Home is Where the Heart Is
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James Truslow Adams coined the term ‘American Dream’ in 1931 by proclaiming it as a “dream of a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for everyone, with opportunity for each according to ability or achievement.” And, so it began. Decades later, people still reflect upon the American Dream, debating what it entails, how to achieve it, even who deserves to achieve it. Home ownership has become a proxy used to measure one’s success of attaining the American Dream.

Shortly after Adams coined the term, the federal government began creating acts, policies, programs, taxes to enable more people to achieve home ownership. President Roosevelt established the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) in 1934 where it provided federally backed insurance for long-term amortized mortgages. Fannie Mae was created in 1938 to buy FHA’s loans, thereby creating the secondary mortgage market. The home ownership rate in 1940 was 44 percent.

Several acts in the 1940s went on to popularize the goal of “a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family” with the House Act of 1949. The 1960s produced the Fair House Act; the 1970s was the birth of Freddie Mac and the Community Reinvestment Act; the 1980s introduced adjustable-rate mortgages; and the 1990s resulted in the National Affordable Act of 1990. By the near end of the 2004, the home ownership rate in 1940 was 44 percent.

Home ownership has been correlated to multiple social factors. Research has yielded results showing children of home owners have fewer socially deviant occurrences, higher test scores and graduation rates, and lower rates of teenage pregnancy. According to medical and social science literature, home ownership has higher, more positive effects in physical, mental and emotional health. More specifically, it is associated with higher household life satisfaction and happiness. A 1996 report by D. Balfour and J. Smith in the Journal of Urban Affairs found that their lower-income participants experienced an increase in self-esteem and personal security after purchasing their home.

Home owners are also more likely to be involved in their community than their renting counterparts. Multiple social capital indicators support this. Home owners have been found to have a higher voting rate than renters (69% vs. 44%). They have also been cited to have higher interests in recycling and more knowledgeable about local environmental concerns, as well as higher volunteer participation among local organizations than their renter counterparts as well.

With all the positive impacts research has shown correlated to home ownerships and its cornerstone within the American Dream, it was considered taboo and controversial when Andrew Oswald of Warwick University disclosed a negative sentiment related to home ownership in the late 1990s. He proposed that owning a home causes the owner reluctance to geographically move, resulting in a rigid labor market. Furthermore, he suggested the increase in home ownership is associated with a rise in unemployment. He believe people move to where there are jobs, but if people are tied down to a home and either choose not to or cannot afford to sell their home, they are not capable of moving to where the jobs are located. At the time, the idea challenged the heart of the American Dream to a point that most did not accept the idea. Critics still maintain that there are many things that could hinder a home owner from moving, such as childrens’ connections to schools and friends.
Highest and Lowest Home Ownership Rates from 2006 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, many economists and policy makers are reevaluating their stance on Oswald’s 1996 suggestion. The Home Ownership and Unemployment Rates table yields interesting results, especially when one digs deep into data. For instance, when the table is sorted by highest home ownership rates in 2009, most of the states at the top are in the middle of unemployment rankings, with several exceptions. Michigan has the fourth highest home ownership (73.2%), as well as the highest unemployment rate (13.3%). On the other hand, New Hampshire and Iowa also rate high with home ownership rates (72.5% and 72.1%, respectively), but have low unemployment rates (6.3% and 5.6%, respectively).

When you look at both rates and their ranks over the four-year period, contradictive results appear for the top three states of home ownership: Minnesota, Delaware, and West Virginia. In 2006, Minnesota was also the top ranked state with ownership rates, but was on the lower end of the unemployment rankings (18th at a 4.1% unemployment rate). Home ownership decreased enough to have a statistically significant difference between 2006 and 2009, but the unemployment rate nearly doubled to 8.1% - which moves them to the middle of the unemployment ranking in 2009. The same pattern occurs for Delaware, but with stronger numbers. In 2006, Delaware ranked second in home ownership rates at 74.4% with a ranking of 11th in the unemployment rate at 3.5%. By 2009, they continued to have the second highest home ownership rates (with a decreased rate change from 2006 not being statistically significant), but their unemployment number doubled in ranking (11th to 22nd) at an employment rate of 8.0%. On the other hand, West Virginia began and ended with the third highest home ownership rates, but their unemployment rankings improved. The rate itself almost doubled (4.5% in 2006 to 7.7% in 2009), but the state fared better than others despite their ownership rates.

One mechanism behind this interesting result could be found deeper in the data when one considers how much monthly income is spent upon mortgages and other home-related costs. As shown in the Income Percentages by State table, Minnesota and Delaware both saw gains in the percentage of income going to the mortgage and other home-related expensive between 2006 and 2009 at the highest category (35% or more); Delaware’s increase was statistically significant. West Virginia, on the other hand, saw a decrease, where 18.7% of home owners originally paid 35% or more of their monthly income to their mortgage and other home-related expenses in 2006. There was an increase in 2007, but by 2009, the category decreased to under the original number at 18.1%.

The United States’ home ownership rate in 2009 was 65.9%, a statistically significant decrease from 2006 at a 67.3% rate. There were 11 states that fell below the national average of home ownership rates, which are disclosed in the same Home Ownership and Unemployment Rates table. Worth noting, Alaska had one of the lowest home ownership rates, but one of the highest unemployment rates in 2006 (64.5%, ranked 45 and 6.5%, ranked 49, respectively). By 2009, their home ownership rates actually increased to 65.2% (statistically significant only when comparing 2007 to 2009; it is not statistically significant when comparing the rates to
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Nevada did not cope so well. They had a low home ownership rate both in 2006 and 2009 (47th at 62.0% and 47th at 59.3%, respectively – a statistical significant difference). Yet, their unemployment rate tripled and is currently one of the worst in the country (4.2% in 2006, 12.5% in 2009). Again, looking at how much of one’s monthly income is spent on the home’s mortgage and other expenses provide a more in-depth understanding. Almost 36 percent of home owners were paying 35% or more of their income on home expenses. The percentage went up to 39.0% in 2008, and back down to 36.9% in 2009, which is still higher than the 2006 level, but not at a statistically significant level. Home owners in the ‘less than 20%,’ ‘20 – 24.9%,’ and 25.0 – 29.9%’ decreased between 2006 and 2009. In other words, Nevada home owners were more likely to move up the percent of income going to home expense category than maintaining their level or decreasing their percentage.

Nebraska is above the national home ownership level with 67.2% of Nebraskans owning their home, either outright or through a mortgage. This rate is slightly lower than 2006, where 67.9% of Nebraskans owned their home. Home ownership actually went up in 2007, again in 2008, before it decreased in 2009. All the while maintaining a low unemployment rate. In 2006, Nebraska had the third lowest unemployment rate at 3.0%. The state lost ground in 2007 and 2008, where it ranked fourth with rates of 2.9% and 3.2%, respectively. However, in 2009, Nebraska ranked second with the lowest unemployment rate at 4.8%. While the unemployment rate has increased since 2006, it is much lower than most other states. Nebraskans have a fewer percent of home owners spending 35% or more of their monthly income on their home and other home expenses when compared to many of the other states. Only 19.7% of Nebraskans spent 35% or more in 2006 and that number decreased to 18.0% in 2009, a statistically significant decrease. The Nebraska 2009 level is similar to the West Virginia level, but Nebraska has fewer home owners than West Virginia that year (67.2% vs. 73.6%, respectively). Additionally, the 30.0% - 34.9% of income going to home related costs category also decreased. Most other states saw this category increase. Nebraska’s smaller categories increased between 2006 and 2009, while other states saw those same categories decrease. Collectively, Nebraskans may have a middle-of-the-range to the lower-range of home ownership rates, but those that do own homes have not seen an economic pinch, as a whole, like other states.

### Income Percentages by State

#### Housing Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1,093,358</td>
<td>1,116,157</td>
<td>1,108,614</td>
<td>1,116,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>168,172</td>
<td>166,834</td>
<td>168,321</td>
<td>158,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>273,706</td>
<td>288,621</td>
<td>276,800</td>
<td>272,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>104,447</td>
<td>108,237</td>
<td>106,322</td>
<td>102,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>438,249</td>
<td>440,127</td>
<td>443,761</td>
<td>451,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>310,066</td>
<td>317,280</td>
<td>309,992</td>
<td>307,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2009 estimates

* denotes statistical significance at the 90 percent confidence level that columns year to 2009 data

2006 to 2009. Furthermore, their unemployment stayed relatively steady between 2006 and 2009; it grew only 1.3% while many other states saw their unemployment rates double or triple. In 2009, Alaska ranked 21st (in the middle, on the lower end side) of the unemployment rankings.

Nevada did not cope so well. They had a low home ownership rate both...
Nebraska’s Private Sector Employment Performance Through Two Recessions

Dave Bauer, Research Analyst

Two eras of national economic recession occurred between 2001 and 2009. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER, www.nber.org), the “watchdog” of United States recessions, the 2001 recession ran for nine months from March to November of that year. The latest recession began in December 2007 and ended eighteen months later in June of 2009, according to the NBER.

In March 2001, at the start of the 2001 national recession, Nebraska’s total private sector employment was 724,864; an increase of 0.4% over the previous March. One year after the onset of the 2001 national recession Nebraska’s March employment numbers were down 1.8% and by March of 2003 they had dropped another 0.2%. By March of 2004 the state’s private sector showed a 0.7% employment gain over the previous March, but it wasn’t until 2005 that the state’s total employment numbers had progressed beyond its March 2001 numbers.

At the outset of the 2007 recession the state’s private sector employment had risen by 1.7% over the previous December, to 770,365. One year later the state’s job numbers dropped by 0.7% and by 2009 another 3.8%. The March 2009 job losses are symptoms of the December 2007 recession and the March 2010 losses are likely its carryover effects. Again, NBER said the December 2007 recession ended in June of 2009 and they declared no subsequent recession.

In 2001 Nebraska’s three largest industries, in order, were: Trade, Transportation and Utilities; Manufacturing; and Education and Health Services. At the onset of the March 2001 recession Manufacturing had already lost 1.7% of it employment since the previous March. By 2009 Manufacturing lost another 16% of its workforce, reducing it to the state’s fourth largest industry.
Between 2000 and 2004, Manufacturing’s employment steadily declined. Manufacturing employment held relatively stable from 2004 to 2008 and has shown declines since. Whether this trend continues into December won’t be evident until the data are released.

Employment in Education and Health Services in 2001 had increased by 3.8% over the previous March 2000 job numbers. In 2001 it was the state’s third largest employer. By 2009 its employment had grown by 19%, making it the state’s second largest industry.

In the 2000 to 2010 time frame the state’s Education and Health Services employment numbers peaked in March of 2010 with 119,388 jobs and its December and annual averages peaked in 2009 at 119,585 and 117,970, respectively. Employment for March and December and annual averages was lowest in 2000 at 94,489, 97,211 and 95,138 respectively.

Trade, Transportation and Utilities, Nebraska’s largest employer in 2001, remained so in 2009, though enough jobs were lost to drop it near its 2004 level.

During the 2000 to 2010 time frame Trade, Transportation, and Utilities’ March employment peaked in 2008 at 190,761, December in 2007 at 197,734 and its annual average in 2008 at 192,297. March employment troughed in 2003 at 181,365; the annual averages in 2002 at 184,475; and the December level was at its ten-year low in 2009 at 188,977. From 2001 to 2009, the time frame that includes the 2001 and 2007 recessions, the employment performance of each of the state’s industries was mixed. Other industries, besides Education and Health Services, showed distinct job gains. Natural Resources and Mining gained 11%. Construction, Financial Activities, and Leisure & Hospitality each gained 6%. Conversely, the Information industry dropped 32% and Other Services dropped 6%. Overall employment growth for all of Nebraska’s industries was a meager 1%.

To what degree the recessions hastened or constrained job growth or loss in the state’s industries isn’t certain. The periodic employment gains and losses at the state level appeared to track both recessions, as did the Trade, Transportation and Utilities industry. It appears job growth in the Education and Health Services industry and job losses in the Manufacturing industry were going to occur regardless of either recession. It takes a while for Nebraska to catch on to national recession events, and one year after the start of the March 2001 recession the state’s employment counts dropped significantly. Four years later it returned to the March 2001 level. The annual average employment followed the same pattern of decline and growth. If that employment recovery time were a rock-solid indicator of its future employment recovery time, Nebraska could expect to return to its peaked 2008 employment level by 2012.
This is part two of a three-part article. Last month’s article looked at Reapportionment. This month’s article focuses on the history of Redistricting. The final part in the three-part series next month will focus on the released local Census data for redistricting.

Introduction

Reapportionment is part one of redistributing U.S. House of Representative members. The next step is redistricting. It is as old as the reapportionment process, but has a much more complex history than apportionment; full of court rulings, politics, phases, and partnerships. The complexity behind the process remains even though Nebraska maintains its three U.S. House Representatives after the 2010 Census.

Redistricting History – Federal Level

As mentioned in last month’s article, redistricting is a state’s responsibility. It is a process where congressional and legislative boundaries are redrawn based upon population counts of the decennial census to ensure equal voting representation. Court systems, particularly federal courts, were unwilling to enter the discussion of redistricting because of their belief that redistricting was a state and political issue, not a judicial one. Likewise, state legislation throughout the country attempted to ignore the political battlefield. Ultimately, this inaction resulted in little changes to district boundaries, which forced courts to become involved.

The U.S. Supreme Court entered the politically charged redistricting topic in 1962 in Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186. A group of Tennessee voters said the lack of updated boundaries had deprived their constitutional right of equal protection of the law. The Court agreed, but did not provide any remedy as to how to solve the redistricting issue. It was not until the following year in Gray v. Sanders, 372 U.S. 368 (1963), that the Supreme Court provided a standard to states for congressional and legislative redistricting. Justice Douglas stated, “[t]he conception of political equality from the Declaration of Independence, to Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, to the Fifteenth, Seventeenth, and Nineteenth Amendments can mean only one things – one person, one vote.”

This ruling opened the door for U.S. Supreme Court to hear, and it did. Over the next two decades, cases were heard to help decipher what Justice Douglas meant when he stated ‘one person, one vote.’ The phrase (one person, one vote) was enunciated by the Court in Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533 (1964). In the end, the phrase has led the High Court to formulate two equal-population standards; one for congressional districts, the other for state legislative districts.

In reference to the congressional standards, the Court ruled in Wesbury v. Sanders, 376 U.S. 1 (1964), that a state’s congressional districts must be as nearly equal in population as practical. It later clarified this decision stating it meant the absolute mathematical equality. If a state...
fails to meet absolute mathematical equality, or as nearly equal in population as practical, the state must show how the mathematical variances were unavoidable, as well as justify them. Twenty years later, in *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725 (1983), reaffirmed there is not inequality too small to worry in redistricting congressional districts. The High Court developed a two-question test to determine if a state has complied with the U.S. Constitution when it comes to redistricting. It also recognized that state law might justify some population variance between congressional districts (i.e. respecting county boundaries, see below), but deemed it impossible to create a list of all possibilities of such examples.

The U.S. Supreme Court has impacted redistricting in two other notable cases related to redistricting, both involving race. While the term gerrymandering was coined from a law by the Massachusetts Governor in 1812, the first case seen by the High Court about the subject matter was not until 1993. Gerrymandering is the redistricting of a voting district in a way that specifically favors a group – e.g. a political party or racial group. In *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993), and *Miller v. Johnwson*, 515 U.S. 900 (1995), the Court specifically cited that a bizarre shape could be used to show circumstantial evidence that race was used to determine a rationale behind the redistricting. The Court developed "traditional districting principles" when it comes to those claiming gerrymandering allegations. These include: compactness, contiguity, preservation of political subdivision boundaries, preservation of communities of interest, preservation of the cores of prior districts, protection of incumbents, and compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. The former three factors are considered most important by the Court.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act enabled the federal government to oversee voter registration, outlawed discriminatory literacy tests, and expanded voting rights to "language minorities," or non-English speaking Americans. There are two principle sections within this Act: Sections 2 and 5. Section 5 specifically declares that certain states must receive federal preclearance, or approval, before changing their election laws. Most of these 16 states are located in the South. There are other states where only certain political subdivisions must receive precleared, including: South Dakota, Michigan, and New Hampshire, to name a few.

Nebraska is not included in Section 5. Section 2 is more detailed. It prohibits any state (or political subdivision) to allow a practice of any type denying one's right to vote based upon race, color, or language type of a minority group.

### Redistricting History – State Level

The Nebraska Constitution is silent when it comes to congressional redistricting. Article III, Section 5, does state to divide the districts into single-member districts in an "as nearly equal in population as may be and composed of contiguous and compact territory." It also states to follow county lines whenever practicable. This very specific phrase, whenever practicable, yielded multiple cases in Nebraska and U.S. Districts Courts. During the 1963 legislative session, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Wesbury v. Sanders, U.S. Supreme Court (mathematical equality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Nebraska's first redistricting plan is ruled unconstitutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Voting Acts of 1965 enacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1965</td>
<td>Court states the redistricting is still unconstitutional; Nebraska Legislature must resolve the issue or elections will be held at large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1965</td>
<td>Sen. Carpenter files a judgment petition in Nebraska Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Nebraska submits 2nd redistricting plan to U.S. District Court for League of Nebraska Municipalities v. Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1965</td>
<td>Nebraska adopts 3rd redistricting plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legislature created its redistricting plan with a formula giving 20 percent weight to an “area” when establishing district boundaries. Under this plan, the state’s district number increases from 43 to 49 where district populations ranged from 21,703 in District 43 – Sheridan, Cherry, and Brown Counties – to 35,757 in District 35 – Hall County. A lawsuit was filed challenging the constitutionality of this plan. The timing of this lawsuit occurred simultaneously with the ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling in *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964), where it reaffirmed the “one person, one vote” concept.

As a result, the Nebraska lawsuit filed in 1963 was ruled to be unconstitutional in *League of Nebraska Municipalities v. Marsh*, 232 F.Supp. 411 (1964). It was cited that the “area” amendment violated the Equal Protection Clause in accordance to *Reynolds v. Sims*. It took the Nebraska Legislature three attempts of redistricts, and several additional lawsuits, to remedy the redistricting plan. In the end, both the Nebraska Supreme Court and the U.S. District Court upheld the third redistricting plan allowing the redistricting process to cross county lines to create an area because of the state’s constitutional amendment.

For the next two decades, there were no constitutional challenges to the legislature’s redistricting plans. That changed after the 1990 Census. The Legislature devised a redistricting plan where it divided Madison County between two legislative districts. The citizens of Madison County filed suit challenging the constitutionality, where the case ended in the Nebraska Supreme Court. The Court ruled in *Day v. Nelson*, 240 Neb. 997 (1992), that the division was unnecessary and unconstitutional; sending the Legislature into a special session to revise such plan. As a result, the two top vote receivers from the primary were disqualified. They filed suit for their constitutional rights being violated. Quite importantly, the Nebraska Supreme Court upheld the second redistricting plan as constitutional and stated that the top two vote receivers’ rights were not violated in *Pick v. Nelson*, 247 Neb. 487 (1995). Rather, the second bill (LB 7) merely delayed the plaintiffs’ ability to vote and run for office. It did not hinder them. The importance of this ruling is if a redistricting bill is challenged in court, it does not necessarily equate to a citizen’s violation of rights should they seek to run for office.

The redistricting plan in 2001, LB 852, was also challenged, but was dismissed without prejudice in 2003.

### The 2010 Census Redistricting Data Program

Redistricting occurs within two years of decennial census, but the planning of it occurs years before the decennial census even occurs. Congress enacted Public Law 94-171 in 1975 stating the U.S. Census Bureau is responsible for providing state legislatures census population tabulations for small areas to complete legislative redistricting. Further, it states it must issue technical criteria for definition of a state’s small areas at a specific time (April 1, 2006, for the 2010 Census). The small areas include census block boundaries, voting districts, and state legislative districts. States could voluntarily provide the Census with their definitions of these small areas.
Phase I (of the Census’s Five-Phase Program), occurring between 2005 and 2006, allowed states to provide the Census with their legislative district plans, codes, and names. The Census verified the information before moving into Phase II, occurring between 2007 and 2009. In this stage, states provided their voting district plans, codes, and names and verification occurs. Phase III, occurring between 2010 and 2011, has the Census collecting data and delivering the local data to each state per their boundary recommendations. This is the stage states and the Census is currently in. Beginning in 2012, the Census Bureau will collect each state’s legislative and congressional district plan created from Phase III. They adjust the geographical base and provide the updated information, as required by law, to the U.S. Postal Service, the Department of Justice, and the U.S. Congress. Phase IV is expected to be complete in 2013. The final phase, Phase V, occurs between 2012 and 2014. Under P.L. 94-171, the Census Bureau must publish a summary of successes and failures of the redistricting process with the feedback from states. This is considered the evaluation and recommendation phase that prepares for Census 2020.

*Nebraska Redistricting Committee*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Congressional District</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Represents</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Avery</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Conrad</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Langemeier</td>
<td>Schyuler</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Congressional District</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Represents</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Nelson</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Lautenbaugh</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Mello</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Congressional District</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Represents</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deb Rischer</td>
<td>Valentine</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Schilz</td>
<td>Ogallala</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Dubas</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2010 Census Redistricting Data Summary Files*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Data Tabulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Population by Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Population by Hispanic or Latino and not Hispanic or Latino by Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Population by Race for the Population of 18 Years and Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Population by Hispanic or Latino and not Hispanic or Latino by Race for the Population of 18 Years and Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Occupancy Status (Housing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The Nebraska Legislature announced at the beginning of February which lawmakers will sit in on the Redistricting Committee as adopted by Rule 3, Section 6 in 2008. This same rule established that the Committee is a nine member committee made up by three members from each congressional district. No more than five of these members may be affiliated with the same political party. The members making up the 2011 Redistricting Committee can be found in the Nebraska Redistricting Committee Table. This committee will work together to create boundaries for multiple entities, including: U.S. House Representatives, Nebraska legislative districts, the Public Service Commission, the State Board of Education, the Board of Regents, and the Supreme Court. The Nebraska Constitution states in Article III, Section 8, that redistricting must be completed at least one year prior to the next general election as to allow future potential candidates to reside in the new district for a year. This asserts the deadline to be November 6, 2011.

On the surface, redistricting seems to be a simple arrangement of boundaries. Not only is there much preparation before redistricting data is even released, there continues to be a large workload at the federal level after the state completes the redistricting process! This is only at the federal level. Getting back to the state level, much work is done to ensure the most equitable redistribution of district boundaries as possible. Nebraska received their local Census data on March 2, 2011. The data came in five tables. The 2010 Census Redistricting Data Summary Files table is an overview of what data is included in these tables. Next month’s Census column will examine these figures and its impact on redistricting.
The above map shows Nebraska counties colored by what each county’s employment did over the last two decades.

Thirty-one Nebraska counties, showed an increase in employment from 1991 through 2000, and a decrease in employment from 2001 through 2010. Hayes, Cheyenne, and Arthur counties showed the three biggest swings with 21.4%, 23.9%, and 22.8% increases in the 90’s respectively, and 22.7%, 16.9%, and 16.6% decreases in the 2000’s.

With less of a loss this decade were 26 counties who showed an increase in employment through the 1990’s and little to no change in the 2000’s.

Twelve of Nebraska’s counties showed significant growth through both decades. Sarpy lead the way with over a 55% increase across the two decades. Buffalo and Dawes counties were close behind with 34.9% and 32.5% increases respectively.

Only 5 counties showed a significant decrease in employment over both decades. Blaine, Greeley, Hitchcock, Keya Paha, and Sioux all had decreasing employment of more than 4% over the 90’s and the 2000’s. Blaine saw the largest decreases with around a 20% decline both decades.

Overall 61 of the state’s counties have seen an increase in employment over the past 20 years and Nebraska as a whole has seen just over an 18% increase in statewide employment.
Arbor Day originated in Nebraska City, Nebraska in 1872. J. Sterling Morton is the founder of Arbor Day. The first Arbor Day was held on April 10, 1872, where an estimated one million trees were planted that day.

The Arbor Day Foundation is a nonprofit conservation and education organization of nearly one million members, with a mission to inspire people to plant, celebrate and nurture trees. It began in 1972 to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the first Arbor Day.

Nebraska’s state tree is the Eastern Cottonwood and the state flower is the Goldenrod.

Trees strategically placed around a house can save up to 25% of energy use. Planting trees on the south and west sides of the house help keep it cooler in the summer and warmer in the winter.

In 2008, there were 284 Forest Conservation Technicians in Nebraska making, on average, $32,962 annually.

There were 30 tree farms and nurseries (North American Industry Classification System code 111421) in Nebraska in the 3rd Quarter of 2010, employing approximately 415 workers.

Nebraska has three areas designated as national forests: The Samuel R. McKelvie National Forest and the Bessie District and Pine Ridge District of the Nebraska National Forest system.

The Bessie District of the Nebraska National Forest is the largest human-planted forest in the United States and was originally begun as a national timber reserve.
There were 1,079 Central Community College graduates between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009. Of these graduates, 818 (76%) were working in Nebraska in the first quarter of 2010. In 2009, there were 79% and in 2008 there were 80% of the graduates working in the state. Slightly more than half (54%) of the graduates were female with 81% of the female graduates working in the state while 70% of male graduates were employed in the state. The percentage of males working in the state was down 6% from the previous year.

There was at least one graduate employed in 55 of the state’s 93 counties. Hall, Adams, and Platte counties had the highest numbers of graduates working in the counties.

There were 237 graduates in 24 degree/fields of study where 90% or more of the graduates working in the state. Within this group, the 13 Dental Hygiene Associate Degree graduates had the highest estimated average annual earnings of $40,998 followed by Registered Nursing with $37,222. Registered Nursing had the highest number of graduates within this group with 63 graduates; 59 of them were working in the state. Majors in technical and medical fields of study produced graduates with the highest wages. Associate Degree graduates in Machine Tool Technology had the highest estimated average annual wages of all fields of study with $45,101. There were eight fields of study/degrees with 158 graduates working in the state that had estimated wages above $30,000 per year.

The eight graduates employed in the Utilities industry had the highest estimated average annual earnings of $35,754, followed by the 116 graduates employed in Manufacturing with $35,431. The Health Care industry had the highest number, 210 of graduates working in the state with estimated average annual of $27,362.

For more outcomes information on Central Community College, Metropolitan Community College, Mid-Plains Community College, Northeast Community College, Southeast Community College, Western Nebraska Community College, Chadron State College, Peru State College, Wayne State College and the University of Nebraska – Kearney, contact the Nebraska Workforce Development Labor Market Information Center.
Economic Indicators of the Month

JOLTS

The Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey is conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The survey involves a monthly collection, analysis, and publication of job openings and labor turnover data. The data is collected from sampled establishments on a voluntary basis. It includes employment, job openings, hires, quits, layoffs and discharges, as well as other separations. JOLTS data helps measure the demand for labor by employers and track the health of the economy.

The number of unfilled jobs is used to calculate the job openings rate and is an important measure of the unmet demand for labor. With this statistic, it is possible to see a more thorough picture of the U.S. labor market, rather than by looking solely at the unemployment rate, which is a measure of the excess supply of labor.

Information on labor turnover is valuable in the analysis and interpretation of significant labor market developments and is a beneficial complement to the unemployment rate.

The job openings rate is calculated by taking the number of job openings and dividing it by the sum of total employment and job openings. Over the past decade the job openings rate has fluctuated between 3.7% in early 2001 and 1.8% in mid 2009. This means that toward the beginning of the decade nearly 4 out of one hundred jobs that employers wanted filled were still open, and that during the recession that number fell to less than 2 out of 100 jobs not being filled. As you can see this paints a bigger picture along with the unemployment rate of not just excess labor and excess jobs, but whether or not that available labor fits the available jobs.

Notes: Unemployment Rates are seasonally adjusted. DXY is the U.S. Dollar compared to a basket of international currencies. Retail Sales figures are in billions of dollars. Median Employment Wages are OES 50th percentile Annual Wage for All Occupations. Crude Oil Price is as of the close of business on the last Thursday of the month. Corn for Grain is based on the price per bushel. Cattle 500+ Lbs is price per cwt. ECI is Employer Cost Index. PPI is Producer Price Index. CPI is Consumer Price Index.

Sources: tradingeconomics.com, bls.gov, fhfa.gov, usda.gov, revenue.state.ne.us, oil-price.net
Continuing in the series of articles highlighting Nebraska’s Economic Regions, this month focuses on the Lincoln Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The Lincoln MSA includes the Nebraska counties of Lancaster and Seward.

Industry Projections
Projected industry growth of 20,719 jobs is expected in the Lincoln MSA by 2018 according to Industry Employment Projections, an increase of 10.9%. Most industry employment in 2008 was in Education and Health Services which employed 42,274 workers, accounting for 22.2% of employment in this region. This industry sector is also expected to experience the highest projected net change in employment by 2018 adding 6,324 jobs, a change of 15.0%. The Information industry employed the least number of workers in 2008, only accounting for 1.4% (2,667 jobs) of the employment in this region and is expected to decline by 9.7% (258 jobs). The fastest growing industry sectors by percent change are Construction at 18.0% adding 1,476 jobs and Education and Health Services at 15.0% adding 6,324 jobs. In addition to the projected decline in the Information industry, The Natural Resources and Mining industry is expected to decline by 8.8% and lose 240 jobs.

The top sub-sector growth industry from 2008-2018 (by numeric change in jobs) is Educational Services (Private, State, and Local) expecting to add 2,480 jobs, a 12.3% increase. The Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services industry is expected to add the second highest amount of jobs increasing by 21.4% and adding 1,919 jobs. Computer systems design, scientific research and design, and management and technical consulting services are all included in this category. As the demand for new technology increases so does the need for workers in these fields.

When examining the five industries expected to experience the greatest amount of decline (by numeric change in jobs) the manufacturing industries of Transportation Equipment and Plastic and Rubber Products are expected to lose the most jobs in the ten year period, a combined loss of 638 jobs. Rounding out the top declining industries list are Publishing Industries (except Internet), Crop Production, and Telecommunications.

### Industries with the Greatest Numeric Changes in Employment 2008-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Title</th>
<th>2008 Estimated Employment</th>
<th>2018 Projected Employment</th>
<th>Numeric Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services (private + state + local)</td>
<td>20,226</td>
<td>22,706</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, &amp; Technical Services</td>
<td>8,988</td>
<td>10,907</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>13,471</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Health Care Services</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>7,602</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Carriers &amp; Related Activities</td>
<td>8,170</td>
<td>9,172</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Equipment Manufacturing</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>-320</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics &amp; Rubber Products Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>-318</td>
<td>-28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Industries (except Internet)</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>-163</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Production</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>-159</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>-145</td>
<td>-18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupational Projections

Industry employment is an important component of the employment picture in a region. It is also important to examine the types of occupations that will experience growth and decline as a result of changes in industry employment throughout the State.

There is expected to be occupational growth in the Lincoln MSA according to the 2008-2018 Occupational Projections. The total projected numeric employment change over the ten year period is 20,719, a 10.9% increase. A total of 65,613 job openings are expected in the Lincoln MSA from 2008-2018, with 22,461 jobs expected from growth and 43,152 from replacements. Replacement openings account for 65.8% of all job openings. This mirrors the statewide trend and can in part be attributed to the high number of Nebraska workers reaching retirement age within the next 10 years.

In 2008, Office and Administrative Support occupations employed 32,291, making it the largest occupational category in the Lincoln MSA, accounting for 17.0% of the regions occupational employment. The largest net change in employment is also expected to occur in Office and Administrative Support occupations where 2,564 jobs are projected to be added by 2018, an increase of 7.9%. Computer and Mathematical occupations is the fastest growing occupational category by percent change adding 917 jobs, a 19.8% increase. Farming, Fishing, and Forestry occupations employed the least amount of workers in 2008, only employing 1,979 or 1.0% of the regions occupational employment. Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance occupations are expected to add the least number of jobs, only 242 jobs in the 10 year period, a 4.2% change. The only occupational category expecting a decline is Farming, Fishing and Forestry occupations by 158 jobs, a decrease of 8.0%.

The highest number of total job openings is expected in Office and Administrative Support occupations with 9,843 total openings-3,182 from job growth and 6,661 from replacements. Office and Administrative Support occupations are projected to have the most replacement openings with 6,661 or 67.7% of the 9,843 total job openings expected to come from replacements. Farming, Fishing, and Forestry occupations rank at the bottom with the 522 replacement openings, the least amount expected of all the occupational categories. However, this is the occupational group with the largest percentage of openings coming from replacements with 95.4% of the total openings expected to be due to replacements. The largest percentage of total openings attributed to growth is projected in Healthcare Support occupations where 64.0% (928) of the 1,451 total openings projected are to be from growth.

The five occupations expected to experience the greatest amount of decline by numeric change over the ten year period are: Telemarketers; Farmworkers and Laborers: Crop, Nursery, and Greenhouse; File Clerks; Order Clerks; and Computer Operators. Many of these occupations are in the Office and Administrative Support occupational category which is overall expected to increase. Increases in other occupations within this category such as Customer Service Representatives and General Office Clerks balance out the losses from these occupations.

A publication with more detail on both occupational and industry projections is published online at http://neworks.nebraska.gov/analyzer/. Look for additional articles spotlighting projections in upcoming issues of Nebraska Workforce Trends.

### Occupations with the Greatest Numeric Changes in Employment 2008-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOC Title</th>
<th>2008 Estimated Employment</th>
<th>2018 Projected Employment</th>
<th>Growth Openings</th>
<th>Replacement Openings</th>
<th>Total Openings</th>
<th>Numeric Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growing</td>
<td>8,427</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Drivers (Heavy &amp; Tractor-Trailer)</td>
<td>7,051</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Representatives</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Food Preparation &amp; Serving Workers, Including Fast Food</td>
<td>3,578</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>759</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Salespersons</td>
<td>6,172</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Clerks, General</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td>935</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmworkers &amp; Laborers, Crop, Nursery, &amp; Greenhouse</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>-145</td>
<td>-11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Clerks</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-111</td>
<td>-26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Clerks</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>-16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Operators</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>-174</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five occupations expected to experience the greatest amount of decline by numeric change over the ten year period are: Telemarketers; Farmworkers and Laborers: Crop, Nursery, and Greenhouse; File Clerks; Order Clerks; and Computer Operators. Many of these occupations are in the Office and Administrative Support occupational category which is overall expected to increase. Increases in other occupations within this category such as Customer Service Representatives and General Office Clerks balance out the losses from these occupations.
The Center for Public Affairs Research (CPAR) is an outreach unit of the University of Nebraska – Omaha’s College of Public Affairs and Community Service. They specifically focus on research and community outreach. CPAR is a lead agency for the Nebraska State Data Center Program, which is a cooperative program between the U.S. Census Bureau and individual states like Nebraska.

This partnership with the Census facilitates CPAR as a leading entity for releasing Census research studies within Nebraska, conducting Census workshops, and providing an overall understanding of Census information. As more Census 2010 data is released, CPAR is a resourceful tool to use to stay well-informed of Census releases.
Note: The following information is obtained through a monthly survey of Nebraska’s Career Center managers as well as news releases and newspaper articles. Openings and expansions that are not public knowledge or that were reported to Career Center managers in confidence are not listed. If you own or know of a business which is opening or expanding, please email Trevor. Nelson@nebraska.gov with your information.

Lincoln
• Fazoli’s, a quick-serve Italian restaurant, opened a new location on North 27th Street.
• The Egg and I, a restaurant specializing in breakfast menu items, opened in Clocktower Plaza at 70th and A streets.
• Burger King, located near 84th & O streets, recently opened.

Omaha
• All(N)1, a security service, opened an office in north Omaha and expects to hire 100 workers over the next three years.
• Cabela’s will be opening 45,000 square foot office in Omaha soon. The company is expected to hire 30 developers and database administrators.
• CVS Pharmacy opened two new stores in the Omaha area.
• CSI Inc., a security and surveillance firm formerly headquartered in Oklahoma, has opened a new office in Omaha in the past six months due to a sharp increase in local market share.
• New publicly announced projects include: Abundant Capital; Benco Dental Supply; Kosama (Douglas and Sarpy); Message Heights; Matador; Nebraska Wildlife Rehab; Panda Express; Spotless Janitorial.
• Retention and Expansion Projects include: Adams Painting Co; Allen Construction Services; Cargill; Marathon Ventures; Signature Performance; 97th Intelligence Squadron.
• According to the Omaha Chamber, the Omaha Economic Development project landed 16 new projects in the 4th quarter of last year resulting in 67 new and 57 retained jobs with $47.6 million in capital investment. The following openings and expansions have been reported by the Omaha Chamber of Commerce: TGI Friday’s, 20 employees; ShipCarsNow a used vehicle delivery company, 21 employees; Twin Peaks restaurant, 20 employees; Sol Cantina, 20 employees.

Nebraska City
• A sub contractor recently held a job fair in Nebraska City and hired over 100 people for temporary jobs for a local nuclear plant shutdown.

Norfolk
• Norfolk had two restaurants open during February – Jimmy Johns & TnT Sports Bar.

Alliance
• Pepsi is in the process of building a 62,000 square foot distribution center. The new site is expected to add five jobs to the area and be completed by mid summer.

Scottsbluff
• Regional West Medical Center started a $6 million construction project to expand the hospital’s MRI services.

Sidney
• Tyco Electronics has purchased ADC Digital Communications; currently looking for 22 new employees.
• Cabela’s has started adding many positions at the corporate level with the majority being in the computer IT/Development positions.
Statewide
Statewide, Non-farm employment estimates were 932,081 in February; 1,156 more jobs than last month and 12,193 more than in February 2010.

Manufacturing industries employed 92,599 workers; 428 more people than last month and 1,814 more than in February 2010.

Statewide, average weekly hours worked in manufacturing industries were 40.7 an increase of 0.2 hours since January, and an increase of 0.1 hours since February 2010. Average weekly earnings increased by $2.05 since January to $664.63, and have risen by $12.19 since February 2010.

Average hourly earnings in manufacturing industries of $16.33 were $0.03 lower than in January and $0.26 more than in February 2010.

Omaha MSA
Non-farm employment estimates were 448,550 in February 2011; 873 less jobs than last month and 2,438 more than in February 2010.

Lincoln MSA
Non-farm employment estimates were 169,446 in February 2011; 952 more jobs than last month and 824 more than in February 2010.

### February 2010 County Rates

#### County Rates

- 2.2 - 3.3%
- 3.4 - 4.2%
- 4.3 - 5.0%
- 5.1 - 6.2%
- 6.3 - 8.2%

### Labor Force Employment by Place of Residence:

**Nebraska (smoothed seasonally adjusted):**
- February unemployment rate: 4.3%
- Change (OTM): 4.3%
- Change (OTY): -0.7%

**Economic Regions (not seasonally adjusted):**
- Central: 4.1%
- Panhandle: 4.7%
- Mid Plains: 4.2%
- Southeast: 5.0%
- Northeast: 4.5%

**Revisions to January Data:**
- Unemployment rate: -0.3%
- Labor Force: -4,779
- Unemployment: -3,497
- Employment: -1,283
TOTAL NONFARM

Janet Oenbring

National

Nationally, over-the-month non-seasonally adjusted employment grew by 0.6% which is twice as strong as the past five years’ average of 0.3%. Since January, six industries increased, three remained stable, and only one decreased. Over-the-year employment rose by 1.0%, which is above the past five years’ average of -0.5%. This month’s highest over-the-year growth were in Professional and Business Services (2.7%), Other Services (2.3%), followed by Educational and Health Services (2.2%). The largest reductions were in Information (-1.7%) and Total Government (-1.2%).

Statewide

Over the past five years, Nebraska Nonfarm employment monthly February changes have ranged from -0.1% to 0.5%. This year from January to February, employment was basically unchanged at 932,081 (up 1,165 or 0.1%). Over-the-year employment in Total Nonfarm increased 1.3% which is notable compared to the past five years’ history of 0.1%. Professional and Business Services gained the most (4.8%), followed by Other Services (3.1%). The only loss below -0.5% was in Mining and Construction (-0.8%).

Lincoln

This month’s employment in the Lincoln MSA increased slightly by 952 jobs to 169,446 (0.6%). Over-the-year employment in February was up slightly (0.5%), which is similar to the five-year average growth of 0.4%. Employment percentage improved the most in Professional and Business Services (2.9%), as well as in Leisure and Hospitality (2.9%).

Omaha

From January 2011 to February 2011, the Omaha MSA employment remained steady at 488,550, which is slightly lower than the past five years’ average of 0.1%. Over the year, the 0.5% gain is better than the past five years’ average of 0.3%. The greatest percentage growth came from Other Services (3.9%), followed by Professional and Business Services (2.9%). The largest percentage decline was in Information (-5.8%).
MINING, LOGGING, AND CONSTRUCTION

Dave Bauer

Heavy and Civil Engineering is the sole statewide Construction industry with employment gains since January, up 2.8%. Nationally, both Heavy and Civil Engineering and Special Trade Contractors reported over-the-month gains of 0.4%. All statewide Construction industries are down for the year with Heavy and Civil Engineering jobs down 2.1%; nationally, it had the only Construction industry job gain with growth of 3.6%. Overall, both statewide and national Construction job levels are at ten-year lows, though the over-the-year job losses are much less severe than a year ago. The exception was national Heavy and Civil Engineering component industry with its over-the-year job gain.

MANUFACTURING

Janet Oenbring

Nationally, Manufacturing remained relatively even at 0.2%, which is better than the average monthly change of -0.4%. Over the year, it has advanced by 1.7%, which is a vast improvement from its average yearly decline of -4.3%. This was the fourth month of gains in an industry that had previously constantly posted over-the-year losses for the past five years.

Statewide Manufacturing employment posted a small increase (0.5%) at 92,599 in February which is higher than its history of remaining steady (0.0%). Over-the-year employment added 1,814 jobs (2.0%), contrary to the past five years’ average of -2.0%. Rolling over-the-year employment has not increased this much since January 2008.

In the Lincoln MSA, the Manufacturing monthly employment was steady (0.4%) with employment at 12,333; which is consistent with its historical average. Since February 2010, employment in Manufacturing increased by 244 (2.0%), going against its historical average of -3.8%. This is the third month in a row it has been above 1.0%. The last time Lincoln’s over-the-year manufacturing was close to 2.0% was in September 2006 (1.9%). In the Omaha MSA, February’s employment stayed even at 31,196 (0.2%), which is not far from normal for this month (-0.2%). The year-to-year employment change was 0.7% which is abnormal compared to its past five years’ average of -1.0%. This is the first time it has been higher than 0.5% since June 2008 (1.8%).

TRADE

Dave Bauer

In spite of statewide job losses since January in both Durable and Non-Durable Merchant Wholesalers, February employment figures represent a ten-year monthly low and high for both industries, respectively. Also, the wholesale trade industry is at a ten-year employment low in each of the Lincoln and Omaha MSAs. Nationally, Durable Goods Merchant Wholesalers held steady over the month. Since 2010, employment in national Durable Goods Merchant Wholesalers grew by 1.5% and Non-Durable Merchant Wholesalers grew by 0.6%.

Since January, statewide Retail Trade employment is down 1.8% with the brunt of the losses occurring in Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores (-3.0%), General Merchandise Stores (-3.5%), and Non-Store Retailers (-4.3%). Likewise, nationwide employment in those respective industries is down 3.4%, 2.2%, and 2.3%. Since a year ago, statewide Retail Trade jobs are up 0.5% while they are up 0.6% nationally. Since 2010, statewide Automobile Dealers is up 3.3%; nationally that employment is up 2.6%. Statewide job numbers in Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores increased by 4.3% over the year while they gained 4.4% nationally. General Merchandise Stores decreased jobs by 3.2% statewide but gained 0.9% nationally since last February. And, while Non-Store Retailers job numbers are up 11.7% statewide since last year, they are unchanged nationally.

TRANSPORTATION, WAREHOUSE, AND UTILITIES

Dave Bauer

Statewide Transportation and Warehousing jobs grew by 4.3% since a year ago with Rail Transportation experiencing a 5.4% rate of growth. Nationwide Transportation and Warehousing experienced a 2.6% rate of growth over the year with Rail Transportation gaining 3.9%.
loss of employment for the Omaha MSA. Omaha’s MSA had a reduction of 657 jobs, down 5.8% from this time last year. Nebraska is tracking national non-seasonally adjusted data.

FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES

Nancy Ritchie

Financial Activities employment remained stable in February with total employment of 67,913. Finance and Insurance was unchanged with employment of 59,310. The Real Estate and Rental and Leasing also remained constant with employment at 8,603. The Financial Activities sector employment is unchanged from February 2010.

Financial Activities was consistent over the month in the Lincoln MSA with total employment of 13,169. The Omaha MSA was steady in February with employment of 39,929.

Over the year, the Lincoln MSA expanded by 180 jobs (1.4%) since February 2010. The Omaha MSA lost 242 jobs (0.6%) in the same time frame.

Nebraska employment trends in the Financial Activities sector are currently stable over the month, as are the national numbers. Over the year, the national totals showed a 0.6% decrease while Nebraska’s numbers declined by -0.2%.

PROFESSIONAL AND BUSINESS SERVICES

Janet Oenbring

Nationally, since last month Professional and Business Services increased by 0.8%, higher than the past five years’ February average of 0.2%. The over-the-year employment growth of 2.7% is much higher than its past average of being stable (-0.1%). It has risen by 2.0% or more since October 2010. After a sizable decrease in January (-1.4%),
Statewide Professional and Business Services remained stable with February’s employment at 102,284 (-0.1%). Since last February, it has grown by 4.6%, which is notably higher than its historical average of 0.8%. Administrative and Waste Services have contributed to the majority of the increase over the year (10.3%).

In the Lincoln MSA, Professional and Business Services was unchanged (-0.3%) since January with employment of 17,557 in February. Since this time last year, this industry has expanded by 2.8%, above the past five years’ average of 0.2%. It has been up over the year by over 1.0% since May 2010. Since January, employment in the Omaha MSA fell by 0.5% to 62,487. Over the year, Professional and Business Services grew by 2.8%, which is the eighth month it has posted numbers higher than 1.0% over the year. The majority of the gain came from Administrative and Waste Services (8.1%).

EDUCATION AND HEALTH SERVICES

Statewide, Educational and Health Services reported an increase in February with total employment of 136,699. Over the year, this industry experienced healthy growth of 1,466 jobs (1.1%). Educational Services employment expanded in February with 18,376 jobs (6.1%). Over the year, jobs rose by 461 (2.6%). Health Care and Social Assistance was unchanged with employment of 118,323 in February. There was an increase of 1,005 (0.9%) since February 2010.

Education and Health Services in the Lincoln MSA had a healthy gain with total employment of 25,404 (1.1%). Over the year, the Lincoln MSA contracted by 710 jobs (2.7%). The Omaha MSA was consistent with 70,018 total jobs. Since February of last year, employment has been stable. The national levels of employment increased 1.3% in February, while Nebraska employment in this sector expanded by 1.1%. Over the year the national employment rose by 2.2% and the Nebraska employment rose by 0.7% in Education and Health Services.

LEISURE AND HOSPITALITY

Statewide, Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation employment increased in February; a gain of 203 jobs. The majority of the job growth can be attributed to the Performing Arts and Spectator Sports industry. Overall, the Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation industries total employment is lower (-2.8%) from what was reported last year.

Statewide, Accommodation and Food Services experienced a decrease of 91 jobs over the month. Employment was unchanged under the Accommodations sector while the Food Services and Drinking Places sector dropped 105. Jobs within this industry are up substantially from this time last year; the addition of 1,162 jobs puts employment 1.8% higher than a year ago. The increase of employment occurred within the Food Services and Drinking Places industries. Full Service Restaurants is the only subsector that achieved an over-the-month and over-the-year increase in jobs. The Limited Service Eating Places subsector, which lost 804 jobs over the month, has 1,008 more jobs now than a year ago at this time.

The Lincoln MSA’s Accommodation and Food Services employment was unchanged over the month. Leisure and Hospitality industry is higher than last year by 1.2%. Employment levels are up 0.4% for the Omaha MSA, while over-the-year figures are 0.2% lower. The over-the-month gain in employment occurred within the Accommodation and Food Service sector.

OTHER SERVICES

Statewide, Other Services gained employment over the month. A 1.8% over-the-month increase within the industry resulted in an addition of 654 jobs. This industry is 3.1% higher than this time last year. The Lincoln MSA was unchanged over the month and over the year. The Omaha MSA added employment over the month that translated to a gain of 162 jobs (0.9%). Increases for the Omaha MSA continued over the year with an addition of 663 jobs, an increase of 3.9%.
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