Employment increased in both of Arizona’s large counties from June 2017 to June 2018, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. (Large counties are defined as those with employment of 75,000 or greater as measured by 2017 annual average employment.) Assistant Commissioner for Regional Operations Richard Holden noted that employment rose 2.8 percent in Maricopa County and 1.6 percent in Pima County. (See table 1.)

Employment nationwide advanced 1.5 percent during the 12-month period as 309 of the 349 largest U.S. counties registered increases. Midland, TX, had the largest percentage increase in the country, up 11.6 percent over the year. McLean, IL, experienced the largest over-the-year percentage decrease in employment with a loss of 2.0 percent.

Between the two large counties in Arizona, employment was higher in Maricopa (1,950,600) in June 2018. Pima County had an employment level of 364,300. Together, Arizona’s two large counties accounted for 83.5 percent of total employment within the state. Nationwide, the 349 largest counties made up 72.9 percent of total U.S. employment.

The average weekly wage in Pima County was $884 in the second quarter of 2018, an increase of 3.8 percent from the second quarter of 2017. (See table 1.) Average weekly wages in Maricopa County were $1,016, a gain of 3.0 percent over the year. Nationally, the average weekly wage increased 3.4 percent from a year ago to $1,055 in the second quarter of 2018.

Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 13 counties in Arizona with employment below 75,000. Twelve of these smaller counties had average weekly wages below the national average in the second quarter of 2018. (See table 2.)

**Large county wage changes**

Pima County’s 3.8-percent rise in average weekly wages from the second quarter of 2017 to the second quarter of 2018 ranked 86th among the nation’s 349 largest counties. Maricopa County’s 3.0-percent wage gain ranked 172nd. (See table 1.)

Nationally, 340 of the 349 largest counties had over-the-year wage increases. Marin, CA, had the largest percentage wage increase in the nation, up 11.7 percent. King, WA, and Lake, IL, tied for the second largest increase, each at 9.3 percent.
Nationwide, eight of the largest counties registered wage declines during the period. New Hanover, NC, had the largest percentage decrease in average weekly wages with a loss of 6.4 percent.

**Large county average weekly wages**
Maricopa County’s $1,016 average weekly wage ranked 126th among the 349 large U.S. counties. The average weekly wage in Pima County, at $884, ranked 253rd. (See table 1.)

Among the largest U.S. counties, 255 reported average weekly wages below the national average in the second quarter of 2018. At $625 a week, Horry County, SC, had the lowest average weekly wage among the 349 large counties. The next three lowest-paying large counties were in Texas: Cameron, TX ($642), Hidalgo, TX ($645) and Webb, TX ($687).

Nationwide, average weekly wages were higher than the U.S. average in 94 of the 349 largest counties. Santa Clara, CA, held the top position with an average weekly wage of $2,573. San Mateo, CA, was second with an average weekly wage of $2,357, followed by San Francisco, CA ($2,083) and New York, NY ($2,025).

**Average weekly wages in Arizona’s smaller counties**
Among the 13 smaller counties in Arizona with employment below 75,000, 12 reported average weekly wages below the national average of $1,055. The exception was Greenlee County with an average weekly wage of $1,339. Among the remaining smaller counties, Santa Cruz had the highest weekly wages ($874), while La Paz had the lowest ($724). (See table 2.)

When all 15 counties in Arizona were considered, 5 had average wages under $800 per week, 8 had wages from $800 to $899, and 2 had wages of $900 or more. (See chart 1.)

**Additional statistics and other information**
QCEW 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 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 2017 edition of this publication, which was published in September 2018, contains selected data produced by Business Employment Dynamics (BED) on job gains and losses, as well as selected data from the first quarter 2018 version of the national news release. Tables and additional content from *Employment and Wages Annual Averages Online* are now available at www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn17.htm.

The County Employment and Wages release for third quarter 2018 is scheduled to be released on Wednesday, March 6, 2019.

**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 9.8 million employer reports cover 143.9 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 (see Technical Note below) 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 2 largest counties in Arizona, second quarter 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average weekly wage (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 2018 (thousands)</td>
<td>Percent change, June 2017-18 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (4)</td>
<td>147,431.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2,770.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa, Ariz.</td>
<td>1,950.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima, Ariz.</td>
<td>364.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Arizona, second quarter 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Employment June 2018</th>
<th>Average Weekly Wage&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>147,431,154</td>
<td>$1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2,770,778</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>17,991</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>34,069</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>63,057</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>14,718</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>5,018</td>
<td>1,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>5,855</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>1,950,647</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>27,150</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>364,256</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>61,415</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>13,337</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>64,678</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>58,990</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

NOTE: Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs. Data are preliminary.
Table 3. Covered employment and wages by state, second quarter 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Employment (thousands)</th>
<th>Percent change, June 2017-18</th>
<th>Average weekly wage</th>
<th>National ranking by level</th>
<th>Percent change, second quarter 2017-18</th>
<th>National ranking by percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States (2)</td>
<td>147,431.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$1,055</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1,969.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>335.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2,770.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1,214.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>17,473.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2,704.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1,704.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>454.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>777.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>8,568.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4,440.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>658.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>745.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6,061.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,075.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1,583.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1,393.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1,905.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1,918.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>636.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2,712.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>3,650.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4,424.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,925.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1,130.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2,829.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>478.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>990.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1,372.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>670.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4,157.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>823.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>9,579.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>4,450.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>426.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5,461.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1,606.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,947.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>5,924.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>491.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2,126.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>439.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2,994.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>12,326.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,483.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>312.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3,941.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3,444.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>702.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2,933.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>853.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See footnotes at end of table.
Table 3. Covered employment and wages by state, second quarter 2018 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average weekly wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Percent change, June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(thousands)</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Arizona, second quarter 2018
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