson, NC.....	1,040	1,033	1,232	-0.6	19.2	58	59	60	2.3	1.6
San Mateo, CA.....	31,688	35,028	41,512	10.5	18.5	703	705	708	0.3	0.5
Loudoun, VA.....	5,069	5,936	7,003	17.1	18.0	146	158	174	8.2	9.9
Douglas, CO.....	4,820	5,507	6,391	14.3	16.1	146	163	180	11.4	10.7
San Francisco, CA.....	33,716	36,997	42,910	9.7	16.0	770	775	776	0.6	0.2
Alameda, CA.....	44,734	48,745	55,972	9.0	14.8	1,406	1,427	1,449	1.5	1.5
Santa Cruz, CA.....	7,686	8,398	9,610	9.3	14.4	251	254	256	1.1	0.8
Slowest growing counties										
Calhoun, AL.....	2,361	2,369	2,364	0.4	-0.2	117	115	111	-1.9	-3.1
Chaves, NM.....	1,193	1,190	1,205	-0.3	1.3	62	62	61	-0.5	-1.2
Cullman, AL.....	1,536	1,612	1,637	5.0	1.6	76	77	78	1.1	0.7
Imperial, CA.....	2,502	2,596	2,641	3.8	1.7	140	141	143	1.0	1.4
Marshall, AL.....	1,574	1,597	1,627	1.4	1.9	81	82	82	0.6	0.3
Tuscola, MI.....	1,131	1,202	1,227	6.3	2.0	58	58	58	0.5	0
Washington, MS.....	1,195	1,183	1,208	-1.1	2.1	65	64	63	-1.4	-1.5
Sandusky, OH.....	1,384	1,427	1,458	3.1	2.1	62	62	62	-0.5	0
St. Bernard, LA.....	1,365	1,390	1,422	1.8	2.3	68	68	67	-0.5	-0.9
Crittenden, AR.....	989	1,032	1,057	4.3	2.4	50	51	51	0.7	0.9

1. Percent changes are calculated using unrounded data.

Alternative Measures of County Employment and Wages

Three widely used measures of annual county employment and wages by place of work are the Census Bureau employment and payroll data in the County Business Patterns (CBP) series, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) employment and wage tabulations from the unemployment insurance (UI) program, and BEA estimates of total wage and salary disbursements and employment.

The CBP data on employment and payrolls are an annual extension of the Census Bureau's quinquennial economic censuses; the data are derived from Federal administrative records and survey information on business establishments. The BLS data on county employment and wages are the product of the Federal-State Covered Employment and Wages, or ES-202, Program; the data are derived from tabulations of monthly employment and quarterly total wages of workers covered by State UI legislation and of Federal workers covered by the unemployment compensation for Federal employees (UCFE) program. BEA's estimates of total employment and total wage and salary disbursements are derived from the BLS data, which account for 95 percent of the wage and salary component of BEA's personal income estimates.

The coverage of the CBP data primarily differs from that of the BLS data because the CBP data exclude most government employees, and the BLS data cover civilian government employees (exhibit A).¹ In addition, the CBP coverage of the employees of educational and membership organizations and of small nonprofit organizations in other industries is more complete than the coverage of these employees in the BLS data. The CBP data also exclude some agricultural production employees and household employees that are covered by the BLS data. Finally, CBP reports employment data for the month of March, whereas the BLS employment data are an annual average of monthly data.

The BEA estimates of employment and wages differ from the BLS data because BEA adjusts the data to account for employment and wages not covered, or not fully covered, by the State UI and the UCFE programs. First, BEA adds estimates of employment and wages to the BLS data to bridge small gaps in UI coverage: For nonprofit organizations not participating in the UI pro-

1. The CBP coverage of government employees is limited to those working in government hospitals, depository institutions, Federal and federally sponsored credit agencies, liquor stores, and wholesale liquor establishments.

gram (several industries), for students and their spouses employed by public colleges or universities, for elected officials and members of the judiciary (State and local government), for interns employed by hospitals and by social service agencies, and for insurance agents classified as statutory employees (insurance agencies). Second, BEA uses additional source data to estimate most or all of the employment and wages for the following: Farms, farm labor contractors, private households, private elementary and secondary schools, religious membership organizations, railroads, military, and U.S. residents who are employed by international organizations and by foreign embassies and consulates in the United States. Third, BEA adjusts employment and wages for misreporting under the UI and UCFE programs.²

The Census Bureau will release data on county total employment and payrolls for 2000 on its Web site this spring (go to <www.census.gov/epcd/cbp/view/cbp-view.html>). BLS released annual county data on total employment and average annual pay for 2000 on October 18, 2001, on its Web site (go to <www.bls.gov/cew>). BEA's revised local area estimates of total wage employment and total wage and salary disbursements for 1999 and 2000 were released December 28, 2001, on its Web site (go to <www.bea.gov/bea/regional/reis>).

2. For more information, see *Local Area Personal Income, 1969-92* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1994): M-9-M-13, or go to <www.bea.gov>, look under "Regional," and select "Articles."

Exhibit A. National Wages and Salaries in the BEA County Estimates and Payrolls and Wages from the Census Bureau and BLS

[Billions of dollars]

	Line	1999	2000
Total payroll, Census Bureau	1	3,554.7
Plus: Civilian government wages, BLS.....	2	657.9	700.0
Other differences, net ¹	3	23.0
Equals: Total wages, BLS.....	4	4,235.6	4,585.8
Plus: Adjustments made by BEA:			
For unreported wages and unreported tips on employment tax returns.....	5	103.6	112.2
For selected industries ²	6	113.6	118.6
Other ³	7	16.5	19.2
Equals: Wage and salary disbursements, BEA.....	8	4,469.3	4,835.8

1. Includes differences of coverage in private education, membership organizations, and government.

2. Consists of the difference between estimates from more comprehensive source data and BLS wages and salaries for agriculture, forestry, and fishing; railroad transportation; health services; educational services; social services; membership organizations; private

households; and the Federal Government.

3. Consists of wages and salaries for the insurance agents, for the students and their spouses employed by public colleges or universities, for the nonprofit organizations not participating in the UI program, and of other adjustments.

BEA Bureau of Economic Analysis
BLS Bureau of Labor Statistics

for metropolitan counties continued to grow faster than that for nonmetropolitan counties, but the difference was smaller.

Source Data and Revisions

This section identifies the principal source data used to revise the estimates for 1998–99 and to prepare the estimates for 2000.³ It also discusses the metropolitan areas that had the largest revisions to personal income for 1999.

Revised estimates for 1998–99. For wage and salary disbursements, the estimates were revised to incorporate revised Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) tabulations of wages and salaries paid by employers; the tabulations are based on reports from the State unemployment insurance system. For other labor income and for personal contributions for social insurance, re-

vised estimates are mainly based on the revised estimates of wages and salaries.

For nonfarm proprietors' income, the estimates were revised to incorporate tax data for sole proprietorships and partnerships for 1998 from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and to incorporate updated data on net margins of rural electric and telephone cooperatives from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

The 1999 estimates of dividends, interest, and rent and of the adjustment for residence, which is an estimate of the net inflow of the earnings of interarea commuters, were revised to incorporate IRS tabulations of individual income tax return data for 1999.

The 1990–99 estimates of per capita personal income were revised to incorporate revised Census Bureau population estimates for 1990–99. In April 2002, the Census Bureau released revised county intercensal population estimates for 1990–99 that are consistent with the April 1, 2000, decennial population counts.

New estimates for 2000. The estimates of wage and salary disbursements are mainly based on BLS tabula-

3. For a detailed description of the sources and methods used to prepare the estimates, go to BEA's Web site at <www.bea.gov>, select "Articles" in the "Regional" section and then select "Comprehensive Revision of Local Area Personal Income: Revised Estimates for 1969–97 and New Estimates for 1998."

Data Availability

This article presents summary estimates of personal income and per capita personal income for 1998–2000. More detailed estimates for 1969–2000 are also available.

The estimates of personal income and employment for local areas are now available interactively on BEA's Web site. Go to <www.bea.gov/bea/regional/reis/> to access these estimates.

The following estimates are available:

- Personal income, per capita personal income, and population for 1969–2000
- Personal income by major source and earnings by industry (SIC two digit) for 1969–2000
- Full-time and part-time employment by industry (SIC division) for 1969–2000
- Regional economic profiles (featuring a selection of personal income and employment data) for 1969–2000
- Transfer payments (by major program) for 1969–2000
- Farm income and expenses (including the major categories of gross receipts and expenses for all farms and for measures of farm income) for 1969–2000
- Counties with the highest and lowest per capita personal incomes in 2000
- Personal income and per capita personal income,

including 2000 rankings by per capita personal income, for 1998–2000

- Total wage and salary disbursements, total wage employment, and average wages per job for counties and metropolitan areas for 1969–2000

In addition, the entire set of estimates for all areas will be available in June 2002 on a CD-ROM that also includes the quarterly State estimates of personal income for 1969–2001 and an updated description of the sources and methods used to estimate local area personal income. To order the CD-ROM *Regional Economic Information System, 1969–2000* (price \$35, product number RCN-0295), call the Order Desk at 1-800-704-0415 (outside the United States, call 202-606-9666).

The local area personal income estimates are also available through the members of the BEA User Group, which consists of State agencies and universities that help BEA to disseminate the estimates in their States. For a list of the BEA User Group on BEA's Web site, go to <www.bea.gov/bea/regional/docs/usergrp.htm>.

For more information, call the Regional Economic Information System at 202-606-5360, fax 202-606-5322, or e-mail reis.remd@bea.gov.

Table F. Largest Percentage Revisions in Personal Income for Metropolitan Areas for 1999

	Millions of dollars			Percent revision ¹	Components ²
	Previously published	Revised	Revision		
United States	7,784,137	7,769,367	-14,770	-0.2	DIR (-0.4)
Areas with the largest upward percent revisions					
Yolo, CA.....	4,206	4,341	135	3.2	AFR (3.0), DIR (.6), TRAN (.3), NFPI (-.7)
Naples, FL.....	9,288	9,538	250	2.7	DIR (2.4), AFR (.5), NFPI (-.3)
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA.....	11,817	12,132	315	2.7	DIR (1.8), NFPI (.6)
San Francisco, CA.....	83,768	85,983	2,214	2.6	AFR (1.1), DIR (.7), NFPI (.6)
Jersey City, NJ.....	15,292	15,660	367	2.4	AFR (2.8), DIR (-.6)
Areas with the largest downward percent revisions					
Dutchess County, NY.....	8,268	7,964	-303	-3.7	AFR (-2.6), DIR (-.5), NFPI (-.4)
Dubuque, IA.....	2,237	2,174	-62	-2.8	DIR (-1.9), NFPI (-1.0)
Rocky Mount, NC.....	3,163	3,080	-83	-2.6	DIR (-1.2), FPI (-1.1), NFPI (-.8)
Hagerstown, MD.....	3,088	3,012	-76	-2.5	AFR (-1.5), DIR (-1.1)
Wilmington-Newark, DE-MD.....	19,067	18,587	-480	-2.5	AFR (-1.9), DIR (-.9)

1. The revision to personal income as a percent of the previously published estimate.

2. This column shows the revised components of personal income and the adjustment that substantially contributed to the revisions to personal income. The revision is shown as a percentage of the previously published estimate of personal income for the area.

AFR Adjustment for residence
DIR Dividends, interest, and rent
FPI Farm proprietors' income
NFPI Nonfarm proprietors' income
TRAN Transfer payments

tions of employers' payrolls for 2000. The estimates of other labor income and of personal contributions for social insurance are mainly based on the estimates of wages and salaries.

For farm proprietors' income, the estimates of government subsidy payments for all States and of gross receipts for most of the major farm States are based on 2000 data from USDA and from State agricultural statistical agencies. The estimates of the production expenses are mainly based on data from the 1997 Census of Agriculture.

For transfer payments, the estimates of social security benefits are based on data for 2000 from the Social Security Administration, and the estimates of veterans benefits are based on 2000 data from the Department of Veterans Affairs. The estimates of Medicare payments are based on 2000 data from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. For most States, the estimates of unemployment compensation and of transfer payments under most of the major means-tested programs—including Medicaid, family assistance, supplemental security income, and food stamps—are based on 2000 data from the State government agencies that administer the programs.

For nonfarm proprietors' income, for dividends, interest, and rent, and for residence adjustment, the 2000 estimates are mainly extrapolated from the data that were used to prepare the 1999 estimates.

Revisions to personal income for 1999. For 1999, personal income for the Nation was revised down \$14.8 billion, or 0.2 percent, to \$7,769.4 billion (table F). The revisions to the estimates for metropolitan areas ranged between 3.2 percent for Yolo, CA, and -3.7 percent for Dutchess County, NY. For Yolo, the revision largely reflected an upward revision to the adjustment for residence, which was based on the incorporation of 1999 IRS wage data; for Dutchess County, the revision reflected a downward revision to the residence adjustment. Personal income was revised up for 103 areas, was revised down for 201 areas, and was unrevised for 14 areas.

Together, the five areas with the largest upward revisions and the five areas with the largest downward revisions accounted for 2.1 percent of the Nation's personal income in 1999. San Francisco, CA, accounted for more than half of the total personal income for these 10 areas.

Tables 1 through 3 follow.

Table 1. Personal Income and Per Capita Personal Income by Metropolitan Area, 1998–2000—Continued

Table with 18 columns: Area name, Personal income (Millions of dollars, Percent change), Per capita personal income (Dollars, Rank in U.S.). Rows list various metropolitan areas such as La Crosse, WI-MN; Lafayette, LA; Lafayette, IN; Lake Charles, LA; Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL; Lancaster, PA; Lansing-East Lansing, MI; Laredo, TX; Las Cruces, NM; Las Vegas, NV-AZ; Lawrence, KS; Lawton, OK; Lewiston-Auburn, ME (NECMA); Lexington, KY; Lima, OH; Lincoln, NE; Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR; Longview-Marshall, TX; Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA; Louisville, KY-IN; Lubbock, TX; Lynchburg, VA; Macon, GA; Madison, WI; Mansfield, OH; McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX; Medford-Ashland, OR; Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay, FL; Memphis-TN-AR-MS; Merced, CA; Miami, FL; Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ; Milwaukee-Waukesha, WI; Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI; Missoula, MT; Mobile, AL; Modesto, CA; Monmouth-Ocean, NJ; Monroe, LA; Montgomery, AL; Muncie, IN; Myrtle Beach, SC; Naples, FL; Nashville, TN; Nassau-Suffolk, NY; New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Danbury-Waterbury, CT; New London-Norwich, CT (NECMA); New Orleans, LA; New York, NY; Newark, NJ; Newburgh, NY-PA; Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA-NC; Oakland, CA; Ocala, FL; Odessa-Midland, TX; Oklahoma City, OK; Olympia, WA; Omaha, NE; Orange County, CA; Orlando, FL; Owensboro, KY; Panama City, FL; Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH; Pensacola, FL; Peoria-Pekin, IL; Philadelphia, PA-NJ; Phoenix-Mesa, AZ; Pine Bluff, AR; Pittsburgh, PA; Pittsfield, MA (NECMA); Pocatello, ID; Portland, ME (NECMA); Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA; Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket, RI (NECMA); Provo-Orem, UT; Pueblo, CO; Punta Gorda, FL; Racine, WI; Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC; Rapid City, SD; Reading, PA; Redding, CA; Reno, NV; Richmond-Kennewick-Pasco, WA; Riverside-Sandersburg, VA; Rocky Mountain, CA; Roanoke, VA; Rochester, MN; Rochester, NY; Rocky Mount, NC; Sacramento, CA; Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI; St. Cloud, MN; St. Joseph, MO; St. Louis, MO-IL; Salem, OR; Salinas, CA; Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT; San Angelo, TX; San Antonio, TX; San Diego, CA; San Francisco, CA; San Jose, CA; San Luis Obispo-Atascadero-Paso Robles, CA; Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA; Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA; Santa Fe, NM; Santa Rosa, CA; Sarasota-Bradenton, FL; Savannah, GA; Scranton-Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, PA; Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA; Sharon, PA; Sheboygan, WI; Sherman-Denison, TX; Shreveport-Bossier City, LA; Sioux City, IA-NE; Sioux Falls, SD; South Bend, IN; Spokane, WA; Springfield, IL; Springfield, MO; Springfield, MA (NECMA); State College, PA; Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV; Stockton-Lodi, CA; Sumter, SC; Syracuse, NY; Tacoma, WA; Tallahassee, FL; Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL; Terre Haute, IN; Texarkana, TX-Texarkana, AR; Toledo, OH; Topeka, KS; Trenton, NJ; Tucson, AZ; Tulsa, OK; Tuscaloosa, AL; Tyler, TX; Utica-Rome, NY; Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA; Ventura, CA; Victoria, TX; Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ; Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA; Waco, TX; Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV; Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA; Wausau, WI; West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL; Wheeling, WV-OH; Wichita, KS; Wichita Falls, TX; Williamsport, PA; Wilmington-Newark, DE-MD; Wilmington, NC; Yakima, WA; Yolo, CA; York, PA; Youngstown-Warren, OH; Yuba City, CA; Yuma, AZ.

1. Per capita personal income was computed using Census Bureau midyear population estimates. Estimates for 1998–2000 reflect county population estimates available as of April 2002.

2. Percent change calculated from unrounded data.

3. The personal income level shown for the United States is derived as the sum of the county estimates. It differs from the estimate of personal income in the national income and product accounts (NIPAs) because of differences in coverage, in the methodologies used to prepare the estimates, and in the timing of the availability

of source data. In particular, it differs from the NIPA estimate because, by definition, it omits the earnings of Federal civilian and military personnel stationed abroad and of U.S. residents employed abroad temporarily by private U.S. firms.

4. Includes Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSA's designated by *), and New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMA's). The New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Danbury-Waterbury, CT NECMA is presented as a PMSA (part of the New York CMSA).

Table 3. Personal Income and Per Capita Personal Income by County, 1998-2000

Table with columns for Area name, Personal income (Millions of dollars, Percent change), and Per capita personal income (Dollars, Rank in State) for 1998, 1999, 2000, and 1999-2000. Rows include United States, Alabama, and various counties in Alaska, Arkansas, and Arizona.

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 3. Personal Income and Per Capita Personal Income by County, 1998–2000—Continued

Table with columns for Area name, Personal income (Millions of dollars, Percent change), and Per capita personal income (Dollars, Rank in State) for 1998, 1999, 2000, and 1999–2000. Rows list various counties and sub-regions in Kansas, including Emmet, Crawford, Decatur, etc.

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 3. Personal Income and Per Capita Personal Income by County, 1998-2000-Continued

Table with 18 columns: Area name, Personal income (Millions of dollars, Percent change, Dollars, Rank in State), and Per capita personal income (Millions of dollars, Percent change, Dollars, Rank in State). Rows include Kentucky (Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan portions), various counties in Kentucky, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 3. Personal Income and Per Capita Personal Income by County, 1998-2000—Continued

Table with columns: Area name, Personal income (Millions of dollars, Percent change), Per capita personal income (Dollars, Rank in State). Rows list Missouri counties (Adair to Pulaski) and Montana counties (Putnam to Wheatland).

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 3. Personal Income and Per Capita Personal Income by County, 1998–2000—Continued

Table with columns for Area name, Personal income (Millions of dollars, Percent change), and Per capita personal income (Dollars, Rank in State). Rows list counties and totals for Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, and South Dakota.

See footnotes at end of table.

