

Utah Data Guide

A Newsletter For Data Users

Utah State Data Center
 Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
 Demographic and Economic Analysis

St. George Ranked as the Fastest Growing Metro Area in the U.S.

Fastest Growing

From 2000-2006, the St. George metro area was the fastest-growing in the nation with a growth rate of 39.8%. Greeley, Colorado ranked second with a growth rate of 31.0% followed by Cape Coral-Fort Myers, Florida (29.6%); Bend, Oregon (29.3%); and Las Vegas, Nevada (29.2%). The Provo-Orem area ranked sixth with a growth rate of 25.9%. Both the Ogden-Clearfield area and the Salt Lake City are ranked in the top 100. Ogden-Clearfield ranked 56th with a growth rate of 12.4% and Salt Lake City ranked 81st with a rate of 10.2%. The top ten fastest-growing metro areas are all in the West (six) or the South (four). Of the top 50 fastest-growing metro areas, 23 are in the West and 25 are in the South.

Palm Coast, Florida was the fastest-growing micro area from 2000-2006 with a rate of growth of 66.7%. Fernley, Nevada ranked second with a growth rate of 48.5% followed by Heber, Utah (33.1%); Pahump, Nevada (31.3%); and Culpeper, Virginia (30.2%). Cedar City, Utah ranked ninth with a growth rate of 20.0% from 2000 to 2006. Two other Utah micro areas ranked in the top 100 fastest growing. Vernal ranked 54th with a rate of 10.8% and Brigham City ranked 58th with a rate of 10.4%.

Numerical Increase

The metro area with the largest numerical increase from April 1, 2000, to July 1, 2006 was the Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, Georgia metro area with 890,211 new residents. Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, Texas ranked second with an increase of 842,449 followed by Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, Texas (824,547); Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, Arizona (787,306); and Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, California (771,314). The top five metro areas were all in the South or West.

In Utah, Salt Lake City ranked 37th with an increase of 98,839 from 2000-2006; Provo-Orem ranked 39th with an increase of 97,402; Ogden-Clearfield ranked 66th with an increase of 54,984; and St. George ranked 91st with an increase of 35,958.

Largest Metro Areas

New York was the most populous metro area on July 1, 2006, with 18.8 million people, followed by Los Angeles (13 million), Chicago (9.5 million), Dallas (6 million), and Philadelphia (5.8 million). Fourteen metro areas had populations of 4 million or more.

The Salt Lake City area continued to be Utah's largest metro area with nearly 1.1 million people on July 1, 2006. Salt Lake was the 48th largest metro area in the nation, moving up from 50th in 2000. The Ogden-Clearfield

area was the second largest in Utah with 497,640 people and the Provo-Orem area followed closely behind with a population of 474,180.

Population Decrease

The New Orleans metro area experienced the greatest numeric loss from April 1, 2000, to July 1, 2006, declining 291,834 people to 1 million. This is almost entirely due to the effects of Hurricane Katrina on the region. The Pittsburgh area experienced a loss of 60,309; Cleveland lost 33,855; Buffalo-Niagara Falls lost 32,589; and Gulfport-Biloxi, Mississippi lost 18,286 since 2000. The New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, Louisiana, metro area also had the biggest percentage loss during the same time period at 22.2%. It was followed by Gulfport-Biloxi, Mississippi (-7.4%); Weirton-Steubenville, West Virginia-Ohio (-5.2%); Lawton, Oklahoma (-5.1%); and Decatur, Illinois (-4.7%). Utah's metro areas all experienced population gains from 2000-2006. For more information and detailed tables please visit <http://www.census.gov/popest/metro.html>.

Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas

The U.S. Census Bureau recently released July 1, 2006 estimates for metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas. Metropolitan (metro) and micropolitan (micro) statistical areas are geographic entities defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget for use by federal statistical agencies in collecting, tabulating, and publishing statistics. When talking about metro and micro statistical areas collectively, the term Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) became effective in 2000.

The concept of a metropolitan or micropolitan statistical area is that of a core area containing a population nucleus, with surrounding communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with the core, often measured by commuting to work. A metro area has an urban core area of 50,000 or more and a micro area has an urban core of at least 10,000 but less than 50,000. Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas can cover one or more counties and even extend across state lines. A local example is the Logan UT-ID metro area which covers Cache County and extends into Franklin County, Idaho.

The largest city in each CBSA is designated a "principal city," with other cities able qualify for that status if specified population and employment requirements are met. The title of each CBSA consists of the names of up to three of its principal cities and the name of each state into which the metropolitan or micropolitan statistical area extends. Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas are further defined on the U.S. Census Bureau's website <http://www.census.gov/popest/metro.html>.

Contents

Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas	1
Local Update of Census Addresses	3
U.S. Census Bureau County Population Estimates	4
Affiliates Corner: Mountainland Association of Governments	6
Current Economic Conditions and Outlook	7

100 Fastest Growing Metropolitan Areas from 2000 to 2006

Rank	Geographic Area	Population Estimates		Change, 2000 to 2006		Population Estimates	
		Base	July 1, 2006	Number	Percent	Base	July 1, 2006
1	St. George, UT	90,354	126,312	35,958	39.8	1,711,716	1,942,217
2	Greeley, CO	180,861	236,857	55,996	31.0	207,355	234,670
3	Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	440,888	571,344	130,456	29.6	129,461	146,153
4	Bend, OR	115,367	149,140	33,773	29.3	142,361	160,301
5	Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	1,375,738	1,777,539	401,801	29.2	2,396,013	2,697,731
6	Provo-Orem, UT	376,778	474,180	97,402	25.9	442,656	497,640
7	Naples-Marco Island, FL	251,377	314,649	63,272	25.2	319,605	359,180
8	Raleigh-Cary, NC	797,025	994,551	197,526	24.8	102,982	115,700
9	Gainesville, GA	139,315	173,256	33,941	24.4	476,230	534,359
10	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	3,251,876	4,039,182	787,306	24.2	99,965	112,123
11	Prescott, AZ	167,517	208,014	40,497	24.2	843,746	946,362
12	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	3,254,821	4,026,135	771,314	23.7	443,340	496,575
13	McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	569,463	700,634	131,171	23.0	729,653	816,811
14	Port St. Lucie-Fort Pierce, FL	319,426	392,117	72,691	22.8	120,061	134,397
15	Ocala, FL	258,916	316,183	57,267	22.1	166,079	185,479
16	Boise City-Nampa, ID	464,840	567,640	102,800	22.1	799,407	891,756
17	Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC	196,629	238,493	41,864	21.3	537,484	599,127
18	Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	347,045	420,876	73,831	21.3	166,823	185,953
19	Austin-Round Rock, TX	1,249,763	1,513,565	263,802	21.1	174,706	194,635
20	Coeur d'Alene, ID	108,685	131,507	22,822	21.0	113,801	126,473
21	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	4,248,012	5,138,223	890,211	21.0	174,682	193,888
22	Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	1,644,563	1,984,855	340,292	20.7	481,398	534,230
23	Laredo, TX	193,117	231,470	38,353	19.9	1,311,789	1,455,097
24	Stockton, CA	563,598	673,170	109,572	19.4	1,927,881	2,137,565
25	Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	1,330,403	1,583,016	252,613	19.0	347,218	384,600
26	Madera, CA	123,109	146,345	23,236	18.9	2,179,320	2,408,750
27	Wilmington, NC	274,550	326,166	51,616	18.8	368,374	407,092
28	Bakersfield, CA	661,655	780,117	118,462	17.9	148,218	163,505
29	Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WA	191,825	226,033	34,208	17.8	4,796,180	5,290,400
30	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	4,715,402	5,539,949	824,547	17.5	163,256	179,951
31	Yuma, AZ	160,026	187,555	27,529	17.2	968,883	1,067,722
32	Reno-Sparks, NV	342,885	400,560	57,675	16.8	129,287	142,407
33	Merced, CA	210,554	245,658	35,104	16.7	342,627	376,753
34	Dover, DE	126,700	147,601	20,901	16.5	548,972	603,178
35	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	5,161,518	6,003,967	842,449	16.3	251,494	276,253
36	Yuba City, CA	139,149	161,806	22,657	16.3	163,618	179,573
37	Lakeland, FL	483,924	561,606	77,682	16.1	423,800	464,389
38	Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL	589,963	682,833	92,870	15.7	174,021	190,278
39	Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	335,227	387,717	52,490	15.7	115,092	125,781
40	Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV	222,771	257,619	34,848	15.6	1,525,104	1,666,032
41	Winchester, VA-WV	102,997	118,932	15,935	15.5	167,396	182,784
42	Sebastian-Vero Beach, FL	112,947	130,100	17,153	15.2	293,299	320,013
43	Warner Robins, GA	110,765	127,530	16,765	15.1	5,007,988	5,463,857
44	Idaho Falls, ID	101,677	116,980	15,303	15.1	130,794	142,661
45	Sacramento-Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	1,796,857	2,067,117	270,260	15.0	381,751	416,322
46	Grand Junction, CO	116,935	134,189	17,254	14.8	141,627	154,438
47	Modesto, CA	446,997	512,138	65,141	14.6	1,096,957	1,194,008
48	Visalia-Porterville, CA	368,021	419,909	51,888	14.1	123,812	134,744
49	Jacksonville, FL	1,122,750	1,277,997	155,247	13.8	104,166	113,320
50	Sioux Falls, SD	187,093	212,911	25,818	13.8	320,204	348,252
51	San Antonio, TX						
52	Olympia, WA						
53	Hanford-Corcoran, CA						
54	El Centro, CA						
55	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL						
56	Ogden-Clearfield, UT						
57	Anchorage, AK						
58	Mount Vernon-Anacortes, WA						
59	Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL						
60	Lawrence, KS						
61	Tucson, AZ						
62	Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL						
63	Albuquerque, NM						
64	Dalton, GA						
65	Athens-Clarke County, GA						
66	Fresno, CA						
67	Colorado Springs, CO						
68	Bellingham, WA						
69	Tyler, TX						
70	Farmington, NM						
71	Las Cruces, NM						
72	Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA						
73	Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro, TN						
74	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA						
75	Salem, OR						
76	Denver-Aurora, CO1						
77	Springfield, MO						
78	Panama City-Lynn Haven, FL						
79	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-						
80	Redding, CA						
81	Salt Lake City, UT						
82	Santa Fe, NM						
83	Huntsville, AL						
84	Charleston-North Charleston, SC						
85	Fort Collins-Loveland, CO						
86	Rochester, MN						
87	Durham, NC						
88	Charlottesville, VA						
89	Auburn-Opelika, AL						
90	Indianapolis-Carmel, IN						
91	St. Cloud, MN						
92	Savannah, GA						
93	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL						
94	Burlington, NC						
95	York-Hanover, PA						
96	Punta Gorda, FL						
97	Richmond, VA						
98	Hattiesburg, MS						
99	Bowling Green, KY						
100	Rockford, IL						

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division

Local Update of Census Addresses

With approximately three years remaining before the 2010 Decennial Census, the U.S. Census Bureau is preparing for that important event. One of the Census Bureau's important programs, the Local Update of Census Addresses, is already well underway. LUCA is a significant way the Census Bureau works with local government to ensure the accuracy of the decennial census.

Introduction

With over 300 million residents, the Census Bureau has found that the mail, both in terms of cost and resource utilization, is the most important method the Census Bureau uses to distribute census surveys. However, participation in the mail survey has decreased over several censuses. From 1970 to 1990, public responsiveness to the mail survey fell from 78% to 65%. In other words, nearly four out of five persons contacted by mail by the Census Bureau in 1970 responded by filling out and returning the census survey without further contact. By 1990, this rate fell to slightly less than two out of three. When households do not respond to the survey by mail, the Census Bureau spends greater resources to track down these non-respondents to ensure a full and complete survey.

In an effort to increase the response rate from mail surveys, Congress passed the Census Address List Improvement Act of 1994. This law authorized the Census Bureau to contact state, local, and tribal governments to invite participation in updating the Census Bureau's address list. Because of the Census Bureau's effort to collaborate with local government in verifying addresses, overall response rates to the 2000 Census increased, reversing a 30-year trend of declining participation. With increased participation for 2010, the hope exists that mail participation will be even higher than 2000.

Why is LUCA important?

LUCA is one of the most important decennial census programs. Since a majority of surveys are returned by mail, a complete and accurate address list is essential to a complete and accurate census. In addition to completing an actual enumeration mandated by the Constitution for apportionment of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, accurate census data are important in other ways. Census data are used to allocate federal monies to state governments. Census data provide statistical support for grant applications which fund important programs in each community--from health programs to security programs.

LUCA allows local governments to review the address lists which the Census Bureau maintains for accuracy. Although the Bureau receives address updates from different sources, including an updated mailing address list from the Postal Service, LUCA is an important part in this process because local governments often have data which are more accurate and more specific than even the Postal Service may have.

Consider two examples where local government may have more accurate data. The first is a situation where a community relies on post office boxes for mail delivery. Because post office boxes do not necessarily correspond to actual physical addresses, post office boxes provided by the Postal Service are less useful to the Census Bureau for enumeration purposes. In this case, physical addresses from local governments, which they may have either for utility billing or 911-emergency services are an important piece of information to the Bureau. Next consider

the case of new construction, a situation facing many communities in Utah. Because of the permitting involved with new construction, local governments are better equipped to ascertain where new residences will be than nearly any other entity.

Confidentiality of Census Information

Census information is highly sensitive, and great measures are taken to ensure that its confidentiality is maintained. This confidentiality is maintained for several reasons. First, the Census Bureau relies on the candor of the public in honestly and truthfully answering the survey items it sends to the public. If the public had any reason to believe that the information shared with the Census Bureau could be used in a way other than that which was represented, the public may be less willing to provide it and the reliability of the Bureau's information could be limited. Second, the Census Bureau has a strong incentive to maintain the highly personal information which it receives. For these, and other, reasons, Census Bureau information is protected and confidential under Title 13 U.S.C. Heavy penalties may be levied against individuals who fail to take the necessary precautions to safeguard Census information.

LUCA Participation and Timeline

The Census Bureau will give local governments several participation options. Each of these options is designed to accommodate the needs of each community based upon the level of participation they desire. The program operates as follows:

- Invited governments designate a LUCA liaison to review the portion of the Census address list covering the area under its jurisdiction. The LUCA liaison will be prohibited from disclosing confidential census information. The address list is confidential under Title 13 U.S.C. Participants must review a set of security guidelines and sign a confidentiality agreement promising to protect the confidentiality of the addresses.
- The Census Bureau will send the LUCA liaison an address list, corresponding maps, and address tallies for the community or communities involved. Small communities have the option of receiving either paper or electronic versions of all materials; for larger communities, the materials are provided in electronic form only.
- The LUCA liaison will review the addresses and provide input based upon the participation option selected. This may include submitting

(Continued on page 6)

Tentative 2010 Decennial Census LUCA Schedule	
Time Frame	Activity
January to February 2007	LUCA Advance notice letters mailed to the highest elected official and other contacts in all active functioning governments.
July 1, 2007	LUCA invitation letters and registration materials mailed to the highest elected official and other contacts of each government.
July 2007 to January 2008	Invited governments register for LUCA and the Census Bureau ships the LUCA review materials to each participating government.
August 2007 to March 2008	LUCA participants review and update the address list and return their comments to the Census Bureau's Regional Office.
April 2008 to October 2008	Census Bureau reviews the participant's LUCA submission and updates the Master Address File and the TIGER geographic
November 2008 to May 2009	Census Bureau prepares for and conducts the Address Canvassing Operation using GPS equipped hand-held computers.
June 2009 to October 2009	Census Bureau ships feedback materials to the LUCA participants showing how we processed each government's LUCA submissions.
September 2009 to December 2009	LUCA participants review their LUCA feedback and have the opportunity to appeal the results to the LUCA Appeals Office.
September 2009 to January 2010	LUCA Appeals Office reviews and adjudicates the appeals.

U.S. Census Bureau County Estimates

Fastest Growing

The U.S. Census Bureau released July 1, 2006 county population estimates on March 22, 2007. Of the counties with a population of 10,000 or more, Flagler County, Florida was the fastest-growing county with a population increase of 66.7% from the 2000 Census to July 1, 2006. Nine of the top-ten fastest-growing counties were located in the South or the West. Kendall County, Illinois ranked second at 61.7% followed by Rockwall County, Texas (60.5%); Loudoun County, Virginia (58.5%); Forsyth County, Georgia (53.4%); Pinal County, Arizona (51.0%); Douglas County, Colorado (50.0%); Henry County, Georgia (49.2%); Paulding County, Georgia (48.9%); and Lyon County, Nevada (48.5%).

Utah had four counties rank in the top 100 fastest growing counties in the nation. Washington County had a growth rate of 39.8% from the 2000 Census to July 1, 2006 and ranked 19th in the nation. Wasatch County ranked 35th, Tooele County ranked 40th, and Utah County ranked 84th, with growth rates of 33.1%, 31.5%, and 26.1% respectively.

From July 1, 2005 to July 1, 2006 the fastest growing county in the nation was Chattahoochee County, Georgia with a growth rate of 13.2%. Seven of the top ten fastest growing counties were in the South, two in the West, and one in the Midwest. Pinal County, Arizona was the second fastest growing county with an growth rate of 12.9%; followed by Kendall County, Illinois (10.8%); Rockwall County, Texas (10.0%); Flagler County, Florida (9.3%); Pearl River County, Mississippi (8.8%); Lyon County, Nevada (8.2%); Paulding County, Georgia (8.0%); Ascension Parish, Louisiana (7.6%); and Sumter County, Florida (7.6%).

Utah had four counties rank in the top 100 fastest growing counties in the nation from July 1, 2005 to July 1, 2006. Wasatch County, with a growth rate of 6.5%, ranked 16th in the nation, followed by Washington County ranking 20th (6.0%), Iron County ranking 37th (5.5%), and Tooele County ranking 91st (4.5%).

Numerical Increase

Maricopa County, Arizona had the largest numerical increase in population from 2000-2006 with an increase of 695,784 people. It was followed by Harris County, Texas (485,653); Riverside County, California (481,416); Los Angeles, California (428,751); and Clark County, Nevada (401,801).

Utah had two counties rank in the top 100 largest numerical increases in the nation. The population in Utah County increased by 96,220 ranking the county 36th in the nation for numerical increase from the 2000 Census to July 1, 2006.

During the same period, Salt Lake County's population increased by 80,289, ranking the county 42nd.

Maricopa County, Arizona also had the largest increase from July 1, 2005 to July 1, 2006 with 129,642 new residents. It was followed by Harris County, Texas (123,363); Riverside County, California (81,411); Clark County, Nevada (68,175); and Tarrant County, Texas (51,629). Salt Lake County had a numerical increase from 2005 to 2006 of 18,404 people, ranking the county 33rd in the nation. Utah County and Davis County also made the top 100 largest numerical increases with 12,905 and 8,175 new residents respectively.

Largest Counties

The largest county in the nation was once again Los Angeles County, California with 9.9 million residents followed by Cook County, Illinois (5.3 million); Harris County, Texas (3.9 million); Maricopa County, Arizona (3.8 million); and Orange County, California (3.0 million).

Salt Lake County was the only county in the Utah to make the top 100 list, ranking 39th with a population of 978,701. Salt Lake County continues to be Utah's most populous county followed by Utah (464,760), Davis (276,259), Weber (213,247), and Washington (126,312) counties.

Population Decline

There were 11 counties with a population decline of 10% or more, five of the 11 were in Louisiana. St. Bernard Parish in Louisiana had the largest decline with 76.9% decrease from the 2000 Census. Orleans Parish had a decline of 53.9% followed by Plaquemines Parish,

County Estimates for Utah

	April 1, 2000		Population Estimates							05-06 % Change
	Census	Estimates Base	July 1, 2000	July 1, 2001	July 1, 2002	July 1, 2003	July 1, 2004	July 1, 2005	July 1, 2006	
Utah	2,233,169	2,233,198	2,243,490	2,288,374	2,325,921	2,355,785	2,421,500	2,490,334	2,550,063	2.4%
Beaver	6,005	6,005	6,018	6,026	6,100	6,069	6,086	6,202	6,294	1.5%
Box Elder	42,745	42,745	42,888	43,720	44,657	45,468	45,927	46,333	47,197	1.9%
Cache	91,391	91,391	91,700	92,219	95,969	96,607	96,780	98,358	98,662	0.3%
Carbon	20,422	20,425	20,380	19,771	19,828	19,832	19,642	19,459	19,469	0.1%
Daggett	921	921	929	922	898	904	921	937	947	1.1%
Davis	238,994	238,994	240,330	244,283	249,202	255,225	261,464	268,084	276,259	3.0%
Duchesne	14,371	14,371	14,379	14,566	14,849	14,887	14,958	15,328	15,701	2.4%
Emery	10,860	10,962	10,952	10,752	10,702	10,739	10,701	10,711	10,698	-0.1%
Garfield	4,735	4,735	4,750	4,691	4,606	4,535	4,449	4,443	4,534	2.0%
Grand	8,485	8,380	8,408	8,497	8,640	8,656	8,693	8,787	8,999	2.4%
Iron	33,779	33,779	33,972	34,570	35,343	35,668	36,438	38,438	40,544	5.5%
Juab	8,238	8,238	8,284	8,469	8,635	8,766	8,997	9,165	9,420	2.8%
Kane	6,046	6,046	6,079	5,955	6,034	6,071	6,114	6,232	6,532	4.8%
Millard	12,405	12,405	12,409	12,397	12,382	12,389	12,324	12,280	12,390	0.9%
Morgan	7,129	7,129	7,162	7,306	7,420	7,490	7,626	7,862	8,134	3.5%
Piute	1,435	1,435	1,438	1,400	1,380	1,379	1,389	1,371	1,347	-1.8%
Rich	1,961	1,961	1,967	1,950	1,951	2,038	2,059	2,057	2,040	-0.8%
Salt Lake	898,387	898,412	900,806	912,881	922,430	925,782	936,194	960,297	978,701	1.9%
San Juan	14,413	14,413	14,374	13,614	13,834	13,832	14,051	14,117	14,265	1.0%
Sanpete	22,763	22,763	22,810	23,208	23,355	23,528	23,691	23,995	24,196	0.8%
Sevier	18,842	18,842	18,882	19,044	19,107	19,127	19,413	19,367	19,640	1.4%
Summit	29,736	29,736	29,998	30,964	31,873	32,806	33,948	35,119	35,469	1.0%
Tooele	40,735	40,735	41,683	43,967	46,005	48,085	49,706	51,269	53,552	4.5%
Uintah	25,224	25,224	25,275	25,776	26,228	26,292	26,580	27,129	27,955	3.0%
Utah	368,536	368,540	370,928	387,901	392,030	399,298	434,114	451,855	464,760	2.9%
Wasatch	15,215	15,215	15,438	16,174	16,919	17,595	18,119	19,015	20,255	6.5%
Washington	90,354	90,354	91,244	94,609	99,609	104,508	110,476	119,188	126,312	6.0%
Wayne	2,509	2,509	2,536	2,530	2,539	2,471	2,468	2,454	2,544	3.7%
Weber	196,533	196,533	197,471	200,212	203,396	205,738	208,172	210,482	213,247	1.3%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division

U.S. Census Bureau County Estimates

Louisiana (-15.9%); Swift County, Minnesota (-13.8%); and Geary County, Kansas (-13.5%). To find more information about the U.S. Census Bureau's county population estimates visit www.census.gov/popest/counties.

Census Bureau vs. Utah Population Estimates Committee

The Utah Population Estimates Committee (UPEC) released July 1, 2006 county estimates for the State of Utah in November 2006. The Census Bureau county estimates vary from the UPEC estimates. For the majority of the counties in Utah, the Census Bureau's estimates as

well as the growth rates are lower than the Utah Population Estimates Committee estimates and growth rates. The percent difference between estimates was largest in Morgan, Cache, Iron, Washington, Millard, and Sanpete counties. Salt Lake County had the largest numerical difference between the Census Bureau and UPEC estimates, followed by Utah, Davis, Washington, and Cache counties. The largest difference between the Census Bureau's growth rates and the UPEC growth rates was in Rich County, followed by Piute, Cache, Utah, and Juab counties. For additional information about the Utah Population Estimates Committee visit www.governor.utah.gov/dea/People.html.

100 Fastest Growing Counties from 2000 to 2006

Rank	Geographic Area	Population Estimates				Rank	Geographic Area	Population Estimates			
		April 1, 2000		Change, 2000 to 2006				April 1, 2000		Change, 2000 to 2006	
		Estimates	Base	July 1, 2006	Number			Percent	Estimates	Base	July 1, 2006
1	Flagler County, FL	49,835	83,084	33,249	66.7	51	Effingham County, GA	37,535	48,954	11,419	30.4
2	Kendall County, IL	54,520	88,158	33,638	61.7	52	Culpeper County, VA	34,265	44,622	10,357	30.2
3	Rockwall County, TX	43,074	69,155	26,081	60.5	53	Stafford County, VA	92,446	120,170	27,724	30.0
4	Loudoun County, VA	169,599	268,817	99,218	58.5	54	Christian County, MO	54,285	70,514	16,229	29.9
5	Forsyth County, GA	98,407	150,968	52,561	53.4	55	Brunswick County, NC	73,141	94,945	21,804	29.8
6	Pinal County, AZ	179,537	271,059	91,522	51.0	56	Comal County, TX	78,021	101,181	23,160	29.7
7	Douglas County, CO	175,766	263,621	87,855	50.0	57	King George County, VA	16,803	21,780	4,977	29.6
8	Henry County, GA	119,344	178,033	58,689	49.2	58	Douglas County, GA	92,244	119,557	27,313	29.6
9	Paulding County, GA	81,608	121,530	39,922	48.9	59	Lee County, FL	440,888	571,344	130,456	29.6
10	Lyon County, NV	34,501	51,231	16,730	48.5	60	Deschutes County, OR	115,367	149,140	33,773	29.3
11	Newton County, GA	62,001	91,451	29,450	47.5	61	Coweta County, GA	89,215	115,291	26,076	29.2
12	Lincoln County, SD	24,147	35,239	11,092	45.9	62	Wakulla County, FL	22,863	29,542	6,679	29.2
13	Delaware County, OH	109,989	156,697	46,708	42.5	63	Clark County, NV	1,375,738	1,777,539	401,801	29.2
14	Collin County, TX	491,772	698,851	207,079	42.1	64	Dawson County, GA	15,999	20,643	4,644	29.0
15	Union County, NC	123,738	175,272	51,534	41.6	65	Pickens County, GA	22,983	29,640	6,657	29.0
16	Williamson County, TX	249,980	353,830	103,850	41.5	66	Sumter County, FL	53,345	68,768	15,423	28.9
17	Osceola County, FL	172,493	244,045	71,552	41.5	67	Walton County, FL	40,602	52,270	11,668	28.7
18	Spencer County, KY	11,766	16,475	4,709	40.0	68	Lincoln County, MO	38,946	50,123	11,177	28.7
19	Washington County, UT	90,354	126,312	35,958	39.8	69	Gwinnett County, GA	588,448	757,104	168,656	28.7
20	Fort Bend County, TX	354,471	493,187	138,716	39.1	70	Berkeley County, WV	75,905	97,534	21,629	28.5
21	Scott County, MN	89,498	124,092	34,594	38.7	71	Boone County, KY	85,989	110,080	24,091	28.0
22	Barrow County, GA	46,144	63,702	17,558	38.1	72	Benton County, AR	153,346	196,045	42,699	27.8
23	Lake County, FL	210,527	290,435	79,908	38.0	73	Wright County, MN	89,993	114,787	24,794	27.6
24	Cherokee County, GA	141,903	195,327	53,424	37.6	74	Suffolk city, VA	63,677	81,071	17,394	27.3
25	St. Johns County, FL	123,148	169,224	46,076	37.4	75	Prince William County, VA	280,813	357,503	76,690	27.3
26	Hamilton County, IN	182,740	250,979	68,239	37.3	76	Kendall County, TX	23,743	30,213	6,470	27.3
27	Matanuska-Susitna Borough, AK	59,322	80,480	21,158	35.7	77	Clay County, FL	140,814	178,899	38,085	27.0
28	Montgomery County, TX	293,768	398,290	104,522	35.6	78	Ascension Parish, LA	76,627	97,335	20,708	27.0
29	DeSoto County, MS	107,199	144,706	37,507	35.0	79	Williamson County, TN	126,638	160,781	34,143	27.0
30	Denton County, TX	432,966	584,238	151,272	34.9	80	Warren County, OH	159,169	201,871	42,702	26.8
31	Franklin County, WA	49,347	66,570	17,223	34.9	81	St. Croix County, WI	63,155	80,015	16,860	26.7
32	Jackson County, GA	41,589	55,778	14,189	34.1	82	Bryan County, GA	23,417	29,648	6,231	26.6
33	Dallas County, IA	40,773	54,525	13,752	33.7	83	Hernando County, FL	130,802	165,409	34,607	26.5
34	Hays County, TX	97,576	130,325	32,749	33.6	84	Utah County, UT	368,540	464,760	96,220	26.1
35	Wasatch County, UT	15,215	20,255	5,040	33.1	85	Hendricks County, IN	104,093	131,204	27,111	26.0
36	Will County, IL	502,267	668,217	165,950	33.0	86	Rains County, TX	9,139	11,514	2,375	26.0
37	Spotsylvania County, VA	90,393	119,529	29,136	32.2	87	Boone County, IL	41,784	52,617	10,833	25.9
38	Sherburne County, MN	64,415	84,995	20,580	31.9	88	Scott County, KY	33,061	41,605	8,544	25.8
39	Canyon County, ID	131,441	173,302	41,861	31.8	89	Hoke County, NC	33,646	42,303	8,657	25.7
40	Tooele County, UT	40,735	53,552	12,817	31.5	90	Burnet County, TX	34,120	42,896	8,776	25.7
41	Placer County, CA	248,399	326,242	77,843	31.3	91	Rutherford County, TN	182,023	228,829	46,806	25.7
42	Nye County, NV	32,512	42,693	10,181	31.3	92	Pike County, PA	46,302	58,195	11,893	25.7
43	Lee County, GA	24,757	32,495	7,738	31.3	93	Sandoval County, NM	90,584	113,772	23,188	25.6
44	St. Lucie County, FL	192,695	252,724	60,029	31.2	94	Fayette County, TN	28,796	36,102	7,306	25.4
45	Riverside County, CA	1,545,387	2,026,803	481,416	31.2	95	Wake County, NC	627,865	786,522	158,657	25.3
46	Weld County, CO	180,861	236,857	55,996	31.0	96	New Kent County, VA	13,462	16,852	3,390	25.2
47	Walton County, GA	60,687	79,388	18,701	30.8	97	Collier County, FL	251,377	314,649	63,272	25.2
48	Kaufman County, TX	71,310	93,241	21,931	30.8	98	Archuleta County, CO	9,898	12,386	2,488	25.1
49	Currituck County, NC	18,190	23,770	5,580	30.7	99	Ellis County, TX	111,358	139,300	27,942	25.1
50	Pasco County, FL	344,768	450,171	105,403	30.6	100	Livingston Parish, LA	91,808	114,805	22,997	25.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division

Affiliates Corner: Mountainland Association of Governments



Mountainland Association of Governments

Mountainland Association of Governments is a political subdivision of the State of Utah, an intergovernmental agency working for all of the cities/towns of Summit, Utah and Wasatch Counties, and the counties of Summit and Wasatch. The Association is governed by the Executive Council, with input from a series of Program Advisory Boards and other coordinating agencies.

The current activities of the Association include administration of the Area Agency on Aging (AAA) for the three county area through the Department of Aging and Family Services, and administration of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Utah County through the Department of Regional Planning.

Other activities include administration of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, administration of the Economic Development District (EDD), administration of the Rural Planning Organization (RPO) in Wasatch County, administration of the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG, Title XX), community planning services, and other functions as needed and directed by the Executive Council.

Mountainland Aging Services

Mountainland's Aging & Family Services Department is the designated Area Agency on Aging charged with the responsibility of planning, advocating, and providing services on behalf of the 42,751 older adults residing in Summit, Utah, and Wasatch Counties. The Department is also the planning agency for Title XX, Social Services Block Grant Funds (SSBG), which supports broader human service needs within our three-county service area.

Mountainland Community Development

Community Development includes demographic information about the region, the coordination of professional community planning services to communities, development of various plans that impact our communities, and administration of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program.

Mountainland MPO and RPO

Transportation Planning is a function of Mountainland AOG conducted in Wasatch County as a Rural Planning Organization (RPO) and Utah county as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). With the high growth occurring though out the region, transportation has become a paramount issue. Mountainland is charged with coordinating with the municipalities, counties, the department of transportation, transit agencies and others in the transportation community to develop solutions to the mounting transportation problems.

(Continued from page 3)

addresses which are missing from the address list provided by the Census Bureau, or providing input regarding the count of housing units and group quarters in each census block. At a later date, the Census Bureau will verify this information during the Address Canvassing Operation.

- If there is a dispute following the Address Canvassing Operation, two of the three participation options allow for an appeal which will be adjudicated by a third-party agency and which must be adjudicated before Census Day 2010.

Contact Information

This is just a brief overview of the LUCA program and its implementation in Utah. State and local government officials have already been contacted about this program, and the Census Bureau is currently holding informational meetings around the state to introduce this program further. The importance of this program cannot be overstated. Utah will benefit considerably from an accurate census, and LUCA is a way that this may be accomplished. Questions regarding the LUCA program may be directed to the Local Geographic Partnerships Branch in Washington, D.C. or to the Denver Regional Office via e-mail, by phone, or by mail. at lucan@geo.census.gov, by phone at 866-511-LUCA, or by mail to:

Mail:

Geography Division
US Census Bureau
Stop 7400
4600 Silver Hill Road
Washington, DC 20233-7400

Geography Section
Denver Regional Office
U.S. Census Bureau
6900 W Jefferson Avenue, Ste. 100
Denver, CO 80235-2032

Email: lucan@geo.census.gov denver.geography@census.gov
Phone: (866) 511-LUCA (5822) (303) 264-0290
Web: <http://www.census.gov/geo/www/luca2010/luca.html>
<http://www.census.gov/roden/www/geo.html>

The Utah State Data Center Program

In 1982 the State of Utah entered into a voluntary agreement with the U.S. Census Bureau to establish the Utah State Data Center (SDC) program. The SDC program provides training and technical assistance in accessing and using census data for research, administration, planning, and decision-making by the government, the business community, university researchers, and other interested data users.

The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget serves as the lead coordinating agency for 34 organizations in Utah that make up the Utah State, Business, and Industry Data Center (SDC/BIDC) information network. This extensive network of SDC affiliates consists of major universities, libraries, regional and local organizations, as well as government agencies that produce primary data on the Utah economy. Each of these affiliates use, and provide the public with economic, demographic, or fiscal data on Utah. The Affiliate's Corner page of the *Utah Data Guide* has been created to highlight and recognize SDC program affiliates and their great work. A complete list of the program affiliates can be found on the back page of this newsletter. For more information on the SDC program, contact SDC staff at (801) 538-1036 or email dea@utah.gov.

Actual and Estimated Indicators for Utah and the U.S.: February 2007

ECONOMIC INDICATORS	UNITS	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	% CHG	% CHG	% CHG	% CHG
		ACTUAL	ACTUAL	FORECAST	FORECAST	FORECAST	CY04-05	CY05-06	CY06-07	CY07-08
PRODUCTION AND SPENDING										
U.S. Real Gross Domestic Product	Billion Chained \$2000	10,703.5	11,048.6	11,422.4	11,733.4	12,083.7	3.2	3.4	2.7	3.0
U.S. Real Personal Consumption	Billion Chained \$2000	7,577.1	7,841.2	8,092.3	8,356.1	8,602.6	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.0
U.S. Real Fixed Investment	Billion Chained \$2000	1,713.9	1,842.0	1,897.1	1,871.2	1,919.7	7.5	3.0	-1.4	2.6
U.S. Real Defense Spending	Billion Chained \$2000	475.4	483.6	492.7	509.9	515.4	1.7	1.9	3.5	1.1
U.S. Real Exports	Billion Chained \$2000	1,120.4	1,196.1	1,302.3	1,408.1	1,528.8	6.8	8.9	8.1	8.6
Utah Exports (NAICS, Census)	Million Dollars	4,718.3	6,055.9	6,798.1	7,494.6	8,283.4	28.3	12.3	10.2	10.5
Utah Coal Production	Million Tons	21.8	24.6	26.0	25.1	25.4	12.5	5.9	-3.5	1.2
Utah Crude Oil Production	Million Barrels	14.7	16.7	18.0	17.8	17.4	13.0	8.1	-1.1	-2.2
Utah Natural Gas Production Sales	Billion Cubic Feet	251.8	275.6	318.2	324.6	331.1	9.5	15.5	2.0	2.0
Utah Copper Mined Production	Million Pounds	581.5	486.6	596.0	600.0	600.0	-16.3	22.5	0.7	0.0
Utah Molybdenum Production	Million Pounds	25.0	34.4	37.0	30.0	27.0	37.6	7.6	-18.9	-10.0
SALES AND CONSTRUCTION										
U.S. New Auto and Truck Sales	Millions	16.9	16.9	16.5	16.4	16.6	0.5	-2.6	-0.5	1.2
U.S. Housing Starts	Millions	1.95	2.07	1.82	1.54	1.58	6.3	-12.3	-15.4	3.0
U.S. Residential Investment	Billion Dollars	675.3	770.4	767.1	675.8	681.9	14.1	-0.4	-11.9	0.9
U.S. Nonresidential Structures	Billion Dollars	300.8	338.6	411.6	460.4	464.4	12.6	21.6	11.9	0.9
U.S. Repeat-Sales House Price Index	1980Q1 = 100	325.1	368.1	375.2	387.1	400.7	13.2	1.9	3.2	3.5
U.S. Existing S.F. Home Prices (NAR)	Thousand Dollars	195.2	219.0	223.3	230.3	238.4	12.2	1.9	3.2	3.5
U.S. Retail Sales	Billion Dollars	3,837.0	4,113.8	4,373.3	4,543.7	4,724.2	7.2	6.3	3.9	4.0
Utah New Auto and Truck Sales	Thousands	101.4	105.2	114.4	117.8	120.2	3.7	8.7	3.0	2.0
Utah Dwelling Unit Permits	Thousands	24.3	28.3	26.3	24.0	21.5	16.4	-6.9	-8.8	-10.4
Utah Residential Permit Value	Million Dollars	3,552.6	4,662.6	4,955.5	5,000.0	5,000.0	31.2	6.3	0.9	0.0
Utah Nonresidential Permit Value	Million Dollars	1,089.9	1,217.8	1,588.4	1,800.0	1,900.0	11.7	30.4	13.3	5.6
Utah Additions, Alterations and Repairs	Million Dollars	476.0	707.6	865.3	800.0	750.0	48.7	22.3	-7.5	-6.3
Utah Repeat-Sales House Price Index	1980Q1 = 100	267.6	295.5	340.4	374.6	393.3	10.4	15.2	10.0	5.0
Utah Existing S.F. Home Prices (NAR)	Thousand Dollars	158.0	173.9	200.3	220.4	231.4	10.1	15.2	10.0	5.0
Utah Taxable Retail Sales	Million Dollars	20,351	22,155	24,614	26,467	28,498	8.9	11.1	7.5	7.7
DEMOGRAPHICS AND SENTIMENT										
U.S. July 1st Population (Global Insight)	Millions	293.7	296.4	299.1	301.8	304.4	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
U.S. Consumer Sentiment of U.S. (U of M)	1966 = 100	95.2	88.6	87.3	92.0	90.8	-7.0	-1.4	5.3	-1.2
Utah July 1st Population (UPEC)	Thousands	2,469	2,547	2,615	2,684	2,748	3.2	2.7	2.6	2.4
Utah Net Migration (UPEC)	Thousands	18.4	40.6	28.7	29.6	24.9	na	na	na	na
Utah July 1st Population (Economy.Com)	Thousands	2,422	2,490	2,550	2,576	2,602	2.8	2.4	1.0	1.0
PROFITS AND RESOURCE PRICES										
U.S. Corporate Before Tax Profits	Billion Dollars	1,144.3	1,518.7	1,813.5	1,876.4	1,915.4	32.7	19.4	3.5	2.1
U.S. Before Tax Profits Less Fed. Res.	Billion Dollars	1,124.3	1,492.1	1,779.2	1,837.3	1,874.8	32.7	19.2	3.3	2.0
West Texas Intermediate Crude Oil	\$ Per Barrel	41.5	56.6	66.1	58.1	61.4	36.4	16.9	-12.1	5.7
U.S. Coal Price Index	1982 = 100	109.3	116.9	126.5	128.8	128.6	7.0	8.2	1.8	-0.1
Utah Coal Prices	\$ Per Short Ton	17.7	19.3	22.4	24.0	23.0	9.3	16.0	7.0	-4.2
Utah Oil Prices	\$ Per Barrel	39.4	54.0	59.8	60.0	60.2	37.2	10.7	0.4	0.2
Utah Natural Gas Prices	\$ Per MCF	5.24	7.16	5.42	5.40	5.90	36.6	-24.3	-0.4	9.3
Utah Copper Prices	\$ Per Pound	1.34	1.69	3.20	2.25	1.50	26.1	89.3	-29.7	-33.3
Utah Molybdenum Prices	\$ Per Pound	15.9	32.8	24.1	15.0	8.0	105.8	-26.3	-37.9	-46.7
INFLATION AND INTEREST RATES										
U.S. CPI Urban Consumers (BLS)	1982-84 = 100	188.9	195.3	201.6	204.7	209.3	3.4	3.2	1.5	2.3
U.S. GDP Chained Price Indexes	2000 = 100	109.4	112.7	116.1	118.5	120.8	3.0	2.9	2.1	2.0
U.S. Federal Funds Rate	Percent	1.35	3.21	4.96	5.18	5.00	na	na	na	na
U.S. 3-Month Treasury Bills	Percent	1.36	3.13	4.72	4.96	4.90	na	na	na	na
U.S. T-Bond Rate, 10-Year	Percent	4.27	4.29	4.79	4.86	5.09	na	na	na	na
30 Year Mortgage Rate (FHLMC)	Percent	5.84	5.87	6.41	6.55	6.85	na	na	na	na
EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES										
U.S. Establishment Employment (BLS)	Millions	131.4	133.7	136.2	138.1	140.1	1.7	1.9	1.4	1.4
U.S. Average Annual Pay (BLS)	Dollars	39,354	40,677	42,566	44,072	45,670	3.4	4.6	3.5	3.6
U.S. Total Wages & Salaries (BLS)	Billion Dollars	5,172	5,438	5,796	6,085	6,397	5.1	6.6	5.0	5.1
Utah Nonagricultural Employment (WFS)	Thousands	1,104.3	1,148.0	1,203.3	1,250.1	1,291.3	4.0	4.8	3.9	3.3
Utah Average Annual Pay (WFS)	Dollars	31,685	32,835	34,539	35,944	37,257	3.6	5.2	4.1	3.7
Utah Total Nonagriculture Wages (WFS)	Million Dollars	34,990	37,696	41,560	44,935	48,110	7.7	10.3	8.1	7.1
INCOME AND UNEMPLOYMENT										
U.S. Personal Income (BEA)	Billion Dollars	9,717	10,225	10,882	11,485	12,137	5.2	6.4	5.5	5.7
U.S. Unemployment Rate (BLS)	Percent	5.5	5.1	4.6	4.7	4.7	na	na	na	na
Utah Personal Income (BEA)	Million Dollars	63,401	67,906	74,289	80,381	86,490	7.1	9.4	8.2	7.6
Utah Unemployment Rate (WFS)	Percent	5.2	4.3	3.3	3.4	3.9	na	na	na	na

Sources: State of Utah Revenue Assumptions Committee, Moody's Economy.Com, and Global Insight

**Demographic and Economic Analysis Section
 Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
 Capitol Complex, East Building, Suite 210
 P.O. Box 142210
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2210**

Presorted
 Standard
 U.S. Post
PAID
 S.L.C., Utah
 Permit 4621



Utah State, Business & Industry Data Center Network

Coordinating Agencies

Bureau of Economic and Business ResearchPam Perlich (801-581-3358)
 Dept. of Workforce ServicesCarrie Mayne (801-526-9421)
 Governor's Office of Economic Development (801-538-8700)

State Affiliates

Population Research LaboratoryMichael Toney (435-797-1238)
 Center for Health DataBarry Nangle, MD (801-538-6907)
 Dept. of Community & CultureLuz Robles (801-538-8700)
 Utah State Office of EducationRandy Raphael (801-538-7802)
 Utah FoundationSteve Kroes (801-355-1400)
 Utah IssuesDoug Macdonald (801-521-2035)
 Harold B. Lee Library, BYUKirk Memmott (801-422-3924)
 Marriott Library, U of UKatherine Holvoet (801-581-8394)
 Merrill Library, USUJohn Walters (435-797-2683)
 Stewart Library, WSULonna Rivera (801-626-6330)
 Gerald R. Sherratt Library, SUUScott Lanning (435-586-7937)
 Salt Lake City LibraryAnne Menzies (801-322-8135)
 Davis County Library SystemPat Montgomery (801-451-2322)
 Utah ChildrenTerry Haven (801-364-1182)
 Office of TourismDavid Williams (801-538-1317)
 Utah System of Higher EducationFarah Thompson (801-321-7161)

Business & Industry Affiliates

Bear River AOGBrian Carver (435-752-7242)
 Five County AOGKen Sizemore (435-673-3548)
 Mountainland AOGShawn Eliot (801-229-3841)
 Six County AOGEmery Polelonema (435-896-9222)
 Southeastern AOGDebbie Hatt (435-637-5444)
 Uintah Basin AOGLaurie Brummond (435-722-4518)
 Wasatch Front Regional CouncilScott Festin (801-363-4250)
 Utah Small Business Dev. Center, SUUTerry Keyes (435-586-5400)
 Utah Small Business Dev. Center, SLCCSterling Francom (801-957-5202)
 Cache Countywide Planning & DevelopmentWendell Morse (435-716-7154)
 Economic Development Corp. of UtahJessica Turner (801-328-8824)
 Moab Area Economic DevelopmentKen Davy (435-259-1348)
 Park City Chamber & Visitors BureauBarbara Wainwright (435-658-9619)
 Weber Economic Development Corp.Ron Kusina (801-621-8300)
 Center for Public Policy & Administration.Janice Houston (801-585-7374)

**Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
 801-538-1027**

John Nixon, Director
 Mindy Powers, Assistant to the Director



Demographic and Economic Analysis Section

Robert Spendlove, DEA Manager
 David Andreasen, Intern
 Walter Busse, Economist
 Douglas DeVore, Research Analyst
 Peter Donner, Senior Economist
 Effie Johnson, Research Analyst
 Lance Rovig, Economic Consultant
 David Stringfellow, Research Analyst

The Demographic and Economic Analysis (DEA) section supports the mission of the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget to improve decision making by providing economic and demographic data and analysis to the governor and to individuals from state agencies, other government entities, businesses, academia, and the public. As part of this mission, DEA functions as the lead agency in Utah for the U.S. Census Bureau's State Data and Business and Industry Data Center (SDC/BIDC) programs. While the 34 SDC and BIDC affiliates listed in this newsletter have specific areas of expertise, they can also provide assistance to data users in accessing Census and other data sources.

**State Data Center
 Phone: 801-538-1036
 Fax: 801-538-1547
 Email: dea@utah.gov**

For a free subscription to this quarterly newsletter, and for assistance accessing other demographic and economic data, call the State Data Center. This newsletter and other data are available via the Internet at DEA's web site:

www.governor.utah.gov/dea