

The impact of the Raise the Wage Act of 2023, by congressional district

Fact Sheet • By [Ben Zipperer](#) • August 22, 2023

What does the Raise the Wage Act of 2023 do?

The federal minimum hourly wage is just \$7.25 and has not increased in 14 years, the longest period of congressional inaction in the history of the minimum wage. As a result, the real, cost-of-living-adjusted value of the minimum wage has fallen by 30%.

The Raise the Wage Act of 2023, introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate on July 25, 2023, would raise the federal minimum wage to \$17 an hour by 2028. The bill would also gradually raise and then eliminate subminimum wages for tipped workers, workers with disabilities, and youth workers, so that all workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) would be at the same wage level.

What would its impact be?

EPI's analysis shows that a \$17 minimum wage in 2028 would raise the wages of 27,858,000 workers across the country, or about 19% of the workforce. The increases would provide an additional \$86 billion annually in wages for the country's lowest-paid workers, with the average affected worker who works year-round receiving an extra \$3,100 per year.

How many workers would benefit in each congressional district?

Table 1 shows the number and shares of workers in each congressional district who would receive wage increases if the Raise the Wage Act of 2023 were enacted into law.

Table 1

Summary of effects in 2028 of increasing the minimum wage to \$17 by 2028, by congressional district

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
United States	146,831,000	27,858,000	19.0%	\$86,352	\$3,100
Alabama – 1	282,000	79,000	28.0%	\$355	\$4,510
Alabama – 2	268,000	80,000	29.8%	\$350	\$4,376
Alabama – 3	263,000	78,000	29.6%	\$330	\$4,238
Alabama – 4	273,000	77,000	28.1%	\$315	\$4,113
Alabama – 5	306,000	77,000	25.1%	\$313	\$4,067
Alabama – 6	307,000	68,000	22.2%	\$283	\$4,155
Alabama – 7	265,000	82,000	31.1%	\$367	\$4,460
Alaska	330,000	53,000	16.1%	\$100	\$1,876
Arizona – 1	372,000	59,000	16.0%	\$58	\$981
Arizona – 2	284,000	49,000	17.5%	\$48	\$971
Arizona – 3	356,000	101,000	28.4%	\$98	\$965
Arizona – 4	385,000	81,000	21.1%	\$76	\$939
Arizona – 5	352,000	53,000	15.1%	\$47	\$894
Arizona – 6	307,000	64,000	20.8%	\$60	\$943
Arizona – 7	318,000	87,000	27.5%	\$83	\$950
Arizona – 8	329,000	62,000	18.8%	\$59	\$948
Arizona – 9	318,000	73,000	22.8%	\$76	\$1,044
Arkansas – 1	276,000	81,000	29.4%	\$283	\$3,485
Arkansas – 2	322,000	81,000	25.1%	\$317	\$3,918
Arkansas – 3	337,000	89,000	26.5%	\$316	\$3,537
Arkansas – 4	278,000	85,000	30.7%	\$299	\$3,502
California – 1	302,000	*	*	*	*
California – 2	345,000	*	*	*	*
California – 3	331,000	*	*	*	*
California – 4	351,000	*	*	*	*
California – 5	333,000	*	*	*	*
California – 6	350,000	*	*	*	*
California – 7	353,000	*	*	*	*
California – 8	357,000	*	*	*	*
California – 9	331,000	*	*	*	*
California – 10	364,000	*	*	*	*
California – 11	393,000	*	*	*	*
California – 12	381,000	*	*	*	*

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
California – 13	301,000	*	*	*	*
California – 14	387,000	*	*	*	*
California – 15	388,000	*	*	*	*
California – 16	369,000	*	*	*	*
California – 17	400,000	*	*	*	*
California – 18	354,000	*	*	*	*
California – 19	368,000	*	*	*	*
California – 20	327,000	*	*	*	*
California – 21	311,000	*	*	*	*
California – 22	300,000	*	*	*	*
California – 23	285,000	*	*	*	*
California – 24	348,000	*	*	*	*
California – 25	300,000	*	*	*	*
California – 26	361,000	*	*	*	*
California – 27	328,000	*	*	*	*
California – 28	350,000	*	*	*	*
California – 29	369,000	*	*	*	*
California – 30	384,000	*	*	*	*
California – 31	370,000	*	*	*	*
California – 32	376,000	*	*	*	*
California – 33	350,000	*	*	*	*
California – 34	379,000	*	*	*	*
California – 35	381,000	*	*	*	*
California – 36	361,000	*	*	*	*
California – 37	366,000	*	*	*	*
California – 38	367,000	*	*	*	*
California – 39	366,000	*	*	*	*
California – 40	372,000	*	*	*	*
California – 41	343,000	*	*	*	*
California – 42	374,000	*	*	*	*
California – 43	356,000	*	*	*	*
California – 44	364,000	*	*	*	*
California – 45	358,000	*	*	*	*
California – 46	382,000	*	*	*	*
California – 47	378,000	*	*	*	*
California – 48	322,000	*	*	*	*

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
California – 49	350,000	*	*	*	*
California – 50	370,000	*	*	*	*
California – 51	368,000	*	*	*	*
California – 52	355,000	*	*	*	*
Colorado – 1	376,000	51,000	13.7%	\$58	\$1,124
Colorado – 2	346,000	54,000	15.6%	\$56	\$1,035
Colorado – 3	300,000	54,000	17.9%	\$55	\$1,016
Colorado – 4	343,000	44,000	12.7%	\$44	\$1,000
Colorado – 5	299,000	46,000	15.4%	\$45	\$974
Colorado – 6	345,000	48,000	13.9%	\$49	\$1,017
Colorado – 7	332,000	41,000	12.4%	\$41	\$1,001
Colorado – 8	339,000	54,000	15.9%	\$52	\$970
Connecticut – 1	340,000	8,000	2.3%	*	*
Connecticut – 2	337,000	14,000	4.1%	*	*
Connecticut – 3	348,000	9,000	2.5%	*	*
Connecticut – 4	348,000	10,000	2.9%	*	*
Connecticut – 5	334,000	9,000	2.7%	*	*
Delaware	427,000	104,000	24.4%	\$251	\$2,412
Florida – 1	293,000	75,000	25.6%	\$99	\$1,327
Florida – 2	307,000	82,000	26.7%	\$100	\$1,218
Florida – 3	279,000	77,000	27.5%	\$92	\$1,202
Florida – 4	312,000	79,000	25.2%	\$95	\$1,212
Florida – 5	340,000	66,000	19.4%	\$83	\$1,264
Florida – 6	277,000	76,000	27.4%	\$91	\$1,192
Florida – 7	329,000	69,000	21.1%	\$84	\$1,205
Florida – 8	295,000	70,000	23.7%	\$84	\$1,197
Florida – 9	350,000	108,000	30.8%	\$131	\$1,218
Florida – 10	342,000	101,000	29.4%	\$123	\$1,219
Florida – 11	286,000	76,000	26.5%	\$92	\$1,209
Florida – 12	273,000	66,000	24.3%	\$76	\$1,143
Florida – 13	310,000	70,000	22.6%	\$87	\$1,246
Florida – 14	356,000	82,000	22.9%	\$101	\$1,236
Florida – 15	337,000	83,000	24.6%	\$100	\$1,208
Florida – 16	315,000	75,000	23.9%	\$93	\$1,240
Florida – 17	285,000	77,000	27.0%	\$94	\$1,224
Florida – 18	283,000	92,000	32.5%	\$111	\$1,212

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
Florida – 19	293,000	77,000	26.3%	\$98	\$1,267
Florida – 20	322,000	92,000	28.6%	\$116	\$1,258
Florida – 21	309,000	82,000	26.5%	\$101	\$1,231
Florida – 22	317,000	89,000	28.1%	\$112	\$1,257
Florida – 23	345,000	80,000	23.2%	\$100	\$1,247
Florida – 24	329,000	104,000	31.5%	\$133	\$1,285
Florida – 25	362,000	77,000	21.2%	\$96	\$1,254
Florida – 26	354,000	111,000	31.2%	\$138	\$1,247
Florida – 27	369,000	94,000	25.4%	\$115	\$1,228
Florida – 28	355,000	95,000	26.7%	\$117	\$1,238
Georgia – 1	297,000	92,000	31.1%	\$403	\$4,370
Georgia – 2	276,000	88,000	32.0%	\$372	\$4,204
Georgia – 3	312,000	83,000	26.6%	\$346	\$4,157
Georgia – 4	351,000	90,000	25.7%	\$373	\$4,138
Georgia – 5	364,000	83,000	22.8%	\$385	\$4,643
Georgia – 6	370,000	64,000	17.3%	\$296	\$4,641
Georgia – 7	344,000	83,000	24.2%	\$399	\$4,788
Georgia – 8	275,000	89,000	32.6%	\$372	\$4,156
Georgia – 9	329,000	88,000	26.9%	\$366	\$4,149
Georgia – 10	326,000	90,000	27.7%	\$371	\$4,106
Georgia – 11	361,000	84,000	23.2%	\$372	\$4,433
Georgia – 12	289,000	91,000	31.5%	\$361	\$3,965
Georgia – 13	341,000	90,000	26.4%	\$402	\$4,457
Georgia – 14	318,000	85,000	26.6%	\$313	\$3,699
Hawaii – 1	354,000	*	*	*	*
Hawaii – 2	330,000	*	*	*	*
Idaho – 1	361,000	89,000	24.5%	\$316	\$3,568
Idaho – 2	360,000	99,000	27.5%	\$345	\$3,475
Illinois – 1	316,000	65,000	20.7%	\$84	\$1,284
Illinois – 2	311,000	71,000	22.9%	\$98	\$1,380
Illinois – 3	370,000	78,000	21.0%	\$118	\$1,518
Illinois – 4	341,000	83,000	24.2%	\$116	\$1,404
Illinois – 5	423,000	56,000	13.3%	\$98	\$1,743
Illinois – 6	358,000	57,000	15.9%	\$81	\$1,426
Illinois – 7	357,000	77,000	21.5%	\$108	\$1,411
Illinois – 8	381,000	71,000	18.6%	\$97	\$1,369

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
Illinois – 9	366,000	57,000	15.5%	\$98	\$1,732
Illinois – 10	355,000	67,000	18.8%	\$96	\$1,444
Illinois – 11	376,000	65,000	17.2%	\$89	\$1,380
Illinois – 12	312,000	67,000	21.5%	\$90	\$1,342
Illinois – 13	313,000	67,000	21.4%	\$99	\$1,480
Illinois – 14	368,000	84,000	22.9%	\$115	\$1,361
Illinois – 15	321,000	67,000	20.7%	\$89	\$1,333
Illinois – 16	336,000	69,000	20.6%	\$93	\$1,342
Illinois – 17	313,000	71,000	22.6%	\$99	\$1,400
Indiana – 1	317,000	80,000	25.4%	\$285	\$3,536
Indiana – 2	319,000	80,000	25.3%	\$257	\$3,194
Indiana – 3	329,000	79,000	23.9%	\$272	\$3,450
Indiana – 4	339,000	80,000	23.5%	\$263	\$3,296
Indiana – 5	336,000	73,000	21.9%	\$278	\$3,784
Indiana – 6	336,000	75,000	22.2%	\$253	\$3,396
Indiana – 7	350,000	93,000	26.6%	\$343	\$3,679
Indiana – 8	322,000	81,000	25.3%	\$281	\$3,453
Indiana – 9	327,000	79,000	24.1%	\$297	\$3,755
Iowa – 1	366,000	98,000	26.9%	\$311	\$3,163
Iowa – 2	365,000	99,000	27.3%	\$333	\$3,347
Iowa – 3	383,000	89,000	23.3%	\$315	\$3,530
Iowa – 4	365,000	100,000	27.5%	\$303	\$3,019
Kansas – 1	341,000	98,000	28.8%	\$354	\$3,605
Kansas – 2	310,000	84,000	27.0%	\$279	\$3,327
Kansas – 3	370,000	64,000	17.3%	\$250	\$3,916
Kansas – 4	321,000	81,000	25.3%	\$301	\$3,702
Kentucky – 1	282,000	81,000	28.6%	\$327	\$4,044
Kentucky – 2	308,000	84,000	27.1%	\$341	\$4,077
Kentucky – 3	342,000	84,000	24.5%	\$379	\$4,523
Kentucky – 4	331,000	75,000	22.7%	\$298	\$3,959
Kentucky – 5	228,000	67,000	29.5%	\$267	\$3,975
Kentucky – 6	334,000	93,000	27.7%	\$397	\$4,285
Louisiana – 1	343,000	97,000	28.3%	\$500	\$5,155
Louisiana – 2	309,000	101,000	32.7%	\$554	\$5,480
Louisiana – 3	328,000	105,000	32.2%	\$554	\$5,253
Louisiana – 4	279,000	101,000	36.1%	\$508	\$5,042

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
Louisiana – 5	286,000	101,000	35.5%	\$504	\$4,966
Louisiana – 6	355,000	105,000	29.5%	\$540	\$5,145
Maine – 1	315,000	50,000	15.8%	\$70	\$1,411
Maine – 2	285,000	56,000	19.8%	\$66	\$1,173
Maryland – 1	352,000	63,000	17.8%	\$163	\$2,603
Maryland – 2	371,000	58,000	15.5%	\$143	\$2,485
Maryland – 3	372,000	46,000	12.3%	\$129	\$2,805
Maryland – 4	370,000	52,000	13.9%	\$122	\$2,374
Maryland – 5	378,000	44,000	11.6%	\$128	\$2,914
Maryland – 6	365,000	44,000	12.1%	\$127	\$2,873
Maryland – 7	335,000	65,000	19.5%	\$140	\$2,149
Maryland – 8	387,000	16,000	4.2%	\$102	\$6,214
Massachusetts – 1	336,000	55,000	16.4%	\$90	\$1,631
Massachusetts – 2	373,000	53,000	14.3%	\$92	\$1,730
Massachusetts – 3	369,000	60,000	16.3%	\$108	\$1,799
Massachusetts – 4	371,000	40,000	10.7%	\$67	\$1,690
Massachusetts – 5	395,000	44,000	11.1%	\$84	\$1,914
Massachusetts – 6	386,000	49,000	12.6%	\$99	\$2,027
Massachusetts – 7	399,000	61,000	15.2%	\$116	\$1,900
Massachusetts – 8	402,000	55,000	13.6%	\$114	\$2,095
Massachusetts – 9	366,000	54,000	14.8%	\$104	\$1,927
Michigan – 1	305,000	74,000	24.1%	\$236	\$3,212
Michigan – 2	308,000	74,000	24.1%	\$233	\$3,134
Michigan – 3	364,000	83,000	22.8%	\$265	\$3,188
Michigan – 4	344,000	77,000	22.4%	\$253	\$3,276
Michigan – 5	321,000	67,000	20.9%	\$208	\$3,105
Michigan – 6	363,000	65,000	17.9%	\$221	\$3,412
Michigan – 7	348,000	71,000	20.5%	\$235	\$3,304
Michigan – 8	307,000	75,000	24.5%	\$251	\$3,336
Michigan – 9	338,000	65,000	19.1%	\$217	\$3,362
Michigan – 10	351,000	69,000	19.8%	\$236	\$3,405
Michigan – 11	377,000	63,000	16.8%	\$237	\$3,745
Michigan – 12	298,000	73,000	24.4%	\$237	\$3,257
Michigan – 13	286,000	79,000	27.8%	\$271	\$3,406
Minnesota – 1	338,000	60,000	17.6%	\$111	\$1,867
Minnesota – 2	360,000	45,000	12.5%	\$71	\$1,565

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
Minnesota – 3	346,000	31,000	9.1%	\$25	\$782
Minnesota – 4	337,000	49,000	14.6%	\$55	\$1,113
Minnesota – 5	365,000	51,000	13.9%	\$38	\$752
Minnesota – 6	350,000	46,000	13.2%	\$72	\$1,552
Minnesota – 7	316,000	53,000	16.8%	\$102	\$1,910
Minnesota – 8	303,000	52,000	17.3%	\$94	\$1,808
Mississippi – 1	311,000	106,000	34.0%	\$485	\$4,595
Mississippi – 2	256,000	100,000	39.1%	\$478	\$4,783
Mississippi – 3	303,000	104,000	34.5%	\$485	\$4,650
Mississippi – 4	293,000	104,000	35.7%	\$550	\$5,261
Missouri – 1	348,000	89,000	25.5%	\$219	\$2,467
Missouri – 2	353,000	57,000	16.3%	\$137	\$2,397
Missouri – 3	356,000	78,000	21.8%	\$186	\$2,391
Missouri – 4	316,000	81,000	25.6%	\$195	\$2,408
Missouri – 5	360,000	86,000	23.9%	\$224	\$2,605
Missouri – 6	324,000	76,000	23.4%	\$173	\$2,280
Missouri – 7	331,000	95,000	28.6%	\$230	\$2,421
Missouri – 8	306,000	84,000	27.6%	\$188	\$2,233
Montana – 1	232,000	60,000	25.7%	\$150	\$2,505
Montana – 2	220,000	53,000	24.2%	\$134	\$2,525
Nebraska – 1	319,000	67,000	20.9%	\$142	\$2,118
Nebraska – 2	312,000	61,000	19.6%	\$156	\$2,540
Nebraska – 3	291,000	65,000	22.5%	\$131	\$2,001
Nevada – 1	327,000	99,000	30.3%	\$224	\$2,264
Nevada – 2	357,000	83,000	23.2%	\$182	\$2,202
Nevada – 3	373,000	104,000	28.0%	\$242	\$2,322
Nevada – 4	321,000	94,000	29.3%	\$218	\$2,322
New Hampshire – 1	344,000	66,000	19.1%	\$226	\$3,434
New Hampshire – 2	324,000	59,000	18.1%	\$183	\$3,127
New Jersey – 1	343,000	63,000	18.3%	\$135	\$2,149
New Jersey – 2	325,000	74,000	22.7%	\$173	\$2,334
New Jersey – 3	354,000	52,000	14.6%	\$103	\$1,995
New Jersey – 4	315,000	54,000	17.3%	\$105	\$1,926
New Jersey – 5	367,000	46,000	12.7%	\$85	\$1,833
New Jersey – 6	369,000	62,000	16.9%	\$119	\$1,912
New Jersey – 7	368,000	51,000	13.9%	\$104	\$2,027

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
New Jersey – 8	381,000	90,000	23.6%	\$150	\$1,660
New Jersey – 9	360,000	76,000	21.2%	\$127	\$1,665
New Jersey – 10	330,000	71,000	21.6%	\$113	\$1,586
New Jersey – 11	357,000	49,000	13.7%	\$87	\$1,773
New Jersey – 12	363,000	56,000	15.6%	\$92	\$1,637
New Mexico – 1	331,000	81,000	24.6%	\$267	\$3,279
New Mexico – 2	285,000	90,000	31.7%	\$277	\$3,067
New Mexico – 3	274,000	75,000	27.3%	\$210	\$2,803
New York – 1	375,000	50,000	13.2%	\$55	\$1,109
New York – 2	399,000	69,000	17.4%	\$76	\$1,090
New York – 3	368,000	49,000	13.3%	\$59	\$1,203
New York – 4	383,000	58,000	15.2%	\$65	\$1,109
New York – 5	353,000	67,000	19.1%	\$73	\$1,086
New York – 6	345,000	70,000	20.4%	\$120	\$1,700
New York – 7	374,000	67,000	18.0%	\$93	\$1,383
New York – 8	314,000	63,000	20.0%	\$69	\$1,092
New York – 9	338,000	64,000	19.1%	\$70	\$1,093
New York – 10	358,000	54,000	15.2%	\$79	\$1,450
New York – 11	326,000	52,000	15.9%	\$65	\$1,245
New York – 12	379,000	19,000	5.1%	\$27	\$1,409
New York – 13	341,000	87,000	25.6%	\$109	\$1,245
New York – 14	314,000	80,000	25.5%	\$116	\$1,447
New York – 15	298,000	95,000	32.0%	\$108	\$1,130
New York – 16	367,000	60,000	16.2%	\$77	\$1,289
New York – 17	346,000	52,000	14.9%	\$58	\$1,130
New York – 18	355,000	60,000	16.9%	\$76	\$1,270
New York – 19	341,000	64,000	18.7%	\$65	\$1,011
New York – 20	362,000	56,000	15.4%	\$59	\$1,053
New York – 21	323,000	57,000	17.8%	\$61	\$1,055
New York – 22	332,000	58,000	17.4%	\$64	\$1,113
New York – 23	326,000	56,000	17.1%	\$59	\$1,052
New York – 24	332,000	60,000	18.1%	\$58	\$968
New York – 25	362,000	62,000	17.2%	\$64	\$1,022
New York – 26	342,000	64,000	18.7%	\$66	\$1,039
North Carolina – 1	292,000	103,000	35.1%	\$419	\$4,082
North Carolina – 2	370,000	74,000	20.0%	\$328	\$4,427

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
North Carolina – 3	274,000	100,000	36.5%	\$429	\$4,284
North Carolina – 4	334,000	94,000	28.1%	\$396	\$4,226
North Carolina – 5	297,000	92,000	31.0%	\$369	\$4,003
North Carolina – 6	328,000	99,000	30.1%	\$437	\$4,433
North Carolina – 7	301,000	97,000	32.1%	\$417	\$4,311
North Carolina – 8	310,000	86,000	27.8%	\$354	\$4,106
North Carolina – 9	274,000	90,000	32.9%	\$378	\$4,198
North Carolina – 10	311,000	91,000	29.3%	\$352	\$3,854
North Carolina – 11	297,000	90,000	30.1%	\$401	\$4,479
North Carolina – 12	355,000	98,000	27.5%	\$421	\$4,312
North Carolina – 13	337,000	85,000	25.2%	\$372	\$4,371
North Carolina – 14	380,000	91,000	24.0%	\$393	\$4,312
North Dakota	367,000	66,000	18.0%	\$224	\$3,404
Ohio – 1	361,000	79,000	21.9%	\$256	\$3,226
Ohio – 2	305,000	73,000	24.0%	\$211	\$2,896
Ohio – 3	389,000	95,000	24.5%	\$282	\$2,962
Ohio – 4	344,000	80,000	23.3%	\$222	\$2,774
Ohio – 5	348,000	88,000	25.4%	\$249	\$2,820
Ohio – 6	319,000	88,000	27.4%	\$258	\$2,949
Ohio – 7	363,000	75,000	20.5%	\$218	\$2,925
Ohio – 8	351,000	80,000	22.8%	\$243	\$3,030
Ohio – 9	340,000	87,000	25.6%	\$271	\$3,113
Ohio – 10	342,000	89,000	26.1%	\$270	\$3,030
Ohio – 11	339,000	98,000	29.0%	\$314	\$3,197
Ohio – 12	337,000	86,000	25.4%	\$244	\$2,840
Ohio – 13	348,000	90,000	25.8%	\$277	\$3,082
Ohio – 14	343,000	83,000	24.2%	\$251	\$3,022
Ohio – 15	362,000	80,000	22.1%	\$240	\$2,998
Oklahoma – 1	352,000	104,000	29.6%	\$443	\$4,251
Oklahoma – 2	301,000	106,000	35.1%	\$430	\$4,070
Oklahoma – 3	320,000	114,000	35.5%	\$488	\$4,290
Oklahoma – 4	329,000	104,000	31.7%	\$440	\$4,212
Oklahoma – 5	363,000	108,000	29.7%	\$478	\$4,428
Oregon – 1	329,000	7,000	2.1%	*	*
Oregon – 2	263,000	40,000	15.3%	\$26	\$650
Oregon – 3	338,000	3,000	0.9%	*	*

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
Oregon – 4	280,000	41,000	14.7%	\$25	\$600
Oregon – 5	308,000	19,000	6.3%	\$12	\$605
Oregon – 6	310,000	30,000	9.7%	\$19	\$629
Pennsylvania – 1	367,000	60,000	16.5%	\$249	\$4,123
Pennsylvania – 2	315,000	85,000	27.1%	\$386	\$4,530
Pennsylvania – 3	348,000	88,000	25.3%	\$368	\$4,168
Pennsylvania – 4	367,000	58,000	15.8%	\$245	\$4,221
Pennsylvania – 5	347,000	66,000	19.1%	\$276	\$4,164
Pennsylvania – 6	367,000	72,000	19.7%	\$312	\$4,326
Pennsylvania – 7	352,000	77,000	22.0%	\$306	\$3,957
Pennsylvania – 8	322,000	75,000	23.4%	\$279	\$3,712
Pennsylvania – 9	317,000	70,000	21.9%	\$250	\$3,597
Pennsylvania – 10	348,000	75,000	21.5%	\$295	\$3,943
Pennsylvania – 11	363,000	82,000	22.5%	\$297	\$3,645
Pennsylvania – 12	348,000	72,000	20.7%	\$295	\$4,104
Pennsylvania – 13	316,000	73,000	23.1%	\$268	\$3,689
Pennsylvania – 14	316,000	70,000	22.1%	\$266	\$3,823
Pennsylvania – 15	305,000	75,000	24.4%	\$264	\$3,547
Pennsylvania – 16	314,000	73,000	23.3%	\$284	\$3,880
Pennsylvania – 17	354,000	62,000	17.5%	\$249	\$4,038
Rhode Island – 1	247,000	43,000	17.5%	\$95	\$2,200
Rhode Island – 2	255,000	41,000	16.0%	\$95	\$2,317
South Carolina – 1	310,000	77,000	24.9%	\$356	\$4,606
South Carolina – 2	317,000	82,000	25.8%	\$345	\$4,225
South Carolina – 3	290,000	79,000	27.4%	\$316	\$3,983
South Carolina – 4	332,000	87,000	26.1%	\$373	\$4,303
South Carolina – 5	302,000	81,000	26.9%	\$332	\$4,086
South Carolina – 6	300,000	87,000	29.1%	\$378	\$4,321
South Carolina – 7	274,000	90,000	33.0%	\$417	\$4,609
South Dakota	401,000	96,000	23.8%	\$250	\$2,619
Tennessee – 1	290,000	90,000	31.0%	\$385	\$4,282
Tennessee – 2	333,000	88,000	26.3%	\$384	\$4,384
Tennessee – 3	315,000	85,000	27.0%	\$361	\$4,233
Tennessee – 4	331,000	91,000	27.6%	\$389	\$4,267
Tennessee – 5	357,000	79,000	22.1%	\$347	\$4,397
Tennessee – 6	332,000	89,000	26.7%	\$371	\$4,174

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
Tennessee – 7	333,000	84,000	25.3%	\$367	\$4,354
Tennessee – 8	303,000	80,000	26.6%	\$329	\$4,083
Tennessee – 9	321,000	99,000	30.9%	\$422	\$4,254
Texas – 1	302,000	88,000	29.0%	\$371	\$4,240
Texas – 2	331,000	67,000	20.3%	\$325	\$4,840
Texas – 3	361,000	62,000	17.2%	\$290	\$4,672
Texas – 4	359,000	73,000	20.4%	\$327	\$4,476
Texas – 5	338,000	90,000	26.7%	\$406	\$4,497
Texas – 6	336,000	91,000	27.0%	\$399	\$4,388
Texas – 7	401,000	101,000	25.2%	\$496	\$4,897
Texas – 8	346,000	79,000	22.7%	\$376	\$4,778
Texas – 9	340,000	100,000	29.5%	\$459	\$4,574
Texas – 10	335,000	87,000	26.0%	\$394	\$4,519
Texas – 11	321,000	89,000	27.9%	\$416	\$4,651
Texas – 12	356,000	82,000	22.9%	\$370	\$4,536
Texas – 13	340,000	101,000	29.8%	\$463	\$4,577
Texas – 14	312,000	76,000	24.2%	\$362	\$4,785
Texas – 15	310,000	114,000	36.9%	\$545	\$4,770
Texas – 16	330,000	116,000	35.2%	\$511	\$4,398
Texas – 17	323,000	92,000	28.4%	\$395	\$4,304
Texas – 18	336,000	102,000	30.4%	\$470	\$4,593
Texas – 19	331,000	106,000	32.1%	\$485	\$4,572
Texas – 20	363,000	121,000	33.2%	\$583	\$4,831
Texas – 21	356,000	90,000	25.3%	\$440	\$4,889
Texas – 22	353,000	71,000	20.0%	\$314	\$4,448
Texas – 23	329,000	97,000	29.5%	\$441	\$4,532
Texas – 24	361,000	73,000	20.3%	\$344	\$4,694
Texas – 25	347,000	86,000	24.8%	\$389	\$4,522
Texas – 26	395,000	78,000	19.7%	\$371	\$4,773
Texas – 27	331,000	96,000	29.1%	\$439	\$4,567
Texas – 28	320,000	113,000	35.2%	\$499	\$4,426
Texas – 29	318,000	113,000	35.5%	\$498	\$4,411
Texas – 30	358,000	102,000	28.4%	\$449	\$4,405
Texas – 31	340,000	77,000	22.7%	\$349	\$4,515
Texas – 32	375,000	98,000	26.1%	\$449	\$4,582
Texas – 33	363,000	113,000	31.0%	\$486	\$4,316

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
Texas – 34	296,000	126,000	42.6%	\$564	\$4,474
Texas – 35	372,000	114,000	30.5%	\$556	\$4,901
Texas – 36	310,000	81,000	26.2%	\$397	\$4,883
Texas – 37	426,000	78,000	18.4%	\$378	\$4,830
Texas – 38	364,000	78,000	21.4%	\$381	\$4,893
Utah – 1	354,000	75,000	21.1%	\$235	\$3,139
Utah – 2	346,000	79,000	22.9%	\$246	\$3,098
Utah – 3	341,000	85,000	24.8%	\$254	\$3,006
Utah – 4	343,000	71,000	20.6%	\$205	\$2,902
Vermont	292,000	46,000	15.7%	\$74	\$1,606
Virginia – 1	356,000	67,000	18.7%	\$173	\$2,593
Virginia – 2	348,000	71,000	20.5%	\$207	\$2,914
Virginia – 3	331,000	85,000	25.8%	\$219	\$2,569
Virginia – 4	350,000	84,000	24.1%	\$208	\$2,466
Virginia – 5	332,000	79,000	23.6%	\$183	\$2,329
Virginia – 6	344,000	82,000	24.0%	\$220	\$2,669
Virginia – 7	374,000	73,000	19.5%	\$196	\$2,698
Virginia – 8	407,000	51,000	12.5%	\$162	\$3,204
Virginia – 9	291,000	68,000	23.5%	\$154	\$2,253
Virginia – 10	399,000	62,000	15.6%	\$176	\$2,823
Virginia – 11	394,000	54,000	13.7%	\$162	\$3,012
Washington – 1	357,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 2	328,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 3	316,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 4	316,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 5	312,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 6	303,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 7	422,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 8	344,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 9	350,000	*	*	*	*
Washington – 10	319,000	*	*	*	*
West Virginia – 1	309,000	84,000	27.2%	\$317	\$3,774
West Virginia – 2	375,000	98,000	26.0%	\$363	\$3,715
Wisconsin – 1	338,000	80,000	23.7%	\$270	\$3,374
Wisconsin – 2	374,000	70,000	18.7%	\$240	\$3,422
Wisconsin – 3	335,000	75,000	22.5%	\$268	\$3,548

Table 1
(cont.)

Congressional district	Total employed	Total affected	Share affected	Total annual wage change (2023\$, millions)	Average annual wage increase of affected workers (2023\$)
Wisconsin – 4	328,000	91,000	27.9%	\$348	\$3,808
Wisconsin – 5	362,000	62,000	17.1%	\$221	\$3,565
Wisconsin – 6	344,000	70,000	20.3%	\$234	\$3,357
Wisconsin – 7	330,000	73,000	22.0%	\$233	\$3,208
Wisconsin – 8	344,000	73,000	21.1%	\$250	\$3,438
Wyoming	260,000	65,000	24.9%	\$278	\$4,288

Notes: Affected workers are workers who would receive wage increases because they are directly affected (otherwise earning less than \$15 per hour in 2025) or indirectly affected (earning just slightly above \$17 in 2028). Asterisks (*) denote districts either where sufficient data are not available or where few, if any, workers are likely to be affected by a change in the federal minimum wage because the prevailing state or local minimum wage will already be \$17 or higher by 2028. For data on the at-large congressional district for the District of Columbia, see Table 2 in [The Impact of the Raise the Wage Act of 2023](#), which provides data on impacts in every state and D.C. The values reflect the result of the proposed change in the federal minimum wage and wage changes resulting from scheduled state and local minimum wage laws are accounted for in the simulation. Totals may not sum due to rounding. See the methodology at <https://www.epi.org/publication/minimum-wage-simulation-model-technical-methodology/> for details.

Source: Economic Policy Institute [Minimum Wage Simulation Model](#) using data from the Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Congressional Budget Office. For national and state-level estimates, see Ben Zipperer, [The Impact of the Raise the Wage Act of 2023](#), July 25, 2023.

Economic Policy Institute

Why are workers in some states less likely to be affected?

In summer 2023, 19 states and localities implemented minimum wage increases based on state, local, or municipal laws that already set the minimum wage higher than the federal standard. In total, 30 states and the District of Columbia have a minimum wage above the federal minimum, and many more localities have minimum wages above their state minimum wage. Workers in most of these states will still benefit from a \$17 federal minimum wage, but the effect is muted because low-wage workers in those states have already seen wage increases above the federal minimum.

California, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Washington all have state- or municipality-level minimum wage laws that will set minimum wages close to, or above, the Raise the Wage Act’s proposal of \$17 by 2028. Because of this, only a small number of workers in those states would be directly affected by the federal policy as state/local laws will have already raised the wages of low-wage workers in those jurisdictions. Because of the smaller impacted population, more detailed impact estimates are unavailable for those states. (Cells for which data are unavailable are marked with * in Table 1.)

Why is it critical that the Raise the Wage Act be passed?

As EPI's [state-by-state minimum wage tracker shows](#), raising the federal minimum wage is critical to protect workers (especially in the South) who have been left behind. A higher federal minimum wage can build on existing state-level standards and [lock in the wage gains](#) made by low-wage workers in the economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Assumptions and documentation for EPI's Minimum Wage Simulation Model

- The estimates are for the year 2028, when the policy's regular minimum wage is \$17 and the tipped minimum wage is \$15.
- The underlying wage distribution is based on the 2022 Current Population Survey.
- The underlying geographic data is based on the 2015–2019 American Community Survey (ACS), reweighted to match 2019 ACS-based gender-specific employment counts of congressional districts for the 118th Congress.
- The simulation assumes nominal wage growth will be at a 5.0% annual rate between 2022 and 2023, and at an annual rate of 0.5% plus projected CPI growth in subsequent years.
- The simulation accounts for estimated effects of projected state and local minimum wages between 2023 and 2028.
- To read more about the EPI Minimum Wage Simulation Model, [see the description in Cooper, Mokhiber, and Zipperer \(2019\)](#).