

Technical information: (202) 691-6567 http://www.bls.gov/cew/ USDL 07-0525

Media contact:

691-5902

For release: 10:00 A.M. EDT Wednesday, April 11, 2007

COUNTY EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES: THIRD QUARTER 2006

In September 2006, Jefferson County, La., had the largest over-the-year percentage increase in employment among the largest counties in the U.S., according to preliminary data released today by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. Jefferson County, a New Orleans suburb, experienced an over-the-year employment gain of 22.4 percent, compared with national job growth of 1.5 percent. Employment gains in Jefferson County reflected significant recovery from substantial job losses that occurred in September 2005 due to Hurricane Katrina. In contrast, Orleans County, which also was affected by Hurricane Katrina, continued to show an over-the-year employment decline (-12.3 percent). Kent County, R.I., had the largest over-the-year gain in average weekly wages in the third quarter of 2006, with an increase of 18.4 percent. The U.S. average weekly wage rose by 0.9 percent over the same time span.

Of the 325 largest counties in the United States, as measured by 2005 annual average employment, 130 had over-the-year percentage growth in employment above the national average (1.5 percent) in September 2006, and 187 experienced changes below the national average. (See chart 1.) The percent change in average weekly wages was higher than the national average (0.9 percent) in 133 of the largest U.S. counties, but was below the national average in 184 counties. (See chart 2.)

The employment and 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 8.8 million employer reports cover 135.0 million full- and part-time workers. The attached tables and charts contain data for the nation and for the 325 U.S. counties with annual average employment levels of 75,000 or more in 2005. September 2006 employment and 2006 third-quarter average weekly wages for all states are provided in

Hurricane Katrina

The employment and wages reported in this news release reflect the impact of Hurricane Katrina and ongoing labor market trends in certain counties. The effects of Hurricane Katrina, which hit the Gulf Coast on August 29, 2005, were first apparent in the September QCEW employment counts and in the wage totals for the third quarter of 2005. This catastrophic storm continued to affect monthly employment and quarterly wage totals in parts of Louisiana and Mississippi in the third quarter of 2006. For more information, see the QCEW section of the Katrina coverage on the BLS Web site at http://www.bls.gov/katrina/qcewquestions.htm.

	Employment in large counties	
September 2006 employment (thousands)	Growth in employment, September 2005-06 (thousands)	Percent growth in employment, September 2005-06
United States 134,988.9	United States 2,013.1	United States 1.5
Los Angeles, Calif 4,161.2 Cook, Ill 2,553.4 New York, N.Y 2,292.3 Harris, Texas 1,959.1 Maricopa, Ariz 1,819.1 Orange, Calif 1,517.9 Dallas, Texas 1,466.0 San Diego, Calif 1,321.7 King, Wash 1,167.1 Miami-Dade, Fla 1,008.4	Harris, Texas79.4Maricopa, Ariz.76.2New York, N.Y.42.0King, Wash.40.6Clark, Nev.39.1Dallas, Texas38.3Jefferson, La.35.5Los Angeles, Calif.29.2Salt Lake, Utah25.4Bexar, Texas24.4	,

 Table A. Top 10 large counties ranked by September 2006 employment, September 2005-06 employment growth, and September 2005-06 percent growth in employment

table 4 of this release. Final data for all states, metropolitan statistical areas, counties, and the nation through the fourth quarter of 2005 are available on the BLS Web site at http://www.bls.gov/cew/. Preliminary data for third quarter 2006, along with updated data for the first and second quarters of 2006, will be available later in April on the BLS Web site.

Large County Employment

In September 2006, national employment, as measured by the QCEW program, was 135.0 million, up by 1.5 percent from September 2005. The 325 U.S. counties with 75,000 or more employees accounted for 70.7 percent of total U.S. covered employment and 76.5 percent of total covered wages. These 325 counties had a net job gain of 1,328,166 over the year, accounting for 66.0 percent of the overall U.S. employment increase. Employment rose in 256 of the large counties from September 2005 to September 2006. Jefferson County, La., had the largest over-the-year percentage increase in employment (22.4 percent). Snohomish, Wash., had the next largest increase, 8.2 percent, followed by the counties of Collin, Texas (7.2 percent), Harrison, Miss. (6.8 percent), and Montgomery, Texas (5.7 percent). The large employment gains in Jefferson County reflected significant recovery from the substantial job losses in September 2005, which were related to Hurricane Katrina. Strong employment growth in Harrison County, which also was impacted by this hurricane, showed that the county had begun to rebound from job losses in 2005. (See table 1.)

Employment declined in 62 counties from September 2005 to September 2006. The largest percentage decline in employment was in Orleans County, La. (-12.3 percent). Employment losses in Orleans County reflected the devastation caused by Hurricane Katrina. Trumbull, Ohio, had the next largest employment decline (-4.5 percent), followed by the counties of Macomb, Mich. (-4.0 percent), Oakland, Mich. (-3.5 percent), and Rock Island, Ill. (-3.0 percent).

Table B. Top 10 large counties ranked by third quarter 2006 average weekly wages, third quarter 2005-06 growth in average weekly wages, and third quarter 2005-06 percent growth in average weekly wages

	Average weekly wage in large counties	
Average weekly wage, third quarter 2006	Growth in average weekly wage, third quarter 2005-06	Percent growth in average weekly wage, third quarter 2005-06
United States \$784	United States \$7	United States 0.9
New York, N.Y.\$1,421Santa Clara, Calif.1,414Arlington, Va.1,323Washington, D.C.1,307San Mateo, Calif.1,278San Francisco, Calif.1,246Suffolk, Mass.1,208Fairfield, Conn.1,191Fairfax, Va.1,179Somerset, N.J.1,165	Kent, R.I. \$132 Orleans, La. 121 Trumbull, Ohio 85 Jefferson, Texas 74 Jefferson, La. 69 Lafayette, La. 56 Mobile, Ala. 55 Ingham, Mich. 52 Morris, N.J. 49 Vanderburgh, Ind. 48 East Baton Rouge, La. 48 Galveston, Texas 48	Kent, R.I. 18.4 Orleans, La. 16.2 Trumbull, Ohio 12.3 Jefferson, La. 10.5 Jefferson, Texas 10.5 Mobile, Ala. 8.6 Lafayette, La. 8.2 East Baton Rouge, La. 7.4 Harrison, Miss. 7.2 Vanderburgh, Ind. 7.1 Ingham, Mich. 7.1 Galveston, Texas 7.1

The largest gains in the level of employment from September 2005 to September 2006 were recorded in the counties of Harris, Texas (79,400), Maricopa, Ariz. (76,200), New York, N.Y. (42,000), King, Wash. (40,600), and Clark, Nev. (39,100). (See table A.)

The largest declines in employment levels occurred in Oakland, Mich. (-25,200), followed by the counties of Orleans, La. (-21,600), Wayne, Mich. (-20,500), Macomb, Mich. (-13,400), and Kent, Mich. (-5,500).

Large County Average Weekly Wages

The national average weekly wage in the third quarter of 2006 was \$784. Average weekly wages were higher than the national average in 111 of the largest 325 U.S. counties. New York County, N.Y., held the top position among the highest-paid large counties with an average weekly wage of \$1,421. Santa Clara, Calif., was second with an average weekly wage of \$1,414, followed by Arlington, Va. (\$1,323), Washington, D.C. (\$1,307), and San Mateo, Calif. (\$1,278). (See table B.)

There were 212 counties with an average weekly wage below the national average in the third quarter of 2006. The lowest average weekly wages were reported in Cameron County, Texas (\$493), followed by the counties of Hidalgo, Texas (\$514), Horry, S.C. (\$517), Webb, Texas (\$525), and Yakima, Wash. (\$537). (See table 1.)

Over the year, the national average weekly wage rose by 0.9 percent. Among the largest counties, Kent, R.I., led the nation in growth in average weekly wages, with an increase of 18.4 percent from the third quarter of 2005. Orleans, La., was second with growth of 16.2 percent, followed by the counties of Trumbull, Ohio (12.3 percent), and Jefferson, La., and Jefferson, Texas (10.5 percent each). The high average

weekly wage growth rate for Orleans County was related to the disproportionate job losses in lower-paid industries due to the impact of Hurricane Katrina. That is, the loss of low paid jobs due to the storm boosted average wages in Orleans County.

One hundred and twelve counties experienced over-the-year declines in average weekly wages. Passaic, N.J., had the largest decrease, -10.2 percent, followed by the counties of Williamson, Texas (-5.7 percent), Fort Bend, Texas (-5.0 percent), Loudoun, Va. (-4.2 percent), and Ventura, Calif. (-4.0 percent).

Ten Largest U.S. Counties

Each of the 10 largest counties (based on 2005 annual average employment levels) reported increases in employment from September 2005 to September 2006. Maricopa County, Ariz., experienced the largest percent increase in employment among the largest counties with a 4.4 percent increase. Within Maricopa County, employment rose in every industry group except information. The largest gains were in education and health services (6.2 percent), followed by construction (5.9 percent). Harris, Texas, had the next largest increase in employment, 4.2 percent, followed by King, Wash. (3.6 percent). The smallest percent increase in employment occurred in Miami-Dade, Fla. (0.6 percent), followed by Cook, Ill., and Los Angeles, Calif. (0.7 percent each). (See table 2.)

Eight of the 10 largest U.S. counties saw over-the-year increases in average weekly wages. King County, Wash., had the fastest growth in wages among the 10 largest counties, with a gain of 4.7 percent. Within King County, Wash., average weekly wages increased the most in information (19.4 percent), followed by natural resources and mining (17.4 percent). Dallas, Texas, was second in wage growth with a gain of 2.2 percent, followed by Harris, Texas (2.0 percent). The smallest wage gains among the 10 largest counties occurred in New York, N.Y. (0.3 percent). San Diego, Calif. (-0.7 percent) and Orange, Calif. (-1.1 percent) experienced declines in average weekly wages.

Largest County by State

Table 3 shows September 2006 employment and the 2006 third quarter average weekly wage in the largest county in each state, which is based on 2005 annual average employment levels. (This table includes two counties—Yellowstone, Mont., and Laramie, Wyo.—that had employment levels below 75,000.) The employment levels in the counties in table 3 in September 2006 ranged from approximately 4.2 million in Los Angeles County, Calif., to 42,100 in Laramie County, Wyo. The highest average weekly wage of these counties was in New York, N.Y. (\$1,421), while the lowest average weekly wage was in Yellowstone, Mont. (\$637).

For More Information

For additional information about the quarterly employment and wages data, please read the Technical Note or visit the QCEW Web site at http://www.bls.gov/cew/. Additional information about the QCEW data also may be obtained by e-mailing QCEWinfo@bls.gov or by calling (202) 691-6567.

Several BLS regional offices are issuing QCEW news releases targeted to local data users. For links to these releases, see http://www.bls.gov/cew/cewregional.htm.

The County Employment and Wages release for fourth quarter 2006 is scheduled to be released on Wednesday, July 25.

Technical Note

These data are the product of a federal-state cooperative program, 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 summaries are a result of the administration of state unemployment insurance programs that require most employers to pay quarterly taxes based on the employment and wages of workers covered by UI. Data for 2006 are preliminary and subject to revision.

For purposes of this release, large counties are defined as having employment levels of 75,000 or greater. In addition, data for San Juan, Puerto Rico, are provided, but not used in calculating U.S. averages, rankings, or in the analysis in the text. Each year, these large counties are selected on the basis of the preliminary annual average of employment for the previous year. The 326 counties presented in this release were derived using 2005 preliminary annual averages of employment. For 2006 data, four counties have been added to the publication tables: Douglas, Colo., Weld, Colo., Boone, Ky., and Butler, Pa. These counties will be included in all 2006 quarterly releases. One county, Potter, Texas, which was published in the 2005 releases, no longer has an employment level of 75,000 or more and will be excluded in the 2006 releases. The counties in table 2 are selected and sorted each year based on the annual average employment from the preceding year.

The preliminary QCEW data presented in this release may differ from data released by the individual states. These potential differences result from the states' continuing receipt

	QCEW	BED	CES
Source	• Count of UI administrative records submitted by 8.8 million establish- ments	• Count of longitudinally-linked UI administrative records submitted by 6.8 million private-sector employers	• Sample survey: 400,000 establishments
Coverage	• UI and UCFE coverage, including all employers subject to state and federal UI laws	• UI coverage, excluding govern- ment, private households, and estab- lishments with zero employment	 Nonfarm wage and salary jobs: UI coverage, excluding agriculture, private households, and self-employed workers Other employment, including railroads, religious organizations, and other non-UI-covered jobs
Publication frequency	• Quarterly - 7 months after the end of each quarter	• Quarterly - 8 months after the end of each quarter	 Monthly Usually first Friday of following month
Use of UI file	• Directly summarizes and pub- lishes each new quarter of UI data	• Links each new UI quarter to longitudinal database and directly summarizes gross job gains and losses	• Uses UI file as a sampling frame and annually realigns (benchmarks) sample estimates to first quarter UI levels
Principal products	• Provides a quarterly and annual universe count of estab- lishments, employment, and wages at the county, MSA, state, and national levels by detailed industry	 Provides quarterly employer dy- namics data on establishment open- ings, closings, expansions, and con- tractions at the national level by NAICS supersectors and by size of firm Future expansions will include data at the county, MSA, and state level 	• Provides current monthly estimates of employment, hours, and earnings at the MSA, state, and national lev- el by industry
Principal uses	 Major uses include: Detailed locality data Periodic universe counts for benchmarking sample survey estimates Sample frame for BLS establishment surveys 	 Major uses include: Business cycle analysis Analysis of employer dynamics underlying economic expansions and contractions An analysis of employment ex- pansion and contraction by size of firm 	 Major uses include: Principal national economic indicator Official time series for employment change measures Input into other major economic indicators
Program Web sites	• www.bls.gov/cew/	• www.bls.gov/bdm/	• www.bls.gov/ces/

Summary of Major Differences between QCEW, BED, and CES Employment Measures

of UI data over time and ongoing review and editing. The individual states determine their data release timetables.

Differences between QCEW, BED, and CES employment measures

The Bureau publishes three different establishment-based employment measures for any given quarter. Each of these measures—QCEW, Business Employment Dynamics (BED), and Current Employment Statistics (CES)—makes use of the quarterly UI employment reports in producing data; however, each measure has a somewhat different universe coverage, estimation procedure, and publication product.

Differences in coverage and estimation methods can result in somewhat different measures of employment change over time. It is important to understand program differences and the intended uses of the program products. (See table on the previous page.) Additional information on each program can be obtained from the program Web sites shown in the table on the previous page.

Coverage

Employment and wage data for workers covered by state UI laws are compiled from quarterly contribution reports submitted to the SWAs by employers. For federal civilian workers covered by the Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) program, employment and wage data are compiled from quarterly reports that are sent to the appropriate SWA by the specific federal agency. In addition to the quarterly contribution reports, employers who operate multiple establishments within a state complete a questionnaire, called the "Multiple Worksite Report," which provides detailed information on the location and industry of each of their establishments. The employment and wage data included in this release are derived from microdata summaries of nearly 9 million employer reports of employment and wages submitted by states to the BLS. These reports are based on place of employment rather than place of residence.

UI and UCFE coverage is broad and basically comparable from state to state. In 2005, UI and UCFE programs covered workers in 131.6 million jobs. The estimated 126.7 million workers in these jobs (after adjustment for multiple jobholders) represented 96.6 percent of civilian wage and salary employment. Covered workers received \$5.352 trillion in pay, representing 94.5 percent of the wage and salary component of personal income and 43.0 percent of the gross domestic product.

Major exclusions from UI coverage include self-employed workers, most agricultural workers on small farms, all members of the Armed Forces, elected officials in most states, most employees of railroads, some domestic workers, most student workers at schools, and employees of certain small nonprofit organizations.

State and federal UI laws change periodically. These changes may have an impact on the employment and wages reported by employers covered under the UI program. Coverage changes may affect the over-the-year comparisons presented in this news release.

Concepts and methodology

Monthly employment is based on the number of workers who worked during or received pay for the pay period including the 12th of the month. With few exceptions, all employees of covered firms are reported, including production and sales workers, corporation officials, executives, supervisory personnel, and clerical workers. Workers on paid vacations and part-time workers also are included.

Average weekly wage values are calculated by dividing quarterly total wages by the average of the three monthly employment levels (all employees, as described above) and dividing the result by 13, for the 13 weeks in the quarter. These calculations are made using unrounded employment and wage values. The average wage values that can be calculated using rounded data from the BLS database may differ from the averages reported. Included in the quarterly wage data are non-wage cash payments such as bonuses, the cash value of meals and lodging when supplied, tips and other gratuities, and, in some states, employer contributions to certain deferred compensation plans such as 401(k) plans and stock options. Over-the-year comparisons of average weekly wages may reflect fluctuations in average monthly employment and/or total quarterly wages between the current quarter and prior year levels.

Average weekly wages are affected by the ratio of full-time to part-time workers as well as the number of individuals in highpaying and low-paying occupations and the incidence of pay periods within a quarter. For instance, the average weekly wage of the work force could increase significantly when there is a large decline in the number of employees that had been receiving below-average wages. Wages may include payments to workers not present in the employment counts because they did not work during the pay period including the 12th of the month. When comparing average weekly wage levels between industries, states, or quarters, these factors should be taken into consideration.

Federal government pay levels are subject to periodic, sometimes large, fluctuations due to a calendar effect that consists of some quarters having more pay periods than others. Most federal employees are paid on a biweekly pay schedule. As a result of this schedule, in some quarters, federal wages contain payments for six pay periods, while in other quarters their wages include payments for seven pay periods. Over-the-year comparisons of average weekly wages may reflect this calendar effect. Higher growth in average weekly wages may be attributed, in part, to a comparison of quarterly wages for the current year, which include seven pay periods, with year-ago wages that reflect only six pay periods. An opposite effect will occur when wages in the current period, which contain six pay periods, are compared with year-ago wages that include seven pay periods. The effect on over-the-year pay comparisons can be pronounced in federal government due to the uniform nature of federal payroll

processing. This pattern may exist in private sector pay, however, because there are more pay period types (weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly) it is less pronounced. The effect is most visible in counties with large concentrations of federal employment.

In order to ensure the highest possible quality of data, states verify with employers and update, if necessary, the industry, location, and ownership classification of all establishments on a 3-year cycle. Changes in establishment classification codes resulting from this process are introduced with the data reported for the first quarter of the year. Changes resulting from improved employer reporting also are introduced in the first quarter.

QCEW data are not designed as a time series. QCEW data are simply the sums of individual establishment records and reflect 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. For example, economic change would come from a firm relocating into the county; administrative change would come from a company correcting its county designation.

The over-the-year changes of employment and wages presented in this release have been adjusted to account for most of the administrative corrections made to the underlying establishment reports. This is done by modifying the prior-year levels used to calculate the over-the-year changes. Percent changes are calculated using an adjusted version of the final 2005 quarterly data as the base data. The adjusted prior-year levels used to calculate the over-the-year percent change in employment and wages are not published. These adjusted prioryear levels do not match the unadjusted data maintained on the BLS Web site. Over-the-year change calculations based on data from the Web site, or from data published in prior BLS news releases, may differ substantially from the over-the-year changes presented in this news release.

The adjusted data used to calculate the over-the-year change measures presented in this release account for most of the administrative changes—those occurring when employers update the industry, location, and ownership information of their establishments. The most common adjustments for administrative change are the result of updated information about the county location of individual establishments. Included in these adjustments are administrative changes involving the classification of establishments that were previously reported in the unknown or statewide county or unknown industry categories. The adjusted data do not account for administrative changes caused by multi-unit employers who start reporting for each individual establishment rather than as a single entity.

The adjusted data used to calculate the over-the-year change measures presented in any County Employment and Wages news release are valid for comparisons between the starting and ending points (a 12-month period) used in that particular release. Comparisons may not be valid for any time period other than the one featured in a release even if the changes were calculated using adjusted data.

County definitions are assigned according to Federal Information Processing Standards Publications (FIPS PUBS) as issued by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, after approval by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to Section 5131 of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996 and the Computer Security Act of 1987, Public Law 104-106. Areas shown as counties include those designated as independent cities in some jurisdictions and, in Alaska, those designated as census areas where counties have not been created. County data also are presented for the New England states for comparative purposes even though townships are the more common designation used in New England (and New Jersey). The regions referred to in this release are defined as census regions.

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 2005 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 fourth quarter 2005 version of this news release. This edition will also be the first to include the data on a CD for enhanced access and usability. As a result of this change, the printed booklet will contain only selected graphic representations of QCEW data; the data tables themselves will be published exclusively in electronic formats as PDF and fixed-width text files. Employment and Wages Annual Averages, 2005 will soon be available for sale from the United States Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250, telephone 866-512-1800, outside of Washington, D.C. Within Washington, D.C., the telephone number is 202-512-1800. The fax number is 202-512-2104. Also, the 2005 bulletin is available in a portable document format (PDF) on the BLS Web site at http://www.bls.gov/cew/ cewbultn05.htm.

News releases on quarterly measures of gross job flows also are available upon request from the Division of Administrative Statistics and Labor Turnover (Business Employment Dynamics), telephone 202-691-6467; http://www.bls.gov/bdm/; e-mail: BDMInfo@bls.gov.

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.

	Establishmente		Employment		Average weekly wage ⁵			
County ³	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	
United States ⁶	8,841.2	134,988.9	1.5	-	\$784	0.9	-	
Jefferson, AL Madison, AL Mobile, AL Montgomery, AL	18.6 8.3 9.8 6.6	374.6 174.2 171.5 138.5	0.8 2.3 2.8 1.0	187 89 60 170	803 863 692 669	1.0 1.8 8.6 2.5	127 72 6 49	
Tuscaloosa, AL Anchorage Borough, AK Maricopa, AZ	4.3 8.2 92.3	84.5 148.8 1,819.1	2.9 0.5 4.4	56 213 16	673 849 792	2.7 -0.7 0.5	42 257 165	
Pima, AZ Benton, AR Pulaski, AR	5.3 14.2	368.6 94.3 249.9	2.6 3.7 1.9	68 30 111	708 686 717	1.9 1.5 1.3	70 86 102	
Washington, AR Alameda, CA Contra Costa, CA Fresno, CA	5.7 49.4 28.2 29.1	93.6 691.1 348.6 366.2	2.1 0.7 0.7 2.9	99 192 192 56	639 1,054 979 619	1.3 0.3 0.8 0.5	102 182 140 165	
Kern, CA Los Angeles, CA Marin, CA Monterey, CA Orange, CA Placer, CA	17.3 392.8 11.8 12.2 95.9 10.5	287.8 4,161.2 110.4 180.4 1,517.9 137.8	2.6 0.7 1.1 0.3 1.1 0.3	68 192 161 230 161 230	676 894 985 695 897 780	2.3 1.7 -0.5 1.3 -1.1 -0.6	55 79 241 102 277 249	
Riverside, CA Sacramento, CA San Bernardino, CA San Diego, CA San Francisco, CA	44.2	635.4 640.5 654.2 1,321.7 537.0	3.6 1.1 1.9 0.9 1.8	33 161 111 178 116	678 871 702 850 1,246	0.0 -0.6 -0.7 2.6	203 249 158 257 44	
San Joaquin, CA San Luis Obispo, CA San Mateo, CA Santa Barbara, CA Santa Clara, CA	17.0 9.1 23.2 13.7 55.9	227.7 105.7 337.3 186.4 884.9	0.9 0.2 1.8 0.9 2.3	178 240 116 178 89	685 664 1,278 751 1,414	-0.3 1.4 0.9 -0.3 0.8	225 94 134 225 140	
Santa Cruz, CA Solano, CA Sonoma, CA Stanislaus, CA Tulare, CA Ventura, CA Yolo, CA Adams, CO Arapahoe, CO Boulder, CO	17.8 13.9 8.9 21.8 5.4 9.4 19.9	102.2 133.1 194.6 179.7 152.4 317.5 102.2 155.2 277.0 158.4	1.3 -0.1 0.4 -0.4 2.8 1.4 2.3 3.1 1.4 2.5	147 261 220 277 60 136 89 53 136 73	772 752 785 677 560 826 760 744 955 955	2.5 1.1 1.2 1.5 1.4 -4.0 -2.6 -0.8 2.0 -3.6	49 120 113 86 94 319 304 264 65 316	
Denver, CO Douglas, CO El Paso, CO Jefferson, CO Larimer, CO Weld, CO	9.0 17.6 19.0 10.2 6.0	436.3 88.5 245.8 208.7 129.6 81.8	1.7 4.6 1.5 0.2 1.7 3.8	118 9 131 240 118 28	988 779 733 809 727 671	4.1 -3.7 -1.1 0.0 0.7 1.7	22 317 277 203 154 79	
Fairfield, CT Hartford, CT New Haven, CT New London, CT	25.0 22.3	418.9 500.4 367.8 130.4	1.3 2.3 1.7 -0.2	147 89 118 266	1,191 945 835 810	-0.5 -2.3 -1.4 -0.2	241 301 288 219	

	Fatabliahmanta		Employment		Average weekly wage ⁵			
County ³	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	
New Castle, DE	19.6	282.8	0.2	240	\$957	4.0	25	
Washington, DC	32.0	674.2	0.7	192	1,307	3.6	28	
Alachua, FL Brevard, FL	6.4	126.5 206.8	1.6 0.0	126 257	679	2.4 -1.1	52 277	
Broward, FL	14.5 63.0	206.8 746.0	1.3	147	738 754	-1.1	134	
Collier, FL	12.3	130.7	4.3	20	721	0.0	198	
Duval, FL	25.6	463.7	2.4	83	784	2.6	44	
Escambia, FL	7.9	130.1	0.7	192	626	-0.6	249	
Hillsborough, FL	35.8	638.0	2.4	83	757	1.1	120	
Lake, FL	6.9	84.4	5.5	6	589	-1.0	273	
Lee, FL	18.6	222.5	4.1	25	689	0.7	154	
Leon, FL	8.0	146.8	0.6	204	694	1.5	86	
Manatee, FL	8.9	126.9	4.1	25	634	0.3	182	
Marion, FL Miami-Dade, FL	8.0 84.1	103.6 1,008.4	4.5 0.6	12 204	584 792	0.5 1.5	165 86	
Okaloosa, FL	6.0	84.4	2.9	56	642	0.0	203	
Orange, FL	34.5	682.2	3.2	51	728	0.0	203	
Palm Beach, FL	48.9	554.3	1.7	118	756	-1.6	296	
Pasco, FL	9.4	100.4	3.5	37	589	4.2	19	
Pinellas, FL	30.8	445.3	0.3	230	682	-0.4	234	
Polk, FL		206.3	2.1	99	644	2.4	52	
Sarasota, FL	14.9	158.9	3.5	37	675	-1.0	273	
Seminole, FL	14.5	177.8	2.4	83	696	0.9	134	
Volusia, FL	13.9	167.4	2.0	105	580	1.6	82 288	
Bibb, GA Chatham, GA	4.7 7.4	84.3 135.3	-1.2 1.9	306 111	644 676	-1.4 0.3	182	
Clayton, GA	4.4	108.7	-0.4	277	738	-2.9	311	
Cobb, GA	20.0	312.4	2.8	60	864	1.3	102	
De Kalb, GA	15.8	277.2	-1.1	302	854	1.8	72	
Fulton, GA	39.6	777.7	1.3	147	1,016	1.0	127	
Gwinnett, GA	23.0	327.2	3.3	48	830	-0.4	234	
Muscogee, GA	4.8	96.6	-2.5	315	625	-0.5	241	
Richmond, GA	4.8	103.1 452.2	-1.9 2.3	313 89	680 744	2.1 0.5	62 165	
Honolulu, HI Ada, ID	24.0 14.7	452.2 210.7	2.3 4.4	16	744 727	1.1	105	
Champaign, IL	4.1	91.6	0.8	187	676	0.6	158	
Cook, IL	135.0	2,553.4	0.7	192	928	1.0	127	
Du Page, IL	34.6	597.4	0.4	220	927	1.1	120	
Kane, IL	12.1	212.5	2.1	99	718	-1.8	299	
Lake, IL	20.3	333.8	0.8	187	936	2.6	44	
McHenry, IL	8.1	103.0	3.4	43	693	-0.3	225	
McLean, IL		85.8	0.4	220	766	0.8	140	
Madison, IL	5.9	95.5	0.3	230	651	0.5	165	
Peoria, IL Rock Island, IL	4.7 3.4	103.3 77.5	2.5 -3.0	73 318	749 756	-0.8 0.1	264 198	
St. Clair, IL	5.3	95.7	-3.0	156	642	0.1	203	
Sangamon, IL	5.2	130.5	-1.1	302	783	2.0	65	
Will, IL	12.5	183.5	4.5	12	717	-1.1	277	
Winnebago, IL	6.8	136.6	0.1	252	695	1.5	86	
Allen, IN	8.9	185.5	1.4	136	681	-0.3	225	
	1	126.9	0.1	252	667	-3.1	313	

	Establishments		Employment		Av	erage weekly wa	ge ⁵
County ³	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change
Hamilton, IN	7.0	101.6	3.7	30	\$767	-3.4	315
Lake, IN		195.6	-0.4	277	۳07 704	0.7	154
Marion, IN		583.0	0.2	240	814	-0.5	241
St. Joseph, IN		125.3	-1.1	302	667	0.0	194
Vanderburgh, IN		108.9	0.2	240	723	7.1	10
Linn, IA		121.0	2.1	99	725	-2.6	304
Polk, IA		271.3	2.4	83	783	-1.0	273
Scott, IA		89.3	-0.8	295	649	1.4	94
Johnson, KS		312.0	-0.8 3.4	43	812	-1.6	296
-							
Sedgwick, KS		252.4	3.3	48	729	1.5	86
Shawnee, KS		93.2	-0.6	288	675	0.4	173
Wyandotte, KS		81.1	2.9	56	770	0.8	140
Boone, KY	3.4	74.8	-2.6	316	712	-3.0	312
Fayette, KY		173.4	(7)	-	715	0.7	154
Jefferson, KY		433.2	1.7	118	775	(7)	-
Caddo, LA		125.7	1.0	170	666	3.3	29
Calcasieu, LA		85.5	0.6	204	654	0.3	182
East Baton Rouge, LA	13.8	262.2	2.5	73	698	7.4	8
Jefferson, LA	14.4	194.2	22.4	1	727	10.5	4
Lafayette, LA	8.2	131.2	4.5	12	737	8.2	7
Orleans, LA	11.7	154.8	-12.3	322	870	16.2	2
Cumberland, ME	12.0	172.6	0.7	192	711	0.3	182
Anne Arundel, MD		228.4	2.4	83	835	1.0	127
Baltimore, MD	21.5	374.2	-0.7	289	809	0.2	194
Frederick, MD		92.2	-0.2	266	752	0.4	173
Harford, MD	5.5	82.2	1.4	136	759	0.8	140
Howard, MD	8.4	143.5	1.2	156	908	-1.2	283
Montgomery, MD		467.1	1.3	147	1,034	0.6	158
Prince Georges, MD	15.5	315.2	0.0	257	867	-0.1	212
Baltimore City, MD	14.1	350.5	-0.4	277	911	0.3	182
Barnstable, MA		97.8	-1.6	310	667	0.6	158
Bristol, MA	15.6	221.7	0.0	257	693	-0.4	234
Essex, MA	20.6	301.2	1.1	161	844	-0.2	219
Hampden, MA	14.1	201.7	-0.1	261	733	0.4	173
Middlesex, MA	47.1	804.6	1.6	126	1,108	-0.3	225
Norfolk, MA	21.5	321.6	0.2	240	943	2.2	59
Plymouth, MA	13.8	179.6	0.5	213	742	-0.7	257
Suffolk, MA	21.5	575.5	1.5	131	1,208	0.8	140
Worcester, MA	20.5	322.3	0.9	178	792	-0.8	264
Genesee, MI	8.3	146.3	-2.4	314	769	5.6	14
Ingham, MI		162.4	-0.3	274	787	7.1	10
Kalamazoo, MI		116.2	-1.2	306	711	0.3	182
Kent, MI	14.6	341.8	-1.6	310	730	1.2	113
Macomb, MI	18.3	322.7	-4.0	320	839	-1.1	277
Oakland, MI	40.4	697.4	-3.5	319	931	0.1	198
Ottawa, MI		115.2	0.2	240	696	-0.9	270
Saginaw, MI	4.5	89.2	-1.5	309	722	4.6	16
Washtenaw, MI		195.2	-0.8	295	913	1.6	82
Wayne, MI	33.6	769.1	-2.6	316	905	-1.5	291
Anoka, MN	7.9	115.7	-0.9	299	748	-0.5	241
Dakota, MN		173.4	0.3	230	755	-2.6	304
Hennepin, MN		841.4	0.2	240	982	-0.9	270
				~	302	0.0	

	Fatabliabmanta		Employment		Average weekly wage ⁵			
County ³	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	
Olmsted, MN	3.6	90.7	0.9	178	\$880	2.7	42	
Ramsey, MN		333.3	-0.4	277	851	-1.2	283	
St. Louis, MN		96.3	0.9	178	641	-2.4	302	
Stearns, MN		80.3	1.4	136	632	1.1	120	
Harrison, MS		84.8	6.8	4	628	7.2	9	
Hinds, MS		128.5	1.3	147	697	1.3	102	
Boone, MO	4.5	82.6	1.6	126	620	0.8	140	
Clay, MO	5.0	87.3	-0.7	289	747	-1.8	299	
Greene, MO		154.4	2.4	83	615	-1.3	286	
Jackson, MO		367.8	1.0	170	799	0.5	165	
St. Charles, MO		122.8	2.5	73	679	-0.6	249	
St. Louis, MO		625.8	0.7	192	825	-0.2	219	
St. Louis City, MO	8.0	223.6	-0.1	261	869	-0.1	212	
Douglas, NE		314.5	1.2	156	734	-0.9	270	
Lancaster, NE		154.8	0.6	204	649	-0.6	249	
Clark, NV Washoe, NV		922.5 221.3	4.4 2.0	16 105	751 749	-0.3 0.1	225 198	
-				074	061	4.4		
Hillsborough, NH		196.8 140.9	-0.3	274 136	861 764	1.1 -2.7	120 308	
Rockingham, NH		140.9	1.4 1.4	136	704 694	-2.7	225	
Atlantic, NJ Bergen, NJ		450.7	0.6	204	969	-0.3	182	
Burlington, NJ	11.6	202.0	0.0	204	909 843	-0.6	249	
Camden, NJ		213.3	1.1	161	794	-1.5	291	
Essex, NJ		360.1	0.4	220	990	-1.1	277	
Gloucester, NJ		104.7	0.2	240	714	-0.4	234	
Hudson, NJ		236.1	-0.8	295	1,061	2.9	36	
Mercer, NJ		227.7	1.1	161	980	-0.4	234	
Middlesex, NJ	21.3	396.4	0.2	240	996	3.2	30	
Monmouth, NJ	20.8	259.2	0.3	230	830	-0.2	219	
Morris, NJ	18.3	288.6	1.3	147	1,136	4.5	17	
Ocean, NJ	12.1	152.4	0.3	230	669	-0.1	212	
Passaic, NJ	12.8	177.3	-0.2	266	835	-10.2	323	
Somerset, NJ		173.1	1.5	131	1,165	1.0	127	
Union, NJ		229.6	0.3	230	967	-0.7	257	
Bernalillo, NM		335.0	3.4	43	709	0.4	173	
Albany, NY Bronx, NY		227.7 221.8	-0.1 0.6	261 204	801 789	-0.5 1.8	241 72	
Broome, NY		94.4	-0.2	266	641	2.6	44	
Dutchess, NY		118.4	0.4	220	814	4.1	22	
Erie, NY Kings, NY		454.1	-0.9	299	689 601	0.4	173	
Monroe, NY		462.9 380.3	1.0 -0.4	170 277	691 782	0.9 1.8	134 72	
Nassau, NY		600.1	-0.4 1.0	170	782 867	1.6	94	
New York, NY	116.2	2,292.3	1.9	111	1,421	0.3	182	
Oneida, NY		110.1	1.3	147	605	-1.3	286	
Onondaga, NY		250.6	-0.5	285	734	2.1	62	
Orange, NY		130.0	0.3	230	676	1.2	113	
Queens, NY	41.9	489.6	1.1	161	782	-1.4	288	
Richmond, NY		91.3	1.9	111	711	0.0	203	
Rockland, NY		113.1	0.6	204	831	2.8	38	
Suffolk, NY		617.2	0.5	213	850	1.8	72	
Westchester, NY	36.3	413.9	0.5	213	1,029	1.8	72	

			Employment		Av	erage weekly wa	ge ⁵
County ³	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change
Buncombe, NC	7.3	112.9	2.2	96	\$629	2.4	52
Catawba, NC	4.4	87.6	1.7	118	617	0.8	140
Cumberland, NC	5.9	116.7	-0.7	289 28	605 1 027	-1.5	291 86
Durham, NC Forsyth, NC	6.3 8.6	177.1 180.7	3.8 0.8	28 187	1,037 762	1.5 -0.1	212
Guilford, NC	13.8	275.1	0.5	213	714	1.1	120
Mecklenburg, NC	28.7	544.4	3.5	37	922	3.1	34
New Hanover, NC	6.9 25.0	101.9 426.7	3.5 3.6	37 33	644 789	1.4 1.3	94 102
Wake, NC Cass, ND	25.0 5.7	426.7 96.2	3.6 3.4	43	789 649	0.2	102
Butler, OH	7.3	146.0	1.0	170	694	-2.4	302
Cuyahoga, OH	38.1	757.1	-0.4	277	800	-0.6	249
Franklin, OH	29.3	683.2	0.4	220	805	0.4	173
Hamilton, OH	24.1	525.5	-0.7	289	871	0.8	140
Lake, OH	6.9	100.5	-0.4	277	646	-2.7	308
Lorain, OH	6.3	102.3	-0.2	266	672	-3.7	317
Lucas, OH Mahoning, OH	10.9 6.3	225.5 105.4	-0.7 0.6	289 204	720 584	1.3 0.0	102 203
Montgomery, OH	13.0	273.5	-1.8	312	564 777	3.7	203
Stark, OH	9.1	162.9	-0.7	289	633	0.6	158
Summit, OH	14.9	274.8	0.3	230	715	-1.7	298
Trumbull, OH	4.8	83.1	-4.5	321	777	12.3	3
Oklahoma, OK	23.0	424.0	1.5	131	708	3.2	30
Tulsa, OK	19.1	342.8	2.6	68	705	0.3	182
Clackamas, OR	12.4	148.1	2.0	105	740	-0.5	241
Jackson, OR	6.7	85.9	1.6	126	599	-0.3	225
Lane, OR	10.8 9.2	150.6	2.3 2.1	89 99	634 638	0.3 4.1	182 22
Marion, OR Multnomah, OR	9.2 26.8	142.3 442.5	3.3	99 48	803	0.5	165
Washington, OR	15.8	247.7	3.2	51	925	-1.5	291
Allegheny, PA	35.3	683.8	0.4	220	823	1.5	86
Berks, PA	9.1	169.8	2.2	96	716	1.3	102
Bucks, PA	20.0	264.6	1.1	161	766	0.8	140
Butler, PA	4.7	77.6	2.5	73	668	1.2	113
Chester, PA	14.9	236.0	1.4	136	983	-0.2	219
Cumberland, PA	5.9	126.7	0.5	213	733	-2.7	308
Dauphin, PA	7.3	183.0	2.5	73	766	-1.5	291
Delaware, PA	13.6	209.7	0.8	187	826	1.6	82
Erie, PA Lackawanna, PA	7.2 5.7	129.0 101.8	-0.5 0.9	285 178	632 613	0.8 -0.5	140 241
Lancaster, PA	12.1	229.6	0.9	252	687	-1.2	283
Lehigh, PA	8.4	178.3	2.5	73	781	2.9	36
Luzerne, PA	7.9	143.3	-1.0	301	623	-0.6	249
Montgomery, PA	27.5	484.6	0.2	240	964	0.6	158
Northampton, PA	6.4	99.0	1.2	156	701	-0.4	234
Philadelphia, PA	29.2	632.9	-0.3	274	929	0.8	140
Washington, PA	5.3	79.0	2.0	105	715	4.5	17
Westmoreland, PA	9.5	138.8	-1.4	308	652 607	2.0	65
York, PA Kent, RI	8.9 5.7	175.5 83.5	1.3 0.4	147 220	697 849	-0.7 18.4	257
Providence, RI	18.2	291.1	0.4	220	754	0.8	140
Charleston, SC	13.8	203.7	2.6	68	671	-0.3	225
-							I

	Fatabliahmanta		Employment		Ave	erage weekly wa	ge ⁵
County ³	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change
Greenville, SC Horry, SC Lexington, SC	13.8 9.6 6.4	231.6 117.4 92.9	1.6 4.6 4.2	126 9 22	\$684 517 613	-0.1 2.8 1.0	212 38 127
Richland, SC Spartanburg, SC Minnehaha, SD Davidson, TN Hamilton, TN Knox, TN Rutherford, TN Shelby, TN Bell, TX Bexar, TX	6.8 6.3 18.2 8.5 10.7 4.0 20.1	212.7 116.7 113.4 451.4 195.0 226.7 99.8 509.4 95.5 704.2	-0.8 0.7 2.0 1.4 0.7 3.0 3.5 0.2 0.9 3.6	295 192 105 136 192 54 37 240 178 33	705 698 668 792 685 670 711 814 615 696	2.3 2.2 0.6 2.5 -0.1 0.3 6.0 0.0 3.2 3.0	55 59 158 49 212 182 13 203 30 35
Brazoria, TX Brazos, TX Cameron, TX Collin, TX Dallas, TX Denton, TX El Paso, TX Fort Bend, TX Galveston, TX Harris, TX	3.7 6.3 15.3 67.0 9.7 13.0 7.5	83.2 84.3 121.4 270.0 1,466.0 157.1 264.1 116.4 93.6 1,959.1	4.3 1.4 4.1 7.2 2.7 (⁷) 1.4 4.4 (⁷) 4.2	20 136 25 3 65 - 136 16 - 22	748 558 493 921 961 693 570 820 723 950	4.2 1.3 1.4 0.9 2.2 (7) 2.3 -5.0 7.1 2.0	19 102 94 134 59 - 55 321 10 65
Hidalgo, TX Jefferson, TX Lubbock, TX McLennan, TX Montgomery, TX Nueces, TX Smith, TX Tarrant, TX Travis, TX Webb, TX	6.6 4.8 7.3 8.0 5.1 35.4	203.7 121.7 122.9 102.9 111.6 150.0 91.5 744.7 553.0 85.3	3.7 2.5 1.2 5.7 2.1 2.5 2.8 4.5 3.0	30 65 73 156 5 99 73 60 12 54	514 781 594 633 723 671 691 814 883 525	2.8 10.5 0.5 1.3 -1.0 2.6 1.9 3.2 -0.1 0.2	38 4 165 102 273 44 70 30 212 194
Williamson, TX Davis, UT Salt Lake, UT Utah, UT Weber, UT Chittenden, VT Arlington, VA Chesterfield, VA Fairfax, VA Henrico, VA	5.8 5.8 7.4 7.1	108.6 101.6 572.1 169.2 91.8 96.6 157.4 118.3 576.3 175.1	5.5 4.2 4.6 5.5 2.5 1.1 0.9 2.2 1.7 0.7	6 22 9 6 73 161 178 96 118 192	742 635 729 617 593 778 1,323 719 1,179 809	-5.7 -0.2 1.4 4.2 1.7 1.8 1.2 2.0 -0.8 -0.7	322 219 94 19 79 72 113 65 264 257
Loudoun, VA Prince William, VA Alexandria City, VA Chesapeake City, VA Newport News City, VA Norfolk City, VA Richmond City, VA Virginia Beach City, VA Clark, WA	6.6 5.9 5.4 3.9 5.7 7.0	126.4 104.0 94.8 98.9 97.9 141.4 161.5 178.8 131.4	1.0 1.7 1.0 1.5 0.1 -1.1 0.6 -0.2 2.3	170 118 170 131 252 302 204 266 89	966 714 1,025 639 711 757 890 627 723	-4.2 -0.8 1.2 1.6 -0.4 -0.8 1.0 1.3 0.4	320 264 113 82 234 264 127 102 173

	Establishes anto		Employment		Average weekly wage ⁵			
County ³	Establishments, - third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴	Ranking by percent change	
King, WA	75.6	1,167.1	3.6	33	\$1,044	4.7	15	
Kitsap, WA		84.5	2.0	105	709	-3.3	314	
Pierce, WA		269.4	2.6	68	716	0.1	198	
Snohomish, WA Spokane, WA	14.8	235.3 206.9 96.9	8.2 3.4 3.5	2 43 37	798 651 733	-0.7 0.9 2.8	257 134 38	
Thurston, WA Whatcom, WA Yakima, WA	6.7	80.8 108.5	2.7 2.8	65 60	632 537	2.8 3.8 2.1	26 62	
Kanawha, WV	6.1	108.1	0.7	192	676	1.2	113	
Brown, WI	6.7	149.2	-0.1	261	707	2.3	55	
Dane, WI		299.4	-0.5	285	784	0.8	140	
Milwaukee, WI		497.2	0.1	252	783	0.4	173	
Outagamie, WI	5.0	102.5	-0.2	266	680	0.4	173	
Racine, WI	4.2	76.9	0.0	257	715	-2.6	304	
Waukesha, WI	3.8	235.8	0.5	213	790	1.4	94	
Winnebago, WI		89.1	-0.2	266	737	0.0	203	
San Juan, PR		299.0	-4.3	(⁸)	514	1.6	(⁸)	

¹ Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
 These 325 U.S. counties comprise 70.7 percent of the total covered workers in the U.S.
 ² Data are preliminary.

 ³ Includes areas not officially designated as counties. See Technical Note.
 ⁴ Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications. See Technical Note. ⁵ Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.

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.
 ⁸ This county was not included in the U.S. rankings.

Table 2. Covered¹ establishments, employment, and wages in the ten largest counties, third quarter 2006²

	E de la la la de la de la de	Emplo	oyment	Average weekly wage ⁴		
County by NAICS supersector	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ³	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ³	
United States ⁵	8,841.2	134,988.9	1.5	\$784	0.9	
Private industry	8,562.2	113,752.0	1.7	776	0.8	
Natural resources and mining		1,895.7	3.3	761	3.7	
Construction	882.5	7,852.5	3.2	829	1.7	
Manufacturing		14,152.6	-0.5	947	0.1	
Trade, transportation, and utilities	1,899.4	25,982.1	1.1	685	0.4	
Information	144.9	3.034.8	-0.7	1,217	0.7	
Financial activities	852.0	8,175.1	1.0	1,133	1.9	
Professional and business services	1,437.6	17,684.7	3.1	938	1.0	
Education and health services	799.9	16,992.1	2.6	748	0.4	
Leisure and hospitality	711.4	13,290.1	2.0	334	0.9	
Other services	1,128.5	4,373.4	0.8	510	1.0	
Government	279.0	21,236.9	0.8	832	1.0	
	270.0	21,200.0	0.0	002		
Los Angeles, CA		4,161.2	0.7	894	1.7	
Private industry		3,608.2	0.8	872	1.2	
Natural resources and mining	0.6	12.2	7.4	1,184	-1.9	
Construction	14.2	160.0	2.8	896	1.8	
Manufacturing	15.9	463.8	-1.7	937	3.3	
Trade, transportation, and utilities		807.9	0.8	750	0.8	
Information	9.0	206.4	-1.6	1,486	1.3	
Financial activities	25.2	247.2	-0.2	1,440	3.0	
Professional and business services	43.4	603.5	1.4	978	-1.4	
Education and health services	28.2	469.4	1.7	834	2.2	
Leisure and hospitality	27.1	392.5	1.9	513	2.8	
Other services	169.9 3.7	245.1	1.9	413	2.2 4.6	
Government	3.7	553.0	0.2	1,038	4.0	
Cook, IL		2,553.4	0.7	928	1.0	
Private industry	133.8	2,241.8	0.9	925	1.3	
Natural resources and mining	0.1	1.6	-0.9	1,036	7.2	
Construction	11.8	100.6	3.1	1,147	3.1	
Manufacturing	7.2	245.6	-1.8	956	-0.1	
Trade, transportation, and utilities	27.5	477.6	0.3	784	3.3	
Information	2.5	58.6	-3.0	1,275	-2.8	
Financial activities	15.5	219.5	0.4	1,433	2.9	
Professional and business services		441.4	2.5	1,135	-0.1	
Education and health services	13.2	363.4	1.8	813	1.0	
Leisure and hospitality	11.3	236.1	2.0	411	2.2	
Other services Government	13.4 1.2	93.8 311.5	-1.9 -0.8	670 (⁶)	1.1 (⁶)	
	1.2	011.0	0.0	()	()	
New York, NY		2,292.3	1.9	1,421	0.3	
Private industry		1,852.5	2.4	1,519	0.9	
Natural resources and mining	0.0	0.1	-7.3	1,571	15.5	
Construction	2.2	32.4	5.1	1,395	2.0	
Manufacturing	3.0	38.9	-7.5	1,105	2.2	
Trade, transportation, and utilities	21.3	241.0	1.2	1,081	1.1	
Information	4.2	132.4	0.5	1,825	2.9	
Financial activities	17.8	369.7	3.2	2,619	0.7	
Professional and business services	23.2	464.3	2.9	1,637	0.7	
Education and health services	8.3	276.2	1.5	967	-0.9	
Leisure and hospitality	10.7	198.8	2.1	685	-0.3	
Other services	16.8 0.2	85.3 439.9	1.2 -0.5	855 1,010	4.3 -4.6	

	E h l'a h a a a h	Emplo	oyment	Average weekly wage ⁴		
County by NAICS supersector	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ³	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ³	
Harris, TX	92.7	1,959.1	4.2	\$950	2.0	
Private industry		1,708.2	4.5	960	1.6	
Natural resources and mining		73.7	10.7	2,286	-6.3	
Construction		142.0	7.1	917	6.3	
Manufacturing		178.4	5.5	1,204	1.4	
Trade, transportation, and utilities		409.4	3.4	846	1.7	
Information		31.9	0.7	1,169	1.0	
Financial activities		117.4	0.2	1,182	5.2	
Professional and business services	-	320.2	5.1	1,074	0. <u>−</u> 1.4	
Education and health services		204.0	3.6	812	0.9	
Leisure and hospitality	-	170.1	4.3	358	0.6	
Other services	-	56.0	1.4	551	0.7	
Government		250.9	2.1	878	4.9	
		200.0				
Maricopa, AZ		1,819.1	4.4	792	0.5	
Private industry		1,605.4	4.8	779	-0.4	
Natural resources and mining		8.1	2.2	682	12.9	
Construction		177.8	5.9	804	1.4	
Manufacturing		136.9	2.3	1,082	0.6	
Trade, transportation, and utilities		366.7	4.1	750	-1.8	
Information		31.3	-1.3	1,024	3.7	
Financial activities	-	150.3	2.7	1,027	-0.1	
Professional and business services		316.8	5.8	756	-0.4	
Education and health services		188.6	6.2	835	-0.4	
Leisure and hospitality		174.0	4.2	368	-1.6	
Other services		47.8	3.0	550	0.5	
Government	0.6	213.7	1.2	897	7.3	
Orange, CA	95.9	1,517.9	1.1	897	-1.1	
Private industry	94.5	1,378.8	1.2	893	-1.0	
Natural resources and mining		5.1	-16.5	636	1.4	
Construction		111.0	3.7	972	1.1	
Manufacturing	5.6	183.4	0.5	1,083	2.4	
Trade, transportation, and utilities		271.2	0.2	826	0.2	
Information	1.4	31.1	-2.3	1,199	-3.5	
Financial activities	11.5	137.0	-5.1	1,381	-5.9	
Professional and business services	19.4	280.4	3.7	931	0.1	
Education and health services	9.9	138.9	4.8	849	0.4	
Leisure and hospitality	7.1	172.2	3.0	387	0.0	
Other services	14.4	48.5	-1.7	549	0.5	
Government	1.4	139.0	0.3	938	-1.6	
Dallas, TX	67.0	1,466.0	2.7	961	2.2	
Private industry		1,306.9	3.0	969	2.2	
Natural resources and mining		7.4	3.4	3,640	48.6	
Construction		80.4	2.4	877	2.5	
Manufacturing	-	148.8	2.4	1,099	-3.9	
Trade, transportation, and utilities		303.9	1.4	907	1.8	
Information		52.7	-2.0	1,300	2.9	
Financial activities		140.8	3.3	1,285	6.4	
Professional and business services		263.3	4.4	1,205	2.2	
Education and health services		139.2	4.1	876	-1.9	
Leisure and hospitality		128.1	4.6	436	3.1	
Other services		38.9	1.2	608	0.7	
Government	-	159.1	0.3	894	3.4	
	0.7	100.1	0.0		0.7	

		Emplo	oyment	Average weekly wage4	
County by NAICS supersector	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ³	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ³
	00.5	1 001 7	0.0	¢oro	0.7
San Diego, CA	92.5	1,321.7	0.9	\$850	-0.7
Private industry	91.0	1,106.4	0.9	832	-0.8
Natural resources and mining	0.8	11.6	-1.6	527	0.6
Construction	7.3	95.0	0.7	877	-1.7
Manufacturing	3.3	103.6	-0.7	1,112	1.6
Trade, transportation, and utilities	14.6	220.1	0.4	695	-0.3
Information	1.3	37.1	-0.7	1,554	-19.2
Financial activities	10.1	83.8	-0.8	1,041	-3.5
Professional and business services	16.6	215.6	1.2	1,052	4.9
Education and health services	8.0	123.5	1.3	816	1.6
Leisure and hospitality	6.8	160.0	3.5	397	-0.3
Other services	22.0	56.0	1.2	479	1.3
Government	1.5	215.3	1.2	944	-0.1
King, WA	75.6	1,167.1	3.6	1,044	4.7
Private industry	75.2	1,015.2	4.2	1,052	4.6
Natural resources and mining	0.4	3.1	-3.7	1,193	17.4
Construction	6.6	70.5	11.0	954	0.1
Manufacturing	2.5	112.4	11.5	1,198	-3.5
Trade, transportation, and utilities	14.7	221.2	1.9	876	2.8
Information	1.7	74.0	5.2	2,812	19.4
Financial activities	6.8	76.0	-0.4	1,247	6.5
Professional and business services	12.4	183.7	5.7	1,095	0.3
Education and health services	6.3	118.2	2.3	796	0.8
Leisure and hospitality	5.9	110.8	2.6	423	2.4
Other services	17.8	45.2	0.0	537	2.7
Government	0.5	151.9	-0.4	984	4.5
Miami-Dade, FL	84.1	1,008.4	0.6	792	1.5
Private industry	83.8	858.2	1.0	760	1.7
Natural resources and mining	0.5	8.4	-2.6	487	4.1
Construction	5.8	53.2	13.6	795	-0.9
Manufacturing	2.6	47.5	-3.2	700	-2.2
Trade, transportation, and utilities	22.9	249.0	1.7	705	-0.8
Information	1.6	21.4	-5.4	1,139	3.5
Financial activities	10.1	71.3	3.4	1,085	0.3
Professional and business services	16.9	138.2	-5.7	943	7.8
Education and health services	8.6	133.1	3.4	763	1.6
Leisure and hospitality	5.6	98.4	-0.3	450	(6)
Other services	7.5	34.5	1.9	490	2.3
Government	0.3	150.2	-1.4	988	1.6

¹ Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE)

programs. ² Data are preliminary. ³ Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications. See Frecht charges were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for
 Technical Note.
 ⁴ Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
 ⁵ Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
 ⁶ Data do not meet BLS or State agency disclosure standards.

Table 3. Covered¹ establishments, employment, and wages in the largest county by state, third quarter 2006^2

	E	Employment		Average weekly wage ⁵	
County ³	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴
United States ⁶	8,841.2	134,988.9	1.5	\$784	0.9
Jefferson, AL	18.6	374.6	0.8	803	1.0
Anchorage Borough, AK	8.2	148.8	0.5	849	-0.7
Varicopa, AZ	92.3	1,819.1	4.4	792	0.5
Pulaski, AR	14.2	249.9	1.9	717	1.3
os Angeles, CA	392.8	4,161.2	0.7	894	1.7
Denver, CO	25.5	436.3	1.7	988	4.1
Hartford, CT	25.0	500.4	2.3	945	-2.3
New Castle, DE	19.6	282.8	0.2	957	4.0
Vashington, DC	32.0	674.2	0.7	1,307	3.6
liami-Dade, FL	84.1	1,008.4	0.6	792	1.5
Fulton, GA	39.6	777.7	1.3	1,016	1.0
Honolulu, HI	24.0	452.2	2.3	744	0.5
Ada, ID	14.7	210.7	4.4	727	1.1
Cook, IL	135.0	2,553.4	0.7	928	1.0
Marion, IN	23.6	583.0	0.2	814	-0.5
Polk, IA	14.4	271.3	2.4	783	-1.0
lohnson, KS	20.0	312.0	3.4	812	-1.6
Jefferson, KY	22.5	433.2	1.7	775	(7)
East Baton Rouge, LA	13.8	262.2	2.5	698	7.4
Cumberland, ME	12.0	172.6	0.7	711	0.3
Montgomery, MD		467.1	1.3	1,034	0.6
Middlesex, MA	47.1	804.6	1.6	1,108	-0.3
Nayne, MI	33.6	769.1	-2.6	905	-1.5
Hennepin, MN	41.9	841.4	0.2	982	-0.9
Hinds, MS	6.5	128.5	1.3	697	1.3
St. Louis, MO	33.7	625.8	0.7	825	-0.2
Yellowstone, MT	5.5	74.8	1.6	637	3.1
Douglas, NE	15.4	314.5	1.2	734	-0.9
Clark, NV Hillsborough, NH	46.2 12.5	922.5 196.8	4.4 -0.3	751 861	-0.3 1.1
Bergen, NJ	24.7	450.7	0.6	060	0.2
Bernalillo, NM		450.7 335.0	0.6 3.4	969 709	0.3 0.4
New York, NY		2,292.3	3.4 1.9	1,421	0.4
Mecklenburg, NC	28.7	2,292.3 544.4	3.5	922	0.3 3.1
Jass, ND		96.2 757 1	3.4	649 800	0.2
Cuyahoga, OH Dklahoma, OK	38.1 23.0	757.1 424.0	-0.4 1.5	800 708	-0.6 3.2
Aultnomah, OR	20.0	424.0	3.3	708	3.2 0.5
Allegheny, PA	26.8 35.3	683.8	0.4	803 823	0.5 1.5
Providence, RI		291.1	0.4	623 754	0.8
Greenville, SC	13.8	231.6	1.6	684	-0.1
/innehaha, SD		113.4	2.0	668	0.6
Shelby, TN		509.4	0.2	814	0.0
larris, TX		1,959.1	4.2	950	2.0
Salt Lake, UT		572.1	4.6	729	1.4
Chittenden, VT		96.6	1.1	729	1.4
airfax, VA		576.3	1.7	1,179	-0.8
King, WA		1,167.1	3.6	1,044	-0.8
King, WA Kanawha, WV		108.1	0.7	676	1.2
Milwaukee, WI		497.2	0.7	783	0.4
	21.4	437.2	0.1	/03	0.4

Table 3. Covered¹ establishments, employment, and wages in the largest county by state, third quarter 2006² — Continued

County ³	Fatabliahmanta	Employment Averag			weekly wage ⁵
	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06 ⁴	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06 ⁴
Laramie, WY	3.1	42.1	2.5	\$757	19.4
San Juan, PR St. Thomas, VI	14.8 1.8	299.0 22.0	-4.3 -2.6	514 644	1.6 12.0

¹ Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

² Data are preliminary.
 ³ Includes areas not officially designated as counties. See Technical Note.
 ⁴ Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications. See Technical Note.

⁵ Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
 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 4. Covered1 establishments, employment, and wages by state,third quarter 20062

	E	Emplo	oyment	Average weekly wage ³	
State	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06
United States ⁴	8,841.2	134,988.9	1.5	\$784	0.9
Alabama	117.3	1,938.9	1.6	682	1.9
Alaska	21.1	324.8	1.4	798	0.1
Arizona	150.6	2,629.0	4.2	753	1.1
Arkansas	81.9	1,183.9	1.5	603	0.7
California	1,270.4	15,655.0	1.5	892	0.6
Colorado	176.9	2,260.1	2.2	819	1.4
Connecticut	111.9	1,680.7	1.6	957	-0.9
Delaware		424.6	0.5	850	3.4
District of Columbia	32.0	674.2	0.7	1,307	3.6
lorida	588.1	7,941.7	1.9	713	0.7
Georgia	264.5	4,039.3	2.0	752	0.5
ławaii	37.4	621.2	2.3	722	1.1
daho	55.3	661.2	4.1	613	1.3
llinois	350.2	5,883.6	1.1	831	0.7
ndiana	155.4	2,922.7	0.3	687	-0.3
owa	92.8	1,480.7	1.2	641	0.0
(ansas	85.6	1,347.3	2.4	662	0.6
Kentucky		1,795.1	0.9	656	0.6
ouisiana	122.5	1,835.7	3.7	683	7.1
Maine	49.4	610.2	0.6	636	0.8
Naryland		2,545.0	0.7	858	0.5
Aassachusetts	208.8	3,228.1	0.9	950	0.3
Aichigan		4,278.9	-1.8	790	0.3
/linnesota	165.5 69.1	2,685.1	0.0 2.9	784 585	-0.6 2.1
Aississippi Aissouri	172.1	1,134.3	2.9	691	2.1
Montana	41.4	2,725.1 434.4	2.3	581	3.0
Nebraska	57.8	434.4 906.9	2.3	633	0.0
Vevada	72.4	1,287.6	3.7	751	0.0
New Hampshire	48.9	634.9	0.6	774	0.3
New Jersey	279.8	3,984.7	0.7	931	0.3
New Mexico		826.1	4.4	654	4.0
New York	573.2	8,471.7	0.8	950	1.1
North Carolina	241.5	3,982.6	1.8	700	1.6
Jorth Dakota		342.2	2.0	589	1.4
Dhio		5,350.9	-0.1	725	0.3
Oklahoma		1,517.6	2.2	633	3.3
Dregon		1,729.2	2.7	719	0.7
ennsylvania	335.9	5,644.8	0.8	768	0.5
Rhode Island		490.8	0.8	763	3.7
South Carolina	132.4	1,866.0	1.8	642	1.1
South Dakota	29.8	389.6	2.1	571	0.7
ennessee		2,761.1	1.4	698	1.2
exas	536.7	10,019.0	3.6	786	2.5
Jtah		1,188.7	4.8	660	2.0
/ermont		305.8	0.6	672	1.4
/irginia		3,649.5	1.0	815	-0.1
Vashington		2,911.9	3.3	823	2.7
Vest Virginia		711.8	1.2	599	1.7
Visconsin	161.8	2,800.8	0.5	687	0.1

Table 4. Covered¹ establishments, employment, and wages by state, third quarter 2006^2 — Continued

State	Fatabliahmanta	Emple	Employment Average weekly wage			
	Establishments, third quarter 2006 (thousands)	September 2006 (thousands)	Percent change, September 2005-06	Average weekly wage	Percent change, third quarter 2005-06	
Wyoming	24.1	274.1	4.6	\$706	10.0	
Puerto Rico Virgin Islands	60.6 3.4	1,020.9 43.2	-1.9 -2.0	439 692	1.2 12.5	

Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
 Data are preliminary.
 Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
 Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.





