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## County Employment and Wages in Oklahoma - Second Quarter 2017

Employment rose in Oklahoma's three large counties from June 2016 to June 2017, 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 2016 annual average employment.) Assistant Commissioner for Regional Operations Stanley W. Suchman noted that employment increased at a 1.1-percent pace in Tulsa County, and edged up 0.4 and 0.2 percent, respectively, in the counties of Oklahoma and Cleveland. (See table 1.)

Employment nationwide advanced 1.7 percent during the 12-month period as 318 of the 346 largest U.S. counties registered increases. Midland, Texas, had the largest percentage increase in the country, up 7.3 percent over the year. Lucas, Ohio, had the largest over-the-year percentage decrease in employment among the largest counties with a loss of 1.9 percent.

Among the three largest counties in Oklahoma, employment was highest in Oklahoma County $(450,000)$ in June 2017. The counties of Tulsa and Cleveland had employment levels of 353,000 and 79,700, respectively. Together, the three largest Oklahoma counties accounted for 55.7 percent of total employment within the state. Nationwide, the 346 largest counties made up 72.7 percent of total U.S. employment.

All three large Oklahoma counties experienced average weekly wage gains from the second quarter of 2016 to the second quarter of 2017. Oklahoma and Tulsa Counties had the fastest rates of increase in average weekly wages, each up 2.5 percent. (See table 1.) Oklahoma County had the highest average weekly wage among the state's largest counties at $\$ 943$. Nationally, the average weekly wage increased 3.2 percent from a year ago to $\$ 1,020$ in the second quarter of 2017.

Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 74 counties in Oklahoma with employment below 75,000 . Wage levels in all of these smaller counties were below the national average in June 2017. (See table 2.)

## Large county wage changes

The 2.5-percent annual average weekly wage gains in Oklahoma and Tulsa Counties ranked $207^{\text {th }}$ among the nation's 346 largest counties in the second quarter of 2017. Cleveland's 0.9-percent gain ranked $303{ }^{\text {rd }}$. (See table 1.)

Nationally, 325 of the 346 largest counties had over-the-year wage increases. New Hanover, N.C., had the largest percentage wage increase in the nation, up 11.9 percent. San Mateo, Calif., and Midland, Texas, tied for the second largest increase, each at 11.4 percent.

Nationwide, 19 of the largest counties registered wage declines during the period. McLean, Ill., had the largest percentage decrease in average weekly wages (-20.4 percent).

## Large county average weekly wages

Weekly wages in the state's three large counties were below the national average of $\$ 1,020$ in the second quarter of 2017. Average weekly wages in Oklahoma County (\$943) and Tulsa County (\$914) ranked $166^{\text {th }}$ and $186^{\text {th }}$, respectively, near the middle of the national ranking. The average weekly wage in Cleveland County (\$749) ranked 332 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$. (See table 1.)

More than 70 percent of the largest U.S. counties (249) reported average weekly wages below the national average in the second quarter of 2017. Three of the four lowest-paying large counties in the U.S. were in Texas. Cameron, Texas (\$615) had the lowest average weekly wage, followed by Horry, S.C. (\$622), and the Texas counties of Hidalgo (\$632) and Webb (\$667).

Nationwide, average weekly wages were higher than the U.S. average in 97 of the 346 largest counties. Santa Clara, Calif., held the top position with an average weekly wage of $\$ 2,392$. San Mateo, Calif., was second with an average weekly wage of $\$ 2,093$, followed by San Francisco, Calif. ( $\$ 1,941$ ) and New York, N.Y. (\$1,907). Average wages in the highest-ranked county, Santa Clara, Calif., were almost four times the average wage in the lowest-ranked county, Cameron, Texas (\$615).

## Average weekly wages in Oklahoma's smaller counties

All 74 smaller counties in Oklahoma - those with employment below 75,000 - reported average weekly wages below the national average of $\$ 1,020$. Among these counties, Woodward posted the highest weekly wage, $\$ 906$, followed by Grant and Washington, each at $\$ 896$. Johnston County reported the lowest average wage in the state at $\$ 521$ per week. (See table 2.)

When all 77 counties in Oklahoma were considered, 20 reported average weekly wages of less than $\$ 650$, 25 registered wages from $\$ 650$ to $\$ 749$, 26 had wages from $\$ 750$ to $\$ 849$, and 6 had average weekly wages of $\$ 850$ or more. (See chart 1.) The higher-paying counties were located in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa metropolitan areas, as well as the smaller areas of Elk City, Enid, and Woodward. The lower-paying counties, those with weekly wages under $\$ 650$, were concentrated in the southeastern portion of the state.

## 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 2016 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 2017 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/cewbultn16.htm.

## The County Employment and Wages release for third quarter 2017 is scheduled to be released on Thursday, March 8, 2018.

## 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 9.9 million employer reports cover 145.2 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 3 largest counties in Oklahoma, second quarter 2017

| Area | Employment |  |  | Average weekly wage [1] |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | June 2017 <br> (thousands) | Percent change, <br> June 2016-17 [2] | National ranking <br> by percent <br> change [3] | Average <br> weekly <br> wage | National <br> ranking by <br> level [3] | Percent change, <br> second quarter <br> $2016-17[2]$ | National ranking <br> by percent <br> change [3] |
| United States [4] | $145,186.4$ | 1.7 | -- | $\$ 1,020$ | -- | 3.2 | -- |
| Oklahoma | $1,583.8$ | 0.8 | -- | 845 | 41 | 2.5 | 35 |
| Cleveland, Okla. | 79.7 | 0.2 | 311 | 749 | 332 | 0.9 | 303 |
| Oklahoma, Okla. | 450.0 | 0.4 | 294 | 943 | 166 | 2.5 | 207 |
| Tulsa, Okla. | 353.0 | 1.1 | 222 | 914 | 186 | 2.5 | 207 |

[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 Oklahoma, second quarter 2017

| Area | Employment June 2017 | Average weekly wage [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States [2] | 145,186,369 | \$1,020 |
| Oklahoma | 1,583,759 | 845 |
| Adair | 4,632 | 653 |
| Alfalfa | 1,494 | 825 |
| Atoka | 3,424 | 613 |
| Beaver | 1,716 | 781 |
| Beckham | 10,150 | 868 |
| Blaine | 3,179 | 766 |
| Bryan | 18,236 | 724 |
| Caddo | 7,514 | 751 |
| Canadian | 33,637 | 798 |
| Carter | 24,127 | 780 |
| Cherokee | 15,319 | 658 |
| Choctaw | 4,124 | 611 |
| Cimarron | 719 | 605 |
| Cleveland | 79,708 | 749 |
| Coal | 1,109 | 616 |
| Comanche | 42,611 | 707 |
| Cotton | 1,486 | 596 |
| Craig | 5,357 | 666 |
| Creek | 18,271 | 811 |
| Custer | 12,426 | 752 |
| Delaware | 9,260 | 622 |
| Dewey | 1,445 | 813 |
| Ellis | 1,172 | 739 |
| Garfield | 24,751 | 818 |
| Garvin | 9,591 | 843 |
| Grady | 11,938 | 714 |
| Grant | 1,462 | 896 |
| Greer | 1,130 | 608 |
| Harmon | 689 | 620 |
| Harper | 1,060 | 683 |
| Haskell | 3,315 | 576 |
| Hughes | 2,898 | 582 |
| Jackson | 9,587 | 736 |
| Jefferson | 1,000 | 667 |
| Johnston | 4,161 | 521 |
| Kay | 18,027 | 766 |
| Kingfisher | 6,477 | 843 |
| Kiowa | 2,060 | 634 |


| Area | Employment June 2017 | Average weekly wage [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Latimer | 2,565 | \$775 |
| Le Flore | 11,870 | 759 |
| Lincoln | 6,551 | 681 |
| Logan | 7,705 | 650 |
| Love | 6,252 | 573 |
| Major | 2,439 | 740 |
| Marshall | 4,102 | 704 |
| Mayes | 12,157 | 806 |
| McClain | 9,100 | 693 |
| McCurtain | 11,197 | 671 |
| McIntosh | 3,814 | 585 |
| Murray | 5,829 | 647 |
| Muskogee | 29,356 | 775 |
| Noble | 4,760 | 812 |
| Nowata | 1,708 | 640 |
| Okfuskee | 2,265 | 579 |
| Oklahoma | 449,977 | 943 |
| Okmulgee | 9,510 | 692 |
| Osage | 6,617 | 691 |
| Ottawa | 12,205 | 632 |
| Pawnee | 3,536 | 695 |
| Payne | 32,105 | 731 |
| Pittsburg | 16,022 | 833 |
| Pontotoc | 18,247 | 760 |
| Pottawatomie | 22,788 | 668 |
| Pushmataha | 2,655 | 589 |
| Roger Mills | 824 | 761 |
| Rogers | 26,288 | 806 |
| Seminole | 6,933 | 701 |
| Sequoyah | 9,019 | 542 |
| Stephens | 13,920 | 778 |
| Texas | 9,793 | 759 |
| Tillman | 1,770 | 695 |
| Tulsa | 353,024 | 914 |
| Wagoner | 9,080 | 763 |
| Washington | 19,544 | 896 |
| Washita | 2,006 | 735 |
| Woods | 3,506 | 813 |
| Woodward | 8,692 | 906 |
|  |  |  |

[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 2017

| State | Employment |  | Average weekly wage [1] |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June 2017 <br> (thousands) | Percent change, June 2016-17 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, second quarter 2016-17 | National ranking by percent change |
| United States [2] | 145,186.4 | 1.7 | \$1,020 | -- | 3.2 | -- |
| Alabama | 1,946.4 | 1.2 | 858 | 38 | 2.8 | 31 |
| Alaska | 338.4 | -0.7 | 1,005 | 16 | -0.5 | 51 |
| Arizona | 2,699.6 | 2.9 | 943 | 23 | 2.5 | 35 |
| Arkansas | 1,206.0 | 0.7 | 810 | 47 | 3.2 | 22 |
| California | 17,150.9 | 2.2 | 1,210 | 5 | 4.7 | 3 |
| Colorado | 2,638.8 | 2.5 | 1,042 | 11 | 4.2 | 5 |
| Connecticut | 1,701.2 | 0.6 | 1,216 | 4 | 0.4 | 50 |
| Delaware | 446.6 | 0.6 | 1,012 | 15 | 2.2 | 43 |
| District of Columbia | 766.5 | 1.0 | 1,675 | 1 | 3.3 | 19 |
| Florida | 8,390.6 | 2.8 | 905 | 27 | 2.5 | 35 |
| Georgia | 4,357.8 | 2.1 | 956 | 21 | 2.9 | 27 |
| Hawaii | 653.0 | 1.0 | 935 | 24 | 3.5 | 13 |
| Idaho | 723.5 | 3.4 | 765 | 50 | 3.4 | 16 |
| Illinois | 6,006.6 | 0.9 | 1,062 | 9 | 2.4 | 39 |
| Indiana | 3,041.0 | 1.5 | 859 | 37 | 3.7 | 9 |
| lowa | 1,571.4 | 0.4 | 853 | 39 | 3.3 | 19 |
| Kansas | 1,377.8 | -0.1 | 849 | 40 | 2.4 | 39 |
| Kentucky | 1,889.4 | 0.8 | 862 | 35 | 2.9 | 27 |
| Louisiana | 1,907.7 | 0.0 | 869 | 34 | 2.0 | 46 |
| Maine | 629.1 | 0.9 | 814 | 46 | 2.5 | 35 |
| Maryland | 2,694.8 | 1.4 | 1,103 | 8 | 3.1 | 23 |
| Massachusetts | 3,604.5 | 1.6 | 1,278 | 2 | 3.6 | 11 |
| Michigan | 4,365.3 | 1.6 | 969 | 19 | 2.9 | 27 |
| Minnesota | 2,902.1 | 2.0 | 1,037 | 12 | 3.9 | 6 |
| Mississippi | 1,128.9 | 0.7 | 732 | 51 | 0.8 | 49 |
| Missouri | 2,818.7 | 1.2 | 889 | 30 | 3.0 | 25 |
| Montana | 473.6 | 1.3 | 797 | 48 | 3.9 | 6 |
| Nebraska | 984.0 | 0.4 | 833 | 43 | 3.5 | 13 |
| Nevada | 1,333.5 | 3.4 | 900 | 29 | 2.9 | 27 |
| New Hampshire | 665.4 | 1.6 | 1,015 | 14 | 1.2 | 48 |
| New Jersey | 4,123.5 | 1.8 | 1,173 | 6 | 2.3 | 41 |
| New Mexico | 815.4 | 0.7 | 823 | 45 | 1.5 | 47 |
| New York | 9,417.4 | 1.6 | 1,237 | 3 | 2.2 | 43 |
| North Carolina | 4,361.4 | 1.8 | 902 | 28 | 4.3 | 4 |
| North Dakota | 422.7 | -0.2 | 953 | 22 | 5.0 | 2 |
| Ohio | 5,422.8 | 1.2 | 912 | 25 | 3.3 | 19 |
| Oklahoma | 1,583.8 | 0.8 | 845 | 41 | 2.5 | 35 |
| Oregon | 1,912.6 | 2.2 | 967 | 20 | 3.8 | 8 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,859.4 | 1.3 | 1,000 | 17 | 3.0 | 25 |
| Rhode Island | 487.3 | 1.0 | 980 | 18 | 2.6 | 33 |
| South Carolina | 2,053.9 | 2.0 | 834 | 42 | 3.6 | 11 |
| South Dakota | 435.5 | 0.6 | 785 | 49 | 3.4 | 16 |
| Tennessee | 2,948.1 | 1.8 | 906 | 26 | 3.5 | 13 |
| Texas | 12,059.6 | 2.1 | 1,027 | 13 | 2.7 | 32 |
| Utah | 1,440.3 | 3.4 | 862 | 35 | 2.6 | 33 |
| Vermont | 314.2 | 1.0 | 870 | 33 | 2.1 | 45 |
| Virginia | 3,886.6 | 1.5 | 1,047 | 10 | 3.7 | 9 |
| Washington | 3,352.5 | 2.2 | 1,141 | 7 | 5.6 | 1 |
| West Virginia | 690.9 | -0.3 | 828 | 44 | 3.4 | 16 |
| Wisconsin | 2,905.3 | 1.1 | 876 | 31 | 2.3 | 41 |
| Wyoming | 280.2 | -0.7 | 875 | 32 | 3.1 | 23 |
| Puerto Rico | 873.6 | -1.0 | 515 | [3] | 1.2 | [3] |
| Virgin Islands | 38.6 | 0.4 | 762 | [3] | 2.6 | [3] |

[^0]Chart 1. Average weekly wages by county in Oklahoma, second quarter 2017



[^0]:    [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.

