



INDIANA
WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT

NEWS RELEASE

For Immediate Release: August 10, 2005

Media Contact: Kip Chase 317-232-3396

State, County and MSA Unemployment Report:

May Revised and June Preliminary State Unemployment Figures Released

Indianapolis – Today the Indiana Department of Workforce Development released revised May and preliminary June unemployment figures for the state, all 92 counties and metropolitan statistical areas.

Ron Stiver, Commissioner for the Indiana Department of Workforce Development, stated, “While we are pleased to see Indiana’s unemployment rate remain low, the growth in the number of Hoosiers employed continues to lag the nation. This supports Governor Daniels’ commitment to growing jobs and employment for Hoosiers through a series of bold economic and workforce reforms.”

Seasonally Adjusted:

Indiana’s preliminary seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for June was 5.1% and remains unchanged from June 2004. The rate for the U.S. for June 2005 was 5.0%.

For the month of June, Indiana’s Midwest neighbors reported the following unemployment rates: Kentucky, 5.7%; Illinois, 6.0%; Ohio, 6.1%; Michigan, 6.8%.

For the month of June, the state’s estimated seasonally adjusted labor force total was 3,186,500. The number of Hoosier workers in the labor force during June was 3,023,500 and the number of unemployed Hoosiers during June was 163,000. May revised data marked Indiana’s labor total at 3,200,400 with 3,048,000 employed and 152,400 unemployed.

Non-Seasonally Adjusted:

Using the same data and reporting non-seasonally adjusted employment trends, Indiana’s June preliminary non-seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was 5.1%. The rate is unchanged from Indiana’s June unemployment rate of 5.1% from one year ago.

The U.S. non-seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was 5.2% for the month of June. Of Indiana’s neighboring states reporting non-seasonally adjusted unemployment rates, Kentucky’s rate was 6.0% and Illinois’ rate was 6.2%. Ohio reported an unemployment rate of 6.2% while Michigan’s rate was reported to be 6.9%.



INDIANA
WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT

The Indiana Department of Workforce Development is charged with continually improving the Hoosier workforce by assisting companies to create new jobs and improve worker skills. The agency offers a variety of training and educational grants, partners with Indiana's 27 WorkOne Centers, administers the unemployment insurance system, provides labor market information, assists employers with preparing workers for layoffs and closures and operates a statewide job placement service.

For more information on Indiana's unemployment rate, contact DWD at 1-888-WorkOne, or visit the website at www.workforce.IN.gov.

Technical Notes:

- In calculating unemployment rates, two different types of numbers are provided. The first, known as the *non-seasonally adjusted rate*, estimates employment and unemployment without taking into account the effects of seasonal trends. In calculating the *seasonally adjusted rate*, or employment that follows more or less a regular pattern each year, holiday, summer and other types of seasonal employment is factored out of the estimate. These adjustments make it easier to observe the cyclical and other non-seasonal movements.
- As previously announced BLS had found errors in some of the employment inputs used in the sub state estimates published earlier this year and decided to conduct a thorough review of all inputs. That review is now complete. The corrections to the data for January, February and March 2005 had small to moderate impacts on employment and labor force levels and little impact on unemployment rates in most areas. The labor force, unemployment and unemployment rate data for 2004 presented in this release also reflects the corrections to the inputs.
- Compiled in conjunction with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the State's unemployment rate is derived from a national survey of about 60,000 households. Of that number approximately 1,300 Indiana households are polled each month.
- The Household survey that calculates the unemployment rate is conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and is conducted during the week of the 12th of the month.
- Labor force is calculated as the number of people 16 years of age and older who were able and available to work.
- For most accurate analysis, please use revised data sets and not preliminary estimates.

INDIANA VS. U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

June, 2005

Seasonally Adjusted

	June, 2005	May, 2005	April, 2005	June, 2004
Indiana				
Labor Force	3,186,500	3,200,400	3,217,100	3,168,500
Employed	3,023,500	3,048,000	3,044,700	3,005,500
Unemployed	163,000	152,400	172,400	163,000
Rate	5.1	4.8	5.4	5.1
U.S.				
Rate	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.6

Not Seasonally Adjusted

	June, 2005	May, 2005	June, 2004
Indiana			
Labor Force	3,233,600	3,214,000	3,207,200
Employed	3,069,900	3,065,700	3,042,400
Unemployed	163,700	148,300	164,800
Rate	5.1	4.6	5.1
U.S.			
Rate	5.2	4.9	5.8

Labor Force Estimates for 2005, the Confluence of Change

In June, Indiana submitted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics revised estimates for January through May of 2005. These figures replaced earlier monthly estimates, reflecting the latest iteration of the 2004 benchmarked estimates and correcting some errors resulting from faulty ratios used as inputs. In July, Indiana submitted revised city-level estimates for January through June, incorporating a change to the production of city-level estimates. These labor force estimates, along with earlier, preliminary estimates for 2005, implemented a variety of changes discussed below, all designed to improve the quality and accuracy of our monthly estimates and of the re-estimated data for prior years.

“Normal” Benchmarking Revisions

In a normal year, the benchmarking process takes updated information into account, including such items as monthly claims data received after the estimates were completed and updated estimates of non-farm employment from the Current Employment Statistics program that include 6 months of universe employment data. These updated data inputs generally create some revisions to the previously-published monthly data in and of themselves.

Geographical Change: Adoption of the Redefined Metropolitan Statistical Areas

Effective with the 2005 estimates, the Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) program adopted changes to the composition of Indiana’s Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) that were announced by the Office of Management and Budget in the summer of 2003. Three new MSA’s were introduced – Anderson, Columbus and Michigan City – and most MSA’s had changes to the counties which compose them, either adding or dropping one or more counties. Historical data for the revised MSA definitions, incorporating the new modeling software and population controls discussed below will be available back to 2000 when all the benchmarking is completed.

Software Change: A New Generation Model

A third generation of the LAUS modeling software was introduced for 2005, after a period of dual estimation during 2004. This new software, while continuing the use of most state-specific inputs, allows for “real-time” benchmarking using employment and unemployment estimates from the national Current Population Survey (CPS). The monthly state estimates will be adjusted/forced to census-region totals derived from the national estimates, which use the CPS (a detailed, monthly telephone survey of participant households’ work or job-search activities) as their methodology. Individual state portions of the CPS survey results are inadequate to use as a single source in estimating the labor force; however, state CPS data are used as one component for monthly estimation in both the old and new models. This improvement to methodology is expected to result in smaller revisions to monthly state estimates.

Population Controls Change: Switch to 2000 Census Population Base

Estimates for 2005 (and benchmarked estimates for 2000-2004) reflect a change to 2000 as the base year in defining the population for the state, MSAs, counties and cities. The population, and the ratio of employment to population, derived from the census are key inputs in monthly estimate processing. 1990 census data, supplemented by interim estimates, were used as inputs from 1995 to 2004.

City Estimates: A New Approach to City-Level Unemployment Estimates

Beginning with the revised Labor Force estimates released in August for the months of January through June of 2005, a change will be introduced in the computation of unemployment estimates for cities (with populations over 25,000). Previously, unemployment estimates for cities were based in large part on a city's "share" of the county's unemployment, as *enumerated during the decennial census*. Monthly unemployment estimates were computed at the county level, and the pro-rata share based on the census data was then applied to that unemployment estimate to arrive at a city-level estimate. Like so:

county unemployment estimate * census share for city = unemployment estimate for city

However, there are problems with this approach. If a city's share of the unemployment was disproportionately high during the census for some reason (e.g. recent closing of a significant employer, etc.) the city will be "stuck" with that share of the county's total unemployment *until the next census*, regardless of how the actual distribution of unemployment between the city and the balance of the county might change during that decade. An additional issue involves the time lag between the actual census and the introduction of census-share ratios for the cities into the modeling software, which might take three to five years.

To respond to this shortcoming, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), which funds and oversees the production of Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) estimates, developed an alternate methodology, which Indiana is adopting with these revised estimates. A Residency Assignment System (RAS) maintained by BLS geo-codes (i.e. assigns longitude and latitude) Unemployment Insurance (UI) claims records based on the claimant address, and assigns place codes based on that "rooftop" mapping of the address. If the address falls within a designated city based on that geo-coding, the city's place code is appended to the record; if the address falls outside the city's defined limits, no city code is added -- although **both** sets of records will be included in the county's UI claims for the period. In considering the city's unemployment claims for the period in question, *only the records coded for the city* will be included. For example: county claims for Floyd County would include all claims records coded for that county, but claims for New Albany would have an additional place code, allowing us to identify those records and arrive at a separate claims count for New Albany. In the case of a county with multiple large cities for which estimates are produced (e.g. Lake County), each city's claims are coded separately.

This new approach has the obvious advantage of reflecting month-to-month changes to the distribution of unemployment claims activity between the city -- or cities -- and the balance of the county (see example using Lake County's city estimates below). It should be noted that the claims counts for cities and counties, while a significant factor, constitute *only one of several* model inputs used in arriving at unemployment estimates. Some cities will see shifts in their unemployment rates with the 2005 estimates compared to the 2000-2004 benchmarked estimates, which employed the "old" methodology, and may experience more month-to-month volatility in their unemployment estimates. For example, some cities may see higher unemployment estimates in January than the county as a whole, since retail establishments tend to be concentrated in urban areas, and post-holiday layoffs may be more frequent among city residents based on proximity to those workplaces. In general, the new methodology will provide more accurate, current estimates for cities' labor force components utilizing current UI claims activity, rather than a static snapshot of unemployment ratios from half a decade ago.

Lake County's City Estimates -- Old and New Methodology

CITY	MONTH	<i>Claims Disag</i>		<i>Census-Share</i>	
		UNEM- PLOYED	RATE	UNEM- PLOYED	RATE
East Chicago	Jan-05	1010	9.5	1630	14.0
Gary	Jan-05	3210	8.8	5420	13.5
Hammond	Jan-05	2710	7.8	2840	7.8
Hobart	Jan-05	930	7.0	570	4.6
Merrillville	Jan-05	930	5.9	580	3.8
Schererville	Jan-05	640	4.5	330	2.5

In the case of Lake County, the distribution of unemployment has shifted somewhat since the 2000 census. The new approach captures the fact that Gary and East Chicago now have a smaller proportion of the county's total unemployment than they did in 2000, while unemployment in some other cities within the county has increased.

Indianapolis, A Tale of Two Cities, Or At Least Two City Estimates

When someone says “Indianapolis” we typically believe we know what/where they are talking about -- although there are cities named Indianapolis in both Iowa and Oklahoma. But in the wonderful world of geo-political definitions, the answers are sometimes not that straightforward. The Indiana Department of Workforce Development has actually been producing two estimates for Indianapolis for some years: one for the consolidated city (think Unigov) and one for the “remainder” or “balance”, without the additional city entities that were aggregated with the former City of Indianapolis in creating the consolidated city back in 1970. Clermont, Crow’s Nest, Cumberland, Homecroft, Meridian Hills, North Crow’s Nest, Rocky Ripple, Spring Hill, Warren Park, Williams Creek and Wynnedale each have their own boundaries (defined by longitude and latitude) for geo-coding/mapping purposes, apart from the “core city” of Indianapolis, and their own population estimates from each Census. The labor force estimates that the department has been publishing heretofore were actually for the “core” city of Indianapolis and do not include employment or unemployment for those additional cities. Estimates for both the core and the consolidated city have been generated and supplied to the Bureau of Labor Statistics on a monthly basis, and were and are available from their website (<http://data.bls.gov/PDQ/outside.jsp?survey=la>). Effective with our June estimates, however, the Department of Workforce Development will begin publishing both the core and the consolidated city estimates on a regular basis. The core city figures will be labeled as “Indianapolis (core)” and these estimates will be consistent in scope with previously published estimates for Indianapolis. The broader definition/consolidated city will be labeled “Indianapolis (cons)”. The population difference between the two city definitions is not large; it works out to about 10,000 people added to the 2000 census population of the core city of about 782,000. The differences between the employment and unemployment estimates for the two definitions will, therefore, be fairly small in relation to the city’s total labor force. When ranking cities based on unemployment rate, we will continue to use the “core” city, as in the past, and exclude the consolidated city. The additional data series is basically being provided as a convenience for our users who may wish to use the more comprehensive definition of the city. Please contact the Research and Analysis group of the Department of Workforce Development with any questions.

LABOR FORCE ESTIMATES

CPS BENCHMARK: 2004

§ § § §

EMPLOYMENT BENCHMARK: 2004

THESE ESTIMATES ARE PREPARED IN COOPERATION WITH THE U. S. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS (BLS) AND HAVE BEEN ADJUSTED TO THE CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY (CPS) FOR USE IN ALLOCATING FEDERAL FUNDS. BECAUSE OF IRREGULAR FLUCTUATIONS IN MONTH TO MONTH CHANGES, THE READER SHOULD USE CAUTION WHEN VIEWING THESE ESTIMATES AS INDICATORS OF ECONOMIC CHANGE.

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>Seasonally Adjusted RATE</u>
U.S.					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	150,327,000	142,456,000	7,870,000	5.2	5.0
May 2005 (Revised)	148,878,000	141,591,000	7,287,000	4.9	5.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	148,478,000	139,861,000	8,616,000	5.8	5.6
INDIANA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	3,233,600	3,069,900	163,700	5.1	5.1
May 2005 (Revised)	3,214,000	3,065,700	148,300	4.6	4.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	3,207,200	3,042,400	164,800	5.1	5.1
<u>METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS</u>					
ANDERSON MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	64,900	60,960	3,940	6.1	
May 2005 (Revised)	64,190	60,820	3,370	5.2	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	63,940	60,330	3,610	5.6	
BLOOMINGTON MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	93,100	88,340	4,760	5.1	
May 2005 (Revised)	91,950	87,620	4,330	4.7	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	92,270	88,060	4,210	4.6	
COLUMBUS MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	37,300	35,500	1,800	4.8	
May 2005 (Revised)	37,290	35,650	1,640	4.4	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	36,680	35,160	1,520	4.1	
ELKHART-GOSHEN MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	103,310	98,810	4,500	4.4	
May 2005 (Revised)	102,290	98,420	3,870	3.8	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	102,500	98,430	4,070	4.0	
EVANSVILLE MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	184,270	175,110	9,160	5.0	
May 2005 (Revised)	182,940	174,690	8,250	4.5	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	182,560	173,860	8,700	4.8	
FORT WAYNE MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	213,820	203,550	10,270	4.8	
May 2005 (Revised)	211,410	202,070	9,340	4.4	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	211,900	201,120	10,780	5.1	
GARY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	330,010	312,040	17,970	5.4	
May 2005 (Revised)	326,230	309,870	16,360	5.0	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	327,840	308,350	19,490	5.9	
INDIANAPOLIS MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	892,780	852,320	40,460	4.5	
May 2005 (Revised)	882,470	845,760	36,710	4.2	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	879,680	839,980	39,700	4.5	
KOKOMO MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	47,480	44,760	2,720	5.7	
May 2005 (Revised)	47,690	45,150	2,540	5.3	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	47,590	44,830	2,760	5.8	
LAFAYETTE MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	91,200	87,000	4,200	4.6	
May 2005 (Revised)	94,170	90,370	3,800	4.0	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	89,760	85,450	4,310	4.8	
MICHIGAN CITY MSA					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	53,870	50,940	2,930	5.4	
May 2005 (Revised)	53,490	50,770	2,720	5.1	
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	53,760	50,640	3,120	5.8	

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
MUNCIE MSA				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	55,700	52,240	3,460	6.2
May 2005 (Revised)	57,500	54,240	3,260	5.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	56,410	53,130	3,280	5.8
SOUTH BEND MSA				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	165,690	157,630	8,060	4.9
May 2005 (Revised)	164,610	157,110	7,500	4.6
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	161,970	154,050	7,920	4.9
TERRE HAUTE MSA				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	81,070	75,840	5,230	6.4
May 2005 (Revised)	81,900	76,990	4,910	6.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	80,970	75,310	5,660	7.0
<u>COUNTIES</u>				
ADAMS				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,100	16,370	730	4.3
May 2005 (Revised)	16,880	16,220	660	3.9
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	16,890	16,220	670	3.9
ALLEN (FORT WAYNE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	181,040	172,220	8,820	4.9
May 2005 (Revised)	179,040	170,970	8,070	4.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	179,290	170,160	9,130	5.1
BARTHOLOMEW (COLUMBUS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	37,300	35,500	1,800	4.8
May 2005 (Revised)	37,290	35,650	1,640	4.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	36,680	35,160	1,520	4.1
BENTON (LAFAYETTE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	4,495	4,260	235	5.2
May 2005 (Revised)	4,635	4,425	210	4.6
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	4,430	4,185	245	5.5
BLACKFORD				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	6,555	6,125	430	6.6
May 2005 (Revised)	6,705	6,320	385	5.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	6,635	6,175	460	6.9
BOONE (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	26,910	25,960	950	3.5
May 2005 (Revised)	26,660	25,760	900	3.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	26,500	25,580	920	3.5
BROWN (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	8,430	8,015	415	4.9
May 2005 (Revised)	8,315	7,955	360	4.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	8,245	7,900	345	4.2
CARROLL (LAFAYETTE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	10,090	9,620	470	4.6
May 2005 (Revised)	10,450	9,990	460	4.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	9,950	9,450	500	5.0
CASS				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	19,860	18,840	1,020	5.2
May 2005 (Revised)	19,900	18,980	920	4.6
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	20,150	18,870	1,280	6.4
CLARK (LOUISVILLE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	54,210	51,520	2,690	5.0
May 2005 (Revised)	53,280	50,880	2,400	4.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	53,760	50,850	2,910	5.4
CLAY (TERRE HAUTE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	13,070	12,230	840	6.5
May 2005 (Revised)	13,140	12,410	730	5.6
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	12,940	12,140	800	6.2
CLINTON				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	16,930	16,070	860	5.1
May 2005 (Revised)	16,950	16,140	810	4.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	16,990	16,070	920	5.4

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
CRAWFORD				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	5,430	5,110	320	5.9
May 2005 (Revised)	5,515	5,230	285	5.2
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	5,425	5,100	325	6.0
DAVISS				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	14,490	13,910	580	4.0
May 2005 (Revised)	14,730	14,220	510	3.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	14,450	13,880	570	3.9
DEARBORN (CINCINNATI MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	26,370	24,870	1,500	5.7
May 2005 (Revised)	25,790	24,670	1,120	4.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	26,240	24,760	1,480	5.6
DECATUR				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	12,790	12,180	610	4.8
May 2005 (Revised)	12,750	12,190	560	4.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	12,810	12,120	690	5.4
DEKALB				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	22,410	21,110	1,300	5.8
May 2005 (Revised)	22,260	21,100	1,160	5.2
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	22,250	21,130	1,120	5.0
DELAWARE (MUNCIE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	55,700	52,240	3,460	6.2
May 2005 (Revised)	57,500	54,240	3,260	5.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	56,410	53,130	3,280	5.8
DUBOIS				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	22,430	21,590	840	3.7
May 2005 (Revised)	22,320	21,570	750	3.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	22,250	21,460	790	3.5
ELKHART (ELKHART-GOSHEN)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	103,310	98,810	4,500	4.4
May 2005 (Revised)	102,290	98,420	3,870	3.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	102,500	98,430	4,070	4.0
FAYETTE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	11,190	10,340	850	7.6
May 2005 (Revised)	11,450	10,630	820	7.2
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	11,260	10,380	880	7.8
FLOYD (LOUISVILLE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	38,370	36,520	1,850	4.8
May 2005 (Revised)	37,780	36,070	1,710	4.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	38,060	36,050	2,010	5.3
FOUNTAIN				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	8,515	8,055	460	5.4
May 2005 (Revised)	8,610	8,205	405	4.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	8,485	8,010	475	5.6
FRANKLIN (CINCINNATI MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	12,100	11,390	710	5.9
May 2005 (Revised)	11,970	11,300	670	5.6
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	12,030	11,340	690	5.7
FULTON				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	10,600	10,100	500	4.7
May 2005 (Revised)	10,540	10,080	460	4.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	10,440	9,880	560	5.4
GIBSON (EVANSVILLE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,420	16,590	830	4.8
May 2005 (Revised)	17,250	16,540	710	4.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	17,290	16,440	850	4.9
GRANT				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	33,370	30,720	2,650	7.9
May 2005 (Revised)	33,340	30,840	2,500	7.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	34,420	31,940	2,480	7.2

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
GREENE (BLOOMINGTON MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	16,080	15,090	990	6.1
May 2005 (Revised)	15,890	14,980	910	5.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	15,920	15,050	870	5.5
HAMILTON (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	123,290	119,400	3,890	3.2
May 2005 (Revised)	121,960	118,480	3,480	2.9
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	121,390	117,670	3,720	3.1
HANCOCK (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	33,850	32,600	1,250	3.7
May 2005 (Revised)	33,500	32,340	1,160	3.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	33,350	32,130	1,220	3.7
HARRISON (LOUISVILLE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	19,490	18,540	950	4.9
May 2005 (Revised)	19,180	18,310	870	4.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	19,320	18,300	1,020	5.3
HENDRICKS (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	67,620	65,250	2,370	3.5
May 2005 (Revised)	66,910	64,750	2,160	3.2
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	66,580	64,310	2,270	3.4
HENRY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	24,020	22,580	1,440	6.0
May 2005 (Revised)	24,010	22,690	1,320	5.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	23,480	21,750	1,730	7.4
HOWARD (KOKOMO MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	39,300	37,030	2,270	5.8
May 2005 (Revised)	39,460	37,350	2,110	5.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	39,480	37,090	2,390	6.1
HUNTINGTON				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	20,970	19,920	1,050	5.0
May 2005 (Revised)	20,880	19,940	940	4.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	20,900	19,830	1,070	5.1
JACKSON				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	22,660	21,630	1,030	4.6
May 2005 (Revised)	22,410	21,490	920	4.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	22,450	21,420	1,030	4.6
JASPER (GARY)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	15,110	14,360	750	5.0
May 2005 (Revised)	14,940	14,250	690	4.6
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	15,060	14,180	880	5.8
JAY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	10,970	10,400	570	5.2
May 2005 (Revised)	10,880	10,350	530	4.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	10,820	10,210	610	5.7
JEFFERSON				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,460	16,590	870	5.0
May 2005 (Revised)	17,710	16,920	790	4.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	17,440	16,660	780	4.5
JENNINGS				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	14,710	13,810	900	6.1
May 2005 (Revised)	14,580	13,720	860	5.9
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	14,370	13,630	740	5.2
JOHNSON (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	70,270	67,550	2,720	3.9
May 2005 (Revised)	69,580	67,030	2,550	3.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	69,240	66,570	2,670	3.9
KNOX				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	19,100	18,120	980	5.1
May 2005 (Revised)	19,190	18,360	830	4.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	19,030	18,130	900	4.7

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
KOSCIUSKO				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	40,750	39,120	1,630	4.0
May 2005 (Revised)	40,900	39,390	1,510	3.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	40,810	39,270	1,540	3.8
LAGRANGE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,500	16,690	810	4.6
May 2005 (Revised)	17,260	16,570	690	4.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	17,260	16,560	700	4.1
LAKE (GARY)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	227,670	214,280	13,390	5.9
May 2005 (Revised)	224,940	212,790	12,150	5.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	226,370	211,750	14,620	6.5
LA PORTE (MICHIGAN CITY MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	53,870	50,940	2,930	5.4
May 2005 (Revised)	53,490	50,770	2,720	5.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	53,760	50,640	3,120	5.8
LAWRENCE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	22,540	20,960	1,580	7.0
May 2005 (Revised)	22,420	20,890	1,530	6.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	23,380	21,870	1,510	6.5
MADISON (ANDERSON MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	64,900	60,960	3,940	6.1
May 2005 (Revised)	64,190	60,820	3,370	5.2
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	63,940	60,330	3,610	5.6
MARION (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	480,960	456,060	24,900	5.2
May 2005 (Revised)	475,260	452,550	22,710	4.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	474,480	449,450	25,030	5.3
MARSHALL				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	22,910	21,820	1,090	4.8
May 2005 (Revised)	22,960	21,960	1,000	4.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	22,820	21,680	1,140	5.0
MARTIN				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	5,205	4,950	255	4.9
May 2005 (Revised)	5,165	4,955	210	4.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	5,240	4,930	310	5.9
MIAMI				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,000	16,000	1,000	5.9
May 2005 (Revised)	17,450	16,500	950	5.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	17,150	16,040	1,110	6.5
MONROE (BLOOMINGTON MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	65,650	62,520	3,130	4.8
May 2005 (Revised)	64,810	62,000	2,810	4.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	65,080	62,320	2,760	4.2
MONTGOMERY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	20,360	19,450	910	4.5
May 2005 (Revised)	20,010	19,230	780	3.9
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	20,030	19,190	840	4.2
MORGAN (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	38,240	36,550	1,690	4.4
May 2005 (Revised)	37,770	36,270	1,500	4.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	37,560	36,020	1,540	4.1
NEWTON (GARY)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	7,180	6,845	335	4.7
May 2005 (Revised)	7,095	6,795	300	4.2
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	7,130	6,765	365	5.1
NOBLE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	24,100	22,730	1,370	5.7
May 2005 (Revised)	23,830	22,640	1,190	5.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	23,870	22,580	1,290	5.4

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
OHIO (CINCINNATI MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	3,135	2,985	150	4.9
May 2005 (Revised)	3,085	2,955	130	4.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	3,140	2,970	170	5.5
ORANGE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	8,960	8,375	585	6.5
May 2005 (Revised)	8,945	8,360	585	6.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	9,215	8,550	665	7.2
OWEN (BLOOMINGTON MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	11,370	10,730	640	5.6
May 2005 (Revised)	11,260	10,650	610	5.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	11,270	10,700	570	5.1
PARKE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	8,170	7,700	470	5.8
May 2005 (Revised)	8,165	7,730	435	5.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	8,115	7,675	440	5.4
PERRY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	10,140	9,570	570	5.6
May 2005 (Revised)	9,940	9,490	450	4.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	9,920	9,355	565	5.7
PIKE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	6,450	6,080	370	5.7
May 2005 (Revised)	6,375	6,075	300	4.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	6,420	6,050	370	5.8
PORTER (GARY)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	80,050	76,560	3,490	4.4
May 2005 (Revised)	79,260	76,030	3,230	4.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	79,280	75,660	3,620	4.6
POSEY (EVANSVILLE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	14,150	13,490	660	4.7
May 2005 (Revised)	13,980	13,450	530	3.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	14,020	13,360	660	4.7
PULASKI				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	7,090	6,760	330	4.7
May 2005 (Revised)	7,115	6,830	285	4.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	6,875	6,515	360	5.2
PUTNAM (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	18,560	17,330	1,230	6.6
May 2005 (Revised)	18,160	17,200	960	5.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	18,060	17,080	980	5.4
RANDOLPH				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	12,940	12,070	870	6.7
May 2005 (Revised)	13,020	12,200	820	6.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	13,170	12,260	910	6.9
RIPLEY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	15,460	14,740	720	4.7
May 2005 (Revised)	15,410	14,730	680	4.4
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	15,150	14,440	710	4.7
RUSH				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	9,420	8,990	430	4.6
May 2005 (Revised)	9,455	9,070	385	4.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	9,390	8,935	455	4.8
SAINT JOSEPH (SOUTH BEND MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	137,580	130,840	6,740	4.9
May 2005 (Revised)	136,420	130,290	6,130	4.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	135,000	128,260	6,740	5.0
SCOTT				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	11,510	10,870	640	5.5
May 2005 (Revised)	11,580	10,990	590	5.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	11,440	10,810	630	5.5

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
SHELBY (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	24,640	23,600	1,040	4.2
May 2005 (Revised)	24,370	23,420	950	3.9
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	24,280	23,260	1,020	4.2
SPENCER				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	11,260	10,640	620	5.5
May 2005 (Revised)	11,080	10,560	520	4.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	11,050	10,500	550	5.0
STARKE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	10,600	9,880	720	6.8
May 2005 (Revised)	10,630	10,020	610	5.8
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	10,640	9,910	730	6.8
STEUBEN				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,400	16,440	960	5.5
May 2005 (Revised)	17,360	16,470	890	5.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	17,440	16,490	950	5.5
SULLIVAN (TERRE HAUTE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	9,255	8,645	610	6.6
May 2005 (Revised)	9,365	8,775	590	6.3
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	9,210	8,590	620	6.8
SWITZERLAND				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	5,870	5,635	235	4.0
May 2005 (Revised)	5,870	5,665	205	3.5
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	5,865	5,615	250	4.2
TIPPECANOE (LAFAYETTE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	76,620	73,120	3,500	4.6
May 2005 (Revised)	79,080	75,950	3,130	4.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	75,380	71,810	3,570	4.7
TIPTON (KOKOMO MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	8,175	7,725	450	5.5
May 2005 (Revised)	8,225	7,795	430	5.2
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	8,115	7,740	375	4.6
UNION				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	3,875	3,685	190	4.9
May 2005 (Revised)	3,880	3,700	180	4.6
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	3,910	3,705	205	5.2
VANDERBURGH (EVANSVILLE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	92,620	87,850	4,770	5.2
May 2005 (Revised)	91,900	87,600	4,300	4.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	91,690	87,010	4,680	5.1
VERMILLION (TERRE HAUTE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	8,060	7,540	520	6.5
May 2005 (Revised)	8,140	7,655	485	6.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	8,100	7,490	610	7.6
VIGO (TERRE HAUTE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	50,690	47,440	3,250	6.4
May 2005 (Revised)	51,260	48,160	3,100	6.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	50,730	47,110	3,620	7.1
WABASH				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,750	16,640	1,110	6.2
May 2005 (Revised)	17,700	16,640	1,060	6.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	17,840	16,800	1,040	5.8
WARREN				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	4,510	4,320	190	4.3
May 2005 (Revised)	4,630	4,450	180	3.9
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	4,520	4,320	200	4.4
WARRICK (EVANSVILLE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	30,290	28,940	1,350	4.5
May 2005 (Revised)	30,030	28,860	1,170	3.9
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	29,970	28,670	1,300	4.3

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
WASHINGTON (LOUISVILLE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	14,290	13,540	750	5.3
May 2005 (Revised)	14,060	13,370	690	4.9
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	14,470	13,370	1,100	7.6
WAYNE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	33,180	31,000	2,180	6.6
May 2005 (Revised)	33,360	31,350	2,010	6.0
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	33,660	31,380	2,280	6.8
WELLS (FORT WAYNE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	15,090	14,450	640	4.2
May 2005 (Revised)	14,890	14,340	550	3.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	15,000	14,280	720	4.8
WHITE				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	12,600	11,960	640	5.1
May 2005 (Revised)	12,560	11,970	590	4.7
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	12,760	11,950	810	6.3
WHITLEY (FORT WAYNE MSA)				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,690	16,880	810	4.6
May 2005 (Revised)	17,480	16,760	720	4.1
June 2004 (Benchmarked)	17,620	16,680	940	5.3
<u>CITIES (Population over 25,000)</u>				
ANDERSON CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	28,400	26,400	2,000	7.0
May 2005 (Revised)	27,980	26,340	1,640	5.9
BLOOMINGTON CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	36,490	34,820	1,670	4.6
May 2005 (Revised)	36,080	34,530	1,550	4.3
CARMEL CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	23,460	22,770	690	2.9
May 2005 (Revised)	23,210	22,600	610	2.6
COLUMBUS CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	19,560	18,570	990	5.1
May 2005 (Revised)	19,530	18,640	890	4.6
EAST CHICAGO CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	11,110	10,020	1,090	9.8
May 2005 (Revised)	10,910	9,950	960	8.8
ELKHART CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	27,030	25,470	1,560	5.8
May 2005 (Revised)	26,740	25,370	1,370	5.1
EVANSVILLE CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	61,760	58,200	3,560	5.8
May 2005 (Revised)	61,290	58,040	3,250	5.3
FISHERS TOWN				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	29,980	29,160	820	2.7
May 2005 (Revised)	29,690	28,940	750	2.5
FORT WAYNE CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	114,030	108,150	5,880	5.2
May 2005 (Revised)	112,750	107,360	5,390	4.8
GARY CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	37,850	34,700	3,150	8.3
May 2005 (Revised)	37,160	34,460	2,700	7.3
GOSHEN CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	15,940	15,230	710	4.4
May 2005 (Revised)	15,760	15,170	590	3.7
GREENWOOD CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	23,250	22,350	900	3.9
May 2005 (Revised)	23,030	22,170	860	3.7
HAMMOND CITY				
June 2005 (Preliminary)	35,790	33,340	2,450	6.8
May 2005 (Revised)	35,350	33,110	2,240	6.3

HOBART CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	13,720	12,980	740	5.4	
May 2005 (Revised)	13,580	12,890	690	5.1	
INDIANAPOLIS CITY (CONS)					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	441,200	418,250	22,950	5.2	
May 2005 (Revised)	435,960	415,020	20,940	4.8	
INDIANAPOLIS CITY (CORE)					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	435,940	413,250	22,690	5.2	
May 2005 (Revised)	430,760	410,060	20,700	4.8	
JEFFERSONVILLE CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	15,120	14,370	750	5.0	
May 2005 (Revised)	14,880	14,190	690	4.6	
KOKOMO CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	21,270	19,830	1,440	6.8	
May 2005 (Revised)	21,350	20,000	1,350	6.3	
LAFAYETTE CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	31,870	30,300	1,570	4.9	
May 2005 (Revised)	32,910	31,470	1,440	4.4	
LAWRENCE TOWN					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	23,660	22,650	1,010	4.3	
May 2005 (Revised)	23,410	22,470	940	4.0	
MARION CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	13,120	11,920	1,200	9.1	
May 2005 (Revised)	13,060	11,960	1,100	8.4	
MERRILLVILLE TOWN					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	16,280	15,410	870	5.3	
May 2005 (Revised)	16,090	15,300	790	4.9	
MICHIGAN CITY CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	14,970	13,990	980	6.6	
May 2005 (Revised)	14,850	13,940	910	6.1	
MISHAWAKA CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	26,960	25,710	1,250	4.6	
May 2005 (Revised)	26,760	25,600	1,160	4.3	
MUNCIE CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	30,580	28,570	2,010	6.6	
May 2005 (Revised)	31,550	29,670	1,880	6.0	
NEW ALBANY CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	19,070	17,980	1,090	5.7	
May 2005 (Revised)	18,740	17,760	980	5.2	
NOBLESVILLE CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	18,840	18,090	750	4.0	
May 2005 (Revised)	18,600	17,950	650	3.5	
PORTAGE CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,620	16,740	880	5.0	
May 2005 (Revised)	17,450	16,630	820	4.7	
RICHMOND CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	17,250	16,040	1,210	7.0	
May 2005 (Revised)	17,340	16,220	1,120	6.5	
SCHERERVILLE TOWN					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	14,750	14,170	580	4.0	
May 2005 (Revised)	14,640	14,070	570	3.9	
SOUTH BEND CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	50,100	47,100	3,000	6.0	
May 2005 (Revised)	49,600	46,900	2,700	5.4	
TERRE HAUTE CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	26,830	24,910	1,920	7.2	
May 2005 (Revised)	27,110	25,290	1,820	6.7	
VALPARAISO CITY					
June 2005 (Preliminary)	14,950	14,320	630	4.2	
May 2005 (Revised)	14,780	14,210	570	3.8	

June 2005 (Preliminary)
May 2005 (Revised)

13,870
14,310

13,340
13,860

530
450

3.8
3.2

- NOTES: 1) UNEMPLOYMENT RATES ARE COMPUTED FROM UNROUNDED DATA.
2) COUNTY DATA MAY NOT ADD TO TOTALS DUE TO ROUNDING.
3) PRELIMINARY DATA WILL BE REVISED THE FOLLOWING MONTH.
4) CITY DATA IS USING A NEW METHODOLOGY, THEREFORE IT IS NOT COMPARABLE WITH 2004
5) INDIANAPOLIS CITY DATA IS NOW LISTED FOR THE INCORPORATED CITY (CORE) AND THE CONSOLIDATED CITY (CONS)

*Starting with January 2005 data, new MSA definitions are used. These will be revised back to 2000

*Also starting with January 2005, new methodology is being used. It will be used back to 2000

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
STRATEGIC RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT/RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
LOCAL AREA UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS (LAUS)
10 NORTH SENATE AVENUE PH: (317) 232-1748
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46204

To make changes to mailing list information
(add/drop/change contact)
Phone: 1-800-262-6949 or
email: cparker@dwd.in.gov



INDIANA
WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT

RANKING OF COUNTY DATA

FOR JUNE 2005 (PRELIMINARY)

PREPARED AUGUST 8, 2005

RANK	AREA	RATE	RANK	AREA	RATE
1	GRANT	7.9	47	CLARK	5.0
2	FAYETTE	7.6	48	HUNTINGTON	5.0
3	LAWRENCE	7.0	49	JASPER	5.0
4	STARKE	6.8	50	JEFFERSON	5.0
5	RANDOLPH	6.7	51	ALLEN	4.9
6	BLACKFORD	6.6	52	BROWN	4.9
7	PUTNAM	6.6	53	HARRISON	4.9
8	SULLIVAN	6.6	54	MARTIN	4.9
9	WAYNE	6.6	55	OHIO	4.9
10	CLAY	6.5	56	SAINT JOSEPH	4.9
11	ORANGE	6.5	57	UNION	4.9
12	VERMILLION	6.5	58	BARTHOLOMEW	4.8
13	VIGO	6.4	59	DECATUR	4.8
14	DELAWARE	6.2	60	FLOYD	4.8
15	WABASH	6.2	61	GIBSON	4.8
16	GREENE	6.1	62	MARSHALL	4.8
17	JENNINGS	6.1	63	MONROE	4.8
18	MADISON	6.1	64	FULTON	4.7
19	HENRY	6.0	65	NEWTON	4.7
20	CRAWFORD	5.9	66	POSEY	4.7
21	FRANKLIN	5.9	67	PULASKI	4.7
22	LAKE	5.9	68	RIPLEY	4.7
23	MIAMI	5.9	69	CARROLL	4.6
24	DEKALB	5.8	70	JACKSON	4.6
25	HOWARD	5.8	71	LAGRANGE	4.6
26	PARKE	5.8	72	RUSH	4.6
27	DEARBORN	5.7	73	TIPPECANOE	4.6
28	NOBLE	5.7	74	WHITLEY	4.6
29	PIKE	5.7	75	MONTGOMERY	4.5
30	OWEN	5.6	76	WARRICK	4.5
31	PERRY	5.6	77	ELKHART	4.4
32	SCOTT	5.5	78	MORGAN	4.4
33	SPENCER	5.5	79	PORTER	4.4
34	STEUBEN	5.5	80	ADAMS	4.3
35	TIPTON	5.5	81	WARREN	4.3
36	FOUNTAIN	5.4	82	SHELBY	4.2
37	LAPORTE	5.4	83	WELLS	4.2
38	WASHINGTON	5.3	84	DAVISS	4.0
39	BENTON	5.2	85	KOSCIUSKO	4.0
40	CASS	5.2	86	SWITZERLAND	4.0
41	JAY	5.2	87	JOHNSON	3.9
42	MARION	5.2	88	DUBOIS	3.7
43	VANDERBURGH	5.2	89	HANCOCK	3.7
44	CLINTON	5.1	90	BOONE	3.5
45	KNOX	5.1	91	HENDRICKS	3.5
46	WHITE	5.1	92	HAMILTON	3.2
				INDIANA	5.1



RANKING OF COUNTY DATA

FOR MAY 2005 (REVISED)

PREPARED AUGUST 8, 2005

RANK	AREA	RATE	RANK	AREA	RATE
1	GRANT	7.5	47	CLARK	4.5
2	FAYETTE	7.2	48	FLOYD	4.5
3	LAWRENCE	6.8	49	HARRISON	4.5
4	ORANGE	6.5	50	HUNTINGTON	4.5
5	RANDOLPH	6.3	51	PERRY	4.5
6	SULLIVAN	6.3	52	SAINT JOSEPH	4.5
7	VIGO	6.1	53	BARTHOLOMEW	4.4
8	VERMILLION	6.0	54	CARROLL	4.4
9	WABASH	6.0	55	DEARBORN	4.4
10	WAYNE	6.0	56	DECATUR	4.4
11	JENNINGS	5.9	57	JEFFERSON	4.4
12	BLACKFORD	5.8	58	MARSHALL	4.4
13	GREENE	5.8	59	RIPLEY	4.4
14	STARKE	5.8	60	BROWN	4.3
15	DELAWARE	5.7	61	FULTON	4.3
16	CLAY	5.6	62	KNOX	4.3
17	FRANKLIN	5.6	63	MONROE	4.3
18	HENRY	5.5	64	NEWTON	4.2
19	LAKE	5.4	65	GIBSON	4.1
20	MIAMI	5.4	66	JACKSON	4.1
21	OWEN	5.4	67	OHIO	4.1
22	HOWARD	5.3	68	PORTER	4.1
23	PARKE	5.3	69	RUSH	4.1
24	PUTNAM	5.3	70	WHITLEY	4.1
25	CRAWFORD	5.2	71	LAGRANGE	4.0
26	DEKALB	5.2	72	MARTIN	4.0
27	MADISON	5.2	73	MORGAN	4.0
28	TIPTON	5.2	74	PULASKI	4.0
29	LAPORTE	5.1	75	TIPPECANOE	4.0
30	SCOTT	5.1	76	ADAMS	3.9
31	STEBEN	5.1	77	MONTGOMERY	3.9
32	NOBLE	5.0	78	SHELBY	3.9
33	WASHINGTON	4.9	79	WARREN	3.9
34	CLINTON	4.8	80	WARRICK	3.9
35	JAY	4.8	81	ELKHART	3.8
36	MARION	4.8	82	POSEY	3.8
37	FOUNTAIN	4.7	83	JOHNSON	3.7
38	PIKE	4.7	84	KOSCIUSKO	3.7
39	SPENCER	4.7	85	WELLS	3.7
40	VANDEBURGH	4.7	86	DAVISS	3.5
41	WHITE	4.7	87	SWITZERLAND	3.5
42	BENTON	4.6	88	BOONE	3.4
43	CASS	4.6	89	DUBOIS	3.4
44	JASPER	4.6	90	HANCOCK	3.4
45	UNION	4.6	91	HENDRICKS	3.2
46	ALLEN	4.5	92	HAMILTON	2.9
				INDIANA	4.6



Unemployment Rate

June 2005

