



For Release: Tuesday, January 26, 2016

15-2450-CHI

MIDWEST INFORMATION OFFICE: Chicago, III.

Technical information: (312) 353-1880 BLSInfoChicago@bls.gov www.bls.gov/regions/midwest

Media contact: (312) 353-1138

County Employment and Wages in South Dakota – Second Quarter 2015

South Dakota's only large county, Minnehaha, reported employment growth of 2.0 percent from June 2014 to June 2015, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. (Large counties are defined as those with employment of 75,000 or more as measured by 2014 annual average employment.) Regional Commissioner Charlene Peiffer noted that in June 2015, Minnehaha County's employment level of 125,200 accounted for 29.2 percent of total employment within the state. (See table 1.)

Nationally, employment rose 2.0 percent from June 2014 to June 2015, as 319 of the 342 largest U.S. counties gained jobs. Nationwide, the 342 largest counties made up 72.1 percent of total U.S. employment, which stood at 140.6 million in June 2015.

The average weekly wage in Minnehaha County was \$825 in the second quarter of 2015, up 3.8 percent from the previous year. Nationally, the average weekly wage rose 3.0 percent over the year to \$968 in the second quarter of 2015.

Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 65 counties in South Dakota with employment below 75,000. All 65 of these smaller counties had average weekly wages below the national average. (See table 2.)

Large county wage changes

Minnehaha County's 3.8-percent wage growth from the second quarter of 2014 to the second quarter of 2015 ranked 51st nationally. (See table 1.) Among the 342 largest U.S. counties, 323 had over-the-year increases in average weekly wages in the second quarter of 2015. Ventura, Calif., ranked first in average weekly wage growth with a gain of 15.2 percent. Sixteen of the 342 largest counties experienced over-the-year decreases in average weekly wages. Olmsted, Minn., had the largest percentage decline in average weekly wages with a loss of 5.2 percent.

Large county average weekly wages

Minnehaha County's \$825 average weekly wage ranked 243rd among the 342 large U.S. counties in the second quarter of 2015. Nationally, weekly wages were higher than the U.S. average of \$968 in 102 of the largest U.S. counties. Santa Clara, Calif., held the top position with an average weekly wage of \$2,109. Santa Mateo, Calif., was second at \$1,863, followed by New York, N.Y. (\$1,842), and San Francisco, Calif. (\$1,730). Minnehaha was among the 240 large U.S. counties with an average weekly wage below the national average. Horry, S.C. (\$568) reported the lowest weekly wage, followed by the Texas counties of Cameron (\$586), Hidalgo (\$614), and Webb (\$651).

Average weekly wages in South Dakota's smaller counties

All 65 counties in South Dakota with employment below 75,000 had average weekly wages lower than the national average of \$968. Among these smaller counties, Union County had the highest average weekly wage at \$928 and Mellette County had the lowest at \$449. (See table 2.)

When all 66 counties in South Dakota were considered, 9 reported average weekly wages of \$549 or less, 18 had wages from \$550 to \$599, 12 reported wages from \$600 to \$649, and 27 had wages of \$650 or more. (See chart 1.)

Additional statistics and other information

Quarterly data for states have been included in this release in table 3. For additional information about quarterly employment and wages data, please read the Technical Note or visit the QCEW Web site at www.bls.gov/cew.

Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online features comprehensive information by detailed industry on establishments, employment, and wages for the nation and all states. The 2014 edition of this publication contains selected data produced by Business Employment Dynamics (BED) on job gains and losses, as well as selected data from the first quarter 2015 version of the national news release. Tables and additional content from Employment and Wages Annual Averages 2014 are now available online at www.bls.gov/cew/publications/employment-and-wages-annual-averages/2014/home.htm. The 2015 edition of Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online will be available in September 2016.

The County Employment and Wages release for third quarter 2015 is scheduled to be released on Wednesday, March 9, 2016.

Technical Note

Average weekly wage data by county are compiled under the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) program, also known as the ES-202 program. The data are derived from summaries of employment and total pay of workers covered by state and federal unemployment insurance (UI) legislation and provided by State Workforce Agencies (SWAs). The 9.6 million employer reports cover 140.6 million full- and part-time workers. The average weekly wage values are calculated by dividing quarterly total wages by the average of the three monthly employment levels of those covered by UI programs. The result is then divided by 13, the number of weeks in a quarter. It is to be noted, therefore, that over-the-year wage changes for geographic areas may reflect shifts in the composition of employment by industry, occupation, and such other factors as hours of work. Thus, wages may vary among counties, metropolitan areas, or states for reasons other than changes in the average wage level. Data for all states, Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), counties, and the nation are available on the BLS Web site at www.bls.gov/cew/; however, data in QCEW press releases have been revised and may not match the data contained on the Bureau's Web site.

QCEW data are not designed as a time series. QCEW data are simply the sums of individual establishment records reflecting the number of establishments that exist in a county or industry at a point in time. Establishments can move in or out of a county or industry for a number of reasons—some reflecting economic events, others reflecting administrative changes.

The preliminary QCEW data presented in this release may differ from data released by the individual states as well as from the data presented on the BLS Web site. These potential differences result from the states' continuing receipt, review and editing of UI data over time. On the other hand, differences between data in this release and the data found on the BLS Web site are the result of adjustments made to improve over-the-year comparisons. Specifically, these adjustments account for administrative (noneconomic) changes such as a correction to a previously reported location or industry classification. Adjusting for these administrative changes allows users to more accurately assess changes of an economic nature (such as a firm moving from one county to another or changing its primary economic activity) over a 12-month period. Currently, adjusted data are available only from BLS press releases.

Information in this release will be made available to sensory impaired individuals upon request. Voice phone: (202) 691-5200; Federal Relay Service: (800) 877-8339.

Table 1. Covered employment and wages in the United States and the largest county in South Dakota, second quarter 2015

Area	Employment			Average weekly wage (1)			
	June 2015 (thousands)	Percent change, June 2014-15 ⁽²⁾	National ranking by percent change ⁽³⁾	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level (3)	Percent change, second quarter 2014-15 ⁽²⁾	National ranking by percent change (3)
United States (4)	140,594.9	2.0		\$968		3.0	
South Dakota	428.6	1.3		740	49	3.9	4
Minnehaha, S.D	125.2	2.0	160	825	243	3.8	51

Footnotes:

- (1) Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
- (2) Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications.
- (3) Ranking does not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
- (4) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Note: Data are preliminary. Covered employment and wages includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

Table 2. Covered employment and wages in the United States and all counties in South Dakota, second quarter 2015

Area	Employment June 2015	Average weekly wage (1)
ited States (2)	140,594,927	\$9
South Dakota		7
Aurora	956	5
Beadle		6
Bennett	868	5
Bon Homme	1,995	5
Brookings	18,051	7
Brown	21,319	7
Brule	1,993	5
Buffalo	518	6
Butte	2,910	ţ
Campbell		
Charles Mix		
Clark	1,102	
	1	·
Clay		
Corner Corner	· 1	
Corson		
Custer		
Davison	l l	l
Day	· 1	
Deuel	1,511	
Dewey	2,256	
Douglas	1,180	
Edmunds	1,262	
Fall River	2,594	
Faulk	640	
Grant	4,353	
Gregory	1,526	
Haakon		
Hamlin	1,952	
Hand	1,408	
Hanson	· 1	
Harding		
Hughes	· 1	
Hutchinson	· 1	
Hyde	525	
Jackson		
Jerauld	· 1	
Jones	493	
Kingsbury	1,862	
Lake	4,957	
Lawrence	12,137	
Lincoln	20,085	
Lyman	1,477	
Marshall		
McCook	1,431	
McPherson	· 1	
Meade		
Mellette		
		•
Miner		
Minnehaha	I I	
Moody	· 1	
Pennington		•
Perkins		
Potter	961	:
Roberts		

Table 2. Covered employment and wages in the United States and all counties in South Dakota, second quarter 2015 - Continued

Area	Employment June 2015	Average weekly wage (1)	
Sanborn	622	566	
Shannon	3,670	725	
Spink	2,478	631	
Stanley	1,385	615	
Sully	628	628	
Todd	2,752	628	
Tripp	2,165	629	
Turner	2,157	582	
Union	9,610	928	
Walworth	2,332	580	
Yankton	12,951	717	
Ziebach	297	636	

Footnotes:

Note: Data are preliminary. Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

⁽¹⁾ Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.

⁽²⁾ Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Table 3. Covered employment and wages by state, second quarter 2015

United States (2)			Average weekly wage (1)				
Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	June 2015 (thousands)	Percent change, June 2014-15	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level	Percent change, second quarter 2014-15	National ranking by percent change	
Alaska	140,594.9	2.0	\$968		3.0		
Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	1,899.3	1.3	819	37	1.6	41	
Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	346.6	0.4	1,028	8	2.4	30	
California	2,549.9	2.5	904	21	1.8	39	
Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	1,184.6	1.7	762	47	2.1	35	
Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	16,338.9	2.8	1,131	5	5.5	1	
Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	2,517.1	3.2	989	13	3.0	13	
District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois	1,693.1	0.9	1,177	4	2.0	38	
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	439.1	2.2	991	12	1.5	42	
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana	745.1	1.8	1,599	1	1.8	39	
HawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndiana	7,907.7	3.6	861	28	2.6	23	
IdahoIllinoisIndiana	4,167.8	3.4	903	22	2.4	30	
IllinoisIndiana	635.9	1.6	876	24	3.8	6	
Indiana	678.5	2.9	713	50	2.3	33	
	5,925.5	1.5	1,015	10	2.6	23	
lowa	2,966.0	1.7	811	40	3.4	7	
	1,561.2	0.9	802	43	2.8	18	
Kansas	1,382.1	0.7	819	37	2.8	18	
Kentucky	1,850.5	1.7	822	35	3.0	13	
Louisiana	1,930.6	0.5	850	30	0.8	47	
Maine	615.8	0.8	768	46	2.9	16	
Maryland	2,631.3	1.4	1,046	7	2.6	23	
Massachusetts	3,488.3	2.1	1,211	2	4.7	2	
Michigan	4,225.0	1.5	916	20	2.1	35	
Minnesota	2,826.3	1.5	977	15	3.2	8	
Mississippi	1,114.7	1.1	709	51	0.6	48	
Missouri	2,746.6	1.7	842	32	2.8	18	
Montana	461.5	1.8	754	48	2.7	21	
Nebraska	968.7	1.2	787	44	4.1	3	
Nevada	1,248.1	3.2	855	29	2.6	23	
New Hampshire	647.7	1.5	967	16	1.3	46	
New Jersey	4,000.2	1.5	1,126	6	2.6	23	
New Mexico	808.4	0.8	805	41	1.4	44	
New York	9,136.9	1.9	1,180	3	3.1	9	
North Carolina	4,185.6	2.6	850	30	3.9	4	
North Dakota	445.0	-1.8	939	18	0.3	50	
Ohio	5,308.1	1.4	865	26	2.4	30	
Oklahoma	1,591.5	0.6	818	39	0.5	49	
Oregon	1,810.4	3.4	899	23	3.0	13	
Pennsylvania	5,763.9	0.8	958	17	2.7	21	
Rhode Island	480.0	1.5	925	19	2.9	16	
South Carolina	1,963.5	2.5	782	45	2.1	35	
South Dakota	428.6	1.3	740	49	3.9	Δ	
Tennessee	2,832.1	2.8	863	27	3.1	9	
Texas	11,689.4	2.4	988	14	1.5	42	
Utah	1,345.9	3.9	821	36	3.1	9	
Vermont	309.3	0.6	831	34	2.2	34	
	3,767.2	1.7	1,000	11	2.2	29	
Virginia	3,197.6	3.3	1,000	9	3.1	28	
Washington	706.5	-0.8	803	42	1.4	44	
West Virginia	2,839.8	-0.8 1.0	836	33	2.6	23	
Wisconsin	2,839.8		869	25	-0.1	23 51	
Puerto Rico	291.5 884.6	-1.5 -1.4	513	(3)	-0.1 2.0	(3)	

Note: See footnotes at end of table.

Table 3. Covered employment and wages by state, second quarter 2015 - Continued

	Employment		Average weekly wage (1)				
State	June 2015 (thousands)	Percent change, June 2014-15	Average weekly wage	National ranking by level	Percent change, second quarter 2014-15	National ranking by percent change	
Virgin Islands	37.9	0.1	748	(3)	2.2	(3)	

Footnotes:

- (1) Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
- (2) Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
- (3) Data not included in the national ranking.

Note: Data are preliminary. Covered employment and wages includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.

Chart 1. Average weekly wages by county in South Dakota, second quarter 2015

