| Economic Effects of 13 State Minimum Wage Increases on January 1, 2014 |              |                     |              |  |                                   |                                     |                |   |   |                         |  |
|--|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|---|---|-------------------------|--|
|  | 2013<br>Rate | Size of<br>increase | 2014<br>Rate | Total<br>Estimated<br>Workers <sup>1</sup> | Directly<br>affected <sup>2</sup> | Indirectly<br>affected <sup>3</sup> | Total Affected | Total<br>Affected as<br>% of<br>Workers | Increased<br>wages for<br>directly &<br>indirectly<br>affected <sup>4</sup> | GDP Impact <sup>5</sup> | Jobs Impact -<br>Full-time<br>employment<br>(job years) <sup>6</sup> |
| Arizona  | \$7.80       | \$0.10              | \$7.90       | 2,428,000                                  | 72,000                            | 3,000                               | 75,000         | 3.1%                                    | \$25,004,000  | \$15,828,000            | 100  |
| Colorado   | \$7.78       | \$0.22              | \$8.00       | 2,226,000                                  | 46,000                            | 58,000                              | 104,000        | 4.7%                                    | \$29,681,000  | \$18,788,000            | 100  |
| Connecticut  | \$8.25       | \$0.45              | \$8.70       | 1,516,000                                  | 63,000                            | 44,000                              | 107,000        | 7.1%                                    | \$38,967,000  | \$24,666,000            | 200  |
| Florida  | \$7.79       | \$0.14              | \$7.93       | 7,588,000                                  | 200,000                           | 216,000                             | 416,000        | 5.5%                                    | \$99,169,000  | \$62,774,000            | 500  |
| Missouri   | \$7.35       | \$0.15              | \$7.50       | 2,510,000                                  | 57,000                            | 47,000                              | 104,000        | 4.1%                                    | \$18,744,000  | \$11,865,000            | 100  |
| Montana  | \$7.80       | \$0.10              | \$7.90       | 394,000                                    | 13,000                            |                                     | 13,000         | 3.3%                                    | \$3,975,000   | \$2,516,000             |  |
| New Jersey   | \$7.25       | \$1.00              | \$8.25       | 3,839,000                                  | 254,000                           | 189,000                             | 443,000        | 11.5%                                   | \$273,624,000   | \$173,204,000           | 1,300  |
| New York   | \$7.25       | \$0.75              | \$8.00       | 8,013,000                                  | 293,000                           | 383,000                             | 676,000        | 8.4%                                    | \$340,025,000   | \$215,236,000           | 1,600  |
| Ohio   | \$7.85       | \$0.10              | \$7.95       | 4,789,000                                  | 178,000                           | 152,000                             | 330,000        | 6.9%                                    | \$61,288,000  | \$38,795,000            | 300  |
| Oregon   | \$8.95       | \$0.15              | \$9.10       | 1,500,000                                  | 96,000                            | 8,000                               | 104,000        | 6.9%                                    | \$25,602,000  | \$16,206,000            | 100  |
| Rhode Island   | \$7.75       | \$0.25              | \$8.00       | 462,00                                     | 9,000                             | 14,000                              | 23,000         | 5.0%                                    | \$6,112,000   | \$3,869,000             |  |
| Vermont  | \$8.60       | \$0.13              | \$8.73       | 286,000                                    | 8,000                             | 2,000                               | 10,000         | 3.5%                                    | \$2,995,000   | \$1,896,000             |  |
| Washington   | \$9.19       | \$0.13              | \$9.32       | 2,841,000                                  | 152,000                           | 6,000                               | 158,000        | 5.6%                                    | \$53,032,000  | \$33,569,000            | 300  |
| Total  |              |                     |              |  | 1,441,000                         | 1,122,000                           | 2,563,000      |   | \$978,218,000   | \$619,212,000           | 4,600  |

Source: Economic Policy Institute analysis of Current Population Survey, Outgoing Rotation Group public use microdata from 2012Q4 through 2013Q3

## Notes:

<sup>1</sup>Total estimated workers is estimated from the CPS respondents who were 16 years old or older, employed, but not self-employed, and for whom either a valid hourly wage is reported or one can be imputed from weekly earnings and average weekly hours. Consequently, this estimate represents the identifiable wage-earning workforce and tends to understate the size of the full workforce.

<sup>2</sup>Directly Affected workers will see their wages rise as the new minimum wage rate will exceed their current hourly pay.

<sup>3</sup>Indirectly affected workers have a wage rate just above the new minimum wage (between the new minimum wage and the new minimum wage plus the dollar amount of the increase in the previous year's minimum wage). They will receive a raise as employer pay scales are adjusted upward to reflect the new minimum wage.

<sup>4</sup> Total annual amount of increased wages for directly and indirectly affected workers.

<sup>5</sup>GDP and job stimulus figures utilize a national model to estimate the GDP impact of workers' increased earnings. Thus the total state stimulus may be lower than this amount because workers in each state will not necessarily spend all of their increased earnings in-state. However, we can assume that most of the increased earnings will be

spent in-state, and thus most of the jobs created will be in-state. Jobs numbers assume full-time employment requires \$133,000 in additional GDP.

<sup>6</sup>The increased economic activity from these additional wages adds not just jobs but also hours for people who already have jobs (work hours for people with jobs also dropped in the downturn). Full-time employment takes that into account, by essentially taking the number of total hours added (including both hours from new jobs and more hours for people who already have jobs) and dividing by 40, to get full-time-equivalent jobs added.

Job impact estimation methods can be found in: Hall, Doug and Cooper, David. 2012. How raising the federal minimum wage would help working families and give the economy a boost. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute. http://www.epi.org/publication/ib341-raising-federal-minimum-wage/ and Bivens, Josh L. 2011. Method memo on estimating the jobs impact of various policy changes. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute. http://www.epi.org/publication/ib341-raising-federal-minimum-wage/ and Bivens, Josh L. 2011. Method memo on estimating the jobs impact of various policy changes. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute. http://www.epi.org/publication/methodology-estimating-jobs-impact/