

Raising the federal minimum wage to \$15 by 2025 would lift wages for over 33 million workers

Fact Sheet • By [David Cooper](#) • July 17, 2019

On Thursday, July 18, the U.S. House of Representatives is set to vote on a proposal to gradually raise the federal minimum wage to \$15 per hour by October 2025. As shown in the tables below, such an increase in the federal wage floor would lift wages for 33.5 million workers across the country by 2025—more than one-fifth of the wage-earning workforce. The increase would boost total annual wages for these low-wage workers by \$92.5 billion, lifting annual earnings for the average affected year-round worker by \$2,800.

Who would benefit if the federal minimum wage is raised to \$15 by 2025?

A total of **33.5 million workers** would benefit, including:

- 30.1 million adults ages 20 or older
- 19.6 million full-time workers
- 19.5 million women
- 9.4 million parents
- 4.6 million single parents
- 6.2 million workers in poverty

More details on the schedule of increases, the affected workforce, the effect on workers' wages, and the estimated impact by state can be found in the tables at the end of this fact sheet.

The proposal being voted on is similar to one that [we analyzed in February](#), which would have raised the

federal minimum wage to \$15 by July 2024.¹ In that analysis, we estimated that nearly 40 million workers would have gotten a raise from that proposed increase. The biggest difference between the estimates in that analysis and the estimates presented here are changes in state minimum wages that have been enacted since February. [EPI's Minimum Wage Simulation Model](#), which we use to produce these estimates, accounts for all existing state and local minimum wage laws so that the results describe only the impact of the proposed federal minimum wage change.² Since our February analysis, New Jersey, Illinois, Maryland, and Connecticut all enacted \$15 state minimum wages, thus significantly reducing the number of workers who would be impacted by the change in the federal minimum wage, as these workers will already have received raises from their rising state minimum wages.³ Phasing in the increases over one additional year also reduces the number of workers affected and the wage impact of the proposal—as some workers who would have been paid wages in the affected range in 2024 will likely be paid wages above the affected range by 2025.

In a [recent report](#), the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated that [a \\$15 minimum wage in 2025 would raise the wages of up to 27.3 million low-wage workers](#).⁴ As best we can tell, our estimates differ from theirs for two reasons:

1. CBO is more restrictive than we are about including workers who report wages below the existing minimum wage. There is considerable measurement error in the hourly wage values reported in the Current Population Survey—the data source for both CBO's and our analyses—particularly because some wage values must be imputed from nonhourly workers' reported weekly wages and their reported usual hours worked. For this reason, EPI assumes that reported or imputed hourly wage values as low as 80 percent of the existing binding minimum wage are likely the result of measurement error and that these workers will benefit from a rising minimum. CBO assumes that wage values more than 25 cents below the existing minimum are the result of employer noncompliance and those workers will not be affected by the rising federal wage floor.
2. CBO also assumes noticeably stronger baseline wage growth for low-wage workers than we do—i.e., wage growth occurring without any change in the federal minimum wage. This assumption means that CBO believes many more workers will experience sufficient wage growth to put them above the level at which they would be affected by the rising federal minimum wage.

The CBO report assumes baseline nominal wage growth averaging 3.5 percent annually for the “low-wage” workforce. This strikes us as very optimistic. CBO's own projections for inflation (as measured by the Consumer Price Index) are an average of 2.4 percent annually over the next six years—meaning that CBO believes low-wage workers will experience wage growth faster than inflation by 1.1 percent every year through 2025 without any change in the federal minimum wage.⁵ For comparison, that since 1973, there have only been 13 years in which the 10th percentile wage rose by 1.1 percent or more (after inflation), and this has never occurred for more than three years consecutively.⁶ The period from 1996 to 1999 is the only three-year span when this occurred, a period with an exceptionally strong labor market which also happened to coincide with an increase in the

federal minimum wage. In fact, if the 10th percentile wage had grown at 1.1 percent above inflation annually since 1979, it would be \$14.68 in 2018 instead of the \$9.97 it actually was.⁷ In short, the failure of this group of workers to see wage growth as fast as that currently forecast by CBO is essentially the entire reason why we need a robust federal minimum wage.

To be clear, it would be a wonderful thing if the low-wage workforce did experience real wage growth of 1.1 percent (or more!) annually for the foreseeable future. We are just skeptical that we can expect this to happen, especially in the absence of a rising wage floor.

-
1. David Cooper, *Raising the Federal Minimum Wage to \$15 by 2024 Would Lift Pay for Nearly 40 Million Workers*, Economic Policy Institute, February 2019.
 2. David Cooper, Zane Mokhiber, and Ben Zipperer, *Minimum Wage Simulation Model Technical Methodology*, February 2019.
 3. New Mexico and Nevada also enacted state minimum wage increases to \$12, though these changes do not meaningfully affect our estimates.
 4. Congressional Budget Office, *The Effects on Employment and Family Income of Increasing the Federal Minimum Wage*, July 2019; Ben Zipperer, “Low-wage Workers Will See Huge Gains from Minimum Wage Hike, CBO Finds,” *Working Economics* (Economic Policy Institute blog), July 9, 2019.
 5. EPI’s simulation assumes baseline hourly wage growth of CBO’s projection for CPI + 0.5 percent, equaling an average of 2.9 percent annually from 2018 to 2025.
 6. Economic Policy Institute, “*Wages by Percentile*,” *State of Working America Data Library*, last updated February 19, 2019.
 7. Author’s calculations using data from Economic Policy Institute, “*Wages by Percentile*,” *State of Working America Data Library*, last updated February 19, 2019.

Table **Summary of minimum wage increases under the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, and number of workers affected by the increases, 2019–2025**

Date	Minimum wage	Increase	Tipped minimum wage	Tipped minimum increase	Total estimated U.S. workforce (thousands)	Directly affected (thousands)	Indirectly affected (thousands)	Total affected (thousands)	Affected workers' share of U.S. workforce
<i>July 2019</i>	\$7.25		2.13						
October 2019	\$8.40	\$1.15	\$3.55	\$1.42	145,357	2,152	4,216	6,368	4.4%
October 2020	\$9.50	\$1.10	\$5.00	\$1.45	146,148	5,013	7,008	12,021	8.2%
October 2021	\$10.60	\$1.10	\$6.45	\$1.45	146,963	8,034	8,578	16,612	11.3%
October 2022	\$11.70	\$1.10	\$7.90	\$1.45	147,801	13,071	7,233	20,303	13.7%
October 2023	\$12.80	\$1.10	\$9.35	\$1.45	148,665	15,487	9,273	24,760	16.7%
October 2024	\$13.90	\$1.10	\$10.80	\$1.45	149,554	19,350	11,210	30,560	20.4%
October 2025	\$15.00	\$1.10	\$12.25	\$1.45	150,469	23,237	10,222	33,459	22.2%

Notes: Values reflect the result of the proposed change in the federal minimum wage. Wage changes resulting from scheduled state and local minimum wage laws are accounted for by EPI's Minimum Wage Simulation Model. Totals may not sum due to rounding. Shares calculated from unrounded values. Directly affected workers will see their wages rise as the new minimum wage rate exceeds their existing hourly pay. Indirectly affected workers have a wage rate just above the new minimum wage (between the new minimum wage and 115 percent of the new minimum). They will receive a raise as employer pay scales are adjusted upward to reflect the new minimum wage. Wage increase totals are cumulative of all preceding steps.

Source: Economic Policy Institute Minimum Wage Simulation Model using data from the Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Congressional Budget Office. See David Cooper, Zane Mokhiber, and Ben Zipperer, *Minimum Wage Simulation Model Technical Methodology*, February 2019.

Economic Policy Institute

Table V **Wage impacts of increasing the minimum wage under the Raise the Wage Act of 2019, 2019–2025 (2018\$)**

Date	Minimum wage (nominal \$)	Minimum wage (2018\$)	Tipped minimum wage (nominal \$)	Tipped minimum wage (2018\$)	Directly affected workers				All (directly & indirectly) affected workers				
					Total wage increase (thousands)	Change in avg. hourly wage	Change in avg. annual income (year-round workers)	Real percent change in avg. annual earnings	Total wage increase (thousands)	Change in avg. hourly wage	Change in avg. annual income (year-round workers)	Real percent change in avg. annual earnings	
<i>July 2019</i>	\$7.25	\$7.08	\$2.13	\$2.08									
<i>October 2019</i>	\$8.40	\$8.21	\$3.55	\$3.47	\$2,308,932	\$0.77	\$1,070	10.4%	\$4,386,358	\$0.46	\$690	4.8%	
<i>October 2020</i>	\$9.50	\$9.06	\$5.00	\$4.77	\$7,164,773	\$1.00	\$1,430	11.7%	\$10,431,478	\$0.58	\$870	5.5%	
<i>October 2021</i>	\$10.60	\$9.86	\$6.45	\$6.00	\$14,549,451	\$1.23	\$1,810	13.4%	\$19,355,468	\$0.77	\$1,170	7.0%	
<i>October 2022</i>	\$11.70	\$10.62	\$7.90	\$7.17	\$26,848,613	\$1.36	\$2,050	13.4%	\$32,310,715	\$1.04	\$1,590	9.0%	
<i>October 2023</i>	\$12.80	\$11.34	\$9.35	\$8.28	\$42,106,884	\$1.77	\$2,720	16.9%	\$49,365,973	\$1.28	\$1,990	10.6%	
<i>October 2024</i>	\$13.90	\$12.03	\$10.80	\$9.34	\$61,250,277	\$2.01	\$3,170	18.3%	\$69,762,064	\$1.44	\$2,280	11.4%	
<i>October 2025</i>	\$15.00	\$12.68	\$12.25	\$10.35	\$83,120,275	\$2.23	\$3,580	19.3%	\$92,402,765	\$1.71	\$2,760	13.3%	

Notes: Values reflect the result of the proposed change in the federal minimum wage. Wage changes resulting from scheduled state and local minimum wage laws are accounted for by EPI's Minimum Wage Simulation Model. Totals may not sum due to rounding. Shares calculated from unrounded values. Directly affected workers will see their wages rise as the new minimum wage rate will exceed their current hourly pay. Indirectly affected workers have a wage rate just above the new minimum wage (between the new minimum wage and 115 percent of the new minimum). They will receive a raise as employer pay scales are adjusted upward to reflect the new minimum wage. Wage increase totals are cumulative of all preceding steps.

Source: Economic Policy Institute Minimum Wage Simulation Model using data from the Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Congressional Budget Office. See David Cooper, Zane Mokhiber, and Ben Zipperer, *Minimum Wage Simulation Model Technical Methodology*, February 2019. Dollar values adjusted by projections for CPI-U in CBO 2018.

Economic Policy Institute

Table **Demographic characteristics of workers affected by increasing the federal minimum wage to \$15 by 2025**

Group	Total estimated workforce (thousands)	Directly affected (thousands)	Share of total directly affected	Indirectly affected (thousands)	Share of total indirectly affected	Total affected (thousands)	Share of total affected	Group's share of total affected
All workers	150,469	23,237	15.4%	10,222	6.8%	33,459	22.2%	100.0%
Gender								
Women	72,988	13,656	18.7%	5,851	8.0%	19,508	26.7%	58.3%
Men	77,481	9,581	12.4%	4,370	5.6%	13,951	18.0%	41.7%
Age								
Age 19 or younger	5,258	2,872	54.6%	486	9.2%	3,358	63.9%	10.0%
Age 20 or older	145,211	20,366	14.0%	9,736	6.7%	30,102	20.7%	90.0%
Ages 16–24	20,500	9,053	44.2%	2,322	11.3%	11,375	55.5%	34.0%
Ages 25–39	50,705	7,325	14.4%	3,824	7.5%	11,149	22.0%	33.3%
Ages 40–54	48,076	3,791	7.9%	2,423	5.0%	6,214	12.9%	18.6%
Age 55 or older	31,188	3,068	9.8%	1,653	5.3%	4,721	15.1%	14.1%
Race/ethnicity								
White	89,040	11,631	13.1%	5,749	6.5%	17,380	19.5%	51.9%
Black	17,784	4,448	25.0%	1,267	7.1%	5,715	32.1%	17.1%
Hispanic	29,595	5,648	19.1%	2,405	8.1%	8,053	27.2%	24.1%
Asian or other race/ethnicity	14,051	1,511	10.8%	801	5.7%	2,312	16.5%	6.9%
Men of color	31,715	5,063	16.0%	2,153	6.8%	7,217	22.8%	21.6%
Women of color	89,040	11,631	13.1%	5,749	6.5%	17,380	19.5%	51.9%
Family status								
Married parent	38,042	3,007	7.9%	1,826	4.8%	4,833	12.7%	14.4%
Single parent	13,940	3,233	23.2%	1,329	9.5%	4,562	32.7%	13.6%
Married, no children	38,588	3,245	8.4%	1,931	5.0%	5,175	13.4%	15.5%
Unmarried, no children	59,899	13,753	23.0%	5,137	8.6%	18,889	31.5%	56.5%
Usual work hours								
Part time (<20 hours)	8,690	2,786	32.1%	821	9.4%	3,607	41.5%	10.8%
Mid time (20–34 hours)	22,353	7,768	34.8%	2,436	10.9%	10,204	45.7%	30.5%
Full time (35+ hours)	119,426	12,683	10.6%	6,965	5.8%	19,648	16.5%	58.7%

Table 3
(cont.)

Group	Total estimated workforce (thousands)	Directly affected (thousands)	Share of total directly affected	Indirectly affected (thousands)	Share of total indirectly affected	Total affected (thousands)	Share of total affected	Group's share of total affected
Educational attainment								
Less than high school	15,314	5,201	34.0%	1,483	9.7%	6,684	43.6%	20.0%
High school	37,401	8,537	22.8%	3,715	9.9%	12,252	32.8%	36.6%
Some college, no degree	35,005	7,043	20.1%	3,090	8.8%	10,132	28.9%	30.3%
Associate degree	13,569	1,455	10.7%	919	6.8%	2,374	17.5%	7.1%
Bachelor's degree or higher	49,181	1,002	2.0%	1,015	2.1%	2,017	4.1%	6.0%
Family income								
Less than \$25,000	20,317	8,712	42.9%	2,628	12.9%	11,340	55.8%	33.9%
\$25,000–\$49,999	30,681	5,783	18.9%	3,216	10.5%	8,999	29.3%	26.9%
\$50,000–\$74,999	27,946	3,585	12.8%	1,840	6.6%	5,424	19.4%	16.2%
\$75,000–\$99,999	21,875	2,111	9.6%	1,069	4.9%	3,180	14.5%	9.5%
\$100,000–\$149,999	26,859	1,978	7.4%	949	3.5%	2,927	10.9%	8.7%
\$150,000 or more	22,791	1,069	4.7%	520	2.3%	1,589	7.0%	4.7%
Family income-to-poverty ratio								
At or below the poverty line	10,421	5,071	48.7%	1,166	11.2%	6,237	59.8%	18.6%
101–200% of poverty line	21,924	7,047	32.1%	2,939	13.4%	9,986	45.5%	29.8%
201–400% of poverty line	47,296	6,856	14.5%	3,932	8.3%	10,788	22.8%	32.2%
401% or above	69,885	3,793	5.4%	2,104	3.0%	5,897	8.4%	17.6%
Poverty status not available	943	471	49.9%	81	8.6%	552	58.5%	1.6%
Industry								
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting	2,463	453	18.4%	151	6.1%	604	24.5%	1.8%
Construction	8,311	841	10.1%	482	5.8%	1,322	15.9%	4.0%
Manufacturing	16,562	1,694	10.2%	822	5.0%	2,516	15.2%	7.5%
Wholesale trade	4,101	437	10.7%	203	4.9%	640	15.6%	1.9%
Retail trade	17,702	5,046	28.5%	1,497	8.5%	6,542	37.0%	19.6%
Transportation, warehousing, utilities	7,834	639	8.2%	347	4.4%	985	12.6%	2.9%
Information	3,207	213	6.6%	105	3.3%	318	9.9%	1.0%

Table 3
(cont.)

Group	Total estimated workforce (thousands)	Directly affected (thousands)	Share of total directly affected	Indirectly affected (thousands)	Share of total indirectly affected	Total affected (thousands)	Share of total affected	Group's share of total affected
Finance, insurance, real estate	9,587	540	5.6%	324	3.4%	864	9.0%	2.6%
Professional, scientific, management, technical services	9,307	313	3.4%	170	1.8%	483	5.2%	1.4%
Administrative, support, and waste management	6,037	1,353	22.4%	494	8.2%	1,846	30.6%	5.5%
Education	14,746	1,438	9.7%	606	4.1%	2,044	13.9%	6.1%
Healthcare	21,591	3,265	15.1%	1,279	5.9%	4,544	21.0%	13.6%
Arts, entertainment, recreational services	3,048	782	25.7%	360	11.8%	1,142	37.5%	3.4%
Accommodation	1,827	600	32.8%	255	14.0%	855	46.8%	2.6%
Restaurants and food service	10,405	4,141	39.8%	2,087	20.1%	6,227	59.8%	18.6%
Other services	6,088	1,200	19.7%	852	14.0%	2,052	33.7%	6.1%
Public administration	7,652	283	3.7%	190	2.5%	473	6.2%	1.4%
Tipped occupations								
Nontipped workers	146,034	21,948	15.0%	7,828	5.4%	29,776	20.4%	89.0%
Tipped workers	4,436	1,290	29.1%	2,394	54.0%	3,684	83.0%	11.0%
Sector								
For-profit	114,498	20,079	17.5%	8,749	7.6%	28,828	25.2%	86.2%
Government	22,777	1,684	7.4%	815	3.6%	2,499	11.0%	7.5%
Nonprofit	13,194	1,474	11.2%	658	5.0%	2,133	16.2%	6.4%

Notes: Values reflect the population likely to be affected by the proposed change in the federal minimum wage. Wage changes resulting from scheduled state and local minimum wage laws are accounted for by EPI's Minimum Wage Simulation Model. Totals may not sum due to rounding. Shares calculated from unrounded values. Directly affected workers will see their wages rise as the new minimum wage rate will exceed their current hourly pay. Indirectly affected workers have a wage rate just above the new minimum wage (between the new minimum wage and 115 percent of the new minimum). They will receive a raise as employer pay scales are adjusted upward to reflect the new minimum wage. The last two columns show what share of the workforce subgroup is affected, and that subgroup's share of all affected workers. So for example, it shows that 26.7% of working women are affected, and that working women constitute 58.3% of all affected workers.

Source: Economic Policy Institute Minimum Wage Simulation Model using data from the Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Congressional Budget Office. See David Cooper, Zane Mokhiber, and Ben Zipperer, *Minimum Wage Simulation Model Technical Methodology*, February 2019.

Economic Policy Institute

Table **Summary of impact of increasing the minimum wage to \$15 by 2025 (in 2025), by state**

State	Total estimated state workforce (thousands)	Directly affected (thousands)	Share of state workforce directly affected	Indirectly affected (thousands)	Share of state workforce indirectly affected	Total affected (thousands)	Total share of state workforce affected	State's share of total affected nationally	Change in total annual wages of state's affected workers (2018\$, thousands)	Change in avg. annual earnings of state's affected year-round affected workers (2018\$)	Real percent change in avg. annual earnings
National total	150,469	23,237	15.4%	10,222	6.8%	33,459	22.2%	100.0%	\$109,327,417	\$3,300	13.3%
Alabama	2,016	565	28.0%	153	7.6%	717	35.6%	2.1%	\$2,880,374	\$4,000	16.6%
Alaska	352	66	18.8%	19	5.4%	85	24.2%	0.3%	\$220,584	\$2,600	9.2%
Arizona	3,020	149	4.9%	850	28.2%	999	33.1%	3.0%	\$830,454	\$800	3.0%
Arkansas	1,246	360	28.9%	97	7.8%	457	36.7%	1.4%	\$1,017,352	\$2,200	8.3%
California	19,073	5	0.0%	5	0.0%	9	0.0%	0.0%	\$15,863	\$1,700	5.9%
Colorado	2,684	97	3.6%	621	23.1%	718	26.8%	2.1%	\$532,839	\$700	2.7%
Connecticut	1,778	8	0.5%	44	2.5%	52	2.9%	0.2%	\$72,685	\$1,400	5.1%
Delaware	436	102	23.5%	32	7.3%	134	30.8%	0.4%	\$438,661	\$3,300	13.9%
District of Columbia	364	2	0.6%	9	2.3%	11	3.0%	0.0%	\$34,029	\$3,100	9.3%
Florida	8,969	2,397	26.7%	712	7.9%	3,109	34.7%	9.3%	\$10,803,265	\$3,500	14.0%
Georgia	4,564	1,197	26.2%	333	7.3%	1,530	33.5%	4.6%	\$6,381,944	\$4,200	17.4%
Hawaii	729	174	23.9%	51	7.0%	225	30.9%	0.7%	\$561,361	\$2,500	9.7%
Idaho	712	194	27.3%	54	7.6%	248	34.9%	0.7%	\$1,001,496	\$4,000	17.0%
Illinois	6,164	52	0.8%	167	2.7%	219	3.6%	0.7%	\$467,096	\$2,100	8.1%
Indiana	3,026	776	25.6%	240	7.9%	1,016	33.6%	3.0%	\$3,618,793	\$3,600	15.3%
Iowa	1,525	386	25.3%	105	6.9%	491	32.2%	1.5%	\$1,619,966	\$3,300	14.5%
Kansas	1,381	329	23.8%	119	8.6%	447	32.4%	1.3%	\$1,490,682	\$3,300	13.7%
Kentucky	1,860	513	27.6%	139	7.5%	652	35.1%	1.9%	\$2,781,378	\$4,300	18.0%
Louisiana	1,993	557	27.9%	163	8.2%	720	36.1%	2.2%	\$3,271,408	\$4,500	18.7%
Maine	616	32	5.1%	160	26.0%	192	31.1%	0.6%	\$176,685	\$900	3.5%
Maryland	3,056	24	0.8%	87	2.8%	111	3.6%	0.3%	\$324,647	\$2,900	10.6%
Massachusetts	3,470	25	0.7%	90	2.6%	115	3.3%	0.3%	\$263,292	\$2,300	8.6%
Michigan	4,375	1,001	22.9%	356	8.1%	1,357	31.0%	4.1%	\$3,547,310	\$2,600	11.0%
Minnesota	2,777	333	12.0%	97	3.5%	430	15.5%	1.3%	\$733,545	\$1,700	7.6%
Mississippi	1,204	378	31.4%	100	8.3%	478	39.7%	1.4%	\$2,176,212	\$4,600	18.7%
Missouri	2,762	636	23.0%	210	7.6%	846	30.6%	2.5%	\$1,336,602	\$1,600	6.3%
Montana	457	123	26.9%	33	7.2%	156	34.1%	0.5%	\$421,124	\$2,700	11.6%
Nebraska	951	203	21.4%	95	9.9%	298	31.3%	0.9%	\$721,848	\$2,400	10.0%
Nevada	1,396	393	28.2%	146	10.4%	539	38.6%	1.6%	\$1,050,316	\$1,900	7.0%
New Hampshire	678	116	17.1%	43	6.4%	159	23.5%	0.5%	\$460,966	\$2,900	13.3%
New Jersey	4,439	15	0.3%	139	3.1%	154	3.5%	0.5%	\$336,402	\$2,200	7.7%
New Mexico	940	264	28.0%	88	9.3%	351	37.4%	1.0%	\$777,868	\$2,200	8.5%
New York	9,535	135	1.4%	966	10.1%	1,101	11.5%	3.3%	\$902,245	\$800	3.0%

Table 4
(cont.)

State	Total estimated state workforce (thousands)	Directly affected (thousands)	Share of state workforce directly affected	Indirectly affected (thousands)	Share of state workforce indirectly affected	Total affected (thousands)	Total share of state workforce affected	State's share of total affected nationally	Change in total annual wages of state's affected workers (2018\$, thousands)	Change in avg. annual earnings of state's affected year-round affected workers (2018\$)	Real percent change in avg. annual earnings
<i>North Carolina</i>	4,496	1,192	26.5%	308	6.8%	1,500	33.4%	4.5%	\$6,204,993	\$4,100	17.3%
<i>North Dakota</i>	380	72	19.0%	27	7.2%	100	26.2%	0.3%	\$299,781	\$3,000	12.7%
<i>Ohio</i>	5,309	1,365	25.7%	370	7.0%	1,735	32.7%	5.2%	\$5,476,859	\$3,200	13.4%
<i>Oklahoma</i>	1,724	427	24.8%	135	7.9%	563	32.6%	1.7%	\$2,355,164	\$4,200	17.1%
<i>Oregon</i>	1,824	19	1.1%	270	14.8%	289	15.9%	0.9%	\$147,427	\$500	1.8%
<i>Pennsylvania</i>	5,920	1,391	23.5%	449	7.6%	1,840	31.1%	5.5%	\$6,840,333	\$3,700	16.4%
<i>Rhode Island</i>	518	87	16.8%	44	8.5%	131	25.3%	0.4%	\$278,357	\$2,100	8.9%
<i>South Carolina</i>	2,140	502	23.5%	182	8.5%	684	32.0%	2.0%	\$2,772,993	\$4,100	16.9%
<i>South Dakota</i>	414	98	23.6%	35	8.5%	133	32.0%	0.4%	\$323,404	\$2,400	9.8%
<i>Tennessee</i>	2,933	766	26.1%	243	8.3%	1,009	34.4%	3.0%	\$3,949,924	\$3,900	15.9%
<i>Texas</i>	13,345	3,543	26.6%	996	7.5%	4,539	34.0%	13.6%	\$19,553,032	\$4,300	17.5%
<i>Utah</i>	1,369	354	25.8%	99	7.2%	453	33.1%	1.4%	\$1,451,431	\$3,200	14.4%
<i>Vermont</i>	301	58	19.2%	22	7.4%	80	26.6%	0.2%	\$109,636	\$1,400	5.4%
<i>Virginia</i>	4,058	863	21.3%	263	6.5%	1,126	27.7%	3.4%	\$4,261,538	\$3,800	15.9%
<i>Washington</i>	3,360	3	0.1%	3	0.1%	6	0.2%	0.0%	\$10,222	\$1,800	6.6%
<i>West Virginia</i>	717	185	25.8%	51	7.1%	236	32.9%	0.7%	\$784,426	\$3,300	13.7%
<i>Wisconsin</i>	2,834	643	22.7%	186	6.6%	829	29.2%	2.5%	\$2,920,966	\$3,500	16.2%
<i>Wyoming</i>	279	63	22.6%	19	6.7%	82	29.4%	0.2%	\$317,643	\$3,900	16.2%

Notes: Values reflect the result of the proposed change in the federal minimum wage. Wage changes resulting from scheduled state and local minimum wage laws are accounted for by EPI's Minimum Wage Simulation Model. Totals may not sum due to rounding. Shares calculated from unrounded values. Directly affected workers would see their wages rise as the new minimum wage rate will exceed their current hourly pay. Indirectly affected workers have a wage rate just above the new minimum wage (between the new minimum wage and 115 percent of the new minimum). They would receive a raise as employer pay scales are adjusted upward to reflect the new minimum wage.

Source: Economic Policy Institute Minimum Wage Simulation Model using data from the Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Congressional Budget Office. See David Cooper, Zane Mokhiber, and Ben Zipperer, *Minimum Wage Simulation Model Technical Methodology*, February 2019. Dollar values adjusted by projections for CPI-U in CBO 2019.

Economic Policy Institute