

CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS

Special Studies

Series P-23, No. 158

Methodology for Experimental County Population Estimates for the 1980's

U.S. Department of Commerce
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by **Sam T. Davis**, under the general supervision of **Donald E. Starsinic**, Chief, Population Estimates Branch. The project was initiated at the request of the National Cancer Institute, which provided major financial support. **Richard Irwin**, Population Division (retired) developed much of the original methodology used for producing the data described in this report. **Ellie Brenner** and **Joan Taylor** provided statistical assistance. **Marie Pees**, assisted by **Austin Lin** and **Leonard Marshall**, provided computer applications and programming support. Professional consultation and review were provided by **Campbell Gibson**, **John Long**, **Jeffrey S. Passel**, and **David Word**. Overall direction was provided by **Jeffrey S. Passel**, Assistant division Chief, Population Division.

The staff of Publications Services Division, **Walter C. Odom**, Chief, provided publication planning, design, composition, and printing planning and procurement. **Paula Coupe** edited and coordinated the publication.

CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS

Special Studies

Series P-23, No. 158



**Methodology for
Experimental County
Population Estimates
for the 1980's**

Issued September 1988



**U.S. Department of Commerce
C. William Verity, Secretary
Donna F. Tuttle, Deputy Secretary
Robert Ortner, Under Secretary
for Economic Affairs**

**BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
John G. Keane, Director**



BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
John G. Keane, Director
C.L. Kincannon, Deputy Director
William P. Butz, Associate Director for
Demographic Fields
Roger A. Herriot, Senior Demographic and
Housing Analyst

POPULATION DIVISION
Paula J. Schneider, Chief

SUGGESTED CITATION

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 158,
Methodology for Experimental County Population Estimates for the 1980's
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1988.

For sale by Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Estimates universe and product.....	1
Methodology.....	1
General.....	1
"Special" populations.....	2
Data sources.....	2
Modifications to the 1975-80 migration data file.....	2
Special counties.....	4
Special adjustments to military populations.....	4
Interpolation and control to independent county estimates.....	5
Accuracy of the method.....	5
Related reports.....	6
 APPENDIXES	
A. Example of Detailed Estimates.....	7
B. List of Counties Adjusted for Military, College, and Institutional Population.....	9
C. List of State Agency Contacts, Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates.....	17

Methodology for Experimental County Population Estimates for the 1980's

INTRODUCTION

In the late 1970's, the Census Bureau began preparing an experimental set of county population estimates by age, sex, and race. Since 1980, we have released such estimates for July 1, 1982, and 1984, and we are developing estimates for other years. This report briefly describes the procedures used in developing the estimates in the 1980's and indicates changes to the methodology previously used. The original methodology used for the estimates for the 1970's is described in Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 103. Those aspects of the procedures which have not changed substantially are not discussed in great detail in this report; in addition, examples of calculations shown in the earlier report are not repeated here.

County estimates by age, sex, and race are prepared by the Bureau of the Census under contract to the National Cancer Institute (NCI). The methodology we use is a cohort-component projection technique in which actual data for the components are substituted for projected values whenever possible and totals are controlled to available estimates by age, sex, race, and geographic area. We consider the estimates experimental because they have not been tested fully against a census and because subnational estimates for race groups, for use as control totals, are only now becoming available.

ESTIMATES UNIVERSE AND PRODUCT

We have produced estimates for the 3,136 counties or equivalent areas, such as parishes (Louisiana), boroughs (Alaska), or independent cities (Virginia, Maryland, Missouri, and Nevada), as they appeared in the 1980 census.¹ The estimates are for 17 5-year age groups and a final group for ages 85 and over, instead of the 16 age groups to 75 years and over that were

prepared in the 1970's. These estimates are further subdivided by male and female for 2 race groups: White, and Black and other races combined.

The July 1, 1982, and 1984 county estimates by age, sex, and race for the entire Nation are available. Appendix A provides an illustrative table and information on how to obtain the estimates.

METHODOLOGY

General

We use a cohort-component technique to prepare the estimates, including separate estimates of births, deaths, and migration, by age, sex, and race. The census population in 1980 is carried forward to 1985 by cohort, using estimates of births and deaths adjusted to agree with registered county totals by race, as far as they are available.² A preliminary approximation of outmigration from 1980 to 1985 is then produced for each county, by cohort, using outmigration rates for the 1975-80 period from the 1980 census. The outmigrants are summed across all counties to form a pool of migrants for each age-sex-race group. The migrant pool is then adjusted to account for international immigration and national change in "special" populations.³ We then distribute the adjusted pool of migrants back to the counties as immigrants using the proportions of the total pool that each county was observed to have received in 1975-80 (according to the 1980 census). After interpolating the population to each estimate year, the preliminary outmigration and immigration data were then adjusted, sometimes extensively, to bring the population estimate for each year into agreement with independent total population estimates for each county developed under the Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates

¹An exception to this is that Kalawao County, Hawaii, is combined with Maui County. We have made no estimates for two new counties that have been separated from their parent county since 1980 (Cibola County, New Mexico, separated from Valencia County in 1981, and La Paz County, Arizona, separated from Yuma County in 1983). Estimates for Valencia and Yuma Counties are for these counties as constituted in 1980.

²When these estimates were actually produced, 1985 births and deaths were not yet available. Data for 1984 were substituted.

³"Special" populations include the military, college and university students, and inmates of institutions. Estimates of immigrants from abroad by age, sex, and race were added into the national pool of migrants. No separate county proportions for immigrants from abroad were used.

(FSCPE).⁴ The computations were carried out separately for Whites and for Blacks and other races combined. The estimates were also adjusted to be consistent with county race estimates derived from the Extended Administrative Records (EAR) estimates for metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan State remainders.⁵

As a final step, estimates of the population in the age groups 65 years and over were developed with measures of change in Medicare enrollment by age, sex, and race. These estimates use the same data as the FSCPE estimates for ages 65 and over, so no major adjustments were required. We substituted the Medicare-based estimates for those obtained by the regular cohort-component procedure.

"Special" Populations

A separate adjustment was made for migration caused by large special populations in military installations, colleges, and correctional institutions. We subtracted this special migration from total migration, thus removing it from the usual computation involving rates and proportions. The 1980 census figures on special immigrants for the 1975-80 period were used to estimate special immigrants for the 1980-85 period. They were adjusted to reflect the change in the size of the special population from 1980 to 1985. Information on the size of this change was obtained from administrative records, i.e., station strength, college enrollment, or prison population. The adjustment technique was generally successful in allowing for the impact of changes in the size and age distribution of the military, college, and prison populations. A list of the counties selected for special treatment is in appendix B.

For the counties with large special populations (college, military, or prison), figures for the civilian, non-college population in 1980 are obtained by subtracting the tabulated special migrants from the 1980 census counts. The resulting population is carried forward to 1985 with components of change—births, deaths, and civilian, non-college migration. The estimated special migrants for the 1980-85 period are added to the 1985 civilian noncollege population to obtain the resident special population. It is a basic feature of this procedure that the special population is

based on the number of migrants who reported in the census that they were in one of the special groups. Special immigrants included all persons who were in the special group in 1980, regardless of their status in 1975. Outmigrants were counted as special if they were in the special group in 1975, regardless of their situation in 1980.

Data Sources

The base population for the production of county estimates for the 1980's was the 1980 census population classified by "OMB-consistent" race,⁶ sex, and 5-year age group for counties. Information on registered births and deaths comes from the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). Migration data by age, sex, and race are sample data from the 1980 census. Specifically, the 1980 census question on residence 5 years ago provided the migration component of population change.⁷

Modifications to the 1975-80 Migration Data File

The 1980 census sample data on residence in 1975 provide the migration data covering the 5-year period 1975 to 1980 by age, sex, and race.⁸ Since the data are from a sample, sampling error for small areas of groups caused some estimates of age distributions to be unacceptable, especially in counties with a low number of migrants. There were further complications in the 1980 data caused by the fact that only half of the

⁶"OMB-consistent race" refers to 1980 census counts which were modified to be consistent with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Directive 15 on race categories in order to reduce the effect of differences in the reporting of race between the census and other sources of administrative data (such as births and deaths). The modification resulted in the addition of 6.3 million persons to the White category and 189,000 persons to the Black population. All persons added to these two groups had reported themselves to be of "other, not specified" race as opposed to specific Asian and Pacific Islander or American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut racial categories; the large majority of the persons shifted to White and Black identified themselves as being of Hispanic origin. This procedure is described in more detail in Jeffrey S. Passel, "Procedures for Producing Preliminary OMB-Consistent Modified Race Data from the 1980 Census by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin for States and Counties," Bureau of the Census, 1982, unpublished. The modified county data are available on tape from Data Users Services Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233, (301) 763-4100.

⁷Information on the migration data is in U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, Supplementary Report, PC80-S1-17, *Gross Migration for Counties: 1975 to 1980*. For a detailed discussion of the accuracy of the data and other technical and procedural matters, see Appendix D of the 1980 Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, PC80-1-C.

⁸An earlier set of 1982 estimates released by the Census Bureau was produced using 1965-70 migration data from the 1970 census before the 1975-80 data became available.

⁴These estimates for 1982 were published in Current Population Reports, Series P-26, No. 83-1-C to 83-50-C, and for 1984, in Series P-26, No. 84-52-C.

⁵The Extended Administrative Records estimates are an extension of the Administrative Records procedure where the migration component is estimated by race. EAR uses race data from a 20-percent sample of Social Security records with the corresponding Internal Revenue Service file. EAR estimates are to be published in a forthcoming Current Population Reports, Series P-23, *Population Estimates by Race and Hispanic Origin for States, Metropolitan Areas, and Selected Counties: July 1, 1985*.

sample data on residence in 1975 was actually processed. We made adjustments to compensate for these problems. The adjustment procedure used to smooth the age-sex distribution redistributes the total migration using an underlying summary distribution.

The underlying summary distributions of migrants by age and sex are based on racial groups and county "type". For each county-type and race group, the aggregate age-sex distribution of 1975-80 in-migrants and out-migrants across all counties was computed from 1980 census data. The county types are based on urban-rural and metropolitan-nonmetropolitan characteristics as classified by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.⁹ The 10 types of counties are:

Metropolitan

1. Large Metropolitan Core (49 counties)—Counties containing the primary central city of large Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) with at least 1 million population in 1970.
2. Large Metropolitan Fringe (137 counties)—Other (suburban) counties of large SMSA's.
3. Medium Metropolitan (269 counties).—Counties of SMSA's with 250,000 to 999,999 population.
4. Small Metropolitan (192 counties).—Counties comprising SMSA's with under 250,000 population.

Nonmetropolitan

5. Urbanized Adjacent (173 counties).—Counties with an urban population of at least 20,000 which are adjacent to a metropolitan county, where adjacency is defined as both touching an SMSA at more than a single point and having at least 1 percent of the labor force commute to the central county of the SMSA for work.
6. Urbanized Nonadjacent (154 counties).—Counties with an urban population of at least 20,000 which are not adjacent by the above definition.
7. Less Urbanized Adjacent (565 counties).—Counties with an urban population of 2,500 to 19,999 and adjacent by definition given in (5) above.
8. Less Urbanized Nonadjacent (734 counties).—Counties with an urban population of 2,500 to 19,999 and not adjacent by definition given in (5) above.

⁹These codes are used and described in "Social and Economic Characteristics of the Population in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties: 1970-80," Rural Development Research Report No. 58, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, issued September 1986. The definitions of these codes use 1970 characteristics and, as a result, the obsolete designation "SMSA" is used in the descriptions of the classifications.

9. Rural adjacent (241 counties).—Counties with no place of 2,500 or more and adjacent by definition given in (5) above.

10. Rural Nonadjacent (623 counties).—Counties with no place of 2,500 or more population and not adjacent by definition given in (5) above.

To determine whether a county's migration data should be redistributed by age, a sex ratio score (SRS) was computed for each race group. This score is given by the formula

$$SRS = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{18} ((M_i * F_i) / (M_i + F_i)) \right] * 4 / \sum_{i=1}^{18} (M_i + F_i)$$

where M_i and F_i are the number of male and female migrants for each age group i . The SRS is directly related to the similarity between the male and female age distributions of migration. If male migration equals female migration for each age group, the score would be 1. As the two distributions become more dissimilar, the SRS decreases to 0. Larger counties tend to have scores closer to 1.

If a county race group has an SRS lower than .90, its migration figures are redistributed to the appropriate underlying distribution using a Monte Carlo technique.¹⁰ This results in a new migration distribution that is similar to, but not exactly the same as, the underlying summary distribution of the group to which the county belongs. As in the 1970's, counties with a relatively large military population are exempt from redistribution, since the age distributions for males and females would normally be quite different in such counties. Also in the 1970's, the SRS for in-migrants determines whether both in-migrants and out-migrants are to be redistributed. Unlike the 1970's, however, only the SRS score is used to determine if migrants are to be redistributed; no other criteria are used.

Migrant pools. In preparation for producing the post-censal estimates, civilian in-migrant pools for age, sex, and race groups were created from 1980 census data. We then computed the proportions of civilian in-migrants going to each county from each pool. These proportions were used to allocate the projected in-migration for the 1980-85 period to each county. For out-migration, rates were used instead of proportions.

¹⁰This is a technique which produces randomly generated results which will, on the average, have the same age-distribution as the underlying distribution. A tendency toward a mean of the underlying distribution is desired rather than the exact distribution since the underlying distribution, while being the best known age-distribution for the county, is not known to be the precisely correct distribution.

These rates for each age-sex-race group were computed as the county's civilian outmigration during the 1975-80 period divided by the 1975 base population for the county.

Ages under 5. Special procedures were used to calculate immigration proportions and outmigration rates for ages under 5. Registered births between 1975 and 1980 were survived to 1980¹¹ and subtracted from the census count in 1980. We also calculated another estimate of net migration by simply subtracting the 1975-80 outmigrants aged 0-4 in the 1980 census from the corresponding immigrants. For each county the census-based estimates of in- and outmigrants were adjusted to agree with the residual estimate of net migration using a "two-thirds/one-third" rule.¹²

Special Counties

Counties with large special populations in the 1980 census were selected for special treatment when making the estimates because of their idiosyncratic patterns of migration by age. Special counties have substantial numbers of military, college, or institutional populations or a combination of these. Before computing outmigrants from these special counties for the outmigrant pool, the special population is removed from the base (as described earlier); the special migrants are also excluded from the general immigrant distribution.

In special counties with large special populations, the data on these groups are collected for each year and used directly in the estimates. Some counties with smaller special populations (but still large enough to treat the counties as special) were designated as "zero-level" counties. In these counties, the special population is still removed before the migration calculations, but annual change in the special population is arbitrarily assumed to be zero. This assumption simplifies the task of maintaining data on special populations. A list of special counties is shown in appendix B; those treated as zero-level counties are identified by (Z).

Military counties. Counties selected as military counties had a large percentage of their population in the Armed Forces. We based selection on a combination

of absolute level of military immigrants, percentage of military immigrants, and percentage of military in group quarters, as enumerated in the 1980 census. Since all Armed Forces in the county are assumed to exhibit migration characteristics more typical of military persons than of civilians, total station strength provided by the Department of Defense (as opposed to barracks count) is used for the level of military population for each estimate year. There are 189 military counties for the 1980's, 61 of which were "zero-level." Of the 169 military counties identified in the 1970's, 14 were dropped; 34 new military counties were added.

College and university counties. Total enrollment, provided by the Department of Education, of the colleges and universities in the county guided selection of these special counties, but the number of students living in residence halls, from the 1980 census, was also taken into consideration. This was done to prevent the selection of counties with large nonresidential universities where the students nearly always live at home and exhibit migration characteristics more like non-students. The special population figure used in computations, however, was total enrollment, since it could be obtained on a more regular basis than residence hall population. The total number of college counties was 513, but 136 of them were "zero-level." Of the 409 college counties in the 1970's, 17 were dropped for the 1980's; there were no additions other than "zero-level" counties.

Institutional (prison) counties. For all practical purposes, the only counties which have a large enough institutional population to be treated specially in the estimation procedure were counties with large correctional facilities. These were selected by the number of prisoners in the facility, obtained from the 1980 census. Out of a total 117 institutional counties, 78 were zero-level. Of the 64 institutional counties in the 1970's, 5 were dropped for the 1980's.

Job Corps counties. Seven counties with Job Corps Training Centers were treated like institutional counties. Special data were obtained for limited age groups to account for residents of these centers.

Special Adjustments to Military Populations

In order to take into account the changing age-sex-race structure of the military population over time, we included a special adjustment for this segment of the population in the estimation procedure. Age, sex, and race adjustment factors were used to make the military population in the estimates reflect the increase in females and Black and other races in the military, as well as the upward shift of the military age distribution during the early 1980's.

¹¹The survival of the births between 1975 and 1980 was accomplished by applying the National Census Survival Rate to the 1975-80 births by race and sex. This produces the number of persons born between 1975 and 1980 who are expected to still be alive in 1980.

¹²The two-thirds/one-third rule splits the total net migration adjustment into in- and outmigration components by allotting two-thirds of the net difference to immigration and one-third to outmigration. This rule is the same as was used for estimates during the 1970's, and a discussion of its adoption and underlying assumptions is in Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 103.

Interpolation and Control to Independent County Estimates

A complicated series of interpolations and adjustments were performed to ensure agreement among the NCI estimates for counties (by age, sex, and race), the Census Bureau's published FSCPE estimates for the total population of counties, and the national population estimates (by age, sex, and race). First, the county estimates by age, sex, and race for 1985 were adjusted to agree with national population estimates for race groups in that year.

Next, the adjusted race totals for each county were interpolated to the estimate year (1982 or 1984). The interpolated race totals were then compared with a set of independently-derived race totals for counties (for 1982 or 1984). These independently-derived race totals for counties are consistent with race estimates developed by the EAR method and with Census Bureau's FSCPE estimates for the total population of counties.¹³ The percent difference between the interpolated total and the independently estimated total for the estimate year was projected to 1985 for each racial group in each county. (The projection to 1985 was not done by simple linear extrapolation; instead, a damping factor was introduced to lessen the potential effect of extreme estimates.) This percentage difference for 1985 was then translated into a population difference for each racial group in each county and, thus, a new 1985 population estimate for the group.

The new 1985 population estimate for each racial group was used in a second interpolative procedure, but first, a new 1985 estimate by age, sex, and race had to be derived. Since births and deaths are registered and are the same for all population estimates used, the difference between the new 1985 population estimate and the original estimate was assumed to represent a change in the migration component. As in the estimates for the 1970's, the difference in the net migration component was split proportionally between males and females and into immigrants and outmigrants by the two-thirds/one-third rule; then, within each race-sex-migrant group, it was distributed to age groups.

The next step was a second interpolation between 1980 and the new 1985 estimate to the estimate year (1982 or 1984) for each age-sex-race group in each county. Within each county, the estimates were next

adjusted to agree with the independent FSCPE estimates of the total population in the county. The final step involved adjusting the age-sex-race estimates for all counties to agree with national estimates for each age-sex-race group.

ACCURACY OF THE METHOD

As yet, we have not conducted a formal evaluation of the estimates (based on the 1980's methodology). Some preliminary comparisons, however, have been made with estimates produced independently by local agencies. The results have been mixed, with larger counties, as usual, comparing more favorably than smaller ones.

We did conduct an evaluation of the 1970's methodology.¹⁴ A special set of NCI estimates for April 1, 1980, was compared with corresponding data from the 1980 census. When each age-race number for all counties are considered, the overall average deviation was 10.0 percent for males and 9.4 percent for females. Upon further analysis, this rather high deviation was found to be concentrated in the less populous counties. Counties of 100,000 or more population had average deviations of only 4.8 percent for age-race groups for males and 4.5 percent for females. The changes made to the original methodology which are discussed in this report have been made in part in an attempt to improve the accuracy of the estimates in the 1980's.¹⁵

Since these estimates are experimental, and plans for future estimates are underway, many facets of the methodology are continuously being examined and modified. Any readers and/or users of these data are invited to share any comments they may have regarding these estimates. If you have any ideas concerning

¹⁴This was presented in "Were the County Age-Sex-Race Estimates OK?", by Richard Irwin, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Demographic Group, Orlando, Florida, October 19, 1984.

¹⁵One problem that has come to light in the early use of these estimates concerns several of the smaller independent cities in Virginia. Because of apparent miscoding of births to their geographic area, problems with the level of in and outmigration as reported in the 1980 census, as well as difficulties with Medicare data previously discussed, the age distributions of the estimates for these areas seem to be rather poor. Similar problems were present for the estimates during the 1970's, but aggregating the data for independent cities in Virginia with the surrounding counties, diminished the difficulties with the estimates. A related, but less pronounced, problem involves St. Louis city, which is independent of St. Louis County, where again the age detail of the estimates is not reasonable. This problem seems to have arisen because of miscoding of migration data from the 1980 census. Persons who, in response to the question of where they lived 5 years ago, responded simply "St. Louis" were all allotted to St. Louis city, when in fact many actually lived in St. Louis County. The effect of this was to increase spuriously the number of outmigrants in certain age groups from St. Louis city.

¹³The EAR estimates consist of estimates by race for 488 counties and groups of counties. These 488 areas are designed to produce estimates by race for states, each metropolitan area, and for the nonmetropolitan balance of each state. Within each multi-county EAR area, the estimated population in each racial group was distributed according to data for that group from the 1980 census. The EAR estimates and subdivisions of them provided the proportionate distribution by race for each county. These proportions were then applied to the Census Bureau's FSCPE estimate for the county to derive race group totals for each county.

the methodology, please send them to the Population Estimates Branch, Population Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington D.C., 20233.

RELATED REPORTS

A detailed description of the methodology used to develop postcensal estimates for the 1970's is in U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 103, *Methodology for Experimental Estimates of the Population of Counties, by Age and Sex: July 1, 1975*. The development of intercensal estimates for the 1970's is described in U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23,

No. 139, *County Intercensal Estimates by Age, Sex, and Race: 1970-80*. The annual intercensal NCI county estimates series for the 1970's is available on a computer tape file from the Customer Services Branch, Data Users Services Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233, (301) 763-4100.

The county age estimates for the 1980's were adjusted to county population estimates for 1982 published in Series P-26, No. 83-1-C to 83-50-C, and for 1984 estimates appearing in Series P-26, No. 84-52-C. Revised total population estimates for counties for the 1981-85 period appear in Series P-26, No. 85-AL-C to 85-WY-C.

Appendix A. Example of Detailed Estimates

NCI county estimates by age, sex, and race for the entire Nation are available on a computer tape file from the Customer Services Branch, Data Users Services Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233, (301) 763-4100. Paper copies of data for counties in specific States have been distributed to the Federal State Cooperative Program agencies in

the States. To obtain copies of data for selected counties in a single State, users should contact the agency for that State. A list of these agencies appears in appendix C. Policies regarding the distribution and charging for these copies are at the discretion of the individual agencies. A sample of the data appears below.

AGE	FIPS:01001 COUNTY NAME: AUTAUGA JULY 1, 1980				EXPERIMENTAL COUNTY ESTIMATES BY AGE, SEX, RACE AND YEAR							
	WHITE		BLACK AND OTHER		JULY 1, 1982		BLACK AND OTHER		JULY 1, 1984		BLACK AND OTHER	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
0-4	985	829	365	355	1064	849	365	375	1173	892	399	385
5-9	1094	989	442	404	1041	885	383	341	1115	894	344	293
10-14	1268	1072	401	429	1235	1007	414	465	1221	958	418	491
15-19	1306	1258	474	437	1191	1117	423	450	1145	1036	359	459
20-24	970	1006	302	383	898	924	283	366	850	876	252	341
25-29	845	908	244	247	877	1013	260	269	938	1157	270	287
30-34	891	985	167	205	960	1009	192	269	1073	1079	210	326
35-39	947	1021	123	171	1049	1036	140	172	1180	1085	163	181
40-44	859	887	137	159	857	863	133	164	930	914	131	170
45-49	829	737	111	167	836	748	118	160	913	822	131	157
50-54	627	598	115	172	658	633	120	189	698	679	125	206
55-59	519	526	115	152	540	566	121	160	587	622	127	166
60-64	427	450	120	170	431	489	128	162	440	537	128	154
65-69	359	418	131	162	375	426	133	167	379	456	112	169
70-74	242	332	87	120	266	364	90	123	261	379	85	114
75-79	122	236	70	95	145	256	67	81	165	284	40	90
80-84	51	136	31	58	52	158	28	75	71	171	31	69
85+	39	85	13	46	44	102	21	46	40	120	20	56
ALL AGES	12380	12473	3456	3932	12519	12445	3439	4034	13199	12961	3385	4114

Appendix B. List of Counties Adjusted for Military, College, and Institutional Population

(M denotes military, C denotes college, and I denotes institutional. (Z) signifies a "Zero-level" county, see text for explanation.)

ALABAMA

Calhoun—M C
Dale—M
Elmore—I (Z)
Lee—C
Macon—C
Madison—M C
Montgomery—M C (Z)
Perry—C (Z)
Pike—C
Russell—M (Z)
Shelby—C
Sumter—C (Z)
Tuscaloosa—C

ALASKA

Aleutian Islands Census Area—M
Anchorage Borough—M
Bristol Bay Borough—M
Fairbanks North Star Borough—M C
Kodiak Island Borough—M (Z)
Southeast Fairbanks Census Area—M
Yukon-Koyukuk Census Area—M (Z)

ARIZONA

Cochise—M
Coconino—C
Graham—I (Z)
Maricopa—M (Z)
Pima—M (Z) C
Pinal—I (Z)
Yuma—M

ARKANSAS

Clark—C
Columbia—C
Craighead—C
Drew—C (Z)
Faulkner—C
Johnson—C (Z)
Lawrence—C (Z)
Lincoln—I
Mississippi—M
Pope—C
Pulaski—M
Saline—I (Z)
Washington—C
White—C

CALIFORNIA

Alameda—M (Z)
Amador—I (Z)
Butte—C
Humboldt—C (Z)
Kern—M (Z)
Kings—M
Lassen—M (Z) I (Z)
Marin—I (Z)
Merced—M
Mono—M (Z)
Monterey—M
Napa—C (Z)
Orange—M (Z)
Riverside—M (Z)
Sacramento—M
San Bernardino—M (Z)
San Diego—M
San Francisco—M (Z)
San Luis Obispo—C I
Santa Barbara—M (Z) C
Santa Cruz—C
Solano—M
Tuolumne—I (Z)
Ventura—M (Z)
Yolo—C
Yuba—M

COLORADO

Adams—M (Z)
Alamosa—C
Arapahoe—M (Z)
Boulder—C
Chaffee—I (Z)
Denver—M (Z)
El Paso—M
Fremont—I (Z)
Gunnison—C
Jefferson—I (Z)
La Plata—C
Larimer—C
Las Animas—C (Z)
Logan—C (Z)
Rio Blanco—C (Z)
Weld—C

CONNECTICUT

New Haven—C
 New London—M
 Tolland—C I (Z)
 Windham—C (Z)

DELAWARE

Kent—M C
 New Castle—C

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington, D.C.—M (Z) C

FLORIDA

Alachua—C
 Bay—M
 Bradford—I (Z)
 Brevard—M (Z)
 Clay—M (Z)
 De Soto—I (Z)
 Duval—M
 Escambia—M
 Hillsborough—M (Z)
 Jackson—I (Z)
 Leon—C
 Monroe—M
 Okaloosa—M
 Orange—M
 Santa Rosa—M
 Union—I
 Volusia—C

GEORGIA

Baldwin—C I
 Bleckley—C
 Bulloch—C
 Camden—M (Z)
 Carroll—C
 Chatham—M
 Chattahoochee—M
 Clarke—C
 Coffee—C (Z)
 Columbia—M (Z)
 Dade—C (Z)
 Dougherty—M (Z)
 Floyd—C (Z)
 Franklin—C (Z)
 Fulton—C
 Habersham—C (Z) I (Z)
 Houston—M
 Liberty—M
 Lowndes—M C
 Lumpkin—C
 Monroe—C (Z)
 Montgomery—C (Z)
 Muscogee—M
 Peach—C
 Richmond—M
 Stephens—C (Z)

GEORGIA—Continued

Sumter—C
 Tattnall—I (Z)
 Tift—C
 Towns—C (Z)
 White—C (Z)

HAWAII

Honolulu—M

IDAHO

Bannock—C (Z)
 Bonneville—M (Z)
 Canyon—C (Z)
 Elmore—M
 Latah—C
 Madison—C

ILLINOIS

Adams—C (Z)
 Bond—C
 Champaign—M C
 Coles—C
 De Kalb—C
 Fayette—I (Z)
 Jackson—C
 Jersey—C
 Johnson—I (Z)
 Kankakee—C (Z)
 Knox—C (Z)
 Lake—M
 La Salle—I (Z)
 Livingston—I
 Logan—C I (Z)
 McDonough—C
 McLean—C
 Morgan—C
 Peoria—C
 Randolph—I (Z)
 St. Clair—M
 Warren—C
 Will—I
 Woodford—C (Z)

INDIANA

Delaware—C
 Grant—C
 Hendricks—I (Z)
 Jasper—C
 Jefferson—C
 Johnson—I
 Knox—C
 La Porte—I (Z)
 Madison—I (Z)
 Miami—M
 Monroe—C
 Montgomery—C
 Porter—C
 Putnam—C I (Z)
 St. Joseph—C (Z)

INDIANA—Continued

Steuben—C
 Tippecanoe—C
 Vigo—C
 Wabash—C

IOWA

Black Hawk—C
 Bremer—C
 Buena Vista—C
 Decatur—C
 Dubuque—C (Z)
 Henry—C (Z)
 Jefferson—C
 Johnson—C
 Jones—I (Z)
 Lee—I (Z)
 Linn—C (Z)
 Mahaska—C
 Marion—C
 Plymouth—C (Z)
 Polk—C
 Poweshiek—C
 Sioux—C
 Story—C
 Warren—C
 Winnebago—C (Z)
 Winneshiek—C
 Woodbury—C (Z)

KANSAS

Atchison—C
 Cloud—C (Z)
 Cowley—C (Z)
 Crawford—C (Z)
 Douglas—C
 Ellis—C
 Ford—C (Z)
 Franklin—C (Z)
 Geary—M
 Harvey—C
 Leavenworth—M I
 Lyon—C
 McPherson—C
 Marion—C (Z)
 Reno—I (Z)
 Rice—C (Z)
 Riley—M C
 Saline—C (Z)
 Sedgwick—M (Z)
 Thomas—C (Z)

KENTUCKY

Boyle—C
 Breathitt—C (Z)
 Calloway—C
 Carter—C (Z)

KENTUCKY—Continued

Christian—M
 Fayette—C
 Franklin—C
 Hardin—M
 Jessamine—C
 Lyon—I (Z)
 McCreary—I
 Madison—C
 Meade—M
 Oldham—I
 Rowan—C
 Scott—C
 Shelby—I
 Taylor—C (Z)
 Union—I
 Warren—C
 Whitley—C

LOUISIANA (Parishes)

Beauregard—I (Z)
 Bossier—M
 East Baton Rouge—C
 East Feliciana—I (Z)
 Iberville—I (Z)
 Lafayette—C
 Lafourche—C (Z)
 Lincoln—C
 Natchitoches—C
 Orleans—C
 Ouachita—C
 Rapides—M
 Tangipahoa—C
 Vernon—M
 West Feliciana—I (Z)

MAINE

Androscoggin—C (Z)
 Aroostook—M
 Cumberland—M (Z) C
 Franklin—C (Z)
 Hancock—M (Z) C
 Kennebec—C (Z)
 Penobscot—C
 Sagadahoc—M
 York—M (Z)

MARYLAND

Allegheny—C
 Anne Arundel—M C I
 Carroll—C (Z)
 Charles—M (Z)
 Frederick—M (Z) C
 Harford—M
 Kent—C
 Montgomery—M (Z)
 Prince George's—M (Z) C
 St. Mary's—M C

MARYLAND—Continued

Somerset—C
Washington—M (Z) I (Z)
Wicomico—C (Z)

MASSACHUSETTS

Barnstable—M (Z)
Berkshire—C
Hampden—C
Hampshire—C
Middlesex—C
Norfolk—I (Z)
Suffolk—C
Worcester—M (Z) C

MICHIGAN

Allegany—I (Z)
Calhoun—C (Z)
Chippewa—C I (Z)
Grand Traverse—C (Z)
Gratiot—C
Hillsdale—C
Houghton—C
Ingham—C
Ionia—I
Iosco—M
Isabella—C
Jackson—I
Kalamazoo—C
Lenawee—C (Z)
Livingston—I (Z)
Marquette—M C I (Z)
Mecosta—C
Midland—C (Z)
Ottawa—C
Washtenaw—C

MINNESOTA

Beltrami—C
Blue Earth—C
Clay—C
Lyon—C
Nicollet—C
Ramsey—C
Rice—C
St. Louis—M (Z)
Sherburne—I (Z)
Stearns—C
Steele—C (Z)
Stevens—C
Waseca—C (Z)
Washington—I (Z)
Winona—C

MISSISSIPPI

Bolivar—C
Claiborne—C

MISSISSIPPI—Continued

Forrest—C
Harrison—M
Hinds—C
Holmes—C (Z)
Jackson—M
Lafayette—C
Lauderdale—M
Leflore—C
Lowndes—M C
Marshall—C
Okibbeha—C
Pearl River—C (Z)
Stone—C
Sunflower—I
Tate—C

MISSOURI

Adair—C
Atchison—C (Z)
Boone—C
Callaway—C
Cape Girardeau—C
Cass—M (Z)
Cole—C I
Greene—C
Howard—C (Z)
Johnson—M C
Lewis—C (Z)
Nodaway—C
Phelps—C
Polk—C
Pulaski—M
Randolph—I (Z)
Taney—C

MONTANA

Beaverhead—C (Z)
Cascade—M
Gallatin—C
Hill—C (Z)
Lewis and Clark—C (Z)
Missoula—C
Powell—I (Z)

NEBRASKA

Adams—C
Buffalo—C
Dawes—C
Dodge—C (Z)
Lancaster—C I (Z)
Nemaha—C (Z)
Saline—C
Sarpy—M
Seward—C
Washington—C (Z)
Wayne—C

NEVADA

Churchill—M (Z)
 Clark—M
 Carson City city—I (Z)

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Cheshire—C
 Grafton—C
 Hillsborough—C
 Merrimack—C
 Rockingham—M
 Strafford—C

NEW JERSEY

Burlington—M
 Cape May—M (Z)
 Cumberland—I (Z)
 Hunterdon—I (Z)
 Mercer—C
 Middlesex—C
 Monmouth—M (Z)

NEW MEXICO

Bernalillo—M (Z)
 Curry—M
 Dona Ana—M (Z) C
 Otero—M
 Roosevelt—C
 San Miguel—C
 Santa Fe—C (Z)

NEW YORK

Albany—C
 Allegany—C
 Broome—C
 Cattaraugus—C
 Cayuga—I
 Chautauque—C
 Chemung—I
 Clinton—M C I (Z)
 Columbia—I (Z)
 Cortland—C
 Delaware—C
 Dutchess—C I
 Franklin—C
 Greene—I (Z)
 Jefferson—M (Z)
 Livingston—C
 Madison—C
 Monroe—C
 Oneida—M
 Onondaga—C
 Ontario—C
 Orange—M I (Z)
 Oswego—C
 Otsego—C
 Rensselaer—C
 St. Lawrence—C

NEW YORK—Continued

Saratoga—C (Z)
 Schenectady—C (Z)
 Schoharie—C
 Seneca—M (Z) C (Z)
 Sullivan—I
 Tompkins—C
 Ulster—C I (Z)
 Washington—I
 Wyoming—I
 Yates—C (Z)

NORTH CAROLINA

Avery—C
 Burke—I (Z)
 Carteret—M (Z)
 Craven—M
 Cumberland—M C
 Durham—C
 Forsyth—C
 Franklin—C (Z)
 Granville—I (Z)
 Guilford—C
 Harnett—M (Z) C
 Hertford—C
 Jackson—C
 Madison—C
 Mecklenburg—C
 New Hanover—M C (Z)
 Northampton—C (Z)
 Onslow—M
 Orange—C
 Pasquotank—M C
 Pitt—C
 Rowan—C
 Scotland—C
 Stanly—C (Z)
 Transylvania—C
 Union—C
 Wake—C
 Watauga—C
 Wayne—M
 Wilson—C

NORTH DAKOTA

Barnes—C (Z)
 Bottineau—C (Z)
 Cass—C
 Grand Forks—M C
 Richland—C
 Stark—C (Z)
 Stutsman—C (Z)
 Traill—C (Z)
 Ward—M C (Z)

OHIO

Ashland—C
 Athens—C

OHIO—Continued

Butler—C
 Clark—C (Z)
 Clinton—C (Z)
 Delaware—C
 Franklin—C
 Gallia—C (Z)
 Greene—M C
 Hardin—C
 Knox—C
 Licking—C (Z)
 Madison—I (Z)
 Marion—I (Z)
 Portage—C
 Richland—I (Z)
 Ross—I
 Scioto—I
 Seneca—C (Z)
 Warren—I
 Washington—C (Z)
 Wayne—C (Z)
 Wood—C

OKLAHOMA

Atoka—I (Z)
 Bryan—C
 Canadian—I (Z)
 Cherokee—C
 Cleveland—C
 Comanche—M
 Custer—C
 Garfield—M
 Greer—I (Z)
 Jackson—M
 Johnston—C (Z)
 Latimer—C (Z)
 Logan—C (Z)
 Oklahoma—M (Z)
 Okmulgee—C
 Ottawa—C
 Payne—C
 Pittsburg—I (Z)
 Pontotoc—C
 Pottawatomie—C
 Texas—C (Z)
 Woods—C (Z)

OREGON

Benton—C
 Clatsop—M (Z) I
 Lane—C
 Marion—I (Z)
 Polk—C (Z)
 Union—C (Z)
 Yamhill—C

PENNSYLVANIA

Adams—C
 Berks—C
 Butler—C
 Cambria—C
 Centre—C I (Z)
 Chester—C
 Clarion—C
 Clinton—C
 Columbia—C
 Crawford—C
 Cumberland—M (Z) C I (Z)
 Delaware—C
 Erie—C
 Greene—C (Z)
 Huntingdon—C I (Z)
 Indiana—C
 Lackawanna—C
 Lancaster—C
 Lawrence—C (Z)
 Lehigh—C
 Luzerne—I
 Lycoming—I (Z)
 Mercer—C
 Monroe—C
 Montgomery—I (Z)
 Northampton—C
 Snyder—C
 Sullivan—I
 Tioga—C
 Union—C I
 Washington—C

RHODE ISLAND

Bristol—C
 Newport—M
 Providence—C
 Washington—C

SOUTH CAROLINA

Abbeville—C (Z)
 Bamberg—C
 Beaufort—M
 Berkeley—M (Z)
 Charleston—M C
 Dorchester—M (Z)
 Greenville—C
 Horry—M
 Laurens—C
 Newberry—C
 Orangeburg—C
 Pickens—C
 Richland—M C
 Spartanburg—C
 Sumter—M
 York—C

SOUTH DAKOTA

Bon Homme—C
 Brookings—C
 Brown—C
 Clay—C
 Davison—C (Z)
 Lake—C (Z)
 Lawrence—C
 Meade—M
 Minnehaha—C I (Z)
 Pennington—M
 Yankton—C

TENNESSEE

Bradley—C (Z)
 Carter—C (Z)
 Chester—C
 Davidson—C
 Franklin—C
 Hamilton—C (Z)
 Hickman—I (Z)
 Jefferson—C
 Knox—C
 Lauderdale—I (Z)
 Madison—C
 Monroe—C (Z)
 Montgomery—M C (Z)
 Putnam—C
 Rhea—C
 Rutherford—C
 Shelby—M
 Tipton—M (Z)
 Washington—C
 Weakley—C

TEXAS

Anderson—I
 Bee—M
 Bell—M
 Bexar—M
 Brazoria—I
 Brazos—C
 Brewster—C (Z)
 Brown—C
 Caldwell—I
 Coryell—M
 Denton—C
 Eastland—C
 El Paso—M
 Erath—C
 Fort Bend—I (Z)
 Grayson—C (Z)
 Gregg—C (Z)
 Guadalupe—C
 Harrison—C (Z)
 Hays—C

TEXAS—Continued

Hockley—C (Z)
 Houston—I
 Hunt—C
 Kleberg—M C
 Lubbock—M(Z) C
 McLennan—C
 Madison—I
 Nacogdoches—C
 Nueces—M (Z)
 Randall—C
 Tarrant—M (Z)
 Taylor—M C
 Tom Green—M C
 Travis—M (Z) C
 Val Verde—M
 Walker—C I
 Waller—C
 Washington—C
 Wichita—M

UTAH

Cache—C
 Davis—M
 Sanpete—C (Z)
 Tooele—M (Z)
 Utah—C

VERMONT

Addison—C
 Bennington—C
 Caledonia—C (Z)
 Chittenden—C
 Lamoille—C (Z)
 Orange—C
 Rutland—C
 Washington—C

VIRGINIA

Albemarle—C
 Amherst—C
 Arlington—M
 Brunswick—C (Z)
 Chesterfield—C
 Fairfax—M I
 Fauquier—M (Z)
 Franklin—C
 Goochland—I (Z)
 Hanover—C
 Montgomery—C
 Powhatan—I (Z)
 Prince Edward—C
 Prince George—M I (Z)
 Prince William—M
 Roanoke—C
 Rockingham—C
 Southampton—I (Z)

VIRGINIA—Continued

Stafford—M
Washington—C (Z)
York—M
Alexandria city—M
Bristol city—C (Z)
Buena Vista city—C (Z)
Charlottesville city—C
Chesapeake city—M
Fredericksburg city—C
Hampton city—M C
Harrisonburg city—C
Lexington city—C
Lynchburg city—C
Newport News city—M
Norfolk city—M
Petersburg city—M (Z)
Portsmouth city—M
Radford city—C
Richmond city—C
Salem city—C
Staunton city—C
Virginia Beach city—M
Williamsburg city—C
Winchester city—C (Z)

WASHINGTON

Clallam—M (Z)
Island—M
Kitsap—M
Kittitas—C
Pierce—M
Snohomish—I (Z)
Spokane—M (Z) C (Z)

WASHINGTON—Continued

Walla Walla—C I
Whatcom—C
Whitman—C

WEST VIRGINIA

Barbour—C
Brooke—C
Cabell—C
Fayette—C (Z)
Gilmer—C (Z)
Jefferson—C
Mercer—C (Z)
Monongalia—C
Ohio—C
Randolph—C (Z)
Upshur—C

WISCONSIN

Ashland—C (Z)
Brown—I (Z)
Dane—C
Dodge—I (Z)
Douglas—C (Z)
Dunn—C
Eau Claire—C
Fond du Lac—C (Z)
Grant—C
Jefferson—C
La Crosse—C
Monroe—M (Z)
Pierce—C
Portage—C
Walworth—C
Winnebago—C

WYOMING

Albany—C
Laramie—M
Park—C (Z)

Appendix C. List of State Agency Contacts, Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates

ALABAMA

Alabama State Data Center, Center for Business & Economic Research
University of Alabama, Post Office Box AK,
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487

ALASKA

FSCPE Coordinator, Research and Analysis Section,
Department of Labor
Post Office Box 25501,
Juneau, AK 99802-5501

ARIZONA:

Arizona Department of Economic Security,
Population Statistics Unit
P.O. Box 6123-045Z,
Phoenix, AZ 85005

ARKANSAS

University of Arkansas—Little Rock,
Library Bldg., Room 509
2801 S. University Ave.,
Little Rock, AR 72204

CALIFORNIA

Population Research Unit,
State Department of Finance
915 L Street,
Sacramento, CA 95814

COLORADO

Department of Local Affairs,
Division Of Local Government
1313 Sherman St., Room 520,
Denver, CO 80203

CONNECTICUT

Division of Health Statistics,
Department of Health Services
150 Washington St.,
Hartford, CT 06106

DELAWARE

Delaware Development Office
99 King's Highway, P.O. Box 1401,
Dover, DE 19903

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Data Services Division, Room 570
415 Twelfth Street NW,
Washington, DC 20004

FLORIDA

Bureau of Economic & Business Research,
University of Florida
221 Matherly Hall,
Gainesville, FL 32611

GEORGIA

Governor's Office of Planning & Budget
270 Washington St. SW, Room 608
Atlanta, GA 30334

HAWAII

Department of Business & Economic Development
P.O. Box 2359,
Honolulu, HI 96804

IDAHO

Division of Financial Management,
Executive Office of the Governor
Statehouse, Room 122,
Boise, ID 83720

ILLINOIS

Division of Health Information & Evaluation
Department of Public Health
535 West Jefferson St.,
Springfield, IL 62761

INDIANA

Division of Public Health Statistics,
State Board of Health
1330 West Michigan St., P.O. Box 1964,
Indianapolis, IN 46206-1964

IOWA

Census Services, 320 East Hall
Iowa State University,
Ames, IA 50011

KANSAS

Division of the Budget
Statehouse, Room 152 E,
Topeka, KS 66602

KENTUCKY

Urban Studies Center, University of Louisville
Gardencourt Campus,
Louisville, KY 40292

LOUISIANA

Research Division, College of Administration and Business,
Louisiana Tech University
Box 10318 Tech Station,
Ruston, LA 71272

MAINE

Division of Data Research,
Department of Human Services
Statehouse,
Augusta, ME 04333

MARYLAND

Maryland Center for Health Statistics,
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
201 West Preston St.,
Baltimore, MD 21201

MASSACHUSETTS

Mass. Inst. for Social and Economic Research (MISER)
Room 50, State House,
Boston, MA 02113-0219

MICHIGAN

Office of Revenue and Tax Analysis,
Department of Management and Budget
Lewis Cass Bldg., P.O. Box 30026,
Lansing, MI 48909

MINNESOTA

Local Estimates, Minnesota State Planning Agency
300 Centennial Office Bldg., 658 Cedar St.,
St. Paul, MN 55155

MISSISSIPPI

Mississippi Research and Development Center
3825 Ridgewood Road,
Jackson, MS 39211

MISSOURI

Office of Administration,
Division of Budget & Planning
Room 124, Capitol, P.O. Box 809,
Jefferson City, MO 65102

MONTANA

Bureau of Business and Economic Research
University of Montana,
Missoula, MT 59812

NEBRASKA

Nebraska Natural Resources Commission
P.O. Box 94876,
Lincoln, NE 68509

NEVADA

Department of Economics,
College of Business Administration
University of Nevada-Reno,
Reno, NV 89557

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Office of State Planning
2 1/2 Beacon St.,
Concord, NH 03301

NEW JERSEY

Office of Demographic and Economic Analysis
Department of Labor, Cn388,
Trenton, NJ 08625-0388

NEW MEXICO

Bureau of Business and Economic Research
University of New Mexico, 1920 Lomas, N.E.,
Albuquerque, NM 87131

NEW YORK

State Department of Economic Development
One Commerce Plaza,
Albany, NY 12245

NORTH CAROLINA

Office of State Budget and Management
116 West Jones Street,
Raleigh, NC 27603-8005

NORTH DAKOTA

State Census Data Center, N.D. State University
P.O. Box 5636,
Fargo, ND 58105

OHIO

Ohio Data Users Center,
Department of Development
P.O. Box. 1001,
Columbus, OH 43266-0101

OKLAHOMA

Office of Economic Analysis,
Employment Security Commission
305 Will Rogers Bldg.,
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4495

OREGON

Center for Population Research & Census,
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751,
Portland, OR 97207-0751

PENNSYLVANIA

State Data Center, Institute of State & Regional Affairs,
Olmstead Bldg. Room E310,
Penn State University—Harrisburg,
Middletown, PA 17057

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program
265 Melrose St., Room 203,
Providence, RI 02907

SOUTH CAROLINA

Office of Demographic Statistics,
Division of Research and Statistical Services
Rembert C. Dennis Bldg.,
1000 Assembly St., Room 442,
Columbia, SC 29201

SOUTH DAKOTA

Center for Policy & Health Statistics,
State Department of Health
523 East Capitol, Room 321
Pierre, SD 57501

TENNESSEE

State Planning Office,
309 John Sevier State Office Bldg.
500 Charlotte Ave.,
Nashville, TN 37219

TEXAS

Department of Rural Sociology,
Texas A&M University System
Special Services Bldg.,
College Station, TX 77843-2125

UTAH

Office of State Planning and Budget
116 State Capitol,
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

VERMONT

Division of Public Health Statistics,
State Department of Health/Population Programs
P.O. Box 70, 60 Main St.,
Burlington, VT 05402

VIRGINIA

Center for Public Service, Dynamics Bldg. 4th Floor
2015 Ivy Road,
Charlottesville, VA 22903

WASHINGTON

Forecasting Division,
Office of Financial Management
Insurance Bldg., AQ44,
Olympia, WA 98504

WEST VIRGINIA

Office of Health Service Research
900 Chestnut Ridge Road,
Morgantown, WV 26505

WISCONSIN

Bureau of Health Statistics,
Department of Health & Social Services
P.O. Box 309,
Madison, WI 53701-0309

WYOMING

Institute for Policy Research, University of Wyoming
P.O. Box 3925, University Station,
Laramie, WY 82071

U.S. Department of Commerce
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
Washington, D.C. 20233

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
CENSUS
PERMIT No. G-58

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, \$300

