
APPENDIX D

**SOCIOECONOMICS
WRITTEN REEVALUATION/TECHNICAL REPORT**

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Purpose.....	1
1.2	Methodology and Approach.....	1
2.0	SOCIOECONOMICS.....	3
2.1	2004 FEIS Analysis Methods & Prevailing Regulations/Guidelines.....	3
2.2	Results from 2004 FEIS.....	3
2.3	Record of Decision Commitments/Mitigation	3
2.4	2008 Update Evaluations.....	4
2.4.1	Changes in Regulations/Guidelines	4
2.4.2	2008 Update Analysis Methods.....	4
2.4.3	Changes in the Existing Conditions	5
2.4.4	Changes in the Future No Build and Build Conditions.....	16
2.4.5	Mitigation.....	16
2.5	Conclusion	17
3.0	REFERENCES.....	17

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In April 2004, the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) proposing the widening of I-93 to four-lanes in each direction between Salem and Manchester. On June 28, 2005, FHWA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) approving the proposed alternative (hereinafter referred to as “the Project”). The Conservation Law Foundation subsequently challenged the ROD in U.S. District Court, contending that NHDOT and FHWA violated the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.* and the Federal-Aid Highway Act, 23 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*

A “Memorandum and Order” was issued on August 30, 2007 by the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire on the case of the Conservation Law Foundation v. Federal Highway Administration and New Hampshire Department of Transportation (*Case No. 06-cv-45-PB and Opinion No. 2007 DNH 106*; hereinafter referred to as “the Order”). The Order directed NHDOT and FHWA to prepare

“...an SEIS that specifically considers how the Delphi Panel’s population forecasts affect Defendants’ analysis of both the effectiveness of the Four Lane Alternative as a traffic congestion reduction measure and the indirect effects of the additional population predicted by those forecasts on secondary road traffic and air quality issues.” [pp. 85-86]

NHDOT and FHWA are preparing a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) on the Project to address the Order, specifically, and to generally supplement the Project’s FEIS consistent with the guidance of FHWA Technical Advisory, entitled, “Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents”, dated October 30, 1987 (T6640.8a), relative to changes, new information, or further developments subsequent to the 2004 FEIS.

1.1 Purpose

This Written Re-evaluation/Technical Report has been prepared to: (1) identify whether or not there have been changes, new information, or further developments relevant to the Project’s socioeconomics effects subsequent to the 2004 FEIS as a result of the Order; and (2) using this identification, assess whether new or updated analyses of the Project’s socioeconomics effects are warranted.

1.2 Methodology and Approach

The following methodology and approach was used to evaluate if changes or updates to the analyses described for each respective environmental resource area analyzed in the 2004 FEIS will be required:

- Identify and describe previous analysis methods and criteria used to assess impacts;

- Describe current analysis methods, regulations and guidelines, industry standards, and criteria used to assess impact significance;
- Identify changes in analysis methods, regulations and guidelines, industry standards, and criteria used to assess impact significance;
- Reanalyze the effects of the proposed project using the Delphi Panel's population and employment projections as well as the latest New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) projections with respect to traffic and air quality. Update the results of the other resource categories as warranted when substantial changes to the impact assessment methods or protocols, industry standards or guidelines, and applicable federal, state, or local government regulations have been identified; and
- Include a summary of findings from these evaluations as part of a stand-alone technical report for each resource category. Each technical report includes a section that provides an overview of the previous analysis methods and criteria used to assess impacts, the results and mitigation recommended in the 2004 FEIS, as well as any changes to the analysis methods, regulations, guidelines, industry standards or criteria used to assess impact significance that have been identified with the updated results. The findings described in each technical report will be incorporated into the Draft SEIS (DSEIS). Refer to Sections 2, 3, and 4 for specific details.

2.0 SOCIOECONOMICS

2.1 2004 FEIS Analysis Methods & Prevailing Regulations/Guidelines

The 2004 FEIS study area for socioeconomics consisted of the five I-93 project corridor municipalities: Salem, Windham, Derry, Londonderry, and Manchester. The 2004 FEIS presented information on population and housing trends based on U.S. Census data and New Hampshire Office of State Planning reports. The 2004 FEIS presented employment by industry, wages, and unemployment rates using data from the New Hampshire Employment Security, Economic, and Labor Market Information Bureau.

Residential and commercial structures that would be acquired for the construction and operation of the 2005 Selected Alternative were determined. In most cases, the need to acquire the structure was due to its location within the proposed right-of-way, and in some cases, loss of access. Individual parcels, the number of full and partial acquisitions, and acreage required were identified.

2.2 Results from 2004 FEIS

The impact analysis identified 21 residential full acquisitions, and 14 business full acquisitions that would require the relocation of residents or businesses. The 2005 Selected Alternative would also require partial property acquisitions totaling 346 acres. These acquisitions would not require the relocation of residents or businesses. The 2004 FEIS concluded that the direct impacts of the 2005 Selected Alternative would not impact local demographics, housing or employment. There would be adequate replacement residential units and commercial sites available in the area. The loss in assessed value associated with the 2005 Selected Alternative property acquisitions would be a very minor portion of the Towns' total assessed value and was expected to be offset over time by new growth and redevelopment.

The people in the households that may potentially be displaced appeared to have the same social and economic characteristics as the rest of the residents in their towns of residency. The race, or ethnicity, of the potentially displaced persons also appeared to be similar to the rest of the residents in their towns. In addition, the 2004 FEIS noted that prior to the acquisition stage, special arrangements would be made to deal with the needs of any disabled or elderly people identified.

2.3 Record of Decision Commitments/Mitigation

Properties requiring acquisition are appraised utilizing recognized and accepted appraisal practices and in conformity with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and applicable to New Hampshire State Law. The amount offered for partial acquisitions is the difference between the fair market value of the property before the partial acquisition and its value after the portion needed for the highway has been acquired. Completed appraisals are carefully reviewed by an independent appraiser to

insure that requirements of condemnation law and acceptable appraisal methods are met. The displaced residences will be eligible for relocation benefits, which include:

- Relocation advisory assistance services;
- Payments for moving and relocation costs;
- Replacement housing payments for home owners;
- Residential mortgage interest differential payments and closing costs; and
- Replacement housing payments for tenants

The displaced businesses will be eligible for relocation benefits, which include:

- Fair market value for acquired property;
- Relocation advisory assistance services;
- Payments for actual reasonable moving; and
- Business re-establishment costs.

Should identifying affordable housing for any residents displaced by the 2005 Selected Alternative (owners or renters) within the existing housing stock and assistance programs prove unfeasible, last resort housing will be made available, if necessary, in accordance with Section 206 of the Uniform Act and governing regulations. The right-of-way acquisition process will ensure that the needs of the displaced residents and businesses are adequately addressed fairly and without discrimination.

NHDOT will continue to coordinate through the design process with the communities to develop project improvements in keeping with their planning goals for potential redevelopment in impacted interchange areas.

2.4 2008 Update Evaluations

2.4.1 Changes in Regulations/Guidelines

There have been no changes in the regulations and guidance pertaining to the analysis of socioeconomic effects since the 2004 FEIS.

2.4.2 2008 Update Analysis Methods

The existing conditions year for the DSEIS updated analyses is 2005, the base year of the updated New Hampshire Statewide model (the existing conditions year for the 2004 FEIS was 2000). The socioeconomic update analysis used New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning municipal-level population estimates for 2005 provided to NHDOT in October 2007. These population estimates were also used as inputs in the New Hampshire Statewide model for traffic, air quality, and indirect effects analyses.

For year 2005 employment, data from the New Hampshire Statewide model was used because it accounts for employment at the municipal level. These employment estimates were based on a model update process that utilized New Hampshire Economic and Labor Market Information

Bureau employment estimates. The model update process also included extensive coordination with the regional planning commissions to adjust the employment estimates and forecasts based on local knowledge of upcoming developments and conditions at the time of the Statewide model update (see DSEIS Appendix G: Indirect Effects Reevaluation/Technical Report).

Updated information on housing units by type was obtained from the OEP report *Current Estimates and Trends in New Hampshire's Housing Supply Update: 2006*. Updated average weekly wage and unemployment rate information was based on New Hampshire Economic and Labor Market Information Bureau data for 2005 and 2007.

2.4.3 Changes in the Existing Conditions

Population

Table 2-1 depicts 1990, 2000, and 2005 population for the five study area communities, the two counties comprising these communities, and the State of New Hampshire.

The population data shows that Derry, Londonderry, and Manchester all experienced slower growth rates between 2000 and 2005 than they did between 1990 and 2000. This trend was most dramatic in Derry, which grew by 0.37 percent annually between 2000 and 2005, compared to 1.4 percent between 1990 and 2000. Despite a slower growth rate, the largest absolute population increase between 2000 and 2005 was for Manchester, which added nearly 3,000 people, bringing its population to almost 110,000.

Salem and Windham experienced faster population growth between 2000 and 2005 than they did between 1990 and 2000. Windham is the least populous municipality in the study area, but is also the fastest growing, with an average annual population growth rate of 3.23 percent between 2000 and 2005, up from 1.76 percent between 1990 and 2000. Both Salem and Windham added over 1,800 persons between 2000 and 2005.

**Table 2-1
 Population – 1990, 2000, 2005, Absolute Change and Average Annual Growth Rate**

	1990	2000	2005	Absolute Change 1990 - 2000	Average Annual Growth Rate 1990 - 2000	Absolute Change 2000 - 2005	Average Annual Growth Rate 2000 - 2005
Salem	25,746	28,112	29,941	2,366	0.88%	1,829	1.27%
Windham	9,000	10,720	12,565	1,720	1.76%	1,845	3.23%
Derry	29,603	34,021	34,655	4,418	1.40%	634	0.37%
Londonderry	19,781	23,263	24,673	3,482	1.63%	1,410	1.18%
Manchester	99,332	107,006	109,964	7,674	0.75%	2,958	0.55%
Rockingham County	245,845	277,359	296,740	31,514	1.21%	19,381	1.36%
Hillsborough County	335,838	380,841	402,789	45,003	1.27%	21,948	1.13%
New Hampshire	1,109,117	1,235,876	1,315,173	126,759	1.09%	79,297	1.25%

Sources: 1990 US Census
 2000 US Census
 New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning population estimates

Housing

Table 2-2 depicts the total number of housing units in 1990, 2000, and 2005 for the five study area communities as well as Rockingham County, Hillsborough County, and the State of New Hampshire as a whole.

With the exception of Derry, the remaining study area municipalities experienced increased housing unit growth rates between 2000 and 2005 as compared to 1990 to 2000. As with population, housing unit growth between 2000 and 2005 was the fastest in Windham (831 units or 3.93 percent per year) and Salem (1,144 units or 2.02 percent per year).

**Table 2-2
 Housing Units – 1990, 2000, 2005 and Average Annual Growth Rate**

	All Housing Units			Average Annual Growth Rate	
	1990	2000	2005	1990-2000	2000-2005
Salem	9,897	10,866	12,010	0.94%	2.02%
Windham	3,327	3,906	4,737	1.62%	3.93%
Derry	11,869	12,735	13,174	0.71%	0.68%
Londonderry	6,739	7,718	8,405	1.37%	1.72%
Manchester	44,361	45,892	48,232	0.34%	1.00%
Rockingham County	100,479	113,023	123,915	1.18%	1.86%
Hillsborough County	135,622	149,961	162,180	1.01%	1.58%
New Hampshire	502,247	547,024	596,096	0.86%	1.73%

Sources: 1990 US Census
 2000 US Census
 New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning- Current Estimates and Trends in New Hampshire's Housing Supply Update: 2007

Table 2-3 depicts the total housing units by type in 1990, 2000, and 2005. Since 2000, Salem and Windham have experienced an increase in the proportion of multi-family housing units. The proportion of multi-family units increased from 22 percent to 25 percent of all housing units in Salem and from 7 percent to 12 percent in Windham. This trend represents a reversal of the 1990 to 2000 pattern of an increasing proportion of single family units and decreasing proportion of multi-family units in these towns.

Between 2000 and 2005 Derry experienced a less than one percent decrease in the proportion of multi-family units, with a corresponding increase in the proportion of single family units. Londonderry experienced the reverse, with a less than one percent decrease in the proportion of single family units, and a corresponding increase in the proportion of multi-family units. Since 2000, Manchester has not experienced any noteworthy change in housing unit composition. Consistent with statewide and county trends, none of the study area municipalities experienced substantial change in the proportion of manufactured homes between 2000 and 2005.

**Table 2-3
 Housing Units by Type – 1990, 2000, and 2005 Totals**

Geographic Boundary	All Housing Units			Single-Family			Multi-Family			Manufactured Homes		
	1990	2000	2005	1990 %	2000 %	2005 %	1990 %	2000 %	2005 %	1990 %	2000 %	2005 %
Salem	9,897	10,866	12,010	67.8%	70.7%	67.6%	23.5%	22.0%	25.1%	8.8%	7.3%	7.3%
Windham	3,327	3,906	4,737	91.1%	92.4%	87.7%	8.5%	7.3%	12.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%
Derry	11,869	12,735	13,174	46.8%	49.8%	50.6%	48.4%	45.8%	45.0%	4.8%	4.4%	4.3%
Londonderry	6,739	7,718	8,405	65.2%	69.8%	69.5%	26.0%	25.9%	26.6%	8.8%	4.3%	3.9%
Manchester	44,361	45,892	48,232	34.5%	37.1%	37.0%	64.4%	62.5%	62.6%	1.1%	0.4%	0.3%
Rockingham County	100,479	113,023	123,915	60.8%	64.5%	64.5%	30.4%	28.8%	29.1%	8.8%	6.7%	6.4%
Hillsborough County	135,622	149,961	162,180	53.0%	56.3%	57.4%	43.6%	41.3%	40.3%	3.5%	2.4%	2.3%
New Hampshire	502,247	547,024	596,096	59.2%	62.3%	63.2%	32.5%	31.1%	30.3%	8.3%	6.5%	6.5%

Sources: 1990 US Census
 2000 US Census

New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning- Current Estimates and Trends in New Hampshire's Housing Supply Update: 2007

Employment

Table 2-4 depicts 2005 employment in Salem, Windham, Derry, Londonderry, and Manchester and Table 2-5 depicts 2005 employment in Rockingham County, Hillsborough County, and the State of New Hampshire. Manchester remains a major employment center, with a total number of jobs at over 70,000, greater than the four other study area municipalities combined. Salem has the second largest employment, at 24,714, while Windham has the smallest at 2,531. Notable employment patterns include the concentration of manufacturing jobs in Londonderry (37 percent of employment) and retail in Salem (31 percent of employment). The largest employment category in Windham, Derry, and Manchester is “Other”, which includes agriculture and forestry related employment, non-metallic minerals, self-employed, and unpaid family workers.

Table 2-4
2005 Employment
Salem, Windham, Derry, Londonderry, and Manchester

Sector	Salem		Windham		Derry		Londonderry		Manchester	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	841	3.40%	86	3.40%	556	6.31%	306	2.55%	7,545	10.74%
Government	300	1.21%	172	6.80%	600	6.81%	402	3.35%	2,309	3.29%
Transportation, Communications, and Utilities	1,807	7.31%	323	12.76%	849	9.63%	2,780	23.16%	9,287	13.22%
Manufacturing	2,665	10.78%	221	8.73%	1,329	15.08%	4,487	37.39%	7,738	11.01%
Other	4,926	19.93%	997	39.39%	2,460	27.91%	1,289	10.74%	19,819	28.20%
Private	4,655	18.84%	314	12.41%	781	8.86%	886	7.38%	6,392	9.10%
Retail	7,557	30.58%	323	12.76%	1,951	22.14%	781	6.51%	11,208	15.95%
Wholesale	1,963	7.94%	95	3.75%	287	3.26%	1,071	8.92%	5,975	8.50%
Totals	24,714		2,531		8,813		12,002		70,273	

Sources: New Hampshire Statewide Model

1. Includes the following ELMI employment categories: Agricultural Services; Non-metallic Minerals, except Fuels; Self-Employed and Unpaid Family Workers
2. Includes the following ELMI employment categories: Services; construction

Table 2-5
2005 Employment
Rockingham County, Hillsborough County and New Hampshire

Sector	Rockingham County		Hillsborough County		New Hampshire	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	10,386	7.23%	13,560	6.27%	37,699	5.70%
Government	6,479	4.51%	5,142	2.38%	31,579	4.78%
Transportation, Communications, and Utilities	14,512	10.10%	20,503	9.48%	62,360	9.43%
Manufacturing	24,480	17.04%	49,642	22.96%	124,401	18.81%
Other ¹	30,556	21.27%	46,420	21.47%	169,767	25.67%
Private ²	13,875	9.66%	28,728	13.28%	69,972	10.58%
Retail	33,658	23.43%	39,338	18.19%	130,852	19.79%
Wholesale	9,707	6.76%	12,914	5.97%	34,670	5.24%
Total	143,653		216,247		661,300	

Sources: New Hampshire Statewide Model

1. Includes the following ELMI employment categories: Agricultural Services; Non-metallic Minerals, except Fuels; Self-Employed and Unpaid Family Workers

2. Includes the following ELMI employment categories: Services; construction

Wages

Table 2-6 depicts average weekly wages by employment sector in Salem, Windham, and Derry and Table 2-7 shows average weekly wages by employment sector in Londonderry, and Manchester. Table 2-8 depicts average annual wages by employment sector in Rockingham County, Hillsborough County, and the State of New Hampshire.

Considering all types of employment, 2005 average weekly wages were the highest in Manchester (\$834) and the lowest in Derry (\$718). Similarly, 2007 average weekly wages were the highest in Manchester (\$1,369) and the lowest in Derry (\$831). Average weekly wages in Salem, Windham, Derry and Londonderry were below the Rockingham County, Hillsborough County, and New Hampshire averages in 2005 and 2007. Across all of the study area municipalities, the highest paying sectors included manufacturing, wholesale trade, information, finance and insurance, professional and technical services, and management of companies/enterprises. The lowest paying sectors included retail trade, arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services.

Table 2-6
Average Weekly Wages by Sector – 1990, 2000, 2005, and 2007 for Salem, Windham, and Derry

Sector	Salem				Windham				Derry			
	1990	2000	2005	2007	1990	2000	2005	2007	1990	2000	2005	2007
Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing	\$316	\$265	*	*	\$0	\$0	*	*	*	\$559	*	*
Mining	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$514	\$908	*	*	\$472	\$722	*	*	*	\$754	*	*
Manufacturing	\$719	\$1,112	\$1,235	\$1,334	\$440	\$895	\$875	\$949	\$472	\$669	\$1,133	\$1,194
Utilities	*	*	*	*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	*	*	*	*
Wholesale Trade	\$687	\$1,178	\$1,232	\$1,455	\$810	\$1,308	\$1,384	\$1,560	\$551	\$989	\$1,279	\$1,704
Retail Trade	\$280	\$361	\$405	\$398	\$267	\$605	\$642	\$529	\$284	\$372	\$469	\$497
Transportation and Warehousing	\$361	\$494	\$511	\$451	*	\$586	\$589	\$683	\$181	\$365	\$488	\$531
Information	\$1,277	\$1,398	\$2,506	\$1,857	*	\$1,076	*	\$1,323	\$312	\$542	*	\$648
Finance and Insurance	\$592	\$959	\$1,148	\$1,260	\$422	\$837	\$1,021	\$1,337	\$371	\$527	\$824	\$901
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	\$389	\$596	\$692	\$784	\$358	\$664	\$856	\$1,091	\$263	\$576	\$592	\$580
Professional and Technical Service	\$656	\$1,092	\$1,139	\$1,270	\$519	\$982	\$1,035	\$1,171	\$614	\$1,645	\$971	\$1,158
Management of Companies/Enterprises	*	\$4,058	\$1,313	\$1,254	\$0	\$0	*	*	\$0	\$0	*	*
Administrative and Waste Services	\$470	\$703	\$709	\$699	\$291	\$697	\$759	\$1,184	\$260	\$467	\$568	\$503
Educational Services	\$224	\$490	\$395	\$456	\$291	\$265	\$381	\$500	\$487	*	*	*
Health Care and Social Assistance	\$444	\$555	\$658	\$671	\$280	\$439	\$398	\$463	\$396	\$621	\$791	\$857
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	\$246	\$374	\$429	\$432	\$264	\$594	\$520	\$499	*	\$184	\$225	*
Accommodation and Food Services	\$192	\$257	\$303	\$312	\$254	\$415	\$383	\$405	\$146	\$250	\$289	\$302
Other Services Except Public Admin	\$234	\$426	\$426	\$451	\$350	\$717	\$886	\$813	\$293	\$494	\$534	\$632
Unclassified Establishments	\$299	*	*	*	\$0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Government	\$540	\$724	\$875	\$855	\$425	\$595	\$754	\$816	\$502	\$608	\$788	\$857
All Employment	\$478	\$707	\$733	\$767	\$404	\$714	\$781	\$831	\$388	\$604	\$718	\$769

Sources:

New Hampshire Employment Security, Economic & Labor Market Information Bureau

* = data does not meet disclosure standards. For example, no data may be disclosed about any group of employers when one employer in the group accounts for more than eighty percent of total employment of the group; or if there are fewer than three employers in the group.

Table 2-7
Average Weekly Wages by Sector – 1990, 2000, 2005, and 2007 for Londonderry and Manchester

Sector	Londonderry				Manchester			
	1990	2000	2005	2007	1990	2000	2005	2007
Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing	\$199	\$406	\$328	\$314	\$0	\$0	*	*
Mining	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	*	*	*	\$0
Construction	\$576	\$930	\$960	\$1,039	*	*	*	*
Manufacturing	\$564	\$941	\$1,026	\$1,103	\$516	\$853	\$919	\$1,626
Utilities	*	*	\$0	*	\$699	*	*	\$0
Wholesale Trade	\$669	\$808	\$972	\$1,066	\$547	\$949	\$1,056	\$1,926
Retail Trade	\$300	\$392	\$494	\$461	\$300	\$476	\$579	\$836
Transportation and Warehousing	\$521	\$710	\$779	\$942	\$535	\$594	\$693	\$613
Information	\$526	\$482	\$1,104	\$612	\$587	\$1,199	\$1,374	\$942
Finance and Insurance	\$471	\$819	\$1,041	\$999	\$497	\$1,014	\$1,324	\$1,818
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	\$312	\$533	\$951	\$857	\$370	\$543	\$1,119	\$1,308
Professional and Technical Service	\$519	\$958	\$1,139	\$1,181	\$656	\$1,141	\$1,323	\$1,859
Management of Companies/Enterprises	*	*	\$1,388	\$1,340	\$674	\$1,022	*	\$1,690
Administrative and Waste Services	\$388	\$551	\$536	\$614	\$286	\$401	\$579	\$1,383
Educational Services	\$536	*	\$532	*	\$371	\$515	\$622	\$548
Health Care and Social Assistance	\$367	\$474	\$613	\$706	\$478	\$657	\$791	\$516
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	\$182	\$247	\$255	\$281	\$279	\$282	\$376	\$261
Accommodation and Food Services	\$157	\$261	\$280	\$276	\$181	\$264	\$302	\$287
Other Services Except Public Admin	\$378	\$504	\$596	\$613	\$330	\$535	\$644	\$461
Unclassified Establishments	\$0	\$1,097	*	*	*	*	\$300	*
Government	\$516	\$650	\$756	\$846	\$565	\$738	\$893	\$786
All Employment	\$450	\$679	\$774	\$832	\$460	\$707	\$834	\$1,369

Sources: New Hampshire Employment Security, Economic & Labor Market Information Bureau

* = data does not meet disclosure standards. For example, no data may be disclosed about any group of employers when one employer in the group accounts for more than eighty percent of total employment of the group; or if there are fewer than three employers in the group.

Table 2-8
Average Weekly Wages by Sector – 1990, 2000, 2005, and 2007
Rockingham County, Hillsborough County and New Hampshire

Sector	Rockingham County				Hillsborough County				New Hampshire			
	1990	2000	2005	2007	1990	2000	2005	2007	1990	2000	2005	2007
Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing	\$225	\$347	\$398	\$395	\$288	\$472	\$510	\$566	\$331	\$461	\$508	\$576
Mining	\$348	\$632	\$849	\$901	\$509	\$835	\$1,266	\$1,336	\$538	\$782	\$950	\$972
Construction	\$499	\$773	\$911	\$937	\$520	\$820	\$932	\$1,020	\$479	\$743	\$870	\$930
Manufacturing	\$600	\$882	\$1,050	\$1,114	\$651	\$992	\$1,150	\$1,311	\$569	\$863	\$1,002	\$1,109
Utilities	\$872	\$1,449	\$1,715	\$1,793	\$798	\$975	*	n	\$846	\$1,237	\$1,442	\$1,548
Wholesale Trade	\$689	\$1,097	\$1,199	\$1,314	\$635	\$1,163	\$1,298	\$1,417	\$635	\$1,139	\$1,278	\$1,373
Retail Trade	\$282	\$408	\$480	\$484	\$290	\$467	\$533	\$546	\$291	\$426	\$501	\$508
Transportation and Warehousing	\$375	\$594	\$671	\$717	\$459	\$548	\$670	\$721	\$405	\$560	\$642	\$681
Information	\$570	\$1,010	\$1,385	\$1,390	\$572	\$1,164	\$1,329	\$1,396	\$580	\$1,088	\$1,187	\$1,278
Finance and Insurance	\$539	\$998	\$1,288	\$1,430	\$522	\$1,194	\$1,481	\$1,625	\$510	\$1,019	\$1,277	\$1,371
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	\$342	\$610	\$811	\$841	\$357	\$607	\$945	\$761	\$348	\$570	\$783	\$733
Professional and Technical Service	\$607	\$1,146	\$1,159	\$1,226	\$656	\$1,168	\$1,292	\$1,467	\$603	\$1,086	\$1,204	\$1,330
Management of Companies/Enterprises	\$1,204	\$2,390	\$2,760	\$3,315	\$686	\$1,186	\$1,285	\$1,479	\$741	\$1,537	\$1,796	\$2,024
Administrative and Waste Services	\$369	\$552	\$648	\$720	\$302	\$466	\$617	\$734	\$322	\$494	\$635	\$746
Educational Services	\$357	\$501	\$617	\$678	\$352	\$489	\$568	\$621	\$415	\$565	\$737	\$814
Health Care and Social Assistance	\$396	\$582	\$724	\$774	\$450	\$618	\$759	\$817	\$418	\$604	\$758	\$820
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	\$239	\$334	\$356	\$375	\$271	\$351	\$375	\$425	\$228	\$302	\$366	\$414
Accommodation and Food Services	\$182	\$267	\$308	\$323	\$174	\$260	\$290	\$312	\$174	\$255	\$295	\$313
Other Services Except Public Admin	\$295	\$471	\$568	\$582	\$324	\$494	\$554	\$595	\$299	\$466	\$543	\$578
Unclassified Establishments	\$739	\$1,096	\$580	\$454	\$452	\$700	*	n	\$540	\$1,180	\$1,214	\$1,351
Government	\$436	\$599	\$742	\$788	\$520	\$692	\$814	\$909	\$449	\$598	\$722	\$787
All Employment	\$429	\$688	\$797	\$849	\$482	\$754	\$867	\$947	\$435	\$668	\$780	\$843

Sources: New Hampshire Employment Security, Economic & Labor Market Information Bureau
 * = data does not meet disclosure standards. For example, no data may be disclosed about any group of employers when one employer in the group accounts for more than eighty percent of total employment of the group; or if there are fewer than three employers in the group.

Unemployment Rates

Table 2-9 depicts the 1990, 2000, 2005, and 2007 unemployment rates for the study area municipalities, Rockingham County, Hillsborough County, and New Hampshire. In 2005, unemployment rates increased in all five study area municipalities since 2000; however the unemployment rates have remained lower than 1990 levels. Salem had the highest unemployment rate in 2005 at 5.6 percent, while Londonderry had the lowest at 3.7 percent. Study area unemployment rates were higher than the New Hampshire statewide unemployment rate of 3.6 percent in 2005.

In comparison to 2005, unemployment rates in 2007 have decreased or remained the same. Salem had the highest unemployment rate in 2007 at 5.0 percent, while Londonderry had the lowest at 3.6 percent. Londonderry’s unemployment rate was lower than the New Hampshire statewide unemployment rates, while all other study area unemployment rates were higher than the statewide unemployment rate.

**Table 2-9
 Annual Unemployment Rates – 1990, 2000 2005, and 2007**

	1990	2000	2005	2007
Salem	8.3	4.1	5.6	5.0
Windham	5.2	3.6	4.0	3.7
Derry	6.4	3.1	4.7	4.0
Londonderry	4.9	2.6	3.7	3.5
Manchester	6.5	2.6	3.9	3.9
Rockingham County	6.2	3.0	4.2	3.9
Hillsborough County	5.4	2.6	3.7	3.6
New Hampshire	5.6	2.7	3.6	3.6

Sources: New Hampshire Employment Security, Economic & Labor Market Information Bureau

2.4.4 Changes in the Future No Build and Build Conditions

As a result of design refinements since the 2004 FEIS, the number of full property acquisitions has changed. The number of residential acquisitions has decreased from the 21 estimated in the 2004 FEIS to 19 based on current right-of-way plans. The number of business relocations has increased from the 14 estimated in the 2004 FEIS to 23 based on current right-of-way plans. These minor changes do not change the conclusion of the 2004 FEIS that the 2005 Selected Alternative would not directly impact local demographics, housing or employment.

2.4.5 Mitigation

The mitigation measures for the relocation and compensation of displaced residences and businesses described in the 2004 FEIS and Record of Decision, including compliance with the

Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, remain valid.

2.5 Conclusion

There have been changes in the socioeconomic setting of the study area since the 2004 FEIS, including additional population and employment growth. Due to design refinements, there have been minor changes in the residential and business acquisitions required for the 2005 Selected Alternative. However, the updated information does not change the conclusion of the 2004 FEIS that the 2005 Selected Alternative would not directly impact local demographics, housing or employment.

3.0 REFERENCES

1990 United States Census

2000 United State Census

Current Estimates and Trends in New Hampshire's Housing Supply Update: 2007, New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning (October 2008)

New Hampshire Statewide Model Documentation (June, 2009)

Final Environmental Impact Statement Interstate 93 Improvements Salem to Manchester IM-IR-93-1(174)0, 10418-C, Federal Highway Authority and New Hampshire Department of Transportation (April 2004)

New Hampshire Employment Security, Economic & Labor Market Information Bureau, 2005 and 2007 Average Weekly Wage