## SNC Vogtle ESP

## ER Supplemental Information

# Chapter 2

`*!* .

Section 2.5

## (GSCI 2005 to USDA 2004b)

. . .

· · ·



JUL 1 7 1989

NUS-SEC

## Alvin W. Vogtle NUCLEAR PLANT

5c| -1

## APPLICANT'S ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

AUGUST  $\cdot 1 \cdot 1972$ 

VOLUME I



GEORGIA POWER COMPANY A CITIZEN WHEREVER WE SERVE

#### Lunch-Money.com: General Information



#### Abour Us

General Information

Privacy Policy

Link to Us

Contact Us

Partnership Opportunitios

Nedla Center

Start Your Free Scholarship Search



## (Lunch-Money Com 2005) Page 1 of 2 Section 2.5, 2.8

### General Informa

## **Company Profile**

We go beyond traditional scholarship search sites to provide students with superior search capabilities and direct access to online scholarship applications!

Lunch-Money.com is a valuable resource for everyone involved in the scholarship process. We have compiled an extensive database of scholarship opportunities for students to sear and we are currently helping scholarship-granting organizations to move their applications online. If you are a student, a scholarship-granting organization, or a school counselor, Lunch-Money.com has something to offer you.

#### For Students

Student are our primary focus at Lunch-Money.com. We have worked hard to develop a comprehensive resource to help you with all the major decisions that come with going to college, including picking a school, financing your education, searching for scholarships an exploring career options. We are your one-stop resource for college information.

#### We go further than other sites

We not only help you find scholarships, but also offer online application forms for select scholarships. We also offer over a dozen ways to search our scholarship, college, and career databases. Save results from all these searches in your briefca areas.

#### We put you in the driver's seat

Our interactive calculators help you get answers that are relevant to your particular circumstances, while our informative guides offer insight from experts on topics ranging from planning your college visits to saving for college to avoiding scholarsh scams.

Unlike many other college-related sites, everything we offer students is free. Learn more about how Lunch-Money.com can help students.

#### For Scholarship-Granting Organizations

Lunch-Money.com has developed several valuable services for scholarship-granting organizations. Each service is aimed at supporting you in your efforts to reach and to scree qualified students.

We want to help you help students, by providing the following services:

- An Electronic Application Service
- A Printable Application Service
- A free Scholarship Listing Service
- A Website Service

Learn more about the breadth of services that Lunch-Money.com has to offer scholarshipgranting organizations.

http://www.lunch-money.com/Information/Info.aspx

#### **For School Counselors**

At Lunch-Money.com, we recognize the hard work and dedication of school counselors. We know that you play a critical role in your students' college and financial aid search. That is why we created the My High\_School page.

Using this free service, you can create a useful resource for your students with minimal effort. Our My High School page allows you to quickly and easily set up a listing of scholarships, which are particularly relevant to your students. This offers students a great starting point in their search for scholarships.

In addition to the My High School page, we allow you to customize and download all of the guides available on our site. Use these guides as handouts to keep your students informed about the financial ald and college admissions processes.

Get more information on all our services for school counselors.

#### For All Users

Looking for a specific page on our site? Find your desired page on Lunch-Money.com with the help of the sitemap.

© Lunch-Money.com 2005. All Rights Reserved.

Privacy Policy Link To Us

#### http://www.lunch-money.com/Information/Info.aspx

~ Lunch-Money.com: College Profile for Augusta Technical College - General Information Page 1 of 2

Scholarabla Search		Assessed a Tradicities I College
Collega Search		Augusta Tecnnical College
Comprehensivo Search	General     Admissions	Tuition / Financial Ald     School News
State	Academics	College Search
School Name		
Careor Exploration	General Information about	Augusta Technical College
Tools & Tips Start Your Free	Augusta Technical College 3200 Augusta Tech Drive Augusta, GA 30906	
Scholarship Search	Financial Aid: (706) 771-4148 Admissions: (706) 771-4000	3.
	Web Address: www.augustat	ech.edu
Search the Web	Level of Institution Control	Public
	Religious Affiliations	N/A
	Calendar System	Quarter
•	Campus Setting / Locale	Mid-size city
		(City with lewer than 250,000 residents)
	Augusta Technical College	e Facts
	Year Founded	-
		• •
	School Colors	
<b>4</b> 1	Otoriant Deskert Assessed	
	Student Body at Augusta	Technical College
	Total Student Population ( Graduate):	Undergraduate & 4,351
	Undergraduates	4,351 (100%)
	Graduates	(0%)
	Bert Time ver Full Time	
	Part-Time VS. Full-Time	
	Full-Time Undergraduat	es 2,162 (50%)
		2,100 (0015)
· .	Breakdown of Full-Time U	ndergraduate Population
	African-American	56%
	American Indian / Alask	a Native 0%
	Asian American	2%
	Caucasian	38%
	Hispanic American	3%
	International	0%

http://www.lunch-money.com/Colleges/Overview/138956.aspx

Lunch-Money.com: College Profile for Augusta Technical College - General Information Page 2 of 2

which the state of the second second

[Back to Top]

Privacy Policy

Link To Us

© Lunch-Money.com 2005. All Rights Reserved.

http://www.lunc	h-money.com/	Colleges/(	Overview/1	l38956.aspx
-----------------	--------------	------------	------------	-------------

Medical College of Georgia Home Page

Page 1 of 1



## Medical College of Georgia GEORGIA'S HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY

About MCG

Education Health Care

Research

Give to ISCG

#### My MCG

#### Nows and Information

Practice management seminar for residents coming Aug. 24

Growth and achievement in allied health sciences

MCG to host TEACH Academy July 19-21

Dr. Jillella named chief of adult hematology/oncology

Science/Medical News

**Campus Announcements** 

**Events Calendar** 

Featured Sites

Clinical Trials & Studies

Ask McG, MCG's online FAQ

IRIS, MCG's online data and Information system

Site Search

Institutional Faculty List

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q B S T U V W X Y Z Text Version | MCG Web Server | Legal Notice | Leave a Comment

> Medical College of Georgia 1120 15th Street, Augusta, GA 30912 Campus Operator: (706) 721-0211

A Unit of the University System of Georgia

Students

- Prospective Students
- Faculty & Staff

V-27

- Alumni & Friends
- Patients & Visitors

#### INFORMATION ABOUT

- Schools & Programs
- + Departments & Units
- Centers & Institutes
- Service & Outreach
- People & Places

QUICK LINKS

- Continuing Education
- Electronic Curriculum
- Information Technology
- . Library Resources
- MCG Catalog
- MCG History
- + Faculty Jobs
- Staff Jobs
- GroupWise

Featured Article: Estrogen, estrogen-like drugs'

ability to protect brain after stroke under study

Featured Service: MCG medical team to staff Augusta Southern Nationals race

http://www.mcg.edu/

Medical Coll	ege of	Georgi	a			
	Georgia's He	alth Sciences Unive	nity		A.T.Inder 1 h	ACC Home 1 MCC
IRIS Home MCG Facts	Planning	Assessment	MCG's Impact I	RIS Site Map	Search IRIS	
Students: Fall Enro	llment Tr	rends by Sch	1001			Excel A
· ·	2000	200	01 20	002	2003	20
Allied Health Sciences	323	45	6 4	73	524	54
Dentistry	225	21	9 2	23	228	. 26
Graduate Studies	379	21	6 2	24	245	2:
Medicine	. 711	71	97	'31 <sup>-</sup>	717	7:
Nursing	292	32	4 3	45	360	3!
Other	2	5	•	5	4	
Total	1,932	1,9	39 2,	001	2,078	2,1

**NOTE:** Enrollment figures displayed on this page do not include medical residents.

**SOURCE:** Office of the Registrar

& Medical College of Georgia | Institutional Research | 1120 15th St. | Augusta, GA 30912 | email us '



## **GEORGIA** - Burke County

Burke County Courthouse \*\* (added 1980 - Building -#80000980) Courthouse Sq., Waynesboro

> Historic Significance: Event, Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Et al., Goodrich,L.F. Architectural Style: Other Area of Significance: Architecture, Communications, Economics, Law, Politics/Government Period of Significance: 1850-1874 Owner: Local Gov't Historic Function: Government Historic Sub-function: Courthouse Current Function: Government Current Sub-function: Courthouse

Haven Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church \*\* (added 1996 - Building - #96000397) Also known as Haven--Munnerlyn United Methodist Church Barron St., S of Jct. of Barron and 6th Sts., Waynesboro

> Historic Significance: Event, Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Gothic Revival Area of Significance: Religion, Black, Architecture Period of Significance: 1875-1899, 1900-1924, 1925-1949 Owner: **Private** Historic Function: Education, Funerary, Religion Historic Sub-function: Cemetery, Religious Structure, School Current Function: Funerary, Religion Current Sub-function: Cemetery, Religious Structure

Hopeful Baptist Church \*\* (added 1993 - Building -#92001734) Winter Rd. E of jct. with Blythe Rd., Keysville

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown

### National Register of Historical Places - GEORGIA (GA), Burke County

Architectural Style: Greek Revival Area of Significance: Architecture, Religion, Black Period of Significance: 1850-1874 Owner: Private Historic Function: Religion Historic Sub-function: Religious Structure Current Function: Religion Current Sub-function: Religious Structure

## Jones, John James, House (added 1980 - Building - #80000981)

## Also known as Jones-Cox House; The Shadows 525 Jones Ave., Waynesboro

للصل

Historic Significance: Person, Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Greek Revival, Late Victorian Historic Person: Jones, John James Significant Year: 1876 Area of Significance: Social History, Architecture Period of Significance: 1875-1899 Owner: Private Historic Function: Domestic Historic Sub-function: Single Dwelling Current Function: Single Dwelling

McCanaan Missionary Baptist Church and Cemetery (added 2001 - Building - #01000643) Also known as First McCanaan Baptist Church McCanaan Church Rd., Sardis

> Historic Significance: Event, Architecture/Engineering Area of Significance: Architecture, Black Period of Significance: 1900-1924, 1925-1949, 1950-1974 Owner: Private

Historic Function: Funerary, Religion Historic Sub-function: Cemetery, Religious Structure Current Function: Funerary, Religion Current Sub-function: Cemetery, Religious Structure

Sapp Plantation \*\* (added 1980 - Building - #80000979) NW of Sardis on GA 24, Sardis

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Other Area of Significance: Agriculture, Architecture Period of Significance: 1825-1849, 1850-1874 Owner: Private Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic Historic Sub-function: Single Dwelling

> > Current Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic

http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ga/Burke/state.html

Page 3 of 4

Current Sub-function: Single Dwelling

Waynesboro Commercial Historic District (added 1993 -District - #93000496) Also known as See Also:Georgia County Courthouses TR E. 6th, E. 7th, E. 8th, S. Liberty and Myrick Sts., Waynesboro Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Multiple Architectural Style: Bungalow/Craftsman, Classical Revival, Early Commercial Area of Significance: Architecture, Commerce, Politics/Government, Community Planning And Development Period of Significance: 1750-1799, 1800-1824, 1825-1849, 1850-1874, 1875-1899, 1900-1924, 1925-1949 **Owner: Private**, Local Gov't Historic Function: Commerce/Trade, Government, Social, Transportation Historic Sub-function: Correctional Facility, Courthouse, Meeting Hall, Pedestrian Related, Rail-Related, Specialty Store Current Function: Commerce/Trade, Government, Industry/Processing/Extraction Current Sub-function: Courthouse, Financial Institution, Professional, Restaurant, Specialty Store, Water Works

## Return to Top

Select a Different GEORGIA County (map) Appling Atkinson Bacon Baker Baldwin Banks Barrow Bartow Ben Hill Berrien Bibb Bleckley Brantley Brooks Bryan Bulloch Burke Butts Calhoun Canden Candler Carroll Catoosa Charlton Chatham Chattahoochee Chattooga Cherokee Clarke Clay Clayton Clinch Cobb Coffee Colquitt Columbia Cook Coweta Crawford Crisp Dade Dawson De Kalb Decatur Dodge Dooly Dougherty Douglas Early Echols Effingham Elbert Emanuel Evans Fannin Fayette Floyd Forsyth Franklin Fulton Gilmer Glascock Glynn Gordon Grady Greene Gwinnett Habersham Hall Hancock Haralson Harris Hart Heard Henry Houston Irwin Jackson Jasper Jeff Davis Jefferson Jenkins Johnson Jones Lamar Lanier Laurens Lee Liberty Lincoln Long Lowndes Lumpkin Macon Madison Marion McDuffie McIntosh Meriwether Miller Mitchell Monroe Montgomery Morgan Murray Muscogee Newton Oconee Oglethorpe Paulding Peach Pickens Pierce Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Randolph Richmond Rockdale Schley Screven Seminole Spalding Stephens Stewart Sumter Talbot Taliaferro Tattnall Taylor Telfair Terrell Thomas Tift Toombs Towns Treutlen Troup Turner Twiggs Union Upson Walker Walton Ware Warren Washington Wayne Webster Wheeler White Whitfield Wilcox Wilkes Wilkinson Worth

Select a Different State (map) Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District Of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming

Return to Home Page

http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ga/Burke/state.html

Frequently Ask Questions | Register Forms www.nationalregisterofhistoricalplaces.com Contact Us



## **GEORGIA - Jefferson County**

Cunningham-Coleman House (added 1984 - Building -#84001119) SE of Wadley, Wadley

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architectural Style: Greek Revival Area of Significance: Agriculture, Architecture Period of Significance: 1825-1849 Owner: Private Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic Historic Sub-function: Agricultural Outbuildings, Single

Dwelling Current Function: Domestic Current Sub-function: Single Dwelling

Jefferson County Courthouse \*\* (added 1980 - Building -#80001099) Courthouse Sq., Louisville

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Heifner,F.P., Denny,W.F. Architectural Style: Classical Revival Area of Significance: Communications, Architecture, Economics, Politics/Government, Law Period of Significance: 1900-1924 Owner: Local Gov't Historic Function: Government Historic Sub-function: Courthouse Current Function: Unknown

 Louisville Commercial Historic District \*\* (added 1994 -District - #93001469)
 Also known as See Also:Georgia County Courthouses TR;Old Market
 Area surrounding Broad St. between Peachtree and Screven Sts.,

including parts of Walnut, Mulberry and Green Sts., Louisville

Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering

Architect, builder, or engineer: Simon, Louis A., Denny, Willis F. Architectural Style: Beaux Arts, Early Commercial, Romanesque Area of Significance: Community Planning And Development, Commerce, Politics/Government, Architecture Period of Significance: 1750-1799, 1800-1824, 1825-1849, 1850-1874, 1875-1899, 1900-1924, 1925-1949 Owner: Private, Local Gov't, Federal Historic Function: Commerce/Trade, Domestic, Government Historic Sub-function: Business, Capitol, City Hall, Correctional Facility, Courthouse, Financial Institution, Post Office Current Function: Commerce/Trade, Government Current Sub-function: Business, Courthouse, Department Store, Financial Institution, Professional, Public Works, Restaurant, Specialty Store

Old Market \*\*\* (added 1978 - Building - #78000991) Also known as Slave Market U.S. 1 and GA 24, Louisville

> Historic Significance: Event Area of Significance: Social History, Commerce Period of Significance: 1750-1799

> > Owner: Local Gov't

Historic Function: Commerce/Trade

Historic Sub-function: Business

Current Function: Recreation And Culture Current Sub-function: Monument/Marker

## Return to Top

Select a Different GEORGIA County (map) Appling Atkinson Bacon Baker Baldwin Banks Barrow Bartow Ben Hill Berrien Bibb Bleckley Brantley Brooks Bryan Bulloch Burke Butts Calhoun Camden Candler Carroll Catoosa Charlton Chatham Chattahoochee Chattooga Cherokee Clarke Clay Clayton Clinch Cobb Coffee Colquitt Columbia Cook Coweta Crawford Crisp Dade Dawson De Kalb Decatur Dodge Dooly Dougherty Douglas Early Echols Effingham Elbert Emanuel Evans Fannin Fayette Floyd Forsyth Franklin Fulton Gilmer Glascock Glynn Gordon Grady Greene Gwinnett Habersham Hall Hancock Haralson Harris Hart Heard Henry Houston Irwin Jackson Jasper Jeff Davis Jefferson Jenkins Johnson Jones Lamar Lanier Laurens Lee Liberty Lincoln Long Lowndes Lumpkin Macon Madison Marion McDuffie McIntosh Meriwether Miller Mitchell Monroe Montgomery Morgan Murray Muscogee Newton Oconee Oglethorpe Paulding Peach Pickens Pierce Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Randolph Richmond Rockdale Schley Screven Seminole Spalding Stephens Stewart Sumter Talbot Taliaferro Tattnall Taylor Telfair Terrell Thomas Tift Toombs Towns Treutlen Troup Turner Twiggs Union Upson Walker Walton Ware Warren Washington Wayne Webster Wheeler White Whitfield Wilcox Wilkes Wilkinson Worth

## MA

Select a Different State (map) Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District Of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming

http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ga/Jefferson/state.html

					1	• • (= 0.000 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	
R	Return to He	ome Page						
w	ww.natior	nalregistero	ofhistoricalp	blaces.cor	Frea n <sup>Property</sup>	quently Ask ( Updates   A	Questions   Be dd Link   Enha	gister Form nced Listing Contact U
	·							
		Ň						

http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ga/Jefferson/state.html

Page 1 of 6



## **GEORGIA** - McDuffie County

Boneville Historic District (added 2000 - District - #00000072) Jct. of Boneville Rd. and the Georgia RR, approx. 5 mi. SE of Thomson, Boneville

> Historic Significance: Event, Architecture/Engineering Architectural Style: Late Victorian, Greek Revival Area of Significance: Entertainment/Recreation, Education, Industry, Community Planning And Development, Architecture, Landscape Architecture Period of Significance: 1825-1849, 1850-1874, 1875-1899, 1900-1924, 1925-1949 **Owner:** Private Historic Function: Commerce/Trade, Domestic, Education, Industry/Processing/Extraction, Landscape, Religion, Transportation Historic Sub-function: Department Store, Manufacturing Facility, Natural Feature, Rail-Related, Religious Structure, School, Single Dwelling Current Function: Domestic, Funerary, Government, Landscape, Religion, Social, Transportation Current Sub-function: Cemetery, Meeting Hall, Natural Feature, Post Office, Rail-Related, Religious Structure, Single Dwelling

Bowdre-Rees-Knox House (added 1979 - Building - #79003109)

## Also known as Half Way House

SW of Thomson on Old Wrightsboro Rd., Thomas

Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Other Area of Significance: Architecture, Exploration/Settlement Period of Significance: 1800-1824 Owner: Private Historic Function: Domestic

Historic Sub-function: Single Dwelling

http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ga/McDuffie/state.html

#### National Register of Historical Places - GEORGIA (GA), McDuffie County

Current Function: Social Current Sub-function: Civic

Carr, Thomas, District \*\*\* (added 1975 - District -#75002059)

N of Thomason near jct. of GA 150 and I-20, Thomson

Historic Significance: Person, Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Sutton,Booker Architectural Style: No Style Listed Historic Person: Carr, Thomas Significant Year: 1810, 1806 Area of Significance: Architecture, Social History, Politics/Government

Period of Significance: 1800-1824

Owner: Private

Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic Historic Sub-function: Agricultural Fields, Single Dwelling Current Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic Current Sub-function: Agricultural Fields, Single Dwelling

Hardaway, James L., House (added 1993 - Building -#93000942) Old Mesena Rd. W of Thomson, Thomson

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Greek Revival Area of Significance: Agriculture, Architecture, Landscape Architecture Period of Significance: 1825-1849, 1850-1874, 1875-1899, 1900-1924, 1925-1949 Owner: Private Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic Historic Sub-function: Processing, Secondary Structure, Single

Dwelling Current Function: Domestic Current Sub-function: Single Dwelling

Hayes Line Historic District (added 2000 - District -#00000106)

Jct. of Twin Oaks Rd. and GA 233, Thomson

Historic Significance: Event, Architecture/Engineering Architectural Style: Other, Bungalow/Craftsman Area of Significance: Black, Agriculture, Architecture Period of Significance: 1900-1924, 1925-1949

#### Owner: Private

Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic Historic Sub-function: Agricultural Fields, Single Dwelling Current Function: Domestic Current Sub-function: Single Dwelling

## Hickory Hill \*\*\* (added 1979 - Building - #79003110) Also known as Watson, Thomas E., House Hickory Hill Dr. and Lee St., Thomson

Historic Significance: Person, Information Potential, Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Italianate, Classical Revival Historic Person: Watson, Thomas E. Significant Year: 1900, 1922, 1864 Area of Significance: Agriculture, Architecture, Historic - Non-Aboriginal, Politics/Government Cultural Affiliation: Twentieth Century Industria Period of Significance: 1850-1874, 1900-1924 **Owner:** Private Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic Historic Sub-function: Agricultural Fields, Secondary Structure, Single Dwelling Current Function: Domestic Current Sub-function: Secondary Structure, Single Dwelling

 Hillman--Bowden House \*\* (added 2002 - Building -#02001259)
 Also known as Pylant Place
 1348 Pyland Crossing Rd., Thomson

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering Architectural Style: Greek Revival Area of Significance: Architecture Period of Significance: 1850-1874 Owner: Private Historic Function: Domestic Historic Sub-function: Single Dwelling Current Function: Social Current Sub-function: Civic

McNeill House \*\* (added 1992 - Building - #92001637) Also known as David Armstrong McNeill,Sr.,House 220 Lee St., Thomson

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Et al., Stone,Edward Durrell Architectural Style: International Style Area of Significance: Architecture Period of Significance: 1925-1949 Owner: **Private** Historic Function: Domestic Historic Sub-function: Single Dwelling Current Function: Domestic

> > Current Sub-function: Single Dwelling

B Old Rock House \*\* (added 1970 - Building - #70000841)

http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ga/McDuffie/state.html

NW of Thomson on Old Rock House Rd., Thomson

Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Ansley, Thomas Architectural Style: Other Area of Significance: Religion, Architecture, Exploration/Settlement Period of Significance: 1750-1799 Owner: Private Historic Function: Defense, Domestic Historic Sub-function: Fortification, Single Dwelling

Current Function: Vacant/Not In Use, Work In Progress

Pine Top Farm \*\* (added 1996 - District - #96000582) Also known as Watson, John S., Homeplace Jct. of US 78 and US 278, 2 mi. E of Thomson, Thomson

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architectural Style: Colonial Revival Area of Significance: Architecture, Agriculture Period of Significance: 1850-1874, 1875-1899, 1900-1924,

> > 1925-1949

Owner: Private

Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic, Funerary

Historic Sub-function: Agricultural Fields, Agricultural Outbuildings, Animal Facility, Cemetery, Single Dwelling, Storage

Current Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic Current Sub-function: Agricultural Outbuildings, Animal Facility, Single Dwelling, Storage

Sweetwater Inn (added 1985 - Building - #85000938) Off GA 17 on Old Milledgeville Rd., Thompson

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Other Area of Significance: Architecture, Transportation, Commerce Period of Significance: 1800-1824, 1825-1849, 1850-1874, 1875-1899

#### Owner: Private

Historic Function: Domestic Historic Sub-function: Hotel Current Function: Vacant/Not In Use

Thomson Commercial Historic District (added 1989 - District - #89000413)

Roughly bounded by Journal St., Greenway St., Railroad St., Hendricks St., and Church St., Thomson

Historic Significance: Event, Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Italianate, Late 19th And Early 20th

Century American Movements, Late 19th And 20th Century Revivals Area of Significance: Architecture, Transportation, Politics/Government, Community Planning And Development, Commerce Period of Significance: 1850-1874, 1875-1899, 1900-1924, 1925-1949 **Owner: Private**, Local Gov't Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Commerce/Trade, Government, Transportation Historic Sub-function: Business, City Hall, Fire Station, Post Office, Rail-Related, Storage Current Function: Commerce/Trade, Education, Transportation Current Sub-function: Business, Library, Rail-Related

Usry House (added 1974 - Building - #74002182) 211 Milledge St., Thomson

> Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: Usry,William Architectural Style: Greek Revival, Gothic Area of Significance: Architecture, Exploration/Settlement Period of Significance: 1800-1824, 1825-1849, 1850-1874 Owner: Private Historic Function: Domestic Historic Sub-function: Single Dwelling Current Function: Domestic Current Sub-function: Single Dwelling

Watson, Thomas E., House \*\*\* (added 1976 - Building -#76002144) Also known as Hickory Hill 310 Lumpkin St., Thomson

> Historic Significance: Person Historic Person: Watson, Thomas E. Significant Year: 1922, 1900 Area of Significance: Agriculture, Politics/Government Period of Significance: 1900-1924 Owner: Private

Historic Function: Domestic Historic Sub-function: Secondary Structure, Single Dwelling Current Function: Domestic Current Sub-function: Secondary Structure, Single Dwelling

 Wrightsboro Historic District \*\*\* (added 1998 - District -#98000701)
 Also known as Wrightsborough;Quaker
 Reserve;Wrightsborough Township;Proper
 Wrightsboro Rd., E. of Ridge Rd., Wrightsboro

Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Information Potential, Event Architectural Style: Other Area of Significance: Architecture, Historic - Non-Aboriginal, Community Planning And Development,

> European, Exploration/Settlement, Landscape Architecture, Social History, Religion

Cultural Affiliation: Ouaker

Period of Significance: 1750-1799, 1800-1824, 1825-1849,

1850-1874, 1875-1899, 1900-1924,

1925-1949

#### Owner: Private

Historic Function: Commerce/Trade, Domestic, Education, Religion

Historic Sub-function: Department Store, Educational Related Housing, Religious Structure, School, Single Dwelling

Current Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Domestic, Funerary, Landscape

unctary, Lanuscape

Current Sub-function: Agricultural Fields, Animal Facility, Cemetery, Forest, Single Dwelling

## Return to Top

Select a Different GEORGIA County (map) Appling Atkinson Bacon Baker Baldwin Banks Barrow Bartow Ben Hill Berrien Bibb Bleckley Brantley Brooks Bryan Bulloch Burke Butts Calhoun Canden Candler Carroll Catoosa Charlton Chatham Chattahoochee Chattooga Cherokee Clarke Clay Clayton Clinch Cobb Coffee Colquitt Columbia Cook Coweta Crawford Crisp Dade Dawson De Kalb Decatur Dodge Dooly Dougherty Douglas Early Echols Effingham Elbert Emanuel Evans Fannin Fayette Floyd Forsyth Franklin Fulton Gilmer Glascock Glynn Gordon Grady Greene Gwinnett Habersham Hall Hancock Haralson Harris Hart Heard Henry Houston Irwin Jackson Jasper Jeff Davis Jefferson Jenkins Johnson Jones Lamar Lanier Laurens Lee Liberty Lincoln Long Lowndes Lumpkin Macon Madison Marion McDuffie McIntosh Meriwether Miller Mitchell Monroe Montgomery Morgan Murray Muscogee Newton Oconee Oglethorpe Paulding Peach Pickens Pierce Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Randolph Richmond Rockdale Schley Screven Seminole Spalding Stephens Stewart Sumter Talbot Taliaferro Tattnall Taylor Telfair Terrell Thomas Tift Toombs Towns Treutlen Troup Turner Twiggs Union Upson Walker Walton Ware Warren Washington Wayne Webster Wheeler White Whitfield Wilcox Wilkes Wilkinson Worth

Select a Different State (map) Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District Of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming

AAA

Return to Home Page

Frequently Ask Questions | Register Forms Property Updates | Add Link | Enhanced Listings | Contact Us

www.nationalregisterofhistoricalplaces.com



Current Sub-function: Agricultural Fields, Single Dwelling

Roberts-McGregor House \*\* (added 1979 - Building -#79000750) Also known as McGregor, Charles E., House

Depot St., Warrenton

-11-41

Historic Significance: Person, Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Unknown Architectural Style: Greek Revival, Federal Historic Person: McGregor, Charles E. Significant Year: 1885, 1824, 1840 Area of Significance: Architecture, Politics/Government, Landscape Architecture Period of Significance: 1825-1849, 1875-1899, 1900-1924 Owner: Private Historic Function: Domestic Historic Sub-function: Secondary Structure, Single Dwelling Current Function: Vacant/Not In Use

Page 2 of 3

 Warren County Courthouse \*\* (added 1980 - Building -#80001259)
 Courthouse Sq., Warrenton

 Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event
 Architect, builder, or engineer: Falls City Construction Co., Chamberlain, Walter
 Architectural Style: Classical Revival
 Area of Significance: Communications, Architecture, Economics, Law, Politics/Government
 Period of Significance: 1900-1924
 Owner: Local Gov't
 Historic Sub-function: Courthouse
 Current Function: Government

Warrenton Downtown Historic District (added 2002 - District - #02000340)
 Roughly centered on jct. of Main and Depot Sts., Warrenton

Historic Significance: Architecture/Engineering, Event Architect, builder, or engineer: multiple Architectural Style: Italianate, Queen Anne Area of Significance: Architecture, Commerce, Community Planning And Development, Politics/Government Period of Significance: 1850-1874, 1875-1899, 1900-1924, 1925-1949, 1950-1974

> Owner: Private, Local Gov't, State, Federal Historic Function: Agriculture/Subsistence, Commerce/Trade, Government, Health Care, Landscape, Recreation And Culture, Social

Historic Sub-function: Courthouse, Department Store, Financial Institution, Post Office, Restaurant, Specialty Store, Warehouse

Current Function: Commerce/Trade, Funerary, Health Care, Landscape, Recreation And Culture, Social, Vacant/Not In Use

Current Sub-function: Courthouse, Department Store, Financial Institution, Post Office, Professional, Restaurant, Specialty Store

 Warrenton Gymnasium--Auditorium (added 2002 - Building -#02001214)
 304 S. Gibson St., Warrentown

> Historic Significance: Event, Architecture/Engineering Architect, builder, or engineer: Claussen-Lawrence Construction Co., Merry & Parsons Architectural Style: Classical Revival Area of Significance: Social History, Architecture, Politics/Government Period of Significance: 1900-1924, 1925-1949, 1950-1974

http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/ga/Warren/state.html

**Owner: Local Gov't** Historic Function: Recreation And Culture Historic Sub-function: Auditorium, Sport Facility Current Function: Recreation And Culture Current Sub-function: Sport Facility

## Return to Top

Select a Different GEORGIA County (map) Appling Atkinson Bacon Baker Baldwin Banks Barrow Bartow Ben Hill Berrien Bibb Bleckley Brantley Brooks Bryan Bulloch Burke Butts Calhoun Camden Candler Carroll Catoosa Charlton Chatham Chattahoochee Chattooga Cherokee Clarke Clay Clayton Clinch Cobb Coffee Colquitt Columbia Cook Coweta Crawford Crisp Dade Dawson De Kalb Decatur Dodge Dooly Dougherty Douglas Early Echols Effingham Elbert Emanuel Evans Fannin Fayette Floyd Forsyth Franklin Fulton Gilmer Glascock Glynn Gordon Grady Greene Gwinnett Habersham Hall Hancock Haralson Harris Hart Heard Henry Houston Irwin Jackson Jasper Jeff Davis Jefferson Jenkins Johnson Jones Lamar Lanier Laurens Lee Liberty Lincoln Long Lowndes Lumpkin Macon Madison Marion McDuffie McIntosh Meriwether Miller Mitchell Monroe Montgomery Morgan Murray Muscogee Newton Oconee Oglethorpe Paulding Peach Pickens Pierce Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Randolph Richmond Rockdale Schley Screven Seminole Spalding Stephens Stewart Sumter Talbot Taliaferro Tattnall Taylor Telfair Terrell Thomas Tift Toombs Towns Treutlen Troup Turner Twiggs Union Upson Walker Walton Ware Warren Washington Wayne Webster Wheeler White Whitfield Wilcox Wilkes Wilkinson Worth

Select a Different State (map) Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District Of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming

Return to Home Page

AAAA

Frequently Ask Questions | Register Forms www.nationalregisterofhistoricalplaces.com Property Updates | Add Link | Enhanced Listings | Contact Us

· National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Home Page, a part of the U.S. Departme... Page 1 of 1



http://nces.ed.gov/

Search For Schools, Colleges and Libraries

I AGO I OI I	Pa	age	1	of	1
--------------	----	-----	---	----	---

7/15/2005

State       -Any State       City       Device bound to be any of laterated (40) public Schools []         Name       Sort by @ Name C State C City       Public Schools []         Name       Sort by @ Name C State C City       Public Schools []         Search Tips       Here are some tips to begin your search.       Ite any of laterated (10)         Vou must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.         Vou must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.         Vou must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       No unust enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.         Vou must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       No unust enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.         Vou must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       Nou must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.         Vou must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       Nou must enter any con search use more search parameters.         In doing a name scarch kcep it as simple as possible to make sure you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary's College in case spelling or abbreviations are different.         In better duty search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.         MCES       NUST RELEASED! MAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress		
State       -Any State		
Zip       Distance       Public Schools            Name       Sort by @ Name C State C City       Public Schools            Sort by @ Name C State C City       Public Libraries          Public Libraries            Search Tips       Here are some tips to begin your search.       •       Public Schools found         You must enter a name, dity, or zip code to begin searching.       •       You must select at least one of the four types of institutions found on the right side of the search tool.       •       In doing a name search keep it as simple as possible to make sure you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary's College in case spelling or abbreviations are different.       •       To better target your search use more search parameters.         •       To better target your search use more search parameters.       •       To better target your search use more search parameters.         •       To better target your search use more search parameters.       •       To better target your search use more search parameters.         •       To better target your search use more search parameters.       •       By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.         MCEES       •       •       UST FIELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Tom Trends in Academic Progress         Meedlines       •       •       •       •         NCES Home   Publications   Surveys & Programs   Academic Pro	- Any State - City City Select any o	of interest (all)
Name       Frivate Schools 1 Colleges F Public Libraries F         Search Tips       Example         Image: Search Tips       Image: Search Tips         Image: Search Tip	Zip Distance Miles Public S	Schools
Sort by & Name C State C City       Public Libraries         Search Tips       Here are some tips to begin your search.         • You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       • You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.         • You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       • You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.         • You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.       • You must select at least one of the four types of institutions found on the right side of the search tool.         • In doing a name search keep it as simple as possible to make sure you in case spelling or abbreviations are different.       • To better target your search use more search parameters.         • To better target your search use more scarch parameters.       • To better target your search use more scarch parameters.         • Dy default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.         NCES       • dyst RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress         Headlines       • JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress         NCES Home   Publications   Surveys & Programs   Outer Tables & Fluers   Data Tools Search   Heel   News Flash   NCES Starf   Contact NCES   Stel Index         National Conter for Education Statistics       National Conter for Education Statistics         Mational Conter for Education Statistics       National Conter NES   Sone, (BA, Phone: (BA) SES / SACOMER   State NEW, Weenington,	Vame C	Schools   Colleges
Search Tips         When the provide the search to be a start of the search to a start of the four types of institutions found on the right side of the search to and the search the search to and the search the search to and the search to and the search th	Sort by @ Name C State C City Public L	ibraries T
Search Tips         Here are some tips to begin your search.         You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.         You must select at least one of the four types of institutions found on the right side of the search tool.         In doing a name search keep it as simple as possible to make sure you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary's College in case spelling or abbreviations are different.         To better target your search use more search parameters.         To find an NCES ID for public & private schools, colleges and libraries click on the name of the institution in the search results.         By default, search results are sorted by mame within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.         MCES       • JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress         Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Irende in Academic Progress         Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Irende in Academic Progress         NCES Headlines       • Surveys & Programs   Outek Tables & Figures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   She Index         National Conter for Education Statistics         Interdent on Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300		
<ul> <li>Here are some tips to begin your search.</li> <li>You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.</li> <li>You must select at least one of the four types of institutions found on the right side of the search tool.</li> <li>In doing a name search keep it as simple as possible to make sure you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary's College in case spelling or abbreviations are different.</li> <li>To better target your search use more search parameters.</li> <li>To find an NCES ID for public &amp; private schools, colleges and libraries click on the name of the institution in the search results.</li> <li>By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.</li> </ul> MCES <ul> <li>JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress</li> <li>Commissioner's Bemarks on NAEP 2004 Irends in Academic Progress</li> <li>Commissioner's Bemarks on NAEP 2004 Irends in Academic Progress</li> <li>Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index</li> </ul> Mational Conter for Education Statistics (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Weshington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	Tips	
<ul> <li>You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin searching.</li> <li>You must select at least one of the four types of institutions found on the right side of the search tool.</li> <li>In doing a name search keep it as simple as possible to make sure you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary's College in case spelling or abbreviations are different.</li> <li>To better target your search use more search parameters.</li> <li>To find an NCES ID for public &amp; private schools, colleges and libraries click on the name of the institution in the search results.</li> <li>By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.</li> </ul> NCES <u>Headlines</u> <ul> <li>JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress . Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004. Trends in Academic Progress</li> </ul> NCES: Home   Publications   Surveys & Programs   Quick Tables & Figures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index National Conter for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept. of Education (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	Here are some tips to begin your search.	
<ul> <li>You must select at least one of the four types of institutions found on the right side of the search tool.</li> <li>In doing a name search keep it as simple as possible to make sure you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary's College in case spelling or abbreviations are different.</li> <li>To better target your search use more search parameters.</li> <li>To find an NCES ID for public &amp; private schools, colleges and libraries click on the name of the institution in the search results.</li> <li>By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.</li> </ul> NCES	• You must enter a name, city, or zip code to begin search	ling.
<ul> <li>In doing a name search keep it as simple as possible to make sure you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary's College in case spelling or abbreviations are different.</li> <li>To better target your search use more search parameters.</li> <li>To find an NCES ID for public &amp; private schools, colleges and libraries click on the name of the institution in the search results.</li> <li>By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.</li> </ul> NCES <ul> <li>JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress</li> <li>Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress</li> <li>Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Interds in Academic Progress</li> </ul> NCES Home   Publications   Surveys & Programs   Quick Tables & Elgures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept, of Education (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	• You must select at least one of the four types of institution on the right side of the search tool.	ons found
you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary's College in case spelling or abbreviations are different.         • To better target your search use more scarch parameters.         • To find an NCES ID for public & private schools, colleges and libraries click on the name of the institution in the search results.         • By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.         NCES Headlines       • JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Itends in Academic Progress         NCES Heme   Publications   Surveys & Programs   Quick Tables & Figures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index         National Center for Education Statistics (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	• In doing a name search keep it as simple as possible to ma	ake sure
<ul> <li>To better target your search use more search parameters.</li> <li>To find an NCES ID for public &amp; private schools, colleges and libraries click on the name of the institution in the search results.</li> <li>By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.</li> </ul> NCES • JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in A	you get results. For example, use Mary instead of Saint Mary in case spelling or abbreviations are different.	r's College
To find an NCES ID for public & private schools, colleges and libraries click on the name of the institution in the search results.     By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.     NCES + Headlines • JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Itends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Itends in Academic Progress • NCES Home   Publications   Surveys & Programs   Ouldk Tables & Figures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index • National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept, of Education (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	• To better target your search use more search parameters.	
Iterantes click on the name of the institution in the search results.         • By default, search results are sorted by name within institution, however, you may select to sort by state or city.         NCES       • JUST RELEASED! NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress         Headlines       • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress         NCES Home   Publications   Surveys & Programs   Culck Tables & Figures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index         National Center for Education Statistics         Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept. of Education         (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 2000s, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	• To find an NCES ID for public & private schools, college	es and
NCES Headlines       • JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress         MCES Headlines       • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress         MCESHome       Publications   Surveys & Programs   Quick Tables & Figures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index         National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept, of Education (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	<ul> <li>By default, search results are sorted by name within insti-</li> </ul>	itution.
NCES Headlines       • JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress         NCES Home   Publications   Surveys & Programs   Quick Tables & Figures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index         National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept, of Education (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	however, you may select to sort by state or city.	
NCES Headlines       • JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress • Commissioner's Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress         NCES Home         Publications   Surveys & Programs   Quick Tables & Figures   Data Tools Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index         National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept. of Education (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300		•
Headlines       • Commissioners. Hemarks on NAEP 2003_Irends.in Academic Progress         NCES:Home         Publications   Surveys & Programs   Quick Tables & Figures   Data Tools         Search         Help       News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index         National Center for Education Statistics       Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept. of Education         (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	JUST RELEASEDI NAEP 2004 Long Term Trends in Academic Progress	
NetS Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept. of Education (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	Ines • Commissioners Remarks on NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress	
National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Dept. of Education (map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	Search   Help   News Flash   NCES Staff   Contact NCES   Site Index	
(map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	National Center for Education Statistics	· •
	(map) 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300	•
		· .
		· •
		. •
		- · ·

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/

## **Ogcechee Technical College**

Print OMore Information

•	·			
Information				
Institution Name: Ogeechee Technical Colleg	Ins ge Co	titution T llege	уре:	
Mailing Address: One Joe Kennedy Blvd Statesboro, GA 30458	General info (912) 681-55 Financial ai (912) 681-55 Admissions (912) 681-55	ormation: 500 d office: 500 office: 500	<b>IPEI</b> 3664	<b>)S ID:</b> 65
Characteristics	•			
Description:	Public, 2-year			
Degrees offered: Certificates offered:	Associate's less-than-4-yea than-1-year	rs, less-tha	in-2-years, l	ess-
Library Information (	2002 data)		•	
Print Material:				2,477
Scriais:	<b></b>		<u>.</u>	109
Euromment				001
Undergraduate enro	llment:		2	,081 2,081
Percent of Undergra	duate enrollm	ent		
by gender				0.00
Men:			3:	5.2%
women:	•		00	5.8%
Dy race/ethnicity	·			700
Black non-Hispan	liC: Alaskan Nati		4	J.1% .
American Indian o	or Alaskan Ivali	ve:		J.2.70
Asian of Pacific Is	sianuer:			J.2% > 0 <i>01</i>
Hispanic:				J.070 7 00%
Pace ethnicity un	lic: known			1.070
Race-connerty un	Encollment data Fal	1 2003)		1.0 %
Financial	(Calosonen cara ra		······	
Academic year prices for	full-time, first	-time und	ergraduate	students
Teudernie geur prices iou		2004-05	2003-04	2002-03
Tuition & fees				
In-state		\$1,161	\$1,125	\$1,086
Out-of-state		\$2,169	\$2,097	\$2,172
<b>Books and supplies</b>		\$1,000	\$1,000	\$800
Off-campus	·			
<ul> <li>Room and board</li> </ul>		\$3,150	\$3,150	\$3,150
Other expenses		\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Off-campus with family	· ·			
Other expenses		\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000

(Source: IPEDS College data 2004-2005)

National Center for Education Statistics

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=366465

## Ogeechee Technical College - College

## Institute of Education Sciences

## Close Window 🛞

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=366465

)

## East Georgia College

Print OMore Information

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Information	•		
Institution Name: East Georgia College	Institution Ty College	pe:	
Mailing Address: 131 College Cir Swainsboro, GA 30401	General information: (478) 289-2000 Financial aid office: (478) 289-2012 Admissions office: (478) 289-2017	IPED 13962	S ID: 4 21
Characteristics			
Description:	Public, 2-year		
Degrees offered:	Associate's		;
Library Information (2	2002 data)	• .	
Print Material:	•	4	1,591
Serials:	· . 		127
Enrollment	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Total enrollment:	· · · · ·	. 1	,420
Undergraduate enrol	liment:	1	420
Percent of Undergrad	duate enrollment	· . ·	
Men:		38	.0%
Women:		62	.0%
by race/ethnicity			
Non-resident alien		C	0.2%
Black non-Hispan		34	.0%
American Indian c	or Alaskan Native:		1.2%
Asian or Pacific Is	ianoer:	( -	0.0%
Mite non-Hispan	ic:	1	070 00%
white non-riispan	IC. Econoliment data E-11 2003)	02	
Financial			
	6.11 4		
Academic year prices for	2004-05	1graduate 2003-04	2002-03
Tuition & fees	•		
In-state	\$1,600	\$1,524	\$1,428
Out-of-state	\$6,004	\$5,718	\$5,424
Books and supplies	\$693	\$673	\$654
Off-campus	<b>.</b>		<u> </u>
Room and board	\$4,515	\$4,384	\$4,257
Other expenses	\$3,955	\$3,840	\$3,729
Other expenses	. 63 055	¢2 840 -	\$2.720
outer expenses	30,700	\$ <b>3,</b> 040 (	93,149

(Source: IPEDS College data 2004-2005)

National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=139621

## 7/15/2005

· ········· · ·

## East Georgia College - College

洞

-----

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=139621

Page 2 of 2

Close Window 🗵

## Swainsboro Technical College

Print OMore Information

				•
Information		•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Institution Name: Swainsboro Technical Col	llege	Institution Ty College	/pe:	
Mailing Address: 346 Kite Rd Swainsboro, GA 30401	General i (478) 289 Financial (478) 289 Admissio (478) 289	nformation: -2200 aid office: -2262 ns office: -2261	<b>IPEI</b> 1411	DS ID: 21
Characteristics	· .			
Description:	Public, 2-ye	ar		
Degrees offered: Certificates offered:	Associate's less-than-4- than-1-year	years, less-tha	n-2-years, I	ess-
Enrollment	• •			
Total enrollment: Undergraduate enr	ollment:			662 662
Percent of Undergr by gender	aduate enrol	lment	•	1 10/
Men: Women: by race/ethnicity		<i>.</i> .	2. 78	8.9%
Black non-Hispa Hispanic:	nic:	· .	4	9.2% 0.2%
white non-Hispa Race-ethnicity u	nic:	2 5.	. (	0.2% ·
• · ·	(Enrollment data	Fall 2003)		• • .
Financial	•	······································		
Academic year prices fo	r full-time, fi	irst-time und 2004-05	ergraduate 2003-04	students 2002-03
Tuition & fees			· .	
In-state		\$1,146	\$1,110	\$1,068
Out-of-state	•	\$2,154	\$2,080	\$2,004
Books and supplies		\$750	\$750	\$1,000
Off-campus	•	<u> </u>	A	A
Room and board		\$7,125	\$7,125	\$7,125
Other expenses		\$2,850	\$2,813	\$2,813
Ull-campus with famil	ly .		64.50	61
Other expenses		\$4,200	\$4,163	\$4,163

(Source: IPEDS College data 2004-2005)

National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=141121



.

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=141121

## Close Window 🛞

١

## Aiken Technical College

SPrint OMore Information

Information		•	•	
Institution Name: Aiken Technical College	Ins Co	titution T llege	уре:	
Mailing Address: 2276 Jefferson Davis Highway Aiken, SC 29829	General inf 8035939231 Financial ai 8035939231 Admissions 8035939231	ormation: 1247 d office: 1248 office: 1247	<b>IPEI</b> 2176	<b>DS ID:</b> 15
Characteristics	· · ·			
Description:	Public, 2-year			
Degrees offered: Certificates offered:	Associate's less-than-2-yea	rs, less-tha	n-1-ycar	
Library Information	(2002 data)		•	
Print Material:     Serials:	•			27,670 241
Schals.				241
Enronmen Total and total	• .			500
1 otal enroument: Undergraduate enro	liment.	•	4	,503 503
Doncomt of Lindonan	- 3	<b>4</b> ·	-	
hv gender	aduate enroum	ent		
Men:			3	7.0%
Women:			6	3.0%
by race/ethnicity				
Non-resident alie	n:	•	1	0.0%
Black non-Hispa	nic:	•	3'	7.5%
American Indian	or Alaskan Nati	ve:	. (	0.8%
Asian or Pacific I	Islander:			0.8%
Hispanic:	-			1.5%
White non-Hispa	nic:		5	7.5%.
Kace-einnichty ur	iknown:			1.9%
	(Enrollment data Fal	1 2003)	<u></u>	<u>_</u>
rinancial	· · · ·			4 • 4-
Academic year prices to	r full-time, first	t-time und 2004-05	ergraduate 2003-04	students 2002-03
Tuition & fees	-	to 000	· ••• <00	¢0 100
In-district		32,000	32,000 63 810	\$2,192 \$2,192
Out_of_state		\$2,000 \$7 Q47	32,040 ¢7 300	\$2,400 \$6 174
Books and supplies		\$600	\$600	\$600
Off-campus		. wooo	6000	<b>400</b> 0
Room and board	•	\$4,600	\$4,500	\$4,500
Other expenses		\$2,500	\$2,400	\$2,400
Off-campus with famil	у	•		
Other expenses		\$5,100	\$5,100	\$5,100

(Source: IPEDS College data 2004-2005)

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=217615

National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences

## Close Window

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=217615

## Denmark Technical College

Print OMore Information

Information			
Institution Name: Denmark Technical College	Institution Ty College	pe:	× *
Mailing Address: 500 Solomon Blatt Blvd Denmark, SC 29042	General information: 80379351490 Financial aid office: 80379351290 Admissions office: 80379351760	<b>IPEI</b> 2179	<b>DS ID:</b> 89
Characteristics			•
Description: P	ublic, 2-year		
Degrees offered: A Certificates offered: la	ssociate's css-than-2-years, less-than	1-1-year	_
Enrollment		•	
Total enrollment:		· 1	.464
Undergraduate enroll	ment:	1	,464
Percent of Undergrad	uate enrollment		
by gender			
Men:		3	8.5%
Women:		. 6	1.5%
by race/ethnicity			
Non-resident alien:		. (	0.1%
Black non-Hispanic	2:	9	4.4%
American Indian or	Alaskan Native:	•	0.2%
Hispanic:		(	0.1%
White non-Hispani	C:		4.5%
Race-ethnicity unk	nown:		0.8%
(E	Inrollment data Fall 2003)		
Financial ·	·		
Academic year prices for I	full-time, first-time unde	ergraduate	students
• •	2004-05	2003-04	2002-03
Tuition & fees			
- In-state	\$2,188	\$2,188	\$2,092
Out-of-state	\$4,276	\$4,276	\$4,084
Books and supplies	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100
On-campus			
Room and board	\$3,096	\$3,096	\$3,096
Other expenses	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700
On-campus		69 000	. ea 000
Koom and board	. 33,800	\$3,800 \$4,000	\$3,800
Other expenses	\$4,000	<b>\$4,000</b>	34,000
Other expanses		\$2 400	¢3 100
Unier expenses	a5,400	\$ <b>3,40</b> 0	. <i>\$</i> 3,400

(Source: IPEDS College data 2004-2005)

National Center for Education Statistics Institute of Education Sciences

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=217989

Denmark Technical College - College

.....

Page 2 of 2

## Close Window 🛞

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=217989
# University Of South Carolina-salkehatchie

Print OMore Information

Information	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Institution Name: University Of South Carolin salkehatchie	Institution T na- College	ype:	
Mailing Address: 465 James Brandt Blvd Allendale, SC 29810	General information: (800) 922-5500 Financial aid office: (803) 584-3446 Admissions office: (803) 584-3446	<b>IPEI</b> 2186	DS ID: 81
Characteristics			
Description: 1	Public, 2-year		
Degrees offered:	Associate's		
Library Information (2	002 data)	. ·	
Print Material:	•		51,362
Serials:			386
Enrollment	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Total enroliment:			789
Undergraduate enrol	lment:	•	789 ·
Percent of Undergrad	luate enrollment	•	
by gender			
Men:	*	28	3.8%
Women:	•	. 71	.2%
by race/ethnicity	•		
Black non-Hispani	<b>c:</b> .	41	.4%
American Indian o	r Alaskan Native:	• 1	.0%
Asian or Pacific Is	lander:	. 1	.0%
Hispanic:		· (	).9%
White non-Hispani	ic:	53	3.1%
Race-ethnicity unk	nown:		2.5%
(	Enroliment data Fall 2003)		
Financial	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Academic year prices for	full-time, first-time und 2004-05	ergraduate 2003-04	students 2002-03
Tuition & fees			
In-state	\$4,058	\$3,656	\$3,080
Out-of-state	\$9,720	\$8,754	\$7,328
Books and supplies	\$890	\$744	\$723
Off-campus	•		۰.
Room and board	\$5,521	\$5,298	\$4,907
Other expenses	\$3,712	\$3,413	\$3,292
Off-campus with family	•		
Other expenses	\$3,310	\$2,917	\$2,512

(Source: IPEDS College data 2004-2005)

National Center for Education Statistics

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=218681

7/15/2005

## ' 'University Of South Carolina-salkehatchie - College

Institute of Education Sciences

Close Window 🗵

http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/col\_info\_popup.asp?ID=218681

7/15/2005

ch by location V-546

•

of 1

NATIONAL REGISTER INFORMATION SYSTEM

Æ

2.5.3.1

(NPS 2005)

Search by Location

- <u>State</u>
- State and Name
- <u>State and County</u>
- State and City
- State and Name with Database Details
- Get a Map

Search by Location with links to Web pages

- <u>State</u>
- State and County
- State and City

Help

- NRIS Main Menu
- General things you should know about how to use this system
- How to use this particular search
- List of state codes
- Return to Research home







Index By State County National Register Information System

06/29/2006 13:42:48

Paz

of 1

No fil	No filter Include filter in navigation						
Row	State ▷	County ▷	Resource Name 👘 🕨	Address 👂	City 👂	Listed <b>b</b>	Multiple 🕨
1	GA	Burke	Burke County Courthouse	Courthouse Sq.	Waynesboro	1980-09- 18	Georgia County Courthouses TR
2	GA	Burke	Haven Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church	Barron St., S of Jct. of Barron and 6th Sts.	Waynesboro	1996-04- 12	
3	GA	Burke	Hopeful Baptist Church	Winter Rd. E of jct. with Blythe Rd.	Keysville	1993-01- 11	
4	GA	Burke	Jones, John James, House	525 Jones Ave.	Waynesboro	1980-02- 15	
5	GA	Burke	McCanaan Missionary Baptist Church and Cemetery	McCanaan Church Rd.	Sardis	2001-06- 14	
6	GA	Burke	Sapp Plantation	NW of Sardis on GA 24	Sardis	1980-02- 08	
7	GA	Burke	Waynesboro Commercial Historic District	E. 6th, E. 7th, E. 8th, S. Liberty and Myrick Sts.	Waynesboro	1993-06- 10	



۰.







http://www.nr.nps.gov/iwisapi/explorer.dll/x2\_3anr4\_3aNRIS1/script/report.iws

6/29/2006

Page 1



**U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission** Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

# NRR OFFICE INSTRUCTION

# **Change Notice**

 Office Instruction No.:	LIC-203, Revision 1	n an
Office Instruction Title:	Procedural Guidance for Prepa Assessments and Considering	ring Environmental Environmental Issues
Effective Date: A second and a second s	May 24, 2004	
Primary Contact:	Stacey Imboden, RLEP	sy a ser a ser a ser

NRR/DRIP/RLEP

301-415-2462 sxf@nrc.gov

**Responsible Organization:** 

Summary of Changes: This is a revision of NRR Office Instruction LIC-203. Changes to the guidance include the clarification of NRR Responsibilities under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. There is a policy change in fulfilling NRR responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act. The Commission is presently formulating its policy statement on environmental justice matters. When finalized, appropriate modifications to this Office Instruction will be considered. Other than these, no significant policy or procedural changes  $= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_$ have been made to the guidance document. 1100.00 ine per contra contra

Training:

E-mail announcement with recommended self-study.

ADAMS Accession No.:

ML033550003

A CARLER



# U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

# NRR OFFICE INSTRUCTION

**Change Notice** 

LIC-203, Revision 1

Office Instruction No.: Office Instruction Title:

**Effective Date:** 

**Primary Contact:** 

May 24, 2004

Stacey Imboden, RLEP 301-415-2462 sxf@nrc.gov

Responsible Organization:

NRR/DRIP/RLEP

**Summary of Changes:** This is a revision of NRR Office Instruction LIC-203. Changes to the guidance include the clarification of NRR Responsibilities under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. There is a policy change in fulfilling NRR responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act. The Commission is presently formulating its policy statement on environmental justice matters. When finalized, appropriate modifications to this Office Instruction will be considered. Other than these, no significant policy or procedural changes have been made to the guidance document.

Training:

E-mail announcement with recommended self-study

Procedural Guidance for Preparing Environmental Assessments and Considering Environmental Issues

ADAMS Accession No.:

ML033550003

Position	Primary Contact RLEP:DRIP:NRR	SC:RLEP:DRIP:NRR	OGC w/comments	PD:RLEP:DRIP:NRR	DRIP:DD	D:PMAS:NRR
Name	Simboden	JTappert	AFernandez	РТКио	DMatthews	DMcCain/ MCase
Date	03/25/2004	03/31/2004	05/03/2004	05/19/2004	05/24/2004	05/24/2004

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION: w/attach JMoore, OGC AFernandez, OGC RVirgilio, STP - And the Annual State of the Annual State of the TQuay, IPSB and a second second • / • • •. MRubin, SPSB والمرجع الأدب الأربان JLyons, RNRP LKokajko, NMSS SFlanders, NMSS LChandler, OGC GImbro, EMEB . . . . . PLohaus, STP . MReinhart, SPSB LReyes, EDO . . . . SCollins, DEDR MVirgilio, DEDE PNorry, DEDM HMiller, RI e je er regelere · •. •. • . WTravers, RII r JCaldwell, RIII BMallett, RIV SECY EMerschoff CIO . · · \*· . المها فالجدي والمراجب والمراجب JFunches, CFO RDennig, SPSB a the state of WKane, DEDH MTschiltz, SPSB 1 . . . . RLEP r/f a ser a s the control of the second second second second second second م آن بر الجهر بالاي المعا · · · · · and the stand stand the second stand we want  $|W_{i}| \geq |W_{i}| \geq |W_{i}| \geq |V_{i}|$ . . . 化合成化合物 化化合物合金 الرواب الأربع التراوي و 1.1 11 . . .

#### NRR OFFICE INSTRUCTION LIC-203, Revision 1

#### Procedural Guidance for Preparing Environmental Assessments and Considering Environmental Issues

#### 1. <u>POLICY</u>

It is the policy of NRR to establish procedures and guidance for its staff to meet the requirements established by legislation and regulation. The purpose of 10 CFR Part 51, "Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions," is to ensure that NRC meets its statutory obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

#### 2. <u>OBJECTIVE</u>

This office instruction, along with the attached guidance documents, provide all staff in the NRC's Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) a basic framework for maintaining NRC's responsibility to comply with 10 CFR Part 51. This office instruction is intended to:

- define the responsibilities of the License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Branch (RLEP) to ensure that NRR is consistent in its implementation of NRC regulations and other Federal environmental requirements;
- define NRR staff responsibilities; and,
- provide guidance to NRR staff on the procedural requirements for demonstrating compliance with environmental statutes and regulations covering environmental issues for regulated facilities.

The office instruction contains guidance for preparing environmental assessments (EAs), in accordance with the NEPA and 10 CFR Part 51, and for considering environmental issues associated with:

- Executive Order (E.O.) 12898,
- Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA),
- Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA),
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), and
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) of 1934.

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

This office instruction describes, in part, how the staff should determine whether or not a proposed action would have an impact on protected coastal zones, threatened or endangered species, archaeological or historical sites, or disparate impacts on minority populations or low-income populations. This office instruction does not address the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). This office instruction supersedes previous guidance on these subjects.

#### BACKGROUND 3.

an want of the first state of the following the second states of the second states of the second states of the Office Letter 906, Revision 2, "Procedural Guidance for Preparing Environmental Assessments and Considering Environmental Issues", was issued on September 21, 1999. A revision to Attachment 3 of Office Letter 906, Revision 2, was issued on October 7, 1999. These documents were issued to include guidance on environmental justice in the office letter and to make improvements to the format and content of an example EA. On November 5, 2003 (68 FR 62642), the Commission published for comment a draft policy statement on the treatment of environmental justice matters in NRC regulatory and licensing activities. It is not formalized, but the procedural guidance from this office instruction and the earlier Office Letter 906 is consistent with the draft Policy Statement. A still the total of the state state of the strengthese total and the state of e la segura de la companya de la com

Office Instruction LIC-203 is a revision to Office Letter 906, providing minor clarifications to guidance. The initial issuance of Office Instruction LIC-203 was June 21, 2001. and while the first state of the second state of the second state of the second state of the second state of the

#### BASIC REQUIREMENTS 4.

#### 4.1 RLEP Staff

. .

·尊重:《《《》注意:"是如何,""等。《《》·《》《》"""。

fentario et vici

10.000

and the second

RLEP is responsible for providing implementation guidance and technical support to the NRR staff for the resolution of environmental issues for regulated facilities. RLEP is also responsible for coordinating environmental issues with other NRC offices, for ensuring NRR meets its obligations under Federal environmental requirements and for properly implementing the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51. Startes and performed to Present 1990

#### 4.2 Control All NRR Staffing spectrations of the state of the state

In addition to its regulatory responsibilities embodied in the health and safety requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, NRC has responsibilities that are derived from NEPA and from other environmental laws (such as the CZMA, the ESA, the NHPA, and the FWCA). The NRR staff should consider environmental issues when performing license amendment activities including, but not limited to: the product of the second and the second second

 increasing the authorized power level of commercial power reactors 2.937 and the power rating stated in the original Environmental Impact Statement or the Final Environmental Statement (power uprate);

Page 3 of 17

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

changing the license expiration date to recapture time between the construction permit and actual operation (construction recapture); eta estatu se archetto e consegue si la sectatore en el consegue performing decommissioning activities under 10 CFR Part 50; and, la a superior de provincia de la companya de la com

revising Appendix B of a licensee's operating license (environmental protection plan).

The NRR staff should consider environmental issues when processing license renewal applications under 10 CFR Part 54, requests for exemptions from NRC regulations, and when conducting rulemaking. 1.1

However, the staff need not perform an environmental review when performing licensing and regulatory activities eligible for categorical exclusions under 10 CFR 51.22(c). The Division of Licensing Project Management (DLPM) and Office of General Counsel (OGC) will determine whether an action qualifies as a categorical exclusion and, if so, include the criterion in the licensing documents. The NRR staff is encouraged to seek early assistance from RLEP in dealing with environmental issues that are unique, particularly difficult, or unfamiliar. Moreover, the NRR staff may request formal guidance in developing EAs from RLEP. Since environmental reviews are fee recoverable under 10 CFR Part 170, when seeking concurrence, assistance, or safety evaluation input, the NRR staff should provide a Technical Assignment Control (TAC) number for tracking and billing purposes. 

#### **RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES** 5.

5. E.F.

5.1 RLEP Staff

RLEP will:

Review and concur on plant-specific and generic EAs prepared by the NRR staff for the activities listed above.

Prepare input for or originate EAs when appropriate (e.g., extended power uprates).

the second second Review and provide guidance and support to the NRR staff participating in the preparation of all EISs (draft, final, and supplements).

. . . . .

and the second states with Participate in environmental rulemaking activities. RLEP will ensure that NRR is current with appropriate environmental legislation, statutes, regulations, and guidance, and will participate in Federal Government-wide meetings. RLEP will provide guidance to the NRR staff regarding the implementation of other applicable environmental statutes.

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

Review new and emerging environmental issues and provide support to the NRR staff in resolving environmental issues.

Review environmental documents submitted by other Federal and State agencies, when appropriate.

والإيرانية المحادث المنازيق المحاد والاي

Review recovery plans for endangered species and prepare or direct the preparation of biological assessments (BAs) as required by the ESA. والمحاجبة فالمحاجب والمراجع والمحاج وال

. . . .

Coordinate environmental issues with other NRC Headquarters and Regional offices and Federal, State, and Tribal agencies.

and a support of the state of the support of the state of

+

- Maintain and update this office instruction. state of the state of the state of the
- 5.2 All NRR Staff

 Bolie March Market and Anna Angles Individual NRR staff members are responsible for implementing the procedural requirements of this office instruction; the staff should consult with RLEP when reviewing environmental issues or safety issues that require an environmental assessment. The provide states of the second

5.2.1 NRR Responsibilities under NEPA: EAs and EISs

化模拟工作 网络白垩合 化二硫酸合物 化乙基氨基苯基酸 As previously discussed under "Basic Requirements," EAs must be prepared for certain licensing and rulemaking activities. Although most environmental reviews performed by NRC result in EAs, it is important to understand the distinction between an EA and an EIS, and when an EA or an EIS is used. 

The process used to determine whether an action will significantly impact the environment is the development of an EA. If the review documented in an EA demonstrates that the proposed action will not have a significant impact on the environment; a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) is made in the conclusion of the EA and no EIS need be prepared. If, on the other hand, the environmental review in the EA reveals that the proposed action will, or has the potential to, significantly affect the environment, then the EA must conclude that a more detailed review of the environmental effects (i.e., an EIS) should be prepared. NEPA requires that a detailed statement of the environmental impact of the proposed action and alternatives be prepared for "major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." This detailed statement takes the form of an EIS. In general, an EIS contains much more detail about the specific environmental impacts of the because the proposed action and alternatives than an EA; and requires extensive public participation, public comment, and coordination with other

agencies. Normally, project managers (PMs) prepare EAs; should an EIS need to be prepared, RLEP will assign an environmental Project Manager (EPM) who will be responsible for coordinating the preparation of the EIS with the PM.

Licensing Actions: Upon receipt of a proposed action, the PM should determine whether an environmental review is needed and, if so, the type of review that should be prepared. If the proposed action is unique or involves unusual circumstances, then the PM should consult with the RLEP staff before initiating the environmental review. Additionally, as mentioned previously in this office instruction, 10 CFR 51.22 identifies categories of actions that are excluded from environmental reviews because the NRC has determined that these actions do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. If the PM, in consultation with OGC, determines that the proposed action is not within one of the excluded categories, then the PM should prepare the EA in accordance with the requirements in 10 CFR 51.30. If the EA concludes that the proposed action will result in significant environmental impacts, then the PM should contact RLEP, and an EIS will be prepared. Section 51.30 requires that an EA:

(1) identify the proposed action,

. . ...

- (2) briefly discuss the need for the proposed action,
- briefly discuss the alternatives to the proposed action, . **(3)** · . .**.**
- (4)· describe the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and

• • •

list agencies and persons consulted and identify sources used. (5) 

EAs should not duplicate the safety details of the review; only the environmental impacts of the proposed action should be considered. An EA should include a FONSI if the EA supports a conclusion that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. If such a finding cannot be made, then an EIS will have to be prepared.

The preparation of the EIS by RLEP will be coordinated with the PM. Appendix B of this office instruction provides a flow chart outlining the process and detailed guidance for each step in the preparation of an EA. Appendix C contains a sample (template) of the appropriate form and content of an EA for licensing actions. The sample is intended to be used as guidance and is not a substitute for an objective consideration of the impacts. PMs must independently determine whether any template

#### Page 6 of 17

 $(A_{1})^{\prime}$ 

. ...

 $\cdot$ 

1. <u>4</u>1

and the second second

 $10^{10}$ 

statements used are correctly applied to the specific action being reviewed. The templates are to ensure stability and predictability whenever appropriate. 

Rulemaking Activities: When an EA is written in support of rulemaking activities that affect NRR regulatory practices, the initiating office, if other than NRR, may implement additional procedures. Detailed guidance is provided in the NRC Regulations Handbook, NUREG/BR-0053. If the EA is not included in the preamble to the proposed rule or final rule (i.e., if the EA is presented in a separate document), then the form and content of the sample (template) EA for rulemaking referenced in Appendix C is appropriate. If the EA review is documented in the preamble for a final or proposed rule, guidance and language in the NRC Regulations Handbook should be followed. The guidance states that the text of the environmental assessment should be considered for paragraphs entitled "Finding of No Significant Environmental Impact: Environmental . Assessment." The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative actions should be discussed. Appendix C contains template Induce that can be considered for this situation.

the states where the second states in the second states of

section In general, after the Federal Register notice (FRN) for the proposed rule is signed by the Secretary to the Commission or the Executive Director for Operations (EDO), and, before the FRN is published, a cover letter with a copy of the draft EA and the FRN should be sent to the State Liaison Officer requesting comments from State organizations. As with an EA for a licensing action, the consultation must be documented in a brief summary in the EA, and must address the comments and staff response. A sample letter is included in NUREG/BR-0053. 

5.2.2 NRR Responsibilities Regarding Environmental Justice ina interneti na anterneti estas de ganta de entre entre de sata

In February 1994, the President issued an Executive Order mandating that Federal agencies make "environmental justice" part of each agency's mission by addressing disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of Federal programs, policies, and activities on mentations and on low-income populations. The Council on Environmental Quality developed guidelines on how to integrate environmental justice into the NEPA process. The guidelines are contained in the document."Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act," December 10, 1997. On November 5, 2003 (68 FR 62642) the Commission published for comment a draft policy statement on the treatment of environmental justice matters in success that we NRC regulatory and licensing actions: NRR has developed a corresponding procedure (Appendix D) for incorporating environmental justice into the licensing process; which is consistent with the draft policy and with a second statement? and should be a lower with a subset

Page 7 of 17

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

5.2.3

المحافظ المحجم والمراجع والم Environmental justice reviews will be performed for all actions requiring preparation of an EIS (or a supplement thereto). An environmental justice review is not usually required for an EA in which a FONSI is made. In most cases, when a FONSI is reached, the staff can conclude that there are no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects associated with the proposed action. However, special circumstances may warrant an environmental justice review for an EA in which a FONSI is made. These cases may include regulatory actions that involve a significant site modification with an identifiable impact on the environment or that have substantial public interest. In these circumstances, the staff will inform NRR senior management and a decision will be made on a case-by-case basis as to whether the circumstances warrant an environmental justice review for an EA. If there is a clear potential for significant offsite impacts from the proposed action to minority and low-income communities, then an appropriate environmental justice review might be needed to provide a basis for concluding that there are no unique impacts that would be significant. If the impacts are significant because of the uniqueness of the communities, then a FONSI may not be possible and mitigation or an EIS should be considered. Appendix D provides a more detailed explanation of environmental justice and a flow chart for conducting environmental iustice reviews. and a second state of the second of the ::

#### NRR Responsibilities under CZMA

The CZMA was promulgated to encourage and assist States and territories in developing management programs that preserve, protect, develop, and, where possible, restore the resources of the coastal zone. A "coastal zone" is generally described as the coastal waters and the adjacent shore lands strongly influenced by each other. This includes islands, transitional and intertidal areas, salt marshes, wetlands, beaches, and Great Lakes waters. Activities of Federal agencies that are reasonably likely to affect coastal zones shall be consistent with the approved coastal management program (CMP) of the State or territory to the maximum extent practical. The CZMA provisions apply to all Federal licenses and actions requiring Federal approval (new plant licenses, license renewals, materials licenses, and major amendments to existing licenses) that affect the coastal zone in a State or territory with a Federally approved CMP. Appendix E of this office instruction lists those States and territories with Federally approved CMPs.

PMs should determine whether the State or territory has an approved CMP and whether their licensee is within the boundary of the CMP because it will influence the schedule for completing certain licensing actions. If the plant is located within the CMP boundary, the PM should

Page 8 of 17

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

consult with RLEP. Within the CMP, predetermined activities are listed that may affect the coastal zone. When the PM determines that a proposed licensing activity may affect coastal uses or resources, the PM should inform the licensee of the need to contact the government of the State or territory and to comply with the provisions of the CZMA.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) regulations also specifically require consistency certification for license renewal applications and major amendments that will affect any coastal use or resource. Regulations implementing the Federal consistency provisions of the CZMA have been promulgated by NOAA at 15 CFR Part 930. Amendments to NOAA's federal consistency certification (65 FR 77124) define major amendments as activities involving a change that affects any coastal use or resource in a way that is substantially different than the description or understanding of the effects at the time of the original activity. Applicants for Federal licenses that are likely to affect a State's coastal zone must submit to the State and Federal licensing agency a certification that the proposed activity is consistent with the State's CMP. Appendix E contains a draft model certification for license amendment applicants, however, some States require use of a state-specific form for consistency certification. If a Federal agency receives an application for an activity that has been pre-listed in a State's CMP, that agency has an obligation to withhold approval until the State has concurred or the Secretary of Commerce overrides any State objection. If an applicant seeks a license or license amendment potentially affecting the coastal zone for an activity that is not listed in the State's CMP, the State has the responsibility to inform the Federal agency and the applicant within 30 days of being notified of the activity that the activity requires State review. Otherwise, the State waives its right to review the unlisted activity.

an an an an Santa an Sec. 19

In general, the only NRC licensing actions requiring a consistency certification are (1) new plant construction permit and operating license applications, and (2) license renewal applications. However, the Act provides States with the right to request a consistency certification for any unlisted activity affecting any coastal use or resource. Potentially affected States have 30 days from the notice of the proposed action in the Federal Register to notify the NRC and applicant of the need for a consistency review. The following guidance is provided regarding operating reactor PMs' responsibilities under the CZMA consistency certification requirements. ( · · ·

المراجع المتحجي والمحج الأحاج

.

(1) PMs should determine whether their assigned facility is located in a State's coastal zone or is located such that changes in the facility could reasonably be expected to affect any coastal use or resource of any coastal zone (e.g. any coastal zone is within a reasonable downstream distance from a facility sited on a river). A list of State coastal management program summaries, with links

to the individual programs, is available at http://www.ocrm.nos.noaa.gov/czm/czmsitelist.html. 

For plants located in a coastal zone or located such that activities could reasonably be expected to affect any coastal use or resource of any coastal zone, identify listed activities requiring a consistency certification (typically, new plant licenses and license renewals are the only listed activities).

(2) Upon receipt of an application for a listed activity, ensure the licensee has provided a consistency certification. Approval of the requested action should be withheld until the State has concurred with the licensee's consistency determination, or the Secretary of Commerce has overridden any State objection. 

Note: For new plant licenses and license renewals, RLEP will be responsible for review of the action and will ensure consistency certification, as required.

...

Upon receipt of an application for an unlisted activity, make a determination as to whether coastal effects are reasonably foreseeable due to the requested action (e.g., significant change in effluents, construction of shoreline structures, etc). Consult with RLEP as needed.

> For routine licensing actions where coastal effects may be reasonably foreseeable, NRC approval should be withheld for 30 days from the date of issuance of the FR notice to allow the State to notify the NRC that a consistency review is required. If the State has not notified the NRC within 30 days that review is necessary, the State waives its right to conduct a review and the action may be approved.

For exigent or emergency actions where coastal effects may be reasonably foreseeable, the PM should consult with RLEP and, if determined to be necessary, should contact the cognizant State agency to ensure timely State determination of the need for consistency review. 1.1.1 . . . . . . . .

In either of the above cases, upon notification that consistency review is required, approval of the requested action may be withheld until the State has concurred with the licensee's consistency determination, or the Secretary of Commerce has overridden any State objection.

(3)

a.

b. .

c.

Page 10 of 17

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

5 I. (2014)

.. .

5.2.4 NRR Responsibilities under ESA

The strength of the second The ESA was promulgated to ensure protection of endangered or threatened species and critical habitats. Section 7 of the ESA imposes two basic requirements on Federal agencies. First, Section 7 requires each Federal agency to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by an agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species, or result in the destruction or impairment of any critical habitat for such species. "Action" has been interpreted broadly and comprises licensing, rulemaking, and lesser regulatory actions that could jeopardize an endangered species. A Federal agency should act, if possible (where it has the legal authority), to prevent endangered species and their habitats from being threatened or destroyed.

and the second Second, Section 7 requires that Federal agencies fulfill the requirements of the ESA in consultation with, and with the assistance of, the Secretary of the Interior (for freshwater and terrestrial species through the Fish and Wildlife Service [FWS]) or the Secretary of Commerce (for oceanic and coastal matters through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries [NOAA Fisheries], formerly National Marine Fisheries Service). If the Federal agency fails to consult with FWS or NOAA Fisheries, and the action by the agency or its licensee results in the "taking" (harassment, harm, pursuit, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capture, collection, or attempt to engage in such activities) of an endangered species or the impairment or destruction of a critical habitat, then the Federal agency (here, the NRC) would be in violation of the ESA. NRR PMs are expected to remain vigilant regarding operational activities that may have an adverse impact on listed species or critical habitats; should takings approach limits in incidental take statements or new takings where take statements do not exist be reported to the NRC; then the NRR PM should contact RLEP at the earliest opportunity. RLEP will initiate consultation early in the review process for activities requiring preparation of an EIS. When an activity requires preparation of an EIS, RLEP will request a list of threatened or endangered species from FWS or NOAA Fisheries early in the review process for the site area and surroundings associated with the proposed action: The second second for a 124 hours of Takes exacts steps age to second second to the test in the test in the

Under Section 7 of the ESA, four consultation processes can be used and are discussed briefly below. The two main types of consultation are informal and formal; early consultation and conference are related a available processes. When we share the Share of the defendence

the end of the second of the second of the second second second Early Consultation: The applicant (licensee) can request that the Federal agency enter into early consultation with FWS or NOAA Fisheries. This

Page 11 of 17

may be done if the applicant believes one or more listed species or critical habitats may be affected by the proposed action. Early consultation occurs prior to an applicant filing an application. The agency initiates early consultation in writing. The process followed is the same as the one discussed under "Formal Consultation"; however, a preliminary biological opinion (BO) is issued. A preliminary BO does not constitute the authority to "take" listed species. The action agency may request confirmation of a preliminary BO as a final BO after the licensee submits an application.

<u>Conference</u>: The conference process is designed to be used at an early planning stage, and is used to discuss effects on proposed species or habitat. Formal and informal consultations are used to discuss effects on listed species or habitat. Conference involves informal discussions between a Federal agency and FWS or NOAA Fisheries regarding the impact of a proposed action on proposed species or proposed critical habitat and recommendations to minimize or avoid harm (mitigation). A conference is required when the proposed action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a proposed species or proposed critical habitat.

Informal Consultation: Most consultations with FWS or NOAA Fisheries are informal consultations. Informal consultation is a process of discussion between FWS or NOAA Fisheries and the Federal agency that may result in formal consultation. A Federal agency may also elect to proceed directly to formal consultation. A biological assessment (BA) may be prepared as part of the informal consultation process. A BA is prepared when a major activity takes place that may affect listed species or critical habitats. The Federal agency requests a list from FWS or NOAA Fisheries of endangered or threatened species and critical habitats or sends FWS or NOAA Fisheries a list of species and habitats that are being reviewed in the BA. Within 30 days of the request, FWS or NOAA Fisheries provides an initial response (provides a list or concurs on the list that was prepared by the Federal agency). If no species or critical habitats are affected, then no further action is required. If only proposed species or habitats (not yet listed as an endangered or threatened species or critical habitat) are involved, then the Federal agency must confer with FWS or NOAA Fisheries, but a BA is not required to be submitted to FWS or NOAA Fisheries. If listed species or critical habitats are involved, then the Federal agency must begin the BA within 90 days of the initial FWS or NOAA Fisheries response. (Although the NRC may coordinate the preparation of the BA with others (e.g., applicant, licensee, contractor) all correspondence with FWS or NOAA Fisheries should be transmitted by the NRC and the NRC is ultimately responsible for assuring the reliability of the information presented.) The BA may include the findings of onsite inspections, opinions of recognized experts, results

. .

of an information review, an analysis of the proposed actions, and 2. a. . . . alternatives. The BA must be submitted to FWS or NOAA Fisheries within 180 days of their initial response. If the BA concludes that the action is not likely to jeopardize the listed species or critical habitat and FWS or NOAA Fisheries concurs, no further consultation is required. If the BA concludes that the action affects listed species or critical habitat. then the Federal agency may initially request an informal consultation to determine whether the action can be modified so that the species or critical habitats are not adversely affected. Otherwise, formal consultation is required as an associate to the end of the

States with the gravity of the transmission of the states and the Formal Consultation: Formal consultation is a process between FWS or NOAA Fisheries and the Federal agency that takes place after the BA has been prepared determining that the action affects or may affect listed species or critical habitats. Appendix F of this instruction contains a flow chart illustrating the formal ESA consultation process. The Federal agency sends a written request for formal consultation to FWS or NOAA. Fisheries. The written request for consultation must be accompanied by a BA containing a description of the action, a description of the area, a description of the listed species, the effects of the action, an analysis of the cumulative effects, and a review of reports and other information. Within 90 days of formal consultation initiation, FWS or NOAA Fisheries is expected to issue a BO. The BO contains a summary of the action, the effects, an opinion on whether the species is in jeopardy as a result of the action, alternatives, incidental "take" provisions, and any proposed conservation measures. After the consultation is complete, the Federal agency must determine whether it has taken all necessary actions. Although the Federal agency is not legally bound to comply with FWS or NOAA Fisheries opinions and can adopt measures that differ from the recommendations, the courts give substantial weight to FWS or NOAA Fisheries opinions. The NRC then provides the BO, including the incidental,"take" provisions and conservation measures, to the applicant second and a second second

a carrierada de la contractiva antigona carra contracto 5.2.5 NRR Responsibilities under NHPA

a and the set of the s The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was promulgated in 1966 and amended in 1992 and 2000 to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect significant historic and archaeological resources. Section:106 of the NHPA directs Federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. The Act allows the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to review and comment on any Federal agency action that might harm historic property. Appendix G is a flow chart the second the factor of the second second

1.2.2.4.2.5

Page 13 of 17

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

....

illustrating the Section 106 process. "Undertakings" denotes a broad range of Federal activities, including the issuance of NRC licenses and permits. "Historic property" is any property listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). a garante de la subligação este . The NHPA statute also provides provisions for review of historic

properties in conjunction with a NEPA review (36 CFR 800.8). In 36 CFR 800.8. "Coordination with the National Environmental Policy Act", the NHPA consultation can be achieved in conjunction with the NEPA process to demonstrate Section 106 compliance. RLEP will use the NEPA process to fulfill the requirements of the NHPA when preparing an EIS. Under 36 CFR 800.8, an agency can use the NEPA process to comply with Section 106 as an alternative to the procedures set forth in 36 CFR 800.3 through 36 CFR 800.6. This allows an agency to "streamline" its overall environmental and Section 106 review process. The key to using the NEPA process to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA is early coordination.

#### The Agency must do the following: • • • • 1. 11. 1. 1.

(1) *Early coordination*. Coordinate section 106 compliance through NEPA. Agencies should plan their section 106 responsibilities as early as possible in the NEPA process, and plan public participation, analysis, and review requirements of both statutes. The Agency must also determine whether the undertaking is a "major Federal action significantly affecting the guality of the human environment." If the Agency determines that the undertaking is a "major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment", then NEPA requires the preparation of an EIS.

> Consulting party roles. Identify the appropriate State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) or Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO), Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, local governments, preservation organizations, and individuals who may be concerned with the possible effects of the proposed undertaking on historic properties in a manner consistent with Section 800.3(f)

an the second second

Inclusion of historic preservation issues. Identify historic properties and assess effects on them in a manner consistent with Section 800.4 through 800.5, but the scope and timing of identification and effect determination may be "phased to reflect the Agency Official's consideration of project alternatives in the NEPA process" and the effort of the Agency shall be "commensurate with the assessment of other environmental factors."

(3)

(2)

•••

#### Page 14 of 17

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

(4) Coordination. Coordinate with the SHPO/THPO, Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, and other parties during NEPA scoping, analysis, and documentation. As commensurate with the Agency's NEPA process, the public must be invited to participate.

و يو ځ د کې

(5) Development of an EIS. Develop alternatives and mitigation measures in consultation with other stakeholders, and describe these measures in its EIS. Advector weeks of 

and the second secon

Therefore, when using the NEPA process to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Agency must perform the substantive steps that the Section 106 regulations call for, but the Agency does not have to follow precisely the same procedures it would if it were following the standard Section 106 review. The Agency has the flexibility to accomplish its assessment in "phases," and the level of effort it puts forth will be similar to that for other kinds of environmental resources.

وأرجع المحاصين والتواقية المحاور والأراد المعود المتعوي والوار 1. 1. 14 Section 800.8(c)(2) requires that an EIS be reviewed by the SHPO/THPO and other consulting parties. Since the product of NRC's NEPA analysis is an EIS. NRC must notify the ACHP by letter of the proposed undertaking and submit the EIS (both draft and final) to the ACHP. If any of these parties objects within the comment period, the Agency will refer the matter to the ACHP, which has thirty days to review the objection. If comment is not received within the thirty day period, then the Agency can complete its NEPA review and make its decision (record of decision [ROD] and in the NRC's case, issue the licensing action) without further Section 106 review. Section 800.4(c)(4) also requires the Agency to specify within its ROD the measures that it will take to mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

5.2.6 NRR Responsibilities under FWCA

> The FWCA was promulgated in 1934 to ensure that water resource development projects (e.g., impounding, damming, diverting, flood control, hydroelectric power) do not conflict with the conservation of fish and wildlife resources. Conversely, water resource development projects can be designed to enhance the quality and enjoyment of fish and wildlife resources if such goals are incorporated into the project plans.

> The FWCA requires that a Federal agency consult with the Department of the Interior, through FWS, when any body of water is proposed or authorized to be modified for any reason. Types of modification include impounding a body of water, damming, diverting a stream or river, deepening a channel, irrigation, or altering a body of water for navigation or drainage. The FWCA also requires that provisions must be made for the conservation of wildlife and its habitat upon modification of any body

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

of water. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized under the FWCA to investigate water resource development projects to determine effects on wildlife. The Secretary of the Interior will conduct investigations through FWS or the U.S. Bureau of Mines. These agencies are authorized to investigate to determine the effects of polluting substances (sewage, wastes, erosion silt) from water resource development projects on wildlife, and report to Congress with recommendations to alleviate negative effects. The Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to consult with Federal agencies regarding protection and stocking of wildlife, minimizing loss of wildlife and its habitat through disease, minimizing effects of overabundant species, and providing public hunting and fishing areas.

PMs should determine whether the licensee is planning any water resource development projects, including any of the modifications mentioned above. If any type of modification is occurring, the PM should ensure that measures are in place for the conservation of wildlife and its habitat. Such activities at regulated facilities will likely result in an environmental review under NEPA. Consequently, the requirements of the FWCA are satisfied through NRC's compliance with NEPA, and separate consultation with FWS is not required.

#### 6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES

·,..

Not applicable

7. PRIMARY CONTACT

Stacey F. Imboden NRR/RLEP 301-415-2462 sxf@nrc.gov

#### 8. **RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATION**

NRR/DRIP/RLEP

#### 9. EFFECTIVE DATE

May 24, 2004

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1 May 24, 2004

#### 10. <u>REFERENCES</u>

10 CFR Part 50, "Domestic Licensing and Production and Utilization Facilities"

. . . . . .

- 10 CFR Part 51, "Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions"
- 10 CFR 51.22, "Criterion for categorical exclusion; identification of licensing and regulatory actions eligible for categorical exclusion or otherwise not requiring environmental review."
  - 10 CFR 51.30, "Environmental assessment."
- 10 CFR Part 170, "Fees for Facilities, Materials, Import and Export Licenses, and Other Regulatory Services Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as Amended"
- 59 FR 7629-7633. 1994. Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations." Washington, D.C.
- 68 FR 62642. 2003. Policy Statement on the Treatment of Environmental Justice Matters in NRC Regulatory and Licensing Actions. Washington, D.C.
- Atomic Energy Act of 1954, 42 USC 2011 et seq.
- Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, 16 USC 1451 et seq.
- Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. *"Environmental Justice: Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act."* Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.
- Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, 16 USC 1531 et seq.
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934, as amended, 16 USC 661 et seq.
- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, 42 USC 4321 et seq.
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, 16 USC 470 et seq.
- National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration, 2003. State and Territory Coastal Management Program Summaries.
   <a href="http://www.ocrm.nos.noaa.gov/czm/czmsitelist.html>">http://www.ocrm.nos.noaa.gov/czm/czmsitelist.html></a> (accessed April 25, 2003).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Digest of Federal Resource Laws of Interest to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. <a href="http://laws.fws.gov/lawsdigest/fwcoord.html">http://laws.fws.gov/lawsdigest/fwcoord.html</a> (accessed April 30, 2003).

#### NRR Office Instruction LIC-203, Revision 1

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service, 1998. Endangered Species Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.
- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1996. *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants*. NUREG-1437, Volumes 1 and 2, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2001. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Regulations Handbook. NUREG/BR-0053, Revision 5, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2003. "Delegation of Signature Authority", Office Instruction ADM-200. Washington, D.C.

·· .

#### Appendices:

Appendix A: Change History

40.00

Appendix B: Environmental Assessment Guidance and Procedural Flow Chart

<u>Appendix C</u>: Format and Content of an Environmental Assessment for a Licensing Action and Rulemaking

<u>Appendix D:</u> Environmental Justice Guidance and Flow Chart

<u>Appendix E:</u> List of States with Federally approved Costal Management Programs, Examples of Consistency Certification, and Coastal Zone Management Act Flow Chart

Appendix F: Endangered Species Act Consultation Flow Charts

Appendix G: National Historic Preservation Act Flow Chart

Appendix A - Change History 

Office Instruction LIC-203,

"Procedural Guidance for Preparing Environmental Assessments and Considering Environmental Issues" · · · en an teach

LIC-203 Change History - Page 1 of 1					
Date	Description of Changes	Method Used to Announce & Distribute	Training		
06/21/2001	This OI is a conversion of OL-906. Changes to the guidance include minor clarifications offered by the NRR staff. No significant policy or procedural changes have been made to the guidance document	(1) E-mail to all staff (2) Copies to SES and licensing assistants	E-mail announcement with recommended self-study		
05/24/2004	This is a revision of NRR Office Instruction LIC-203. Changes to the guidance include the clarification of NRR Responsibilities under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. There is a policy change in fulfilling NRR responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act. The Commission is presently formulating its policy statement on environmental justice matters. When finalized, appropriate modifications to this OI will be considered. Other than these, no significant policy or procedural changes have been made to the guidance document.	E-mail to all staff	E-mail announcement with recommended self-study		
	an standig and a second of the second of		<u></u>		
erf ender Alexandre Referenceser Referenceser	(a) all spectral problems for the second system of the second system of the second system of the second system of the second system of the second system of the second system of the second system of the second system of the system of the second system of the second system of the second system of the system of the second system of the second system of the second	a de la companya de l Companya de la companya de la company Recompanya de la companya de la comp	<ul> <li>The set of the discrete</li> <li>The set of the discrete</li> <li>The discret</li> <li>The discre</li></ul>		

## Appendix B - Environmental Assessment Guidance and Procedural Flow Chart

This guidance is intended to provide assistance in developing an environmental assessment (EA). It outlines specific sections in an EA and provides insight on the content that should be in each of those sections. They are:

- identification of the proposed action,
- the need for the proposed action,

the environmental impacts of the proposed action,

the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action,

- the alternative use of resources, and
- agencies and persons consulted.

·. .·

The specific sections of the EA are differentiated below by the underscore. Figure 1, a procedural flow chart, also follows.

#### Identification of the Proposed Action

This section should briefly describe the action proposed and reference the pertinent licensee application.

#### The Need for the Proposed Action

Section 51.30(a)(1)(i) of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations requires that an EA shall contain a brief discussion of the need for the proposed action. When writing this portion of the EA, the person preparing the EA should discuss the applicant's motivation for submitting the application to the NRC. For example, does the requested exemption or amendment provide some benefit to the applicant if granted? How would the applicant be affected if the application was not approved?

#### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The environmental impacts of the proposed action must be evaluated by the Commission in accordance with 10 CFR 51.30(a)(1)(iii). The person writing the EA should describe how the environmental resource (e.g., land or water) is used, how the resource would be affected by a change in (or addition of) a plant component (e.g., the construction of a building) or a change in the operation of the plant (the amount of water taken in by the plant), and the significance of the

relationship between the environmental resource and the change. For example, air (the environmental resource) would be affected by a release of radioactive chemicals from plant effluents (the plant component) and the significance of the release would depend on the types and amounts of the emission. Is the emission for the contaminant above the regulatory limits or is it a small fraction of the regulatory limits? These are the relationships that should be described. The section should include an evaluation of radiological and non-radiological impacts. The impacts section should also certify that the proposed action will not significantly increase the probability of accidents or entail an NRC undertaking involving historic sites. Additionally, if the proposed action (typically a change in a plant component or a change in plant operation) does not affect any environmental resources, explain that in this section.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

· . . . . .

and the second state of th

Sections 51.30(a)(1)(ii) and (iii) require that an EA include alternatives to the proposed action and the environmental impact of the alternatives. NEPA requires NRC to consider alternatives in the preparation of all EAs whenever the following two conditions are present: (1) there is some identifiable environmental impact from the proposed action and (2) there is an unresolved conflict of available resources. The fact that the EA involves a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) does not automatically exempt the person preparing the EA from considering alternatives. As long as there is some identifiable impact on the environment from the proposed action, the person preparing the EA should consider alternatives. At a minimum, all EAs must include the no-action alternative.

1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

and a second second

For those actions involving a small impact, it is reasonable to consider a limited range of alternatives. In fact, in several decisions, the courts have stressed that the range of alternatives an agency must consider in an EA decreases as the environmental impact of the proposed action becomes less and less substantial.

A non-significant impact does not equate to no impact. Therefore, if an even less harmful alternative is feasible, then it ought to be considered. If the environmental impact of a proposed action is zero, there is no need to consider alternatives because there is no use of natural resources associated with the action. In those cases involving no environmental impact at all, it is reasonable to limit the discussion of alternatives to consideration of the no-action alternative. If the "no-action" alternative is the only alternative examined, the alternatives section may contain the following:

"As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no-action alternative"). Denial of the proposed action would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar."

Alternative Use of Resources

In accordance with Section 102(2)(E) of NEPA, agencies must consider alternative courses of action if the proposed action involves an unresolved conflict on how available resources, such as water, land, or other physical materials, will be used under the proposed action. This consideration will take place when the objective of the proposed action can be achieved in one of two or more ways that will have differing impacts on the environment even if a FONSI has been made.

#### Agencies and Persons Consulted

E.

•

÷.,

Section 51.30(a)(2) requires the EA to list Federal and State agencies and persons consulted and to identify the sources used. The person preparing the EA must consult with the affected State before the EA is issued and must solicit comments on the environmental impact of the proposed action and any other comments the State may have. Additionally, the person preparing the EA is responsible for ensuring that other appropriate agencies are contacted if an action may involve some impact on the natural or physical environment. The consultation must be documented in a brief summary in the EA and should contain (1) the name of the agency or person contacted (consulted with), (2) the date and purpose of the consultation, (3) a brief summary of the views or comments expressed and the staff's resolution, and (4) references to publicly available documents containing additional information, as applicable. .

The person preparing the EA should briefly describe why the consultation was initiated. For example, if the National Marine Fisheries Service was contacted on July 25, 1995, to discuss a specific issue involving short-nosed sturgeon, the summary could make the following statement:

"The National Marine Fisheries Service was contacted on July 25, 1995, to discuss the evaluation of the ability of short-nosed sturgeon to avoid capture after the proposed modification of the river water intake."

If the consultation was made to meet strictly a programmatic requirement and not a specific issue, the consultation with the State could be summarized as follows:

"In accordance with its stated policy, on [insert date], the staff consulted with the [insert name of State] State official, [insert name of official] of the [insert name of agency], regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had [choose one - comments or no comments]." · . ...

If comments are received from the State or agency, the comments should be summarized in the EA. Minor comments could be characterized as "general agreement" or "no objection" by the State or agency. More extensive comments require the person preparing the EA to summarize the details of the issues and the resolution of the comments in the EA or to place them in a separate document and reference them in the EA. Resolution of the comments should be placed in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) to ensure public access.

Before issuing an EA supporting an exemption to the regulations, the person preparing the EA should contact the State government to solicit comments on the environmental impact of the proposed action. Although notifying the State is not required by 10 CFR 50.91, it is required by NEPA. This requirement may be met by sending a copy of the incoming exemption request to the State. If the State has a comment, the person preparing the EA should resolve and document the comments in the EA, as previously discussed.

**B-3** 

## Appendix C - Format and Content of an Environmental Assessment for a Licensing Action and Rulemaking

### Format and Content of an Environmental Assessment and Cover Letter for a Licensing Action

(Addressee)

### SUBJECT: PLANT NAME - (TAC NOS. MXXXX and MXXXXX)

Dear:

Enclosed is a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact related to your application for [amendment/exemption] dated \_\_\_\_\_, as supplemented on \_\_\_\_\_. The proposed [amendment/exemption] would \_\_\_\_\_.

The assessment is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely, [Signature Authority as Outlined in NRR Office Instruction ADM-200, "Delegation of Signature Authority"] Project Directorate Division of Licensing Project Management Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. \_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_

Enclosure: Environmental Assessment

and in the standard state

cc w/encl: See next page1

<sup>1</sup>[PREPARER: WHEN PROCESSING THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR CONCURRENCE, ATTACH A NOTE TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE THE OGC MAILROOM THAT IDENTIFIES THE STANDARD REVIEW PLAN SECTION NUMBER TO WHICH THE PROPOSED ACTION PERTAINS. THE OGC MEMBER THAT REVIEWS THE SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION SHOULD ALSO REVIEW THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION.]

7590-01

#### UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

# (DOCKET NOS.)

(LICENSEE)

#### (PLANT NAME)

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an

[amendment to/ exemption from 10 CFR 50.\_\_ for] Facility Operating License Nos. \_\_\_\_ and

\_\_\_\_\_, issued to [insert name of licensee] (the licensee), for operation of the [facility name], located in \_\_\_\_\_. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this

environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action would [briefly describe what the amendment/exemption would do].

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated \_\_\_\_\_, as supplemented by letter dated \_\_\_\_\_.

The Need for the Proposed Action:

The proposed action [describe why amendment/exemption is needed].

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The NRC has completed its safety evaluation of the proposed action and concludes [give safety conclusion]. The details of the staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the [license amendment or exemption] that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the [license amendment or exemption to the regulation].

. C-2

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site. There is no significant increase in the amount of any effluent released off site. There is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. [PREPARER SHOULD DECIDE IF THE PROPOSED ACTION IS A TYPE OF ACTION THAT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO AFFECT HISTORIC PROPERTIES]. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts: [PREPARER PLEASE NOTE THAT ANY OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED TO BE REASONABLE SHOULD BE EVALUATED AND DISCUSSED.] The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

#### Alternative Use of Resources:

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those previously

C-3

considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the [insert name of facility], NUREG\_\_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_ [and the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (NUREG-1437 Supplement\_\_) dated\_\_\_].

Agencies and Persons Consulted:

On [insert date], the staff consulted with the [insert name of State] State official, [insert name of official] of the [insert name of agency], regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

•••••

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated \_\_\_\_\_\_, as supplemented on \_\_\_\_\_\_. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the NRC Web site, <u>http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html</u>. Persons who

C-4

do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737,

or send an e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this day of

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION [Signature Authority as Outlined in NRR Office Instruction ADM-200, "Delegation of Signature Authority"] Project Directorate

同時 愛知道を行った されいとう 相議

Division of Licensing Project Management

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

and the second secon

1477日本1月24日,1月11日(1月11日)。 1479日(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1日)(1月1

•••••

 $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} = \{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} : \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}$ 

n an an Analas an an Anna Allanda an an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna Anna Anna Anna an Anna an

.

and the state of the state of the second

المراجع من المراجع من المراجع ا المراجع المراجع

가 가 같아. 가가가 가지 않는 것이 가지 않는 것이 있는 동안을 가지 않는 것이 가지 않는 것이 가가가 가지 않는 것이 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 가 가 있었다. 것이 가 있었다. 같이 같이 있다. 유민물일을 만나 있는 사람이 있었는 동일에 가 가 가라 편하는 것이 하는 것이 같은 가 한 것이 있는 것이 같아. 것이 있는 것이 같이 다는 것이 다 가는 것이 있는 것이 같이 있는 것이 같아. 것이 있었다. 같이 것이 것이 같아. 것이 있는 것이 같이 있는 것이 같이 있다. 같이 있는 것이 같이 있는 것이 같이 있는 것이 같이 있는

## Format and Content of an Environmental Assessment for a Rulemaking<sup>1</sup>

# UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF

NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

#### FOR JAN AMENDMENT TO 10 CFR PART XX / THE PROPOSITION OF A NEW RULE]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is evaluating the environmental

impacts of [an amendment to its regulations in 10 CFR Part \_\_\_\_/a proposed new rule].

Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is performing this environmental assessment

review and documenting its finding of no significant impact.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action would [DESCRIBE THE AMENDMENT TO THE RULE OR THE

NEW RULE].

#### The Need for the Proposed Action:

The proposed action is [DESCRIBE WHY THE AMENDMENT TO THE RULE OR NEW RULE IS NEEDED].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This is an example format and content of an environmental assessment for when the rulemaking review is documented in a separate document apart from the preamble. The provision of the NRC Regulatory Handbook should be followed when *summarizing* the findings of the environmental assessment in the preamble. No formal cover letter is needed, as the environmental assessment documented apart from the preamble is inserted into the rulemaking package to the Commission. When the environmental assessment review is documented in the text of the preamble, the NRC Regulatory Handbook should be followed, and the sample language for the sections titled "Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action," "Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action, " and "Alternative Use of Resources" can be used as guidance where the NRC Regulatory Handbook directs the authors of the preamble to "insert the text of the environmental assessment."

#### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that [DISCUSS THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. IF IT IS LOGICAL THAT THERE WOULD BE NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION, STATE THAT LOGIC].

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No changes are being made in the types or quantities of radiological effluents that may be released. There is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites [PREPARER SHOULD DECIDE IF THE PROPOSED ACTION IS A TYPE OF ACTION THAT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO AFFECT HISTORIC PROPERTIES]. No changes are being made in the type or quantities of non-radiological plant effluents and there are no changes in activities that would disrupt the environment. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the proposed action would result in no change in the current environmental impacts. [PREPARER - IDENTIFY ANY ALTERNATIVES OUTLINED IN THE REGULATORY ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENT THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THOSE ALTERNATIVES. THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE EA

C-7

SHOULD MATCH THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE REGULATORY ANALYSIS.] The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action [(s)] are similar. <u>Alternative Use of Resources</u>

This action does not involve the use of any different resources than those previously considered in the original rule dated \_\_\_\_\_. [IF THE PROPOSED ACTION IS A NEW RULE, LIST THE RESOURCES (I.E., LAND, WATER, OTHER PHYSICAL MATERIALS) THAT ARE EXPECTED TO BE AFFECTED BY THE NEW RULE AND STATE IF THERE ARE ANY UNRESOLVED CONFLICTS OVER THE USE OF THOSE RESOURCES.]

#### Agencies and Persons Consulted:

The NRC has sent a copy of the [proposed/final] rule to every State Liaison Officer and requested their comments on the environmental assessment. [STATE WHETHER COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED AND IF SO, WHAT THE COMMENTS WERE]

#### FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the [proposed/final] rule dated \_\_\_\_\_. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. Persons who do not

C-8
have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in

ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or

51

send an e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this - \_\_\_\_day of

. . .

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

; .

[Signature Authority as Outlined in NRR Office Instruction ADM-200, "Delegation of Signature Authority"] Policy and Rulemaking Program Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

الم المحمد ال المحمد المحم المحمد المحمد

1.35

÷. -

5 se

. 1.5  $\sim 2$ · · · · · 2. **.** 16. . 1: .. • . . . . \* e+ -Sec. Sec. and the second 1.16 ۰. ta el 29 Anzi territori ditto e ta Core di tizzente de cor 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -. •. • : 15.3 and a part of provident and carbonal C-9 ار میں برد ار میں دروا the second second second second second 

Appendix D - Environmental Justice Guidance and Flow Chart

#### BACKGROUND

This procedure provides guidance to the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) staff on conducting environmental justice (EJ) reviews for proposed actions requiring an environmental impact statement, and in special cases an environmental assessment, as part of NRC's<sup>-</sup> compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This guidance does not create any new NEPA-related requirements, as consideration of environmental justice is consistent with the purposes and policies of NEPA. This guidance is intended to ensure that NRR is fully discharging its existing NEPA responsibilities. Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," 59 FR 7629 (1994), directs Federal agencies in the Executive Branch to "make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities" on minority and low-income populations. Although an independent agency, the NRC indicated its willingness to comply with the Executive Order.

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) developed guidelines to assist Federal agencies with integration of EJ into the NEPA process. The guidelines are contained in CEQ's December 10, 1997, document, "Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act." CEQ's guidance is not binding on NRC activities; however, much of CEQ's guidance has been incorporated in this procedure. On November 5, 2003, the Commission published for comment a draft policy statement on the treatment of environmental justice matters in NRC regulatory and licensing actions. It is not finalized, but the following guidance is consistent with the draft policy statement and previous practice.

#### SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOR NRR REVIEWS

Environmental justice reviews will be performed for all regulatory actions, including licensing actions and rulemaking activities, requiring preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). An EIS is required for licensing and regulatory actions that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment or actions that involve a matter which the Commission has determined should be covered by an EIS. A list of types of actions requiring an EIS is found in 10 CFR 51.20(b), and includes issuance of a limited work authorization or a permit to construct a nuclear power reactor and issuance or renewal of a full power or design capacity license to operate a nuclear power reactor. It is important to note that agency consideration of impacts on minority or low-income populations may lead to the identification of disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects that are significant and that otherwise could be overlooked.

For environmental assessments (EAs) with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) determination, the staff concludes, as part of its analysis, that there will be no significant environmental impacts as a result of the proposed action. The potential for environmental justice impacts should be considered when preparing an EA to ensure that minority and low-income populations are not significantly impacted by the proposed action. If significant environmental impacts are identified, then a FONSI determination cannot be made. For most licensing actions requiring an environmental assessment, there will be no potential for disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects to minority or low-income populations and an environmental justice review will not be necessary. However,

under special circumstances, environmental justice reviews may be needed for actions in which an EA is prepared if there is the potential that an analysis of environmental justice issues may identify significant environmental impacts that would otherwise not be identified. If a potential for environmental justice impacts is recognized either as a result of public interest in the proposed action, knowledge about particular groups that may be effected, or the nature of the impacts, then RLEP, the program responsible for environmental reviews, should be notified for assistance. RLEP concurs on all EAs issued by NRR and will notify management if it appears that an environmental justice review is warranted. NRR management will then make a decision on a case-by-case basis whether the circumstances are such that a minority or low-income population may be affected and an environmental justice review should be performed for the action. An environmental justice review is not required for those actions listed in 10 CFR 51.22 and the second second as being categorically excluded from environmental review. 

## GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

1.5.5

Environmental justice issues encompass the usual broad range of impacts normally covered by NEPA. The staff should be sensitive to the fact that environmental justice issues may arise at any step of the NEPA process. . 

·. . . ·

14 Mar 1 Mar 1

• The staff should consider the composition of the affected area to determine whether minority or low-income populations are present in the area and may be affected by the proposed action. If there are significant impacts from the proposed action, the staff needs to determine whether there may be disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations.

The staff should develop effective public participation strategies. The staff should acknowledge and seek to overcome linguistic, cultural, institutional, geographic, and other barriers to meaningful participation and should incorporate active outreach to affected groups.

The staff should strive for meaningful community representation in the process. The staff should be aware of the diverse constituencies within any community and should endeavor to have complete representation of the community as a whole. The staff should be aware that community participation must occur as early as possible if it is to be meaningful.

The staff should seek Tribal agency representation in the process in a manner that is consistent with government-to-government relations.

The staff should consider relevant public health data and industry data concerning the potential for multiple or cumulative exposure to human health or environmental hazards in the affected population and historical patterns of exposure to environmental hazards, to the extent such information is reasonably available.

The staff should recognize the interrelated cultural, social, occupational, historical, or economic factors that may amplify the natural and physical environmental effects of the proposed agency action. These factors should include the physical sensitivity of the community or population to a and a second a submarked a submarked a submark of the second second second second second second second second

particular impacts; the effect of any disruption on the community structure associated with the proposed action; and the nature and degree of impact on the physical and social structure of the community.

The review is forward looking and should focus on the action being taken. For example, if the action is a license amendment, only the activities covered by the amendment and not the overall impact from the issuance of the original license should be reviewed even if an EJ review was not performed for the original action.

and the second secon

Under NEPA, the identification of a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on a minority or low-income population does not preclude a proposed agency action from going forward, nor does it necessarily compel a conclusion that a proposed action is environmentally unsatisfactory. Rather, the identification of such an effect should heighten agency attention to alternatives (including alternative sites), mitigation strategies, monitoring needs, and preferences expressed by the affected community or population.

#### PROCEDURES FOR LICENSING ACTIONS

2.

The following guidance should be used when performing an environmental justice review. This procedure may not address all situations that may occur. Project managers should consult with RLEP whenever an environmental justice review is undertaken. See Figure 1 on page D-5 for an environmental justice process flow chart.

 Determine if the action requires an environmental justice review. Determine whether the regulatory action will be supported by an EIS or by an EA. When the regulatory action requires the preparation of an EIS, an EJ review must be conducted using the process discussed in steps 2 through 5, below. When the regulatory action involves the siting or licensing of new facilities, or requires the evaluation of alternative sites, then environmental justice information must be developed for each site.

Under most circumstances, no environmental justice review is required when an EA is prepared. However, in special cases, the staff will conduct an environmental justice analysis in preparing an EA. As discussed in the scope section above, such a determination will be made on a case-by-case basis and only when there is a clear potential that the consideration of specific demographic information may identify significant impacts that would not otherwise be considered. In the event that an environmental justice analysis is performed for an EA, the process outlined in steps 2 through 5, below, should be followed.

Conduct a screening for minority and low-income groups and integrate environmental justice into the scoping process. Early on in the process (before or at the beginning of scoping), the staff should attempt to identify the location of any minority or low-income groups in the area potentially affected by the proposed action, usually within a 50-mile radius, using the procedures in the following subsection, "Identifying Minority and Low-income Populations." If any potentially affected minority or low-income groups are identified, then the staff should develop a strategy for effective public involvement in the NRC's scoping process.

#### 3. Identifying minority and low-income populations

The staff should use the following steps to assist with identification of minority and low-income populations at the beginning of the review (before or at the beginning of scoping). These steps can also be used to help determine whether there are any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, when a potentially effected minority or low-income group is identified. In the latter case, environmental impact areas will be defined for potentially significant environmental impacts and the steps will be used to determine if there is a minority or low-income population within the environmental impact area.

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

A. Determine geographic area for comparison

. . ..

•

In determining whether a minority or low-income population exists, define the geographic area to be used for the comparative analysis. The area used for the comparative analysis is larger and encompasses the entire area of potential impact from the proposed action or all of the environmental impact areas (it is called the geographic area). See Figures 2 and 3 for examples.

When a regulatory action is being considered that involves alternative site considerations, such as an early site or construction permit, then, in addition to determining the individual geographic area for each site as defined above, determine an overall geographic area that encompasses all of the alternative site geographic areas. See Figure 3 for an example.

If the environmental impact areas overlap more than one government jurisdiction (State, County, etc.), then the geographic area will encompass parts of each government jurisdiction. The geographic area does not have to follow established boundaries such as county or State lines.

B. Determine the minority and low-income composition in the geographic area Determine the percentage of the total population within the geographic area for each minority and low-income category and for the aggregate minority population.

The staff should use the most recent demographic data available from the Bureau of the Census (the Bureau) to identify the composition of the potential geographic area. Geographic distribution by race, ethnicity, and income, as well as delineation of tribal lands and resources, should be examined. Information may be found through demographic information and studies, such as the LandView environmental mapping software developed by the Bureau to assist in utilizing data from a geographic information system. This information is also contained in RLEP's Geographical Environmental & Siting Information System (GEn&SIS).

and a start of a start A start of a A start of a

Minority categories are defined as: American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; or Black races; or Hispanic ethnicity ("other" may be considered a separate minority category).<sup>2</sup>

Low-income households should be identified using the annual statistical poverty thresholds from the Bureau.

C. Determine the minority and low-income composition in the environmental impact area

For the area of potential impact for all impacts (typically, a 50-mile radius) or for the environmental impact area for a particular impact, determine the percentage of each minority category in the area and for the aggregate minority categories. Likewise, determine the percentage of the households within the area that are below the poverty level (low-income). The selection of the appropriate unit of geographic analysis may likely be a census block group because this geographic area is small enough so as not to dilute a potential minority or low-income population within the larger general population. At the beginning of the scoping process, it is more appropriate to compare individual census block groups, or other similar geographic unit, with the larger area of potential impact for all impacts associated with the proposed action in order to determine the location of any potential minority or low-income groups. If, during the review, it appears that a minority or low-income group may be affected, then it will be necessary to focus the review on potentially significant impacts and to determine the environmental impact area for each potentially significant environmental impact. The percentage of minorities and low-income households in the census block groups, or other similar geographic unit, that are located in the environmental impact area should be used in the comparison to determine if the area contains a minority or low-income population. A determination of whether or not a census block group that only partially falls in an environmental impact area should be included in the comparison may be based on the population density of the census block group within the environmental impact area or use of other appropriate criteria.

D. Determine if there are any minority or low-income populations

A "minority population" is considered to be present if: 1) the minority population in the census block group or environmental impact site exceeds 50 percent, or 2) the minority population percentage of the environmental impact area is significantly greater (typically at least 20 percentage points) than the minority population percentage in the geographic area chosen for the comparative analysis, for example, the county or State.

<sup>2</sup>The 2000 Census included multi-racial data. The staff should consider multi-racial individuals in a separate minority category, in addition to the aggregate minority category when the Bureau releases the updated information.

A "low-income population" is considered to be present if: 1) the low-income population in the census block group or the environmental impact area exceeds 50 percent, or 2) the percentage of households below the poverty level in an environmental impact area is significantly greater (typically at least 20 percentage points) than the low-income population percentage in the geographic area chosen for the comparative analysis.

.

4.

.

and the set of the transfer of the state and the second In identifying minority or low-income populations, reviewers may consider a community either as a group of individuals living near one another or a group of individuals that experience common conditions of environmental exposure or effect. The criteria listed above should only serve as a guideline for determining the presence of a minority or low-income population. If it is apparent through interviews, public comment/interest, or by investigation that there is a distinct minority or low-income population that may be adversely effected by the proposed action, then the reviewer should proceed with the environmental justice review, even if the population is not identified through use of the census data.

(2) Study and the state of the construction of the transfer of the state of the ֥ , ; If no minorities or low-income households are identified in the potentially affected area or environmental impact area, then document the conclusion. The environmental justice review is complete.

a name in the state of the second state of the second second Consistent with scoping activities conducted under NEPA, the staff may consider measures for increasing participation of minority and low-income groups such as outreach through minority business and trade organizations, schools, colleges, labor organizations; or other appropriate organizations. Meetings open to the public should be advertised through locally-targeted media, mailings, and the internet. Other means of advertising include posting of flyers in local shopping, community, government and other public places. If representatives of the affected group(s) are identified, these individuals should be included on the mailing list for the review. When communicating with the public, the staff should consider innovative approaches to overcoming linguistic, institutional, cultural, economic, historical, or other potential barriers to effective participation in the decision-making process. During the scoping process the staff should supplement the census data with inquiries of the local planning departments, social service agencies, and other local offices to identify minority or low-income groups that may not be identified through the census data. The sub-

staden mil social de provinsi se la semandar a lar da l'adhadan menerikanat If no minority or low-income groups are found during scoping or later on in the review, then the results should be documented and the environmental justice review is complete.

如此我们就是我们就是这个事实,要我们的时候就是这些人,这些你能够了你是这些你们的事实的?""我想要我<u>的</u>我们的?""你说,我们是我的你……""你们

Determine whether there are potentially significant environmental impacts to minority or low-income populations. If any minority or low-income groups are identified during the scoping process or at any other stage of the review, then the staff should determine the significance of environmental impacts to these groups during development of the EIS. The staff should use a graded approach and focus the review on any adverse human health or environmental impacts that are known to be significant or perceived as significant by groups and/or individuals. The locations that have been identified as areas affected by the proposed action are called environmental impact areas. More than one environmental impact area may exist if multiple impacts can occur from the

proposed action. The size, shape, and geographic location of the environmental impact area will vary according to the nature of the impact and should be consistent with the areas used to review environmental impacts in the EIS. For example, an environmental impact area may include transmission line rights-of-way, a river or other surface water body, a 10-mile radius, etc. Environmental impact areas may or may not follow political jurisdictions. Typically, the severity of environmental impacts will vary inversely with the - distance from the facility; therefore, the review should be focused on areas closer to the site. See Figure 2 for examples of individual environmental impact areas and the larger geographic area.

The percentage of minorities and low-income households in the census block groups, or other similar geographic unit, that are located in the environmental impact area should be used in the comparison to determine if the area contains a minority or low-income population using the steps outlined in the subsection, "Identifying Minority and Low-Income Populations."

If there are no minority or low-income populations within the impact area(s) or if there are no potentially significant environmental impacts, then these results should be documented and the environmental justice review is complete.

Determine whether there are disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects to minority or low-income populations. When the review does identify minority or low-income populations in a potentially significant environmental impact area(s), the staff needs to determine whether disproportionately high and adverse effects result from the proposed action by considering the following:

.

5.

Are the radiological or other health effects significant or above generally accepted norms? Is the risk or rate of hazard significant and appreciably in excess of the general population? Do the radiological or other health effects occur in groups affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental hazards?

Is there an impact on the natural or physical environment that significantly and adversely affects a particular group? Are there any significant adverse impacts on a group that appreciably exceed or is likely to appreciably exceed those on the general population? Do the environmental effects occur or would they occur in groups affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposure from environmental hazards?

Reviewers should recognize that the impacts to minority or low-income populations may be different from impacts on the general population due to a community's distinct cultural practices. In addition, reviewers should take into account different patterns of living and consumption of natural resources, such as subsistence consumption.

.

Reviewers should assess the significance or potential significance of such adverse impact on each minority or low-income population and also provide an assessment of the degree to which each minority or low-income population is disproportionately receiving benefits compared to the entire geographic area.

If there are significant impacts to the minority or low-income population, then it is necessary to look at mitigative measures and benefits. The reviewer should determine and discuss whether there are any mitigative measures that could be taken to reduce the impact. To the extent practicable, mitigation measures should reflect the needs and preferences of the affected minority or low-income populations. The conclusion may be that there are disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations; however, factors such as the mitigative measures and/or the benefits of a project may outweigh the disproportionate impacts. In any case, the facts should be presented so that the ultimate decision-maker can weigh all aspects in making the agency decision. The Executive Order does not prohibit taking an action when the agency taking the action determines that there are disproportionate high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations.

Make a determination regarding environmental justice impacts and document the conclusion. Each EIS shall contain a section titled, "Environmental Justice," which will either contain the complete environmental justice review or a reference to another document containing the review. If a reference to another document is used, a summary of the review and its conclusions should be included in the EIS section. An EA will only have an environmental justice section in the rare situation where a review was performed as a result of an NRR management decision.

The staff should clearly state the conclusion regarding whether or not the proposed action will have disproportionately high and adverse environmental impacts on minority or low-income populations. This statement should be supported by sufficient information to allow the public to understand the rationale for the conclusion. The underlying information should be presented as concisely as possible, using language that is understandable to the public and that minimizes use of acronyms or jargon.

#### PROCEDURES FOR RULEMAKING ACTIVITIES

· • • • •

6.

- 1. The staff responsible for rulemaking should integrate EJ into the proposed and final rules that require an EIS to the same extent that it integrates other relevant environmental considerations.
- 2. If it is known in advance that a particular rulemaking might impact a specific population disproportionately, then the NRC staff should ensure that the population knows about the rulemaking and is given the opportunity to participate. Such actions may include translating the *Federal Register* Notice (FRN) into a language other than English for publication in a local newspaper and holding public outreach meetings in the affected area.
- 3. As noted in the "Scope" section, there may be special circumstances under which a rulemaking that has an EA/FONSI prepared may identify special environmental impacts not otherwise identified. In these cases, the staff will inform NRR senior management and a decision will be made on a case-by-case basis whether the circumstances warrant an environmental justice review.

- 4. If an environmental justice analysis is performed for a rulemaking activity, then the staff should include language contained in NUREG/BR-0053, Revision 5, "NRC Regulations Handbook," Section 5.15 and Section 7.15 in the FRN to seek public comments on environmental justice. The staff should follow steps 2-5 of "Procedures for Licensing Actions," above, to perform the environmental justice review.
- 5. Public comments received pertaining to environmental justice on a rulemaking should be addressed in the final FRN in the same section and at the same level of detail as comments received on other aspects of the environmental considerations for the rule.

6.

- When a rule is being modified or developed that contains siting evaluation factors or criteria for siting a new facility, the staff should consider including specific language in the rule or supporting regulatory guidance to state that an environmental justice review will be included as part of the normal environmental analysis performed in siting a new facility.

D 40

### Appendix E - List of States With Federally-Approved Coastal Management Programs, Example of Consistency Certification, and Coastal Zone Management Flow Chart

### List of States with Federally-Approved Coastal Management Programs

- 1. Alabama 2. Alaska
- 3. American Samoa
- 4. California
- 5. Connecticut
- 6. Delaware
- 7. Florida
- 8. Georgia
- 9. Guam
- 10. Hawaii
- 11. Indiana
- 12. Louisiana
- 13. Maine
- 14. Maryland
- 15. Massachusetts
- 16. Michigan
- 17. Minnesota
- 18. Mississippi
- 19. New Hampshire
- 20. New Jersey
- 21. New York
- 22. North Carolina
- 23. Northern Mariana Islands
- 24. Ohio
- 25. Oregon
- 26. Pennsylvania
- 27. Puerto Rico
- 28. Rhode Island
- 29. South Carolina
- 30. Texas
- 31. Virginia
- 32. Virgin Islands
- 33. Washington
- 34. Wisconsin

### Example of Consistency Certification for Federal Permit and License Applicants

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA) requires that any applicant for a Federal license or permit or authorization, certification, approval, or other form of permission, which any Federal agency is empowered to issue to an applicant to conduct an activity, inside or outside of the coastal zone, affecting any land or water use or natural resource of the coastal zone of that State, shall certify in the application to the approving Federal agency that the proposed activity complies with the enforceable policies of the State's approved program and that such activity will be conducted in a manner consistent with the program. At the same time, the applicant shall furnish to the State or its designated agency a copy of the certification, with all necessary information and data. See 16 U.S.C. 1456(c)(3)(A); 15 CFR 930.51(a). At the earliest practicable time, the State agency shall notify the Federal agency and the applicant whether the State agency concurs or objects to a consistency certification. [15 CFR 930.63(a).]

[Insert name of State] has an approved CZMA Program, which includes [insert the statutory provisions and regulations of the State's CZMA Program].

**Consistency Certification:** 

[Insert name of applicant] has determined that the proposed [insert name of project] complies with the [insert name of State] approved coastal management program (CMP) and will be conducted in a manner consistent with such program.

#### Necessary Data and Information:

- 1. This section provides a detailed description of the proposed activity and its associated facilities. [Provide a copy of the Federal application and other materials pursuant to 15 CFR 930.58(a)(1), which will permit adequate assessment of probable coastal zone effects by the State.]
- 2. This section contains the necessary information and data required by the State's CMP as described in the State's CMP program document and subsequent approved amendments. [Provide information pursuant to 15 CFR 930.58(a)(2) and 930.56(b).]
- 3. This section contains a brief assessment relating the probable effects of the proposed [insert name of project] and its associated facilities on any land or water use or natural resource of the coastal zone to the relevant enforceable policies of the [insert name of State] CMP. [Contact the State coastal management agency to help determine relevant enforceable policies, briefly describe the relevant policies, and write a brief assessment of how the effects of the proposed activity relate to the relevant policies.]
- 4. This section contains a brief set of findings, derived from the assessment, that the proposed [insert name of project], its associated facilities, and their effects are all consistent with the enforceable policies of the [insert name of State] CMP. [Prepare a set of findings for each distinguishable aspect of the proposed activity-essentially a conclusion of fact based on the assessment.]

By this certification that the [insert name of project] is consistent with the [insert name of State] CMP, the State of [insert name of State] is notified that it has 6 months from receipt of this letter and accompanying information in which to concur with or object to [insert name of applicant] certification. However, pursuant to 15 CFR 930.63(b), if [insert name of State] has not issued a decision within 3 months following commencement of State agency review, it shall notify [insert name of applicant] and the Federal agency of the status of the matter and the basis for further delay. The State's concurrence, objection, or notification of review status shall be sent to [insert name of applicant].

E-3

# Intensive Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Expansion Areas at the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

Burke County, Georgia



### Intensive Archaeological Survey of Proposed Expansion Areas at the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

Burke County, Georgia

Report submitted to:

Tetratech NUS, Inc • 600 Trail Ridge Road • Aiken, SC 29803

Report prepared by:

New South Associates • 6150 East Ponce de Leon Avenue • Stone Mountain, Georgia 30083

Notal: P. Clan

Natalie P. Adams – Principal Investigator and Co-author

DCO

Julie Coco - Editor

Keith C. Seramur – Geomorphologist and Co-author Johannes Loubser – Co-author

> August 2, 2006 • Draft Report New South Associates Technical Report 1365

## ABSTRACT

As a result of the archaeological survey of proposed expansion areas at Plant Vogtle in Burke County, Georgia 10 new archaeological sites were identified as well as seven isolated finds. None of the sites recorded by Nick Honerkamp in 1973 were encountered.

Of the 10 sites identified, two (9BK419 and 9BK420) are recommended as potentially eligible and two others (9BK416 and 9BK423) are recommended as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The remaining six sites are recommended as ineligible since they have very little integrity and/or cannot address any significant research questions regarding the history or prehistory of the middle Savannah River Valley.

In addition to the archaeological survey, a geomorphological study was performed along the river bluff to determine if deep excavations for the water intake line would damage deeply deposited cultural resources or encounter paleontological resources. The results of this study are provided in Chapter VI.

The two potentially eligible sites and two eligible sites are prehistoric settlements or camps and have relatively deep and intact deposits. It is recommended that they be avoided if possible. If the sites cannot be avoided Phase II testing or Phase III data recovery is recommended. No further work is recommended for the remaining six sites.

This report also presents the results of background research to identify sites and structures determined eligible for or are listed in the National Register of Historic Places within 10 miles of Plant Vogtle and within 1.2 miles of the Thalmann line, which runs south a distance of 159 miles and the Scherer line which runs west for a distance of 154 miles.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

New South Associates would like to thank Karen Patterson of Tetra Tech NUS for coordinating the project and answering numerous questions. Amy Aughtman and Tom Moorer of Southern Nuclear helped get us oriented in the field, assisted in getting the backhoe into the property, and were on site during the geomorphological investigation. Mike Burke of Southern Nuclear provided information on the location of known sites as well as limestone and marl outcrops. Thanks to the Miller sisters and the staff of the Burke County library who assisted us with historical research. Keith Seramur served as project Geomorphologist and we appreciate his assistance on this project.

Henry Mintz and Paul Lewis were the field technicians on this project. Their interest, enthusiasm, and hard work were greatly appreciated. Matt Tankersley, Staci Richey, and Terri Gillett collected information on the previously identified sites around Plant Vogtle and associated transmission lines. Tom Quinn and Jessica Avasthi drafted the graphics for this report.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
I. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT	7
GEOLOGY AND SOILS	7
CLIMATE, FLORA, AND FAUNA	8
III. THE CULTURAL CONTEXT	11
PREHISTORIC OVERVIEW	11
HISTORIC OVERVIEW	16
PREVIOUS RESEARCH IN THE AREA	23
IV. METHODS	35
ARCHIVAL/HISTORICAL RESEARCH	35
FIELD METHODS	35
LABORATORY METHODS AND CURATION	36
V. RESULTS AND EVALUATIONS	37
	37
SURVEY CONDITIONS AND LEVEL OF EFFORT	37
IDENTIFIED SITES	40
ISOLATED FINDS	60
VI. GEOMORPHOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION	61
PURPOSE	61
METHODS	61
GEOLOGIC SETTING AND SITE GEOMORPHOLOGY	65
PROFILE DESCRIPTIONS	71
INTERPRETATION	76
DISCUSSION	83
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	85
REFERENCES CITED	87
APPENDIX A. ARTIFACT CATALOG	95
APPENDIX B. RESUME FOR NATALIE P. ADAMS	
APPENDIX C RESUME FOR KEITH C SERAMUR	

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Location of Plant Voatle on the Shell Bluff and Girard USGS Topographic Map
Figure 2. Location of Plant Vogtle and the Thalmann and Scherer Transmission Lines.
Figure 3. Locations of Expansion Areas on the Plant Voatle Property.
Figure 4. 1780 Faden Map Showing the Plant Vogtle Area
Figure 5. 1899 Central Georgia Railway Map of Georgia and Alabama. Showing the Location of
Telfairville
Figure 6. 1909 General Highway Map, Burke County, Georgia,
Figure 7. Location of Previously Identified Archaeological Sites as well as New Sites and Isolated Finds on
Plant Voatle as shown on the Shell Bluff and Girard USGS Topographic Maps
Figure 8. Location of Previously Identified Archaeological Sites as well as New Sites and Isolated Finds on
Plant Voatle in Relation to Expansion Areas
Figure 9. 9BK414 Site Map
Figure 10, 9BK415 Site Map
Figure 11 9BK416 Site Map and Profile of Trench 1 Showing Spatial Relationship to 9BK417 and
9BK423
Figure 12 Prehistoric Artifacts from 9BK416 and 9BK423
Figure 13 98K417 Site Man and Northwest View of Site
Figure 14 9PK418 Site Map and Northwest View From the Landfill Trench
Figure 15, 9BK419 Site Man
Figure 16 9BK420 Site Map
Figure 17 9BK421 Site Map
Figure 18 9BK422 Site Map
Figure 19, 98K423 Site Map
Figure 20 U.S.G.S. 7.5 Minute Quadrangle of Savannah River Valley along the Project Area Map shows
wide flat terraces north of the river and steen bluff to the south
Figure 21 Field logs of profile descriptions for trenches excavated during the geomorphology investigation
A. Trenches excavated on river bluff B. Trenches excavated into T, terrace of the Savannah
River 63
Figure 22 Geologic map of the Coastal Plain formations in the vicinity of the project area lafter Summerour
et al 1994)
Figure 23 Geologic column of project area listing the age formation name and lithologic member lafter
Huddleston and Hetrick, 1986). Site 9BK416 on the river bluff is formed in recent agolian sand
that caps the Tobacco Road sand. Site 98K423 on the Tyterrace is deposited in alluvial sand
that overlies the Litley Limestone along the river channel
Eigure 24 Map showing outcrops of Litley Limestone and location of geologic profiles recorded by
Huddleston and Hetrick (1986)
Figure 25 Aerial photograph of the river valley along the project area (from TerraServer com). Photograph
shows geomorphic landforms reference points discussed in the text and reported location of
the Vogtle Whale
Figure 26 Sedimentology logs for Trenches 1 and 3 at site 98K416 on the River Bluff 72
Figure 27 Sedimentology Logs for Trench 4 at Site 9BK 416 on the River Bluff and Trench 7 Excavated
on the Unland Ridge
Figure 28 Sedimentology Logs for Trenches 5 North and 5 South at Site 98K416 on the River Bluff 75
Figure 29 Sedimentology logs for Trench 1 at site 98K423 on the T, terrace 77
Figure 30. Bivariate Plots of Mean Grain Size with Standard Deviation and Skewness for All Sediment
Samples Analyzed During This Study 81
Figure 31 Bivariate Plots of Mean Grain Size with Standard Deviation and Skewness For Sediment
Samples Collected From Trench 1 at Site 98K/16

iv |

# LIST OF TABLES

7
2
:
3
7
4
?
?
2
4
5

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report discusses the findings of archival research and intensive archaeological survey of planned expansion areas at Plant Vogtle in Burke County, Georgia in support of an Early Site Permit application submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Southern Nuclear Operating Company. The plant is located on the Savannah River between the Shell Bluff and Girard communities, just north of Beaverdam Creek (Figure 1).

The locations requiring archaeological survey are all planned elements of Southern Nuclear's expansion of the reactor capacity at Plant Vogtle. The elements of this project include the plant expansion site; the temporary Batch Plant and Parking Facility associated with the plant; temporary Construction Warehouse, Office and Laydown Area; the Water Intake Structure; an access road and water line to the intake structure; a temporary haul road; Simulator Building expansion site; new Barge Facility Options 1 and 2; two new transmission lines within Plant Vogtle (one of which is no longer considered for construction); transmission line corridor expansion for the Scherer and Goshen lines, and transmission line corridor reroute for the Thalmann line within Plant Vogtle. In total, the area under investigation contains roughly 672 acres. In addition to the archaeological surveys, New South Associates also conducted research on historic properties within a 10-mile radius of the plant site that are listed in or have been recommended eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or are included in State or local inventories of historic and cultural resources and also researched NRHP eligible or listed sites within a 1.2 mile distance of existing transmission lines – the Thalmann line, which runs south a distance of 159 miles and the Scherer line which runs west for a distance of 154 miles (Figure 2).

Of the areas requiring survey (Figure 3), the plant site has been heavily impacted by the construction of the current reactor facility and support structures at Plant Vogtle. Review of historic and current aerials as well as field inspection indicates that this area has been leveled during the plant's construction and thus has little potential for intact archaeological remains. Both the Parking Area and Batch Site have been cleared, but otherwise appeared intact, and required intensive survey. Neither appeared to have high potential for archaeological resources. The haul road crosses some areas of prior disturbance as well as areas with site potential crossing near the location of two previously recorded sites (sites 2-B and 2-C; Honerkamp 1973). Both the barge facilities are located on the Savannah River, and hence have site potential, with Barge Option 1 located near a previously recorded site (2-A). The Water Intake Site and associated access roads and water lines are located along a side slope, in the flood plain, and adjacent to a steep bluff directly overlooking the Savannah River, and this location and portions of this area were thought to have potential to contain deeply buried sites as well as paleontological resources.



Source: USGS 7.5' Quadrangles; Alexander, Shell Bluff Landing, Girard, NW Girard, GA 1989



Figure 2 Location of Plant Vogtle and the Thalman and Scherer Transmission Lines

#### 3



Source: Southern Comapany Services

 $\overline{}$ 

4

As a result of this survey, 10 new sites were identified. They consist of two late nineteenth to twentieth century home sites and eight prehistoric lithic scatters, camps or settlements. Of those, two prehistoric sites are recommended as potentially eligible and two prehistoric sites are recommended as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The remaining sites are recommended as not eligible. None of the previously identified sites were encountered.

All artifacts and notes collected were prepared for curation at the Antonio Waring Laboratory of the University of West Georgia. Appendix A provides a catalog of all artifacts collected. Appendix B consists of the resume of the Principal Investigator, Natalie P. Adams. Appendix C consists of the resume of the project Geomorphologist, Keith Seramur.

## II. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

This section provides information on the natural setting of Plant Vogtle. Pertinent information that is presented in this section includes the physiographic setting of the project area, a discussion of microenvironments, such as flora, fauna, geology, soils, pertinent climatic history, and prehistoric and historic resource (e.g., lithic, water, and soil resources) potential in or near the project area. This information provides a context within which the prehistoric and historic archaeological sites can be assessed in terms of settlement location and locally occurring subsistence resources.

Plant Vogtle is located in eastern Burke County along the Savannah River. It is located in the Southern Coastal Plain physiographic province, which formed during successive and periodic fluctuating sea levels that deposited marine sediments in the area.

#### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The underlying geology of the project area consists of coastal plain sedimentary rocks (Lawton 1977). Pliocene-Miocene deposits are predominant. These deposits include sand, clay, gravel, minor limestone, dolomite, and marl. Outcrops of bedrock chert, a metamorphosed limestone, occur in the vicinity of Plant Vogtle. In fact, the largest deposits of chert in eastern Georgia are found along Brier Creek in Burke and Screven counties (Goad 1979; Paulk 1981, 1986). According to Goad (1979), nodules and blocks of chert are found in the Barnwell Sands along the crests of low, rolling hills in the northern portion of Burke County. A local amateur archaeologist, J. T. Mims, has compiled a map of chert sources in the Waynesboro area. The closest known chert outcrops occur in the Brier Creek drainage catchment. Mims also documented outcrops along the headwaters of the Buckhead Creek. Generally speaking, the in situ chert formations near Waynesboro are exposed on the escarpment edges of fairly steep valley slopes along the major creeks and their tributaries, approximately 250 feet (82 meters) above mean sea level. Redeposited chert in the area can be found as nodules along creek edges or on the surfaces of plowed fields. The relative abundance of chert in the area is attested by the chert piers that serve as foundations of at least some historic period houses in Burke County. Also, chert is by far the most prevalent raw material utilized by prehistoric communities in the area. Along the Savannah River, about five miles south of the Savannah River Site and 14 miles downstream from Plant Vogtle, fossiliferous chert of Oligocene age outcrops (Fallaw and Price 1992: 32).

Several related materials also utilized by aboriginal populations include chalcedony and jasper. Chalcedony is a cryptocrystalline quartz and chert that is microscopically fibrous (Goad 1979), whereas jasper is a cryptocrystolline quartz with a dull fracture and reddish color. These materials occur in Georgia in small amounts. Quartz is a crystalline rock that originates in the Piedmont region and is available in the upper Coastal Plain as river cobbles. Quartz occurs as igneous veins and as scattered "float" material, and its distribution in the Piedmont is widespread to the northwest of the project area (Veatch and Stephenson 1911). Orthoquartzite is also found in the upper Coastal Plain and represents another stone of economic importance to prehistoric people. Although the distribution of this stone is not well defined in the Savannah River drainage shed, it may occur in the Barnwell Formation (Veatch and Stephenson 1911).

Limestone and marl outcrops occur in the area and are part of the Middle or Upper Eocene Clinchfield Formation. Two type localities are found on Plant Vogtle and include the Utley Limestone and Blue Bluff units (Fallaw and Price 1992: 5). In 1983, construction crews at Plant Vogtle unearthed a fossilized whale dating approximately 40 million years in age. It is a member of one of the oldest families of whales known as the Protocetidae. It represents a completely new genus and species, *Georgiacetus vogtlensis*. Reconstructions of the whale indicated that it had large, functional hind legs that assisted the tail to propel the animal through the sea. Although primarily a fis-eating fully aquatic mammal, the Vogtle whale may have had to return to land to give birth, like modern seals. The whale was found embedded in a limestone formation about 11 feet above the water table (Southern Company n.d.).

Soils within the uplands of Plant Vogtle exclusively consist of well-drained Lucy loamy sand and somewhat exclusively drained Troup fine sand. The floodplain contains the somewhat poorly drained to well-drained Tawcaw-Shellbluff soil association, while creek beds contain poorly drained Osier and Bibb soils (NRCS 2005).

Burke County falls within the Vidalia Upland District (Clark and Zisa 1976). It is characterized by a moderately dissected topography with a well-developed dendritic stream pattern on gravelly, clayey sands. The project area borders the Savannah River and is drained by un-named creeks. Beaverdam Creek is located just south of Plant Vogtle and includes Telfair Pond. Historically, Beaverdam Creek was referred to as Telfair's Mill Creek.

#### CLIMATE, FLORA, AND FAUNA

Information obtained from Carolina bays is not the only evidence that the climate has undergone many changes during the Holocene Epoch. Palynological evidence, for example, suggests that following the retreat of Pleistocene glaciation there was a warming trend accompanied by increasing moisture that lasted from about 8000 to 5000 B.C. (Delcourt and Delcourt 1985). During this time, oak and hickory trees reached their climax, beech trees were reduced in areal range, and gum trees increased. Following 5000 B.C. the climate grew warmer and possibly drier, resulting in an increase of pine forests, which replaced oak and hickory forests in the upper Coastal Plain. This trend continued to spread until about 2000 B.C., when the climate again became wetter. The development of the extensive river swamps and their associated vegetation in the Coastal Plain probably occurred sometime after 3500 B.C.

Plant Vogtle is located in a humid, subtropical zone, which receives an average of 154 cm (61 in) of precipitation per year. This precipitation, largely in the form of rainfall, is highest in March and lowest in November. Prevailing winds are from the northwest during fall, winter, and spring, but from the south during the summer. During September, however, the prevailing wind is from the east (Carter 1969; Langley and Marter 1973). In winter the average temperature is 47 degrees F, and the average daily minimum temperature is 35 degrees F. In summer the average temperature is 79 degrees F, and the average daily maximum temperature is 90 degrees (Paulk 1981; Paulk 1986).

The project area is in the Southeastern Evergreen Coastal Plain Forest region (Braun 1950:262). The Ogeechee River floodplain is dominated by three tree species: bald cypress, black gum, and tupelo gum.

Commonly occurring shrub species include: blueberries, huckleberries, holly, and wild azalea (Hillestad 1977:2). Wetland areas are dominated by species such as gum, laurel oak, cypress, red maple, sweet bay, water elm, and ash (Wharton 1977). In the general project area, the dominant upland pine forests present today would have consisted of a more even hardwood mix interspersed with occasional pines in antiquity. Prior to this type of forest there would have been old, climax forests made up entirely of mixed, mature southern hardwoods such as the American beech, American holly, chinkapin, devilwood osmanthus, dogwood, laurel and live oak, saw palmetto, and southern magnolia. The occasional pines would have consisted of loblolly, longleaf, pond, short leaf, slash, and spruce (McKee 1984:35).

This vegetation, in addition to the creek tributaries, swamps, and well-drained uplands contributed, and continue to contribute to an assortment of fauna. A variety of birds in the area include pileated woodpeckers, wild turkeys, quail, ducks, geese, herons, egrets, wood storks, swallow-tailed kites, barred owls, hawks, and vultures. The ivory-billed woodpecker and the Carolina parakeet once shared this habitat but are now extinct (McKee 1984:39). Other wildlife that would have been present in the area include alligators, turtles, snakes, elk, rabbits, foxes, river otters, muskrats, beavers, black bears, bobcats, deer, squirrels, opossums, and raccoons (Ledbetter 1988). About 30 years ago, the armadillo population migrated into the Plant Vogtle area. Now, they are commonly seen in Burke County.

Fish include permanent species such as the catfish, sucker, bowfin, longnose gar, sunfish, bluegill, crappie, and largemouth bass, while anadromous species include American shad, hickory shad, eel, striped bass, and short-nosed sturgeon. At least four species of freshwater clams are found in the Coastal Plain (Wharton 1978:45-47). Alligators are also abundant in the rivers, creeks, swamps and wetlands in the vicinity of the proposed project.

## **III. THE CULTURAL CONTEXT**

### **PREHISTORIC OVERVIEW**

This section places the area of potential effect in a regional culture prehistoric setting. The description is organized by prehistoric cultural/temporal periods that emphasize chronology, settlement patterns, means of subsistence, and any other pertinent characteristics that are deemed relevant to a discussion of the study area.

The regional culture prehistoric setting is based on results from a number of archaeological survey, testing and data recovery projects that have been conducted in the study area vicinity. These projects include the surveys on the Fort Gordon Military Reservation, on the Savannah River Site Reservation in South Carolina, at the Strom Thurmond and Richard B. Russell Lakes, the Savannah River Parkway survey (Entorf 1987), the southwest-northeast oriented Vogtle-Wadley transmission line (Wheaton et al. 1982) and excavations at sites such as Mims Point, Stallings Island, Raes Creek, Groton Plantation, Theriault/Midden Point, Pig Pen, 9RI45, Taylor Hill, Phinizy Swamp, Old Dike, and Lovers Lane (Benson 1994; Brockington 1971; Claflin 1931; Crook 1990; Elliott 1986, 1988, 1994; Elliott and Doyon 1981; Ledbetter 1988; Sassaman et al. 1990; Stoltman 1974; Wood et al. 1986). The data from these studies, most of which represent riverine settings, have been use in constructing the following prehistoric and historic context of the study area.

#### PRE-CLOVIS OCCUPATION (> 12,000 B.C.)

Pre-Paleoindian occupations (>12,000 B.P.) in the Southeast are highly debated within the archeological community. However, Albert Goodyear of the University of South Carolina has reported a pre-Clovis assemblage at the Topper site located along the middle Savannah River Valley near Allendale, South Carolina. Radiocarbon dates of more than 50,000 B.P. were obtained from a possible hearth area. If the dates are correct and are associated with human occupation, then the site provides evidence which destroys the previously held belief that humans first inhabited this portion of North America around 13,000 B.P.

Excavations at the Topper site extended below a Clovis layer, through a red paleosol zone, and exposed white Pleistocene alluvial sands (Pleistocene terrace) that are believed to be the normal pre-Clovis zone for the site. Within this Pleistocene layer, small flakes, some with bend break fractures, were recovered. These items are believed to be pre-Clovis chert processing piles. In one area of the site six chert artifacts (small blades, endscraper, and sidescrapers) were found around a large boulder, which had been used as an anvil. Of considerable interest was the recovery of charcoal from the pre-Clovis layer. There was an area of abundant charcoal in a shallow depression, from which a chert flake was recovered and Goodyear believes that this represents a hearth. Two radiocarbon samples were submitted, which resulted in dates of 50,300 RC yr. B.P. and 51,700 RC yr. B.P. (Goodyear 2005). If the dates are cultural and are correct, this work could have great implications for understanding the origin and migration of the human species in North America.

#### THE PALEOINDIAN PERIOD (12,000 B.C-7800 B.C.)

Traditional interpretation of the Paleoindian period has relied on a view of Paleoindians as hunters of Pleistocene megafauna exclusively. The recent re-interpretation of the few sites from this period in Georgia and the Southeast has revised this conventional wisdom, however (see Sassaman et al. 1990 for a more detailed summary). Research beginning in the mid to late 1980s and continuing today indicates that while reliance on megafauna may have been the norm in the Western part of North America, Southeastern aboriginal groups may have relied on a more varied diet including plants and small game (Sassaman et al. 1990:8). In accordance with the revisionist perspective, archaeologists have suggested less mobile populations that selected choice areas of settlement for initial colonization and subsequently expanded into other regions as necessary (Sassaman et al. 1990:8).

In spite of increasing research into Paleoindian sites, there are few sites in the Southeast that have produced diagnostic Paleoindian artifacts and even fewer such sites that contain more than surface materials. The Savannah River region has been described as being "geographically peripheral" to major concentrations of Paleoindian populations (Stoltman 1974:230). It remains to be determined whether this apparent peripheral occupation is factual, or whether it is an illusion based on the lack of diagnostic Paleoindian artifacts present at sites recorded as "non-diagnostic lithic scatters" or possible "base camps" that produced no diagnostic artifacts.

Archaeological investigation at the Groton Plantation in South Carolina, south of and across the Savannah River from the current project area, produced only two slightly fluted lanceolate points and one unfluted lanceolate point exhibiting lateral grinding (Stoltman 1974:230). A questionable Paleoindian date was assigned to them.

No major Early or Middle Paleoindian assemblages have been excavated in the Savannah River drainage in either Georgia or South Carolina (Anderson and Joseph 1988), with the exception of Al Goodyear's work at the Topper site in Allendale County, South Carolina. However, the focus of his research has been the documentation of a possible pre-Clovis occupation. A small Early Paleoindian component was investigated at the Simpson's Field Site during the Russell Reservoir Project (Wood et al. 1986). The Theriault Site, located along Brier Creek in the Georgia Coastal Plain, produced one Early Paleoindian point (Brockington 1971). Minor Late Paleoindian Dalton and Hardaway components have been found at sites like Pen Point and G.S. Lewis East along the Savannah River in South Carolina (Sassaman et al. 1990).

#### THE ARCHAIC PERIOD (7800 B.C.-1050 B.C.)

The Archaic period reflects continual changes and expansion from the economic and social patterns adopted in the earlier Paleoindian period. Dietary strategies were expanded to include a wide variety of birds, fish, mammals, and reptiles, with white-tailed deer and shellfish constituting the bulk of the population's dietary needs. Also, the adaptation to the warmer post-Pleistocene environment is reflected in the tools excavated from this period. The appearance of a variety of notched bifaces across the southeast during the beginning of this period suggests that not only were populations distributed throughout the Southeast by 8000 B.C., but that subregional traditions were already being developed by various populations within this region (Sassaman et al. 1990:9).

Archaeologists continue to argue over the extent and kind of mobility experienced by Early Archaic peoples. The conventional school of thought maintains that Early Archaic people occupied winter base camps along major rivers from where they conducted occasional forays into the uplands to complete specialized, short-term tasks (Anderson and Hanson 1988). Within this model, upland sites (many of which are located next-to Carolina bays) are thought to have been mere stopover locations for annually mobile bands in their late spring rounds. A more recently refined model, based on evidence obtained from excavated upland sites in South Carolina, proposes that upland sites are not always functionally distinct from those along large rivers (Eberhard et al. 1994). Proponents of the updated model propose that population movement up and down the major river valleys of the region was along the divides of major rivers, instead of the major floodplains. Whatever the scenario, it is suggested that factors other than mere location was relevant during Early Archaic land-use, such as seasonality or other short-term environmental changes.

The mid-Holocene warming trend of the Hypsithermal has been the accepted cause of subsistence and settlement changes during the Middle Archaic period. Stemmed points replaced earlier notched points, with the Morrow Mountain (5500-4000 B.C.) and Guilford (4000-3000 B.C.) being the most common in the Savannah River region (Sassaman et al. 1990:10). It is during this time when the cultural behaviors of populations in the Coastal Plain begin diverging from those in the Piedmont. Large-scale tool production, intensive occupation, and the manufacture of certain tool types not found in the Piedmont (notched, stemmed, and lanceolate bifaces) are indicative of Middle Archaic Coastal Plain activities (Sassaman et al. 1990:10). Sassaman et al. (1990) suggest these changes are the result of decreasing mobility and a less homogeneous resource environment in the Coastal Plain.

The Late Archaic period has long been described as a time when populations mastered their adaptation of post-Pleistocene changes, as reflected in population growth, increased sedentarism, technological innovation, and greater subsistence exploitation (Sassaman et al. 1990:11). The Late Archaic period is visible in the archaeological record in numerous ways. The design of the broad Savannah River Stemmed Point, the development of fiber-tempered pottery, and the initiation of freshwater shellfishing are all temporal markers of this time. The Coastal Plain populations began heavily exploiting riverine environments during the Late Archaic. This intensive use of riverine resources may have eventually led to massive depletion and a shift in settlement patterns to smaller, upland tributaries (Sassaman et al. 1990:11).

While the Groton Plantation area experienced little habitation during the Early and Middle Archaic, population within the Savannah River drainage system began to increase by the third millennium B.C. The Stallings Island I culture consisted of a population supported extensively by shellfish harvesting and left a definitive mark in the archaeological record through the resulting formation of shell middens along the coast. The Stallings Island II, non-agrarian culture, was responsible for the invention of fiber tempered pottery. Rabbit Mount, at Groton Plantation, produced radiocarbon dates from pottery within its shell middens of 3500 years B.C. (Stoltman 1974:232). Shell middens throughout areas north of Augusta, Georgia, to the coast illustrate the popularity of riverine exploitation during the Stallings Island II and III phases. However, shellfishing declined along the lower Savannah River following the Stallings Island III phase. This decline is presumably due to the decrease in the supply of shellfish resulting from rising sea levels that transformed active rivers and streams into oxbow lakes. Shellfishing along the Atlantic Coast continued after the Stallings Island III phase.

Stoltman sees the contribution of fiber tempered pottery to mark one of the few times that the lower Savannah River region culture led the way in technological advances in Southeastern prehistory. The region lost its influence following the Archaic period, after which time it adopted other advances rather than creating them (Stoltman 1974:234).

The difference in technology between populations in the Coastal Plain, as contrasted with the Fall Zone and Piedmont suggests sociopolitical regulation. A differentiation in point types between the two physiographic regions support this suggestion, as does the development and use of fiber tempered pottery on the Coastal Plain and its delayed introduction in the Piedmont. Conversely, the widespread use of soapstone in cooking at sites in the Piedmont contrasts sharply with the limited soapstone cooking artifacts recovered from Coastal Plain sites, indicating socio-political distinctions during the Late Archaic period (Sassaman et al. 1990:12).

#### THE WOODLAND PERIOD (1050 B.C.-A.D. 800)

Traditional, thirty-year old prehistoric chronologies have defined Woodland culture as represented by horticulture, pottery, and mound construction. This definition is not useful for the Coastal Plain, with its invention of fiber tempered pottery in the Archaic period and its temporal lag in horticulture and mound building (Sassaman et al. 1990:12). Early Woodland culture in the Coastal Plain is identified by Refuge pottery, which contains surface treatments such as dentate stamped, simple stamped, and plain, and dating between 2000-450 B.C. (Sassaman et al. 1990:12). Lithic artifacts representative of the Early Woodland period in the Coastal Plain include locally variable raw materials, tool types, and small, stemmed bifaces. Coastal Plain sites of this period often contain shell and remnants of bone and antler tools.

The shift from the lower Savannah River to uplands continued during the early Woodland and allowed for a larger and more diversified plant subsistence base than available near the coast during this time. Less dependence was placed on shellfish resources, probably reflecting a decrease in its availability. The lack of shellfish and the fluctuations in sea level at this time may have played a part in the abandonment of large shell midden sites by 1000 B.C.

Middle Woodland is represented in the Coastal Plain by Deptford phase pottery displaying simple stamping, check stamping and linear check stamping on its surface. Deptford pottery dates between 450 B.C. and A.D. 550. The similarity between this pottery and Cartersville in the Piedmont suggests the possibility of regional integration between Coastal Plain and the Piedmont populations. Intensive plant gathering and hunting dependence, from seasonal or permanent base camps was common during this part of the Woodland period. Camps contained large populations, supported in part by food preservation and storage on a grand scale (Sassaman et al. 1990:12).

The development of agriculture is one of the prime characteristics of the Woodland Period and included the cultivation of squash, gourds, sunflowers, and maize. Sites in the Savannah River region have yet to present evidence of such cultivation. The Late Woodland period saw the introduction of cord marked Deptford pottery, in addition to heavy cord marked, grog tempered Wilmington phase pottery. The coastal populations became increasingly insular from Southeastern culture, and by the Wilmington and Savannah I phases, their pottery lacked the typical paddle stamping of the period found elsewhere.

In fact, Swift Creek ceramics are uncommon on Georgia's northern coast. This lack of participation in southeastern pottery traditions indicates that the coastal aboriginals did not partake of the Hopewellian cultures and traditions. The Late Woodland period also saw a growing ceremonialism as reflected in death. Burial mounds in the Savannah River region were numerous by the Savannah I phase, and perhaps as early as the Wilmington phase (Stoltman 1974:240). The beginnings of slash and burn agriculture is evident at this time in dispersed upland settlements, eventually giving way to corn agriculture, larger villages in floodplains, and a broader sociopolitical hierarchy (Sassaman et al. 1990:15).

#### THE MISSISSIPPIAN PERIOD (A.D. 800-A.D. 1450)

Traditionally, this period has been defined by the presence of flattopped mounds, open plazas, permanent occupation, agriculture based subsistence, and new ceramic types. The new school of Mississippian thought has archaeologists leaning away from defining the period with mandatory architectural and cultural categories, and toward new levels of cultural development in the "pansoutheastern interaction sphere" (Griffin 1985; Schnell and Wright 1993). The Mississippian period marks the expansion of chiefdoms and the broad reach of social, political, and religious cultural manifestations across the Southeast. The extension and enforcement of these cultural norms were brought about through a complicated network of villages and mound centers.

Mound centers have been thought to have a ceremonial and iconographic relationship with the hinterlands (Ferguson 1971). The hinterlands fell under political territories, and the project area likely was in the sphere of the nearby Lawton Field mound site located along the Savannah River in Allendale County, South Carolina. In turn, this mound site was connected to others along the river including Irene near Savannah, Georgia and the Hollywood Mound near Augusta, Georgia.

Recently, a large Mississippian village was identified in North Augusta, South Carolina as part of an SCDOT undertaking, under several feet of alluvium. Currently, a data recovery plan is being developed for the site (Mr. Wayne D. Roberts, personal communication 1996).

#### THE PROTOHISTORIC PERIOD (A.D. 1450-A.D. 1540)

The lower Savannah River Valley retained much of its "buffer zone" quality during the Protohistoric period until circa 1670. During this period various groups of Native Americans traveled throughout the interior coastal plain following the dissolution of many of the Mississippian chiefdoms. These groups included the Apalachee, Apalachicola, Chickasaw, Shawnee, Westo, Yamacraw, and Yuchi (Sassaman et al. 1990:16). Shawnee, the historic name of a community in the project area, suggests that this group may have located in this general vicinity at on time. However, most protohistoric Native American groups relocated frequently during this period and left little trace of their occupations.

#### THE HISTORIC INDIAN PERIOD (A.D. 1540-A.D. 1700)

Europeans coming into Georgia during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries found Native American groups composed of various remnants of the earlier chiefdoms that had once flourished and later declined. Some of these diverse groups, later termed Creeks and Seminoles, were characterized by multiple languages including Muskogee and Hitchiti, with Apalachee, Shawnee, Yamasee, and Yuchi used among some groups (Braley 1994a:4).

The non-homogeneous nature of individuals within tribes was mixed further in the late 1700s by tribal intermarriage with both white and black colonists.

Both the Ogeechee and lower Savannah River drainage sheds experienced little Historic Indian period occupation. Archival evidence of limited occupation during this period in the Ogeechee drainage shed includes the Galphinton site and Ogeechee Old Town, both dating between the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and located in Jefferson County. Bulloch County contains the eighteenth-century sites of Indian Johnny's Town and Iago's Town (Braley 1994a:38). More extensive archaeological surveys of the lower Savannah River indicate that it too was equally unoccupied at this time. At least two Apalachicola settlements in this area are known historically, and one has been relocated. The latter is the site of Palachacola in Hampton County, South Carolina at Stokes Landing. Evidence of a small Yuchi presence during this time has been documented in the Coastal Plain at the Yuchi site of Mount Pleasant, in Effingham County, on a bluff overlooking the Savannah River (Elliott and Elliott 1990). During the late seventeenth century, the Yamacraw settled at what is now the city of Savannah, later moving to the Irene Mound site and then to the Chattahoochee River (Braley 1994a:40). To date, there is no 'archaeological evidence of Westo, Savannah (Shawnee), or Apalachee sites in the Coastal Plain of Georgia, although archival evidence supports their presence in limited numbers.

#### HISTORIC OVERVIEW

#### GENERAL COUNTY HISTORY

Georgia's European colonization began in earnest in 1732 with the granting of the royal colonial charter to the twenty-one Trustees who would attempt to mold a new civilization out of the wilderness. The British monarchy was quick to grant a Georgian charter that would serve the ulterior motives of protecting the more established colonies to the north from the threat of Spanish attack. In contrast, the Trustees and their leader, General James Oglethorpe, saw the new colony as a haven from conflict and a place where the honest indigent and the persecuted religious could begin a new and rewarding life.

This vision guided the Trustees in all their actions and reactions regarding the new colony. They struggled to keep the liquor, slavery, rice agriculture and its ensuing large plantation owners so prevalent in South Carolina out of Georgia's reach. They wanted to seed a colony full of small yeoman farmers who worked hard, made a successful living, and did not fall prey to the lifestyles of the plantation elite and the threat of slave revolts. The Trustees encouraged Great Britain's mercantilist policy in the colonies by expecting Georgia to raise, harvest, and export raw materials to the motherland that were prohibitively expensive to obtain from other parts of the world. Colonists in Georgia were expected to produce wine, olives, silk, potash, naval stores, and other exotic commodities. These raw products would then be further refined or manufactured in Great Britain and sold back to her colonies across the globe. The Salzburger settlers of New Ebenezer, in what was to become present day Effingham County, were virtually the only settlers to successfully adhere to this mandate, particularly in the production of silk, crops, and medicine.

The benevolent, but misinformed guidelines of the Trustees eventually led to conflict in Georgia. The tail-male laws prohibiting females and all but the eldest son to inherit property dissatisfied those struggling to improve their and their families' lots in life.

The prohibition of slaves and the lack of available indentured servants made clearing and settling the wilderness an insurmountable task. Chronic complaints eventually led to the introduction of slavery in Georgia in 1750. By 1752 almost twenty-seven percent of the 3,000 people in the colony were slaves (Coleman 1977:44). The same year proved to be a watershed for legal repeal. The hated tail-male law, that gave widows and daughters little opportunity to retain their land and provided men with little incentive to improve property that might not stay in their family after their death, was abolished. The Trustees also eliminated the prohibition against liquor during this same year.

Colonization of Georgia was expanded through the creation of numerous towns. The port city of Savannah was established in 1733 and organized according to the European plan of numerous town squares surrounded by individual house lots. In 1734 the town of Ebenezer was laid out according to the same plan, near the confluence of Ebenezer and Little Ebenezer Creek. Other settlements followed, but the Trustees could not overcome their disappointment in what they viewed as the failure of the colony. The novelty of a humanitarian Utopia had given way to the frustrations of administration, finance, and other mundane practicalities. In 1754 they surrendered their charter and Georgia was transformed to a royal colony under the governorship of Captain John Reynolds. At this same time settlement was moving from the coast inland, and colonists traveled to the area of present-day Screven County. By 1763 the Treaty of Paris reassured colonists of their safety and helped illustrate the colony's worth as an economically viable holding. Following the treaty, Georgia's production of raw timber, barrel staves, and wooden shingles escalated 500 percent between 1762 and 1772 (Reese 1963:127).

The Indian land cessions of 1763 and 1773 opened up new land to colonial Georgians while moving the threat of Native American uprisings farther away. By 1760 there were 10,000 colonists in Georgia governed by James Wright, the third royal governor. Many of these colonists moved westward into the interior following the land cessions. The availability of additional land did not appease colonists angered by Great Britain's increasingly restrictive laws and financial impediments. The American Revolution soon touched the lives of most, if not all, colonial Georgians. The Revolution brought chaos to Georgia, leaving Savannah and many smaller towns attempting to recover from the ruins. By 1782 Georgia was made up of one hundred million acres (Coleman 1977:105). Two new Indian cessions, the 1783 and the 1827 treaties, continued to encourage westward migration of Georgians.

Burke County was one of the first counties in Georgia. It was formed in 1777 from St. George Parish and was named in honor of Edmund Burke, an English spokesman for American liberty. In 1796, the state capital, which was located at Louisville, was in Burke County. However, in that year Burke County was divided, and the town of Louisville became part of the newly created Jefferson County. In 1793, a part of Burke County was cut off to form Screven County, and in 1905 another part went to Jenkins County.

In 1783, the legislature provided for the establishment of Waynesborough, the county seat. Waynesboro, as it is known today, was incorporated in 1813. Royal, headright, bounty, and state grants made possible the establishment of cotton plantations. These plantations controlled the economy until the Civil War.

Burke County south of Waynesboro was heavily damaged during the war, and the economy was disrupted. On November 26, 1864 the first fighting occurred in the vicinity of the project corridor when advance Union troops under Captain Estes destroyed a portion of the railroad track and bridge over Brier Creek. The troops then passed through Waynesboro and encamped in a line of battle 4.8 km (3 mi) south of the town (United States House of Representatives 1893:363). It is here that the news reached the Union soldiers that Union prisoners had been removed from the prisonerof-war camp at Magnolia Spring, about 15 km (9.3 mi) to the south. On December 2, 1864, Union troops under Major General Slocum reached Buckhead Church about 4.8 km (3 mi) west of US 25/SR 121. Forming the left wing of General Sherman's thrust to Savannah, Union troops under Slocum, Kilpatrick and Baird once again moved towards the railroad south of Waynesboro on December 3, their main objective being the destruction of the rail lines. Confederate troops under General Wheeler tried to stop this destruction by shelling Union encampments and attacking work details. In spite of Confederate attacks on Union positions, Union troops managed to destroy the bridge over Brier Creek and tear up three miles of track near Thomas' Station on December 4. By December 5 the area was under Union control and Sherman's "March to the Sea" continued unabated. While they were in the area, Union troops not only destroyed three miles of railroad track, but also eight railroad cars, one engine, a wagon shop, and 25 barrels of salt at Waynesboro (United States House of Representatives 1893:367-368).

Since the Civil War, plantations have given way to large farms. Farming is still a major part of the Burke County economy. While the earliest settlers were predominantly subsistence farmers, following the advent of the cotton gin, the acreage in cotton increased rapidly, and cotton became the chief income crop. In 1909, 42,406 ha (104,786 ac) of cotton were grown. The economic depression of the 1930s led to misuse of the land. This misuse increased erosion on most sloping soils. Many fields were abandoned because of low crop yields. Changes in land ownership were common, and soil fertility was not maintained in most places.

From the late 1920s until 1969, the acreage in cotton gradually declined and corn production increased. Since 1969, the acreage of corn has decreased and production of wheat and soybeans has increased. In 1978, farms covered 50.2 percent of Burke County (Paulk 1986:3-4).

#### HISTORY OF THE PLANT VOGTLE AREA

Perhaps the biggest landowner in the Plant Vogtle area was Georgia governor Edward Telfair. Although no details were collected about his ownership, a 1780 map (Figure 4) shows two settlements on Plant Vogtle or on property managed by Southern Nuclear: "Telfare's Plantation" and "Matthew's Bluff". In addition, "Telfare's Saw Mills" are shown below Plant Vogtle on what is now Beaverdam Creek. A pond referred to as Telfair Pond appears on modern USGS topographic maps (see Figure 1). The road depicted on the map is the Old River Road, which runs through the Plant Vogtle property. According to Hillhouse (1985), the area adjacent to the river and south of Hancock's Landing has been historically known as "Telfair's Woods" and was part of Governor Telfair's extensive holdings in the county.

Telfair was born in Scotland in 1735. After coming to Virginia in the 1750s, he later moved to Savannah in 1776 where he held extensive holdings. Although Savannah was his home, he held


للطي

## Figure 4 1780 Faden Map Showing the Plant Vogtle Area

numerous properties elsewhere in Georgia. He was known as a Patriot during the American Revolution as one of the members of the Council of Safety who helped to break open the powder magazine in Savannah.

He was also a signer of the "Articles of Confederation" that proceeded the U.S. Constitution. He was elected governor in 1786 and again in 1789. In 1807 he died at the age of 72 and was buried in Savannah.

The property at Vogtle remained in family hands. The 1818 Anderson Map of the Barnwell District in Mills' (1826) Atlas of South Carolina shows some features on the Georgia side of the river. A limestone bluff is depicted in the location of what is today known as Blue Bluff. Dog Ferry appears in what is now known as Hancock Landing. An 1823 map of the area depicts no names in the vicinity of Plant Vogtle. The closest settlement is referred to as Gordon's, which is located north of Vogtle at the intersection of River Road and the road leading to Shell Bluff landing.

In the 1820 population census, a Henry Utly is listed as overseer for Alexander Telfair – son of the deceased Edward Telfair. According to Utley family history, Henry's brother Elisha also served as Telfair's overseer (www.members.aol.com/sambraswell/uttley.htm). A total of 105 individuals are listed with Henry, mostly slaves probably belonging to the Telfair family. In 1830 the population census no longer lists Telfair, but Henry Utly is still shown, although spelled Utley. He is listed in the 66<sup>th</sup> company district of Burke (which includes the area of Plant Vogtle). There are four white males and five white females in his household. He is shown as owning 12 slaves. Interestingly, there are nine free blacks listed in the census after Utley – some owning slaves. Of the 50 blacks listed, 15 of these are slaves. The disappearance of the Telfair name in the Burke County census and the appearance of several free black families after Utley's is interesting, but interpretation at this point is sheer speculation. It may be possible that, with the sale of the Telfair land, a number of slaves were given their freedom. In the 1840 census, a William Utley is shown in Henry's place and is believed to be his son. There are four free white persons in the household. In addition, there are 32 free blacks listed and 43 slaves with Utley. In 1850 William and his wife are listed with five male children. William is 36 years old. He owns 11 slaves. In 1860 William is apparently dead, but his wife Sarah appears in the census. She is living with three of her children. Also living there is a teacher, housekeeper, and overseer. Again, 11 slaves are listed. William's younger brother Henry, Jr. (age 28) is living next door with his wife, four children, and a farm hand. Henry Jr. owned no slaves according to the 1860 census. Henry, Jr. was killed at the Battle of Gettysburg in 1863 (www.members.aol.com/sambraswell/Utley.htm).

An 1864 map of Georgia shows Telfair's Mill Creek below Plant Vogtle, but no other place names in the immediate area of the plant. In 1870, over half of the 17 Utley's listed are either black or mulatto. Henry's wife Cornelia and her children are listed. Sarah was no longer in the census and may have also died. By 1900, all the white Utley's appear to have moved out of Militia District 66 of Burke County. However, numerous black Utley's remained in the area. The Utley name is clearly associated with Plant Vogtle as the old landing where the barge dock is located was once referred to as Utley Landing (Georgia site form 9BK1). Also, underneath Mallard Pond is a cave referred to as Utley's Cave. In addition, the limestone outcrop in this location is referred to as Utley limestone.

An 1899 map depicts a town called "Telfairville" along Hwy 23 west of Plant Vogtle (Figure 5), apparently in honor of the former governor and landowner. Later early 20<sup>th</sup> century maps continue to show it although sometime between 1910 and 1915, the town disappears from maps. A 1909



Source:

•



map shows the town along Hwy. 23 and depicts Hancock Landing at the north end of Plant Vogtle and several properties including "W.M. Buxton Pl.", "Allen's Chapel (Col)", and "Cochran Pl." (Figure 6). Based on this map and the known location of the old River Road through Plant Vogtle, the Buxton property is in the location of a site found during this survey (9BK414). Allen's Chapel appears to be just east of the cooling towers, and the Cochran property appears to be located between the Wilson Combustion Turbine Plant and the Visitor Center Access Road. The Utley surname does not appear in the area at all. In 1920, numerous white Utley's are found further south in the area of Girard.

## PREVIOUS RESEARCH IN THE AREA

This section describes the results of archaeological studies that have been recorded near the project area. The results of the most extensive surveys and syntheses in the surrounding area are described first and then more specific archaeological work at Plant Vogtle is considered. All these archaeological studies, in conjunction with the outline of regional prehistoric and historic periods presented above, provide the basis for assessing site significance at Plant Vogtle.

#### ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES IN NEIGHBORING AREAS

The extensive surveys at Fort Gordon provide the largest quantity of data from an area closest to, and physiographically most similar to, the present study area. Fort Gordon comprises over 16,188 ha (40,000 ac) of land, which has been surveyed over a period of several years (Benson 1994; Braley 1991, 1994b; Braley and Price 1991). This Sand Hills locality is located within a large military reservation and provides the most accurate data available for the Sand Hills region of the Savannah River drainage shed. Site density at Fort Gordon was one per 10 ha (1:24 ac) (Benson 1994:102). While only the northern portion of the current project corridor is located in Burke County, the physiography of this interriverine region is very similar to that of the Fort Gordon area.

Benson (1994) and Braley (1991, 1994b) have compared data from extensive surveys of Sand Hills and Upper Coastal Plain locales. These include Fort Gordon (interriverine) and Fort Benning (riverine) in the Sand Hills, and DiLane Plantation (interriverine) and the Savannah River Site (SRSriverine) in the Upper Coastal Plain. Paleoindian through Middle Archaic components generally comprise a greater proportion of prehistoric components in the Sand Hills than in the Upper Coastal Plain (Benson 1994:103). DiLane Plantation, however, shows a relatively high Early Archaic proportion. Fort Gordon and Fort Benning are remarkably similar in Early Archaic and Middle Archaic frequency. Middle Archaic component frequency in the Upper Coastal Plain is also very similar. Frequency of Late Archaic locations increases dramatically for all of the compared areas, but the Sand Hills areas show a greater increase.

Beyond the Late Archaic period the Upper Coastal Plain shows greater occupation frequency than the Sand Hills. Human occupation of the Upper Coastal Plain continues to increase after the Late Archaic period, but the increase is largely due to the high frequency of Early Woodland (Refuge) locations at the Savannah River Site (SRS). DiLane Plantation, also in the Upper Coastal Plain, produced only marginal Early Woodland occupation. The Sand Hills areas also produced fewer Early Woodland sites. Woodland through Mississippian occupation fluctuates in the Sand Hills, with Middle Woodland locations being the most prevalent on both Fort Gordon and Fort Benning. The difference between Upper Coastal Plain and Sand Hills occupation is striking. The number of Late Woodland sites increases in the Upper Coastal Plain, largely due to the high frequency of Late Woodland sites on the SRS, while the frequency of Late Woodland sites greatly decrease in the Sand Hills. The proportion of Late Woodland and Mississippian sites are roughly similar for both the Upper Coastal Plain and the Sand Hills.

Generally, component proportions between areas within physiographic provinces are similar. Intensity of Paleoindian/Archaic land use is higher in the Sand Hills, while intensity of Woodland/Mississippian land use is higher in the Upper Coastal Plain. Differences do exist between areas within physiographic provinces, more so between the two areas in the Upper Coastal Plain than in the Sand Hills (Benson 1994:103).

Braley (1994b:234-239) has addressed site patterning based on an array of environmental variables including type of landform, source of water, distance to water, and elevation above water. Apparently the high, dry uplands were rarely selected for campsites by prehistoric groups, but were favored by late historic period farmers whose house sites are somewhat common. Historic sites are three times more likely to be located on ridge tops, upland slopes and upland flat areas when compared to prehistoric sites. Prehistoric sites are much more likely to occupy toe slopes, small knolls and terraces. Nearly 60 percent of the prehistoric sites are located within 50 m (164 ft) of water and 80 percent are within 100 m (328 ft). Most often the water source is a small, rank 1 stream or spring.

Diagnostic Early Archaic stone tools were found on nearly 20 percent of the sites or occurrences. Middle Archaic sites are comparatively rare on Fort Gordon. Late Archaic sites are well represented, and nearly 14 percent of Fort Gordon sites yielded diagnostic Late Archaic artifacts. Fiber tempered pottery is poorly represented on Fort Gordon, with ceramic sites clustered along Brier Creek and its major tributaries (Braley 1994b:236).

No sites with Thoms Creek pottery have been identified on Fort Gordon, despite the fact that such sites are common on the South Carolina side of the Savannah River (Braley 1994b; Sassaman et al. 1990). The Savannah River may have served as a territorial boundary during the Late Archaic-Early Woodland transition. Similarly, no definite Early Woodland Refuge ceramics have been identified on Fort Gordon, although some simple stamped wares classified as Deptford (Middle Woodland) have been found. While the Middle Woodland is fairly well represented, the Late Woodland period is poorly represented by cord marked ceramics.

Small Mississippian period sites comprise approximately 17 percent of identified prehistoric components on Fort Gordon. Based on test excavations at site 9MF57, it appears that the late prehistoric use of the Sand Hills was on a seasonal basis (Braley 1994b). The Fort Gordon surveys indicate that the Sand Hills were utilized during the early and middle part of the Mississippian. Late Mississippian (Lamar) pottery is present but in very low density, supporting the idea that the Savannah River valley was nearly abandoned at the time of first European contact in 1540 A.D.

Documentary and archaeological data suggest that the Sand Hills lagged behind other regions in historic settlement, primarily due to the low agricultural potential of the soils. Although the Augusta area was settled in the early eighteenth century, it was not until after the Revolutionary War that the Sand Hills were settled. Initially, wealthy individuals purchased large landholdings, but a cottonbased plantation economy was not as developed as it was elsewhere in the state. Instead, small sawmills were constructed along the major streams, and the virgin longleaf pine forests were harvested for timber, which was shipped down river to Savannah. The vast majority of historic sites on Fort Gordon range in date from circa 1860 to 1940, after the large landholdings were divided and sold to yeoman farmers (Braley 1994b:238).

According to cemetery records from Fort Gordon, the peak years of birth in the area were between 1861 and 1880. It appears that births in the region declined during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Peak death rates occurred between 1901 and 1920. The reduction of births after 1920 may reflect the out-migration of farm families following the invasion of the boll weevil. While cotton was never a very productive crop in the Sand Hills, the general decline of the region's economy following 1920 probably did lead to abandonment of many farms (Braley 1994b:239).

Archaeological data has also been recovered from recent highway widening projects east of the study area. Three similar highway surveys have been conducted along SR 21, from Rincon to Millen during May and July of 1994 (Elliott 1994), from Rincon to Shawnee during the fall of 1992 (Elliott 1993), and from Sylvania to Millen during the spring of 1993 (Espenshade and Roberts 1993). Elliott (1994:10) compares and contrasts the results of archaeological survey along these three sections of SR 21.

The survey from Rincon to Millen (Elliott 1994) covered 33 km (20.6 mi) along SR 21 within Effingham and Screven counties. Elliott (1994) identified 28 archaeological sites and 28 isolates, with an additional 3 sites and 2 isolates found around a Carolina bay. Site types included eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and twentieth-century house sites and artifact scatters; non-diagnostic aboriginal lithic scatters and short term camps; and Paleoindian, Archaic, and Woodland base camps. Four of these sites (9EF78, 9SN165, 9SN167, and 9SN168) were recommended as potentially eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

The survey from Rincon to Shawnee consisted of a 27 km (15 mi) long corridor entirely within Effingham County and by-passing the town of Springfield. A total of six sites and two occurrences was located and determined ineligible to the NRHP (Elliott 1993). Site density along this survey area compares to other surveys within the county, known for its numerous wetlands and low lying ground. One site and one occurrence were predominantly prehistoric while the remaining sites and occurrences dated to historic times. Site 9EF230 was the only solely prehistoric site and consisted of a large lithic scatter including Early and Late Archaic projectile points. The site was located along an upland slope near a flood plain. The severity of disturbance of this site resulting from its use as a borrow pit made it unlikely to contain intact features or stratigraphy, and it was recommended ineligible for the NRHP. Predominantly historic sites included: 9EF225, containing one prehistoric Woodland period sherd, an eighteenth-century sherd, and middle nineteenth-century artifacts; 9EF229, a nineteenth-century site; 9EF227, a middle nineteenth-century site; and sites 9EF226 and 9EF228, middle nineteenth to twentieth-century sites. These historic sites were not eligible to the NRHP because of one or more of the following conditions: lack of artifacts below the plowzone, re-deposition of artifacts, very low density of artifacts, and massive disturbance.

Archaeological survey from Sylvania to Millen, consisted of 27 km (15 mi) in Screven and Jenkins counties. The survey area was divided almost equally between the two counties. This survey located nine sites and three isolated finds. The Screven County portion contained seven of the nine sites. Two of the sites were prehistoric, seven were historic, and all were recommended as

ineligible for the NRHP (Espenshade and Roberts 1993). Prehistoric sites consisted of 9JS8, on a bluff overlooking Horse Creek, and site 9SN108, located on a large knoll above Ogeechee Creek. The former consisted of chert flakes and the latter contained chert debitage and sherds. Neither contained diagnostic artifacts.

Historic sites 9JS7, 9SN109, and 9SN111 date to the late nineteenth-early twentieth century. Site 9SN110 dates to the early twentieth century. Sites 9SN113 and 9SN114 contained diagnostic artifacts from the early-middle twentieth century, while Site 9SN112 was occupied a short time later during the middle twentieth century. Sites 9SN109, 9SN110, 9SN111, and 9SN113 are recorded as tenant house scatters. Site 9SN112 is listed as tenant house refuse. Site 9JS7 is a house scatter while 9SN114 is recorded as a multi-structure scatter. All seven sites were described as extensively disturbed, lacking stratigraphy and features.

The majority of archaeological research conducted east of the project area has been in the northern and central portions of Screven County within the Brier Creek drainage system in conjunction with the construction of Plant Vogtle and its associated transmission lines. Survey, testing, and data recovery of these sites have resulted in a large body of data (Blanton 1985; Elliott 1986; Elliott and O'Steen 1987; Espenshade 1986; Garrow 1984; Joseph 1985; O'Steen 1986; and O'Steen and Espenshade 1985). Test excavations at site 9SN53 (known as field site GP-SN-03) revealed that it was occupied during the Early Archaic and Woodland periods and was stratified. Test excavations at 9SN59 (also known as field site GP-SN-05) recovered Late Archaic and Woodland artifacts (O'Steen and Espenshade 1985). Data recovery was conducted at Site 9SN68 (field site GP-SN-13) and resulted in the determination that it contained Early, Middle, and Late Archaic components. Data recovery was also conducted on portions of Field Sites GP-SN-03, GP-SN-08 and GP-SN-09 (Elliott 1986; Blanton 1985; O'Steen 1986). Site GP-SN-08 was characterized by stratified alluvial deposits representing Early Archaic through modern occupations, with the late Middle Archaic being the most intensive occupation period. Artifacts represented a low diversity of activities, with intermediate and final stage biface reduction most prominent. Elliott concluded that the site represented an area of repeated short-term occupation rather than a base camp (Elliott 1986). Excavation on areas of Field Site GP-SN-09 revealed that it too was used as a short-term activity area. The northern portion of the excavated area was occupied mostly during the Late Archaic, with other minor components from Middle Archaic to Early Woodland. Major occupation of the southern area took place during the terminal Late Archaic. Discrete artifact occupation zones were observed in the stratigraphy (Blanton 1985).

Across the river in South Carolina, there has been extensive survey at the Savannah River Site. In 1990, a prehistoric synthesis of the archaeology that had been accomplished by that time was published. Based primarily on survey data, Sassaman et al (1990:330-332) listed eight typological and chronological research domains and seven research problems in cultural patterning and process for the Middle Savannah River Valley. These research domains and problems are rather broad, indicating that much more research at the testing and data recovery level are needed before they can be adequately addressed. Several sites have also been excavated as part of new construction. The results of excavations at the G.S. Lewis-East Site and 38AK157 have been published by the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program (Sassaman et al. 2002; Sassaman 1993). Site 38AK157 is a Woodland Period site located on a ridgenose overlooking Upper Three Runs Creek, while the G.S. Lewis-East site dates primarily to the Early and Late Archaic Period and is located at the confluence of Upper Three Runs Creek and the Savannah River. Most of the riverfront at Savannah River Site consists of swamp or floodplain. This confluence is the only location where a low rise (10 to 20 feet above the river) overlooking the river channel occurs.

Several publications have also been produced on the historic resources at Savannah River Site. The most comprehensive publication focuses on changing settlement patterns (Brooks et al 1991) based on the survey and identification of a number of historic settlements. Topic or site specific publications consist of a study of consumer behavior on a postbellum farm (Crass et al. 1995); a study on the archaeology of rural modernization (Cabak and Inkrot (1997); a study on the archaeology of cattle raising (Brooks et al. 2000); and the results of data recovery at the Bush Hill Plantation (Cabak and Groover 2005).

Site forms for sites and standing structures that are either eligible or listed on the National Register of Historic Places were gathered for resources within 10 miles of Plant Vogtle and within 1.2 miles of the Thalmann and Scherer transmission line routes.

#### PREVIOUSLY RECORDED SITES AND STRUCTURES WITHIN PLANT VOGTLE

In 1973, Nicholas Honerkamp performed a reconnaissance survey of high probability areas of the Plant Vogtle property and located seven sites. Of these sites, three (9BK1/9BK20, 9BK21, and 9BK22) were initially thought to possibly be located within the areas to be improved. The sites Honerkamp identified are summarized below in Table 1 and shown on Figures 7 and 8 along with new sites and isolated finds identified during this survey. No previously recorded standing structures occur within Plant Vogtle.

ScieSie	Honerkemp#	Easting	Northing	Site Type 14 Sec.
9BK1/9BK20	2-A	429500	3667850	Prehistoric Camp/Settlement
9BK21	2-B	427500	3667700	Prehistoric Isolated Find
9BK22	2-C	427400	3667520 ·	Prehistoric Isolated Find
9BK23	1-C	430100	3667500	Prehistoric Camp
9BK24	1-D	430540	3667120	Prehistoric Camp
9BK25	1-A	430550	3666950	Prehistoric Camp
· 98K26	1-B	430700	3666950	Prehistoric Camp

Table 1. Sites Identified by Honerkamp during the 1973 Reconnaissance Study.

#### 9BK1/20

Site 9BK1 was identified by Becky Plunkett in 1971on a ridge nose overlooking the Savannah River and known as Utley's Landing. There she picked up prehistoric pottery, two projectile points, several prehistoric tools, and a number of chert flakes. The site was revisited by Nick Honerkamp in 1973 and was issued a new site number (9BK20). The site was located at Brown's Cabin, which was being used by the Georgia Power Company to store soil samples. The site was a multicomponent prehistoric occupation. It was found to be eroded and had been bulldozed to



Source: USGS 7.5' Quadrangles; Alexander, Shell Bluff Landing, Girard, NW Girard, GA 1989



ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE VOGTLE GENERATING PLANT

Source: Southern Comapany Services

create a dam to the southeast of the site. Because of the large quantity of surface materials, Honerkamp excavated nine test pits at the site to determine the site's condition. Although the depth of deposits was not mentioned, he did state that only a small area of midden was seen. Artifacts consisted of chert and quartzite debitage and tools, Early to Late Woodland pottery, and a Savannah River Stemmed Point. A total of 250 artifacts were collected primarily from the ground surface. The size of the site is unknown.

Of all the sites Honerkamp identified, this was the only site he believed needed additional work. However, this recommendation was made with some reservations since bulldozing, erosion, and collecting by amateurs had disturbed the site.

According to Mr. Mike Burke of Southern Nuclear, the site was disturbed during initial construction for Vogtle and much of the soil, along with the artifacts, was removed and relocated to other areas of the property. Currently, the barge landing occupies the landform containing the site and it is presumed to have been destroyed.

#### 9BK21

Site 9BK21 was identified by Honerkamp on a rise overlooking a springhead. Surface collected was on Middle Mississippian Madison type point and a chert flake. The report indicates that test pits were placed at the site, but does not state how many. Regardless, no other artifacts were found. It should be noted that the UTM coordinates on the state site form do not place the site in the location shown on Honerkamp's map. Based on correspondence with the Georgia site files, the UTM coordinates on the site form are assumed correct.

#### 9BK22

Site 9BK22 was identified just northwest of 9BK21 closer to the springhead. Despite the excavation of an unknown number of test pits, only one artifact was found. It consisted of a late Paleoindian/Early Archaic Hardaway/Dalton point. Like site 9BK21, it should be noted that the UTM coordinates on the state site form do not place the site in the location shown on Honerkamp's map. Based on correspondence with the Georgia site files, the UTM coordinates on the site form are assumed correct.

#### 9BK23

Site 9BK23 is a prehistoric camp located about 500 to 600 feet north of a powerline on secondary bluffs of the Savannah River. Honerkamp's report indicates that all artifacts came from test pits, but that no midden was found. He did note that the site was highly disturbed by roots. The size of the site is also not noted. Artifacts consisted of 32 pieces of chert debitage, two plain sherds, three simple stamped sherds, one Mossy Oak cord marked sherd, and one Deptford check stamped sherd, placing the site in the Early to Middle Woodland Period.

#### 9BK24

Site 9BK24 was another prehistoric camp located on secondary bluffs overlooking the Savannah River and flanked by two small stream valleys. Honerkamp indicates that the vast majority of artifacts were surface collected and does not specify how many test units were excavated. The size of the site is also not noted. Artifacts consisted of 17 pieces of chert debitage, one chert scraper, one chert projectile point fragment, three Mossy Oak cord marked sherds, five Deptford simple stamped sherds, five undetermined simple stamped sherds, two Dunlap fabric impressed sherds, four plain sherds, two undetermined cord marked sherd, and one Swift Creek stamped sherd. These date the site from the Early to Late Woodland periods.

#### 9BK25

Site 9BK25 was a prehistoric camp found about 850 feet north of the northeast corner of the fence surrounding the combustion turbine plant. It was found at the beginning of a highly eroded logging road that extended to the river. The site was highly disturbed and may have been fill brought in from elsewhere. Only a few artifacts were recovered from an unspecified number of test units. Collected from the site were 29 pieces of chert debitage, two incomplete chert projectile points, and three plain pottery sherds. This site probably dates to sometime in the Woodland period.

#### 9BK26

Site 9BK26 was a prehistoric camp located on a secondary bluff overlooking the Savannah River on a rise between two streams. The vast majority of artifacts were surface collected. Only three artifacts were recovered from an unknown number of test pits. No midden deposits were noted. Artifacts consisted of three pieces of chert debitage, one partial quartzite projectile point, one Deptford linear check stamped sherd, one Deptford simple stamped sherd, one Mossy Oak simple stamped sherd, and one simple stamped sherd of an unknown type.

#### Other Sites and Artifacts

Another site is mentioned in Honerkamp's report, which he refers to as 3A. Unfortunately, it does not appear on his overall map, as do the other sites. In addition, no form for this site was found in the State site files. In other words, there are no supporting documents. He notes that it was located on the northern fork of a jeep trail, which he refers to a R-5 on the edge of a top bluff. A highly eroded logging road was found extending from the site down to the river. He found eight artifacts from the surface including five pieces of chert debitage, a chert chopper or core, one Deptford simple stamped sherd, and one plain sherd. He stated that although the immediate area was extensively tested, no material or midden was found.

Honerkamp made several large surface collections from the powerlines, but did not attempt to delineate sites. Without additional description from Honerkamp's report, it is impossible to know where these materials came from.

## NEARBY RESOURCES LISTED OR DETERMINED ELIGIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The background research identified sites, structures, buildings, and districts that have been determined eligible for or are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Within 10 miles of Plant Vogtle there are 22 archaeological sites that have been determined eligible. Although there are many sites that have been recommended as eligible, determinations of eligibility were found for these 22 sites (Table 2). All of these are located on the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. Table 3 lists structures, buildings, and districts determined eligible for or listed in the National

There is the standard in the sector	The second considered and the adjust the back string station in	an an an ann an an an an an an an an an	ton grazitert	and the second and the second seco		
			UTMI	V:01991 -		
		Sze				Eligibility
Stellunler	Components	(meler)	વિદ્યાણિ	INCITLING	Gradhyels	នាយខ
10 MILE RADIU	S			200 - SR		
38AK415	EW-LW	135 x 65	435640	3679600	New Ellenton SW	Determined
38AK417	EW-LW	160 x 60	435460	3679800	New Ellenton SW	Determined
38AK660	UP, 19th-20thc.	130 x 90	432180	3681000	New Ellenton SW	Determined
38AK677	MW, 19th-20thc.	135 x 95	430980	3681160	New Ellenton SW	Determined
38BR31	LA-Miss, 19th-20th c.	250 x 400	430610	3672280	Girard NW	Determined
38BR35	UA-Miss	150 x 150	432360	3672050	Girard NW	Determined
38BR55	MA-Miss	125 x 700	441460	3667980	Girard NW	Determined
38BR104	EA-MW	40 x 60	441100	3668240	Girard NW	Determined
38BR112	UP, 19th-20thc.	250 x 50	441600	3667680	Girard NW	Determined
38BR259	EA-LW	80 x 120	440880	3672240	Girard NW	Determined
38BR269	LA; 18th-20thc.	unknown	441490	3664350	Girard	Determined
38BR273	18th-20thc.	30 x 40	440520	3672460	Girard NW	Determined
38BR274	20th	100 x 130	440320	3672240	Girard NW	Determined
38BR277	20th	40 x 50	440320	3672520	Girard NW	Determined
38BR283	UP; 20th	75 x 75	440820	3673140	Girard NW	Determined
38BR286	19th	20 x 400	441400	3667000	Girard NW	Determined
38BR288	19th-20th c.	30 x 150	440720	3669780	Girard NW	Determined
38BR291	MA, EW-LW; 18th-20th c.	30 x 60	440460	3671300	Girard NW	Determined
38BR494	19th-20th c.	200 x 250	440460	3672020	Girard NW	Determined
38BR495	EA-LW	60 x 90	440780	3671900	Girard NW	Determined
38BR527	EA-MW	100 x 150	441460	3673060	Girard NW	Determined
38BR528	MA-LW; Miss	50 x 200	441240	3672930	Girard NW	Determined
VOGTLE TO 40	not a light the state .		7.52	L. Cold	A States and the second	
SCHERER						
9JO229	W-Hist (Native American)	50 X 30	245580	3658040	Dames Ferry	Determined
9WG29	19th-20thc.	<u>  190 X 100 .</u>	354200	3644500	Davisboro	Listed
VOGTLE TOT				mend		
9EF28	18th-19thc.	unknown	482936	3582025	Hardeeville NW	Listed
MACINTOSH TO THALMANN					•	
9CH688	18th-19thc.	140 X 60	471467	3544438	Meldrim SE	Listed

Table 2. Archaeological Sites Listed or Determined Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places Within 10 Miles of Plant Vogtle and Within 1.2 Miles of the Scherer and Thalmann Transmission Lines.

Key: EA=Early Archaic; MA=Middle Archaic: LA=Late Archaic; EW=Early Woodland; MW=Middle Woodland; LW=Late Woodland; Miss=Mississippian; UP=Unknown Prehistoric; UA=Unknown Archaic Table 3. Structures, Buildings, and Districts Listed or Determined Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places Within 10 Miles of Plant Vogtle and Within 1.2 Miles of the Scherer and Thalmann Transmission Lines.

Recource:Namet (Umcanied) ເຂດຍາແດະເຮົາໄດ້ກີ ອິໂດກໃຊ້)	ૡૺઌ૫ૡ૽ૻૹૻ	!locetfon	Bullit Dore	Distence:	জনে <b>ত</b>	ित्तारः मिछल्दाः (प्रतीहारत्वे (प्रतीहारत्वे हित्ति हित्तार्थ)
10 MILE RADIUS		<u></u>				
Sapp Plantation	Burke	NW of Sardis on GA 24	1825	9.5 miles	Listed	1980
Savannah River Site District	Aiken and Barnwell	East bank of Savannah River opposite Vogtle	1950s	0.1 mile	Determined	
VOGILEITO SCHERER		- Jacon Sta		etter in	e de la composition de la comp	
Hurt-Rives Plantation	Hancock	Rives Road	1800	· 1.1	Listed	1996
Bowen House	Jones	W. side Hwy 23 at Hwy 22	1933	1.1	Listed	1974
Jones-Ross House	Jones	Old Church Road	1826	i	Listed	1974
Clinton Methodist Church	Jones	Old Church Road	1821	0.6	Listed	1974
Califf House	Jones	One block N. Courthouse Square	1820	0.6	Listed	1974
Rockville Academy	Putnam	146 Rockville Road	1889	0.1	Listed	2002
Warthen Historic District	Washington	Jct. of GA 15, GA 102, Warthen St., Old Sadersville-Sparta and Walker Dairy Rds.	1750- 1949	0.5 miles	Listed	1997
Francis Plantation	Washington	SE of Davisboro on SR 2189	c. 1850	0.1 miles	Listed	1975
<b>VOGTLE TO MACIN</b>	TOSHA				HOP Y AL	10427
New Ebenezer Townsite	Effingham	Ebenezer Road	c. 1738	0.5 miles	Listed	1974
Jerusalem Lutheran Church	Effingham	Ebenezer Road	c. 1769	0.5 miles	Listed	1974
Jerusalem Church Parsonage	Effingham	Ebenezer Road	c. 1832- 1838	0.5 miles	Listed	1974
Gugel/Waldhour/Fai I House	Effingham	Ebenezer Road	c. 1790- 1799	0.5 miles	Listed	1974
MAGINTOSHITO THAUMANN No resources listed or					al interio	<b></b>
determined eligible				•		

Register of Historic Places. Two resources were identified: the Sapp Plantation, which is listed and the Savannah River Site District, which has been determined eligible. Preliminary boundaries for the Savannah River Site District are the current property boundaries.

The background research also identified sites, structures eligible or listed in the National Register of Historic Places within 1.2 miles of the Thalmann and Scherer transmission lines. The Thalmann transmission line is divided into two segments by a substation for location identification purposes and consistency with original Plant Vogtle licensing by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Vogtle McIntosh and McIntosh-Thalmann. There are three archaeological sites that are currently listed and one that has been determined eligible (Table 2). While there are a number of other sites that have been recommended as eligible, a determination of eligibility was found for only one of these. Within 1.2 miles of the Thalmann and Scherer transmission lines there are 12 buildings or districts listed in the National Register of Historic Places (Table 3).

34 |

## IV. METHODS

## ARCHIVAL/HISTORICAL RESEARCH

The study began with a background archaeological and historical literature review that covered a 10-mile radius area from the powerplant site and 1.2 miles on either side of the current Thalmann and Scherer Transmission Line routes. This consisted of a review of the State of Georgia Archaeological Site Files maintained at the University of Georgia in Athens, and the South Carolina Archaeological Site Files at the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. Site forms were copied for all eligible or listed archaeological sites within a 10-mile radius of the study area as well as portions of all relevant accompanying technical reports. The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) files at the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History were searched to determine if there are any National Register listed properties in the 10-mile radius, including properties recorded on the Department of Energy's Savannah River Site. Finally, the state Historic Structure files for Georgia and South Carolina as well as determination of eligibility files were checked for all listed properties. Archaeological sites that were determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register or are listed in the National Register are included. Architectural sites are those that are listed as well as those that have been determined eligible. Additional background historical research was conducted at the Georgia Department of Archives and History, the Burke County Library, and the University of Georgia Science Library and focused on historic maps and historic aerial photographs to develop a general view of the historic development of the area and to determine the locations of early roads, dwellings etc. The results of this background research were presented in the previous chapter.

## FIELD METHODS

Archaeological field coverage methods varied depending on the area under investigation. For the powerplant site, the project Archaeologist reviewed the historic and current aerial and topographic maps to determine if there are any locations left in this area that might have some integrity. Preliminary review conducted for this proposal suggested not. The Archaeology team then excavated a limited number of shovel test pits to confirm disturbances and characterize soils and conditions. Other areas were examined using single or multiple 30-meter interval transects as needed with shovel tests excavated at 30-meter intervals. All exposed ground surfaces were visually inspected and collected if artifacts were present. Shovel test pits were excavated in areas of less than 75 percent surface visibility and of less than a 15 percent slope, except for wetlands. Each test measured approximately 35 cm in diameter, and was be excavated until culturally sterile subsoil was found where practicable. All tests were screened through one-quarter inch hardware cloth. Tests yielding cultural materials were given a discrete number, and locations were placed on project field maps. Artifacts recovered were bagged by shovel test or portion of the site collected.

If artifacts were found, additional shovel tests were excavated at a 15-meter (50-foot) interval in a cruciform pattern until two negative tests were reached in each direction. Site boundaries would not

be determined beyond the confines of the study tracts, although in some cases definition was feasible without straying too far beyond the study tracts. A site was defined by the presence of artifacts from the same broad cultural period, pre-1955, with the following combinations; three or more artifacts from a 30-meter (100-foot) surface area; two or more artifacts from a shovel test that are not co-joinable; or one artifact from a shovel test and one from the surface within a 20-meter (65-foot) radius. Also to be considered were the presence of surface features, such as wells, chimney falls, or house piers. The location of surface features and structures were considered in the determination of site boundaries. An isolated find was defined by the discovery of two or fewer artifacts found within a 30-meter radius or more than two artifacts that were obviously redeposited.

All data and materials recovered were analyzed with the primary goal of determining their age and cultural affiliation. All data required for the completion of a Georgia State Archaeological Site Form was gathered for each newly recorded or revisited site and new forms or updated forms were submitted to the site files for permanent numbers, which are used in all project reports.

In addition to the archaeological survey methods outlined above, a geoarchaeological investigation of the high bluff line along the Savannah River was required to assess the potential for deeply buried archaeological remains and paleontological potential.

## LABORATORY METHODS AND CURATION

Artifacts were returned to New South Associates' Stone Mountain laboratory for analysis. The artifacts were washed and sorted according to provenience. Historic period artifacts were analyzed using a system based on Stanley South's 1977 artifact patterning typology. Each historic artifact was catalogued using a six-digit code identifying functional group, raw material, artifact type, and subtype. South's functional groups are Activities, Architecture, Arms, Clothing, Furniture, Kitchen, Miscellaneous, Personal and Tobacco. After being assigned a functional group, the artifacts were further divided by raw material such as ceramic, glass, stone, metal, plastic or biological. For example, a fragment of clear bottle glass is coded as KG0301: K - Kitchen; G - Glass; 03 - bottle glass; 01 - clear. These codes were entered into a database designed by New South which allows us to easily manage complicated proveniences as well as to easily generate information such as mean ceramic dates (MCD) and *terminus post quem* (TPQ) dates. Prehistoric lithic and ceramic artifacts were identified by material types, temper, decoration and form and will be compared with regional typologies to determine if typological characterization is feasible. All collected bone was examined by a qualified zooarchaeologist.

Artifacts, notes, photographs, and other records will be prepared for curation at the Antonio Waring Laboratory of the University of West Georgia. Appendix A provides a catalog of artifacts recovered.

# V. RESULTS AND EVALUATIONS

## INTRODUCTION

As a result of the intensive archaeological survey of the expansion areas at Plant Vogtle, 10 archaeological sites and seven isolated finds were identified and assessed for their National Register eligibility (Figures 7 and 8). None of Honerkamp's sites were encountered during this survey. This was determined in coordination with the Georgia State Site Files office. The archaeological sites are summarized in Table 4. Of these sites, two are recommended as potentially eligible and two as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The remaining six are recommended as not eligible. Before these are described, the conditions and level of survey for each area are discussed below.

Table 4. Summary of Sites Identified.

Site #J.	A Time Period	Site Type	Northing	Easting	Size (ft)	NRHP
9BK414	late 19th/early 20th c	Historic home site	3667613	427541	250 x 150	NE
9BK415	early to late 20th c.	Historic home site	3667495	427175	200 x 200	NE
9BK416	EA, EW, MW	Prehistoric camp	3668193	429269	450? X 2200?	E
_9BK417	20th c.	Liquor still	3667941	429285	50 x 50	NE
_9BK418	Unknown Prehistoric	Prehistoric Camp	3667534	428293	250 x 450	NE
9BK419	EW, MW	Prehistoric Camp	3667678	429356	100 x 300	PE
9BK420	Unknown Prehistoric	Prehistoric Camp	3667407	429775	200 x 400	PE
9BK421	Unknown Prehistoric	Lithic Scatter	36677.67	429135	<u>50 x 100</u>	NE
9BK422	20th c., Unknown Prehistoric	Historic and Lithic Scatter	3665220	430509	50 x 75	NE
9BK423	MA, EW, MW, Miss	Prehistoric Camp	3668289	429327	75 x 150	E

Key: Time Period; EA=Early Archaic; EW=Early Woodland; MW=Middle Woodland; Miss=Mississippian.

## SURVEY CONDITIONS AND LEVEL OF EFFORT

Generally speaking, much of the Plant Vogtle survey area has been heavily impacted by previous construction and clearing. For the approximately 288 acre plant site (Area A in Figure 3), which includes the cooling tower area, proposed future ISFSI storage area, new plant footprint, and switchyard expansion a total of 105 shovel tests were excavated at 100 and 200 foot intervals on transects 100 feet apart, depending on soil conditions. These shovel tests were excavated in the unpaved open areas, where pines had been planted. In most conditions, little to no topsoil was encountered and construction gravel was often moderate to dense. This indicated that the area had been previously graded. Most of this area, however, was under pavement or existing buildings. No sites were identified.

In the approximately 63 acre temporary construction warehouse, office, and laydown area (Area B in Figure 3) a total of 24 shovel tests were excavated, primarily in the eastern third of the area where a landform ran north-south. To the west, it sloped down sharply to a very large drainage that had once been paved for water run off. Further to the west of this, was the sharp upslope of the other side of the gully. All of the shovel tests in the far eastern portion of the parcel were excavated

at 100 foot intervals on transects 100 feet apart. Judgmental shovel tests were excavated elsewhere. Shovel tests generally indicated very little to no topsoil, . No sites were encountered.

The construction access road and temporary haul road (Area C in Figure 3) were approximately 38 acres. Surface visibility was good in some areas and no visibility occurred in others. A total of 40 shovel tests were excavated in areas of poor visibility. Soil conditions varied. The area contained topsoil in the western two thirds, while the eastern third was heavily eroded. One site (9BK418) was identified as well as two isolated finds (IF1 and IF2).

The approximately 44.5 acre temporary construction parking area (Area D in Figure 3) contained planted pine and the large drainage that ran through the temporary construction warehouse, office, and laydown area was encountered. Some areas of planted pine, particularly closest to the railroad tracks contained very good surface visibility, which was used for site identification, and it was clear that this area was heavily eroded. A steep drainage with 8 to 17 percent slope occurs in the west central area. A total of 39 shovel tests were excavated at 200 foot intervals on transects 100 feet apart, primarily in the eastern and southern portion of the tract. Shovel tests profiles uniformly indicated that the area was eroded. One site (9BK415) was identified.

The roughly 10.2 acre temporary batch plant location (Area E in Figure 3) consisted of an area of planted pines. In some areas surface visibility was excellent and surface indications were used for site identification. A total of 27 shovel tests were excavated at 100 foot intervals on transects 100 feet apart in areas of poor visibility. One site (9BK414) was identified.

The proposed future expansion for Scherer transmission line (Area F in Figure 3) was shovel tested at 100 foot intervals. Steeply sloping areas were walked over and areas with good surface visibility were examined. The line runs from New River Road east and terminates just west of Mallard Pond. A second area about 500 feet long runs just east of Mallard Pond to the Switchyard Expansion area. The length is approximately 5,500 feet. A total of 34 shovel tests were excavated. No sites were identified.

The proposed future expansion for the Goshen transmission line (Area G in Figure 3) was shovel tested at 100 foot intervals. Steeply sloping areas were walked over and areas with good surface visibility were examined. The line run from the property boundary at the northwestern portion of the Plant to the southeast, ending at the existing transformer yard. The length is approximately 6,500 feet. A total of 45 shovel tests were excavated. No sites were identified.

The originally proposed MacIntosh/Thalmann rerouted transmission line (Area H in Figure 3) was shovel tested at 100 foot intervals. Steeply sloping areas were walked over and areas with good surface visibility were examined. This line runs north from the existing transformer yard north to the old security training facility, then heads southeast past the cooling towers, then turns south and runs just west of the Wilson Combustion Turbine Plant and ends at New River Road. The length is approximately 13,000 feet. A total of 72 100 foot interval shovel tests were excavated. Three sites (9BK421, 9BK422, and 9BK423) were identified as well as three isolated finds (IF3, IF4, and IF5). Since the field survey occurred, it has been decided that this proposed rerouted line will not be built.

A newly proposed MacIntosh/Thalmann rerouted transmission line (Area 1 in Figure 3) (approximately 72 acres) roughly runs along the southern boundary. Where River Road turns north,

the line turned north until it encountered the Scherer transmission line. There it paralleled the line to the south, then turned south where it terminated at the Switchyard Expansion area. It was shovel tested at 100-foot intervals along 100 foot interval transects. Steeply sloping areas were walked over and areas with good surface visibility were examined. The length is approximately 17,000 feet. A total of 206 shovel tests were excavated in two parallel transects. No sites or isolated finds were identified.

The proposed New Barge Facility Option 1 and Construction Area consists (Area J in Figure 3) of about 10 acres. Near the existing barge dock, the landscape has been greatly modified through previous construction activities. Further south, the property consists of a steeply sloping landform as well as floodplain of the Savannah River. Vegetation in the uplands consists of a mix of pine and hardwoods whereas the wetlands contain primarily tupelo and cypress trees. The vast majority of the upland landform contained 17 to 25 percent slope. A narrow area at the apex was less sloping and was surveyed with a single transect containing 10 shovel tests at 100 foot intervals. The floodplain was walked to look for micro landforms. None were found and the soil was clearly saturated. No sites were identified in this area.

The proposed New Barge Facility Option 2 (Area K in Figure 3) is located just north of the existing barge dock and runs from the river, roughly parallel to a paved road and ending at a transmission line. The western one third was walked over and examined for surface remains, as it was heavily disturbed by erosion. Nearer to the river, 100 foot interval shovel testing was performed, identifying two sites (9BK416 and 9BK417). Due to the identification of these two sites and to prevent disturbances, Southern Nuclear has chosen to locate the barge facility at Option 1.

The proposed New Water Intake Structure (Area L in Figure 3) is located primarily on the river floodplain and bluff sideslope. A small portion of the 15.8 acre tract occurs at the edge of the bluff. Vegetation in the uplands consists of a mix of pine and hardwoods whereas the wetlands contain primarily tupelo and cypress trees. The top of the bluff was shovel tested with 14 100-foot interval shovel tests on two 100 foot interval transects, where a portion of 9BK416 was encountered. Site 9BK416 was also found at Barge Facility Option 2 described above. Two microlandforms were surveyed in the side or at the base of the bluff and contained eight shovel tests placed judgmentally, but not exceeding 100 foot intervals. The floodplain contained wetland vegetation and appeared saturated. Therefore, it was walked over to look for surface artifacts, but not shovel tested. However, two backhoe trenches were placed in the floodplain to examine and verify soil conditions. The trenches began filling in with water after about one foot of excavation depth. One site (9BK423) was identified on one of the microlandforms situated about 10 feet above the floodplain.

The proposed New Water Intake Structure access road and waterline (Area M in Figure 3) runs from the intake structure along the base of the bluff for about 700 feet and then heads upslope, terminating at the proposed haul road. This road and waterline is approximately 2,100 feet long. Two parallel transects were excavated at 100 foot intervals. A total of 40 shovel tests were excavated at 100 foot intervals. The north end of site 9BK416 was encountered here as well as isolated finds 6 and 7. Originally, the road and waterline were to run along the existing barge landing road and then turn northwest and parallel the bluff edge. The access road and waterline were moved to the new location when it became clear that the original alignment had the potential of heavily impacting site 9BK416. There were two proposed New Spoils and Overflow Storage areas, both being approximately 36 acres in size. The one located just west of the Wilson Combustion Turbine Plant (Area N in Figure 3) contained planted pines as well as a large borrow pit. Surface visibility was generally good and erosional gullies were found throughout. Exposed areas revealed that the area lacked topsoil. Due to the soil conditions, borrow pit, and surface visibility, 18 shovel tests were excavated at 200-foot intervals on transects 100 feet apart in the 36 acre tract. No sites were identified.

The second area (Area O in Figure 3) is located just south and east of the security entrance building. A portion of the tract is occupied by a pond; previously a borrow pit from initial construction. Otherwise, conditions consist of young pines and briars, with numerous pushpiles perhaps used to help control erosion. A number of large gullies were noted. Surface visibility was good in spotty areas, including a transmission corridor that cuts across the tract near its eastern edge. Due to the soil conditions, the pond, and surface visibility, at total of 42 shovel tests were excavated at 200 foot intervals on transects 100 feet apart in the 36 acre tract. No sites were identified.

The roughly 4 acre Simulator Building Expansion Area (Area P in Figure 3) is located just west of the existing building on the south side of New River Road. Much of the parcel was open, although the western edge contained pine and hardwoods. A helicopter landing pad, no longer in use, was found within the open area. A total of 16 shovel tests were excavated at 100 foot intervals on transects 100 feet apart. One site (9BK422) was identified.

## **IDENTIFIED SITES**

#### 9BK414

Site 9BK414 is a late 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century house site located on a ridge knoll. This may be the W.M. Buxton house, which shows up in this vicinity on a 1909 map of Burke County (see Figure 6). It was initially identified in regular interval shovel testing, when three consecutive tests recovered historic artifacts along Transect 28. A total of 15 50-foot interval shovel tests were excavated in a cruciform pattern, with seven containing artifacts (Figure 9). The site was delineated by two negative shovel tests in each direction. Surface examination of the area identified no above ground architectural features such as foundation piers or a chimney base.

However, the area contained some ornamental vegetation and some hardwood trees, whereas the surrounding vegetation consisted of young pines. Two surface trash piles were noted. They contained roofing tin, bed springs, and a few fragments of bottle glass and ceramics. A few of the temporally sensitive artifacts were collected from the surface. Based on positive shovel tests and surface artifacts, the site measures 250 by 150 feet in size.

Kitchen related artifacts consist of two pieces of refined earthenware with blue exterior and white interior, two plain white graniteware, one red, green, and purple transfer printed ware, two pieces of amethyst glass, one piece of aqua glass, seven pieces of clear bottle glass, three pieces of light green bottle glass, one piece of olive green glass, and two clear glass unidentifiable tableware fragments. In addition, a clear glass machine made bottle was collected from the surface. The base is embossed with the symbol for the W.J. Latchford Glass Company (1925-1938). This bottle,



along with the amethyst glass (1880s to 1917) are the most temporally sensitive of the kitchen artifacts. Other artifacts consisted of three wire nails (which generally post date the 1880s), one glass lamp body fragment, a table knife, one piece of window glass, and two brick fragments. These artifacts suggest a late 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century occupation, which corresponds to the known location of the W.M. Buxton house on a 1909 map.

The average soil profile from positive shovel tests consisted of 1.1 feet of grayish brown sand overlying sterile yellowish brown sand. The soils are classified as excessively drained Troup fine sand, 5 to 8% slope. The central UTM coordinates are N3667613 E427541 (NAD 27).

Disturbance to the site appears to be rather great. It is likely that whatever structures stood here were razed and removed. The surrounding area has been clear cut and replanted in pines. Because the site lacks intact above ground architectural features and no subsurface midden deposits were found, it is unlikely to be able to address any significant research questions about late 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century lifeways in Burke County. Therefore, site 9BK414 is recommended as not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

#### 9BK415

Site 9BK415 is an early to late 20<sup>th</sup> century house site located on the side slope of a ridge. The site shows up on a 1989 photo revised USGS topographic map of the Shell Bluff Landing quadrangle as a house and outbuilding. The house site was located in the field, but no outbuildings were found. The site was initially identified during a surface survey of an area with excellent visibility and was seen as several trash piles of early to late 20<sup>th</sup> century farm equipment and household items. A total of nine shovel tests were excavated in a cruciform pattern from a center point placed near one of the trash piles. Of these, only one yielded artifacts. Based on the positive shovel tests and the extent of surface debris, the site measures approximately 200 by 200 feet in size (Figure 10). Surface visibility was excellent and the area contained scattered young pine trees.

On the ground surface, but not collected, was roofing tin, clothing, light fixtures, concrete, brick, enameled tinware, car parts, and whiteware. A few surface items were collected, which consist of a wood stove part, an automobile part, one piece of white graniteware, one clear machine made bottle embossed with "Collins Corp Vidalia, GA 1926" on the base, and one cobalt blue machine made bottle with "Bellmont Labs Inc. Phila PA" embossed on the base. From the positive shovel test, one piece of clear glass was recovered. The artifacts suggest an early to late 20<sup>th</sup> century occupation.

The soil profile from positive shovel test consisted of 0.4 feet of grayish brown sand overlying sterile yellowish brown sand. The soils are classified as excessively drained Troup fine sand, 5 to 8% slope. The central UTM coordinates are N3667495 E427175 (NAD 27).

Disturbance to the site is great. It is highly eroded and has been clear cut. No architectural features were found and there was only one shovel test that contained any artifacts. Because the site lacks intact above ground architectural features, is eroded, is primarily less than 50 years old, and has been clear-cut, it is unlikely to be able to address any significant research questions. Therefore, site 9BK415 is recommended as not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.



Site 9BK416 is a large multicomponent prehistoric site located along the river bluff north of the barge landing. The site was initially identified during shovel testing at the location of proposed Barge Option 2. The site was not delineated beyond the proposed Barge Option 2, and was also encountered in shovel testing and backhoe trenches at the top of the bluff adjacent to the proposed Intake Structure An access road and waterline were originally run along the bluff edge to the Intake Structure, but the plans for the access road and water line were changed prior to the completion of field work in order to avoid the site. While there was little internal shovel testing done and there are gaps of as much as 500 feet between areas tested, the bluff line does not break and there is no reason to believe that the site does not continue between these points. Also, in several locations between the trenches flakes were noticed in a few areas that were not covered in leaf litter; most notably, in exposed soil at the base of tree trunks. As it is currently defined, it is 2800 feet northwest-by southwest. However, the southwestern boundary is currently undefined. A total of 61 shovel tests were excavated at 50 and 100 foot intervals. Of those, 35 contained artifacts. Artifacts were also collected from five trenches excavated by the project Geomorphologist within the site boundaries (Figure 11).

Classification	CPC	Ft. Payne	Quartzite	Quartz	Total
Primary	7				7
Secondary	22		2		24
Interior	51			1	52
Flake Fragment	116	2		1	119
Bifacial Thinning	137			1	138
Shatter	16				16
Utilized Flake	2				2
Hammerstone/Grinding Stone	1		1		2
Biface	2				2
РРК	2		•		2.
Total	356	<b>2</b>	3	3	364

Table 5. Lithic Debitage and Tools from 9BK416.

Artifacts were entirely prehistoric and dated from the Early Archaic to the Middle Woodland Periods. Prehistoric ceramics consisted of three Early to Middle Woodland Deptford Cordmarked sherds, one indeterminate check stamped sherd, one indeterminate eroded sherd, one indeterminate sherd used as a hone, and two residual sherds. The ceramics were all found in shovel tests adjacent to the spring head located at the south end of the site.

Prehistoric lithic debitage and tools accounted for 364 artifacts (Table 5). The vast majority of debitage was Coastal Plain chert, with very small quantities of quartzite, and quartz. Two pieces of debitage appeared to be Fort Payne chert, which is considered an exotic material found in eastern Tennessee and northwest Georgia. The quartz and quartzite could have been obtained just above the fall line into the Georgia Piedmont. Two Coastal Plain chert projectile points were found at the site. Both were classified as Early Archaic Kirk Corner Notched. One was surface collected near

r . /



Trench 3 and the other was found in a shovel test at the south end of the site adjacent to the spring head. Artifacts from 9BK416 and 9BK423 are illustrated in Figure 12.

In general, the soil profile from positive shovel tests consisted of 0.6 feet of dark grayish brown sandy loam, overlying 1.1 feet of a yellowish orange sand, overlying pale yellow subsoil. Artifacts were found in the top two strata to a depth of 1.7 feet below surface. In some areas, artifacts were found as deep as 1.9 feet.

Six trenches were excavated on or near the edge of the bluff within the site to determine if there were more deeply buried deposits that could not be accessed through shovel testing. Details about the stratigraphy are provided in the geomorphology report in the following chapter. In Trench 1, artifacts seemed to be primarily confined to two zones: between the ground surface and 1.3 feet, and between 3 and 3.9 feet. The lower band of artifacts consisted of undiagnostic lithic debitage. In Trenches 2 through 6 artifacts were found to a maximum depth of 2 feet, but no real separation was noted. The soil stratigraphy was similar to that of Trench 1, although compressed.

Soils at the site consist of a combination of Troup fine sand (5 to 8 percent slope) and Lakeland loamy sand (0 to 5 percent slope). The central UTM coordinates are N3668315 E429116 (NAD 27).

Site 9BK416 consists of a multicomponent prehistoric site containing evidence of stratigraphically separable cultural levels. In addition, there was horizontal separation of time periods, as illustrated by the cluster of Woodland Period pottery around the springhead. Since artifacts were found below old plowzone and upper level disturbances, and since separable levels were noted, the site exhibits very good integrity. Although its boundaries are currently undefined and little shovel testing has occurred within the site's interior, it exhibits the ability to address research questions pertaining to the prehistoric occupation of the middle Savannah River Valley. Very little work has occurred on these large bluff edge sites. Perhaps the nearest, most comparable site (environmentally speaking) is the G.S. Lewis-East site located on a low bluff at the confluence of the Savannah River and Upper Three Runs Creek on the Savannah River Site in Aiken County, South Carolina (Sassaman et al. 2002). Although few organic artifacts were recovered, the G.S. Lewis-East site produced a dense array of artifacts dating primarily from the Early Archaic and Late Archaic Periods providing excellent information on site structure during the two time periods. Site 9BK416 is known to date from the Early Archaic and Middle Woodland Periods, although other components may be there that went unrecognized. This site is very likely to provide the same kinds of data, therefore testing out conclusions made from work at G.S. Lewis-East as well as adding new information about Woodland Period settlements along the Savannah River. In addition, the undiagnostic lithic layer that was found sealed in Trench 1 has the potential to provide very early data, perhaps even dating to the Paleoindian Period.

Because the site can contribute significant information regarding the prehistoric occupation of the Middle Savannah River Valley, it is recommended as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. If the site cannot be preserved in place, data recovery is needed to mitigate any damage. Since so little is understood about the structure of various portions of this very large site, a phased data recovery is recommended. This phased data recovery should first determine the kinds of research questions the portions of the site that will be impacted might be able to address in order to formulate an appropriate data recovery plan. However, conversations with Southern Company



indicated that all efforts will be made to avoid the site, which may include moving a small portion of the access road and intake line further away from the northern end of the site. The area surrounding the proposed intake structure will be restricted so as to avoid impacting the top of the bluff.

## 9BK417

Site 9BK417 is a mid 20<sup>th</sup> century liquor still located in a springhead just north of the road leading to the barge landing. The site was initially identified on the surface near Transect 33 Shovel Test 8. Located were seven punctured 55 gallon metal barrels within a 50 by 50 foot area (Figure 13). The puncturing was likely done by law enforcement to render the barrels unusable. Only one bottle was found on the ground surface. It was a clear crown cap type soda bottle and was not collected. No other artifacts were found on the ground surface. No shovel testing was attempted since liquor stills tend to only consist of visible surface remains restricted to the narrow spring channel. Soils surrounding the still consist of Troup fine sands at 17 to 25% slope. The central UTM coordinates are N3667941 E429285 (NAD 27).

The site consists of a defunct liquor still and it is highly unlikely that additional documentation would yield significant information about the industry. This still has been rendered unusable and there are only barrels and a single bottle left at the site. Therefore, 9BK417 is recommended as not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

#### 9BK418

Site 9BK418 is an undiagnostic lithic scatter located on the north side of a ridge overlooking the headwaters of the creek that runs past Hancock Landing and into the Savannah River. The site was initially identified in a dirt road and adjacent landfill trench. Shovel testing was performed parallel to the road and the site was found at Transect 35 Shovel Test 19. A total of 17 shovel tests were excavated in the site area, with five yielding artifacts. The site was delineated on all sides by two negative shovel tests or a lack of surface artifacts. Based on surface finds and positive shovel tests, the site measures 250 by 450 feet in size. About one half to two thirds of the site exists in a landfill trench and there are several push piles in the northern half of the site (Figure 14).

Artifacts from the four positive shovel tests (n=13) and the surface (n=68) consist of 81 pieces of lithic debitage. They consist of one agatized chert primary flake, two Coastal Plain chert primary flakes, four Coastal Plain chert secondary flakes, 18 Coastal Plain chert interior flakes, 20 Coastal Plain chert bifacial thinning flakes, 34 Coastal Plain chert flake fragments, one quartz bifacial thinning flake, and one quartzite flake fragment.

The average soil profile from positive shovel tests consisted of 0.5 feet of dark grayish brown sand. From 0.5 to 1.1 feet the soil consisted of a transition zone containing dark grayish brown sand and tan sand. From 1.1 feet to 2.0 feet the soils consisted of tan sand and under this layer to 3.0 feet was a sterile grayish pale brown sand. The soils are classified as Troup fine sand, 5 to 8% slope. The central UTM coordinates are N3667534 E428293 (NAD 27).



Figure 13 9BK417 Site Map and Northwest View of Site

48

للمغيب



Figure 14 9BK418 Site Map and Northwest View of Site

50

Northwest View from Landfill Trench

\_\_\_\_\_

Although shovel testing indicated that artifacts are deeply deposited north of the dirt road, the excavation of a landfill trench has impacted the site, by removing about two thirds of the site's contents. Additional damage has occurred in the northern half of the site where several push piles were noted. Because past practices have compromised the integrity of the site, it is unlikely that it can offer significant information about prehistoric life in the Savannah River region. This is due to the fact that excavations in the intact portion of the site are highly unlikely to produce meaningful information since it would be examined out of context with the portion of the site impacted by earth removal. Therefore, 9BK418 is recommended as not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

## 9BK419

Site 9BK419 is an Early to Middle Woodland prehistoric site located on a narrow ridge nose overlooking springs that feed directly into the Savannah River. While most of the artifacts consisted of lithic debitage, a small quantity of pottery was also found. The site was initially identified during regular shovel testing at Transect 37, Shovel Test 9. In order to define the site within the expansion area 12 50-foot interval shovel tests were excavated. Of those, eight yielded artifacts. The site is bisected by a transmission line where surface artifacts were collected. A transmission line tower stands on the crest of the landform. The site is defined to the north, east, and west by sharp landform drops. The site has not been delineated to the south where it extended well beyond the proposed expansion. As it is currently defined, the site measures 100 by 300 feet in size (Figure 15).

Recovered from the eight positive shovel tests (n=44) and the surface (n=42) were 86 Coastal Plain chert lithic artifacts consisting of five primary flakes, 14 secondary flakes, eight interior flakes, 24 bifacial thinning flakes, 31 flake fragments, three pieces of shatter, and one projectile point fragment. Outside of the site, but apparently washed downslope into an adjacent drainage were three pieces of pottery. One contained an eroded stamped design and two were cordmarked. The temper was a fine to medium sand and they appear to be Early to Middle Woodland Deptford.

The average soil profile consisted of 0.6 feet of dark grayish brown sand. Between 0.6 and 2.2 feet, the soils consisted of yellowish sand. Beneath this layer was a light grayish tan sand, which was sterile. The soils are classified as Troup fine sands, 5 to 8% slope. The central UTM coordinates are N3667678 E429356 (NAD 27).

The only damage to the site has been the tower for the transmission line and some surficial damage through logging and clearing. Some minor erosion appears to have occurred along the site fringes. Artifacts were found to extend to 2.2 feet below ground surface. It is possible that the portion of the site below the surficial damage is intact and may have separable stratigraphy. Site 9BK49 is recommended as potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Since the survey, it has been determined that the new transmission line proposed for this area will not be built. Therefore, the site will not be impacted.



## 9BK420

Site 9BK420 is an undiagnostic lithic site located on a ridge overlooking the Savannah River floodplain. The site was initially identified on exposed ground surface with a transmission line corridor. A total of 28 50 and 100-foot interval shovel tests were excavated in a modified grid pattern. Of those 28 shovel tests, 12 yielded artifacts. The site is defined to the north, west, and south by two negative shovel tests. On the east, shovel testing was terminated at the edge of a very sharp drop off. Based on surface artifacts and positive shovel tests the site measures 200 by 400 feet in size (Figure 16).

Artifacts consist of 47 pieces of Coastal Plain chert lithic debitage from the surface (n-4) and from the 12 positive shovel tests (n=43). They consisted of one primary flake, three secondary flakes, five interior flakes, 21 bifacial thinning flakes, 14 flake fragments, one rejuvenation flake, one piece of shatter, and one utilized flake.

The average soil profile from positive shovel tests consist of 0.5 feet of dark grayish brown sand. Between 0.5 feet to 2.2 feet was a yellowish sand, overlying sterile grayish tan sand. The soils are classified as Troup fine sands, 5 to 8% slope. The central UTM coordinates are N3667407 E429775 (NAD 27).

The only damage to the site has been some surficial damage through logging and clearing. Artifacts were found to extend to 2.2 feet and it is possible that the portion of the site below the surficial damage is intact and may have separable stratigraphy. The site is recommended as potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Since the survey, it has been determined that the new transmission line proposed for this area will not be built. Therefore, the site will not be impacted.

## 9BK421

Site 9BK421 is a small undiagnostic lithic scatter located on a small bench of a ridge side slope overlooking a spring that feeds directly into the Savannah River. The site was initially identified on the ground surface immediately adjacent to a transmission line tower. Although these remains were found a bit south of our study corridor, a decision was made to test the site. A total of 10 shovel tests were excavated at the site, with three yielding artifacts. The site was delineated by two negative shovel tests to the south and east and by a landform drop off to the north and west. Based on surface artifacts and positive shovel tests, the site measures 100 by 50 feet (Figure 17).

Artifacts consisted of 12 pieces of Coastal Plain chert lithic debitage from the three positive shovel tests. They consisted of six flake fragments, five bifacial thinning flakes, and one piece of shatter. Although a small amount of lithic debitage was noted on the surface near N500E500, none was collected. The average soil profile from positive shovel tests consist of 0.6 feet of dark grayish brown sand with lithic debitage. A strong brown sterile sand was found thereafter. The soils are classified as Troup fine sands, 5 to 8% slope. The central UTM coordinates are N3667767 E429135 (NAD 27).

Site 9BK421 is small and has been severely damaged by the construction of the transmission line and tower, as well as by erosion. It is very doubtful that the site can address any significant research questions and is recommended as not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.


Figure 17 9BK421 Site Map



Site 9BK422 consists of a small scatter of historic and prehistoric artifacts on a small landform overlooking Beaverdam Creek and one of its tributaries. The site was initially identified in a shovel test at Transect 53, Shovel Test 4. Inspection of the surrounding area located additional artifacts. A total of 9 shovel tests were excavated at 50 foot intervals in a cruciform pattern. Only the initial shovel test contained artifacts, which were collected from the surface prior to excavation. Base on the positive shovel test and surface artifacts, the site measures approximately 50 by 75 feet in size (Figure 18).

Artifacts consisted of two pieces of wall plaster (originally thought to be whiteware in the field), one Coastal Plain chert bifacial thinning flake, and two Coastal Plain chert flake fragments.

The soil profile for the positive shovel test consisted of 0.5 feet of dark grayish sand overlying sterile yellow sand. The soils are classified as excessively drained Troup fine sand, 5 to 8% slope. The central UTM coordinates are N3665220 E430509.

The site is small, is shallow, and has been damaged by logging and clear cutting. In addition, few artifacts were recovered from the site. Therefore, 9BK422 is recommended as not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

#### 9BK423

Site 9BK423 is a multicomponent prehistoric campsite located on a small bench about 10 feet above the active Savannah River floodplain. The site was initially suspected due to the known desirability of such a landform to prehistoric inhabitants. In addition, an initial walkover of the site found a number of depressions that appeared to be pothunter's holes and examination of the shoreline recovered several prehistoric artifacts that had eroded out. The bench measures approximately 150 by 75 feet in size. On the north end of the site is an outcrop of Utley limestone, which is likely the reason this landform exists. While typically, river waters would scour this area, the limestone outcrop caused a build up of alluvial deposits in this location, eventually forming this bench. Five judgmental shovel tests were excavated at the site, all of which yielded artifacts. In addition, two backhoe trenches were excavated at the edge of this landform, revealing several cultural layers. Details regarding the geomorphological interpretation are provided in the following chapter. The site appears to occupy the entire bench measuring approximately 150 by 75 feet in size (Figure 19).

A total of 170 lithic and prehistoric ceramic artifacts were recovered from the site. They are listed below in Tables 6 and 7. Of these, 40 artifacts were recovered from the ground surface. The remaining were collected from shovel tests and the two backhoe trenches In addition to the lithic and ceramic artifacts listed below, one of the shovel tests yielded one deer phalange and six pieces of unidentified bone within a thin lens of mussel shell (not collected).

Most of the lithic debitage and tools consisted of Coastal Plain chert. Small quantities of chalcedony, Ft. Payne chert, Jasper, and quartz were recovered. Of these, Ft. Payne chert is truly exotic, as it's closest occurrence is east Tennessee and northwest Georgia. The quartz projectile





Table 6. Lithic Debitage and Tools from 9BK423.

Stage of Reduction	Chalcedony	CEPC-	<b>FisRayne</b>	Jäsper	Quartz	Total
Primary		6				6
Secondary .		1 ·	• •			1 ·
Interior		. 16	1	1	•	18
Flake Fragment	1	36	1			38
Bifacial Thinning		35				35
Shatter	1	4	•		1	· 6
Utilized Flake		2				2
Core		1				1
Preform		2				2
PPK .					1	<u>1</u> .
Total	2	103	2	State State	233	110

Table 7. Pottery from 9BK423.

Surface Treatment	Deptford	Savannahi	Mississippian	<b>Atladeterminate</b>
Plain		14		3
Burnished		2		
Incised	1			
Complicated or Check Stamped			1	
Check Stamped	2	8	•	
Cord Marked	2	1		2
Indeterminate Decorated			· ·	3
Total	5	25		8

point appeared to be a small Guilford lanceolate that is heavily water worn. The point was collected from the riverbank where it had eroded down from the bench area.

The pottery consisted primarily of what appeared to be Early Mississippian Savannah phase sherds. Although some contained medium sand temper, the interiors were well smoothed. A small amount of Early to Middle Woodland Deptford phase pottery was also found. These wares tended to be grittier, with a more sandpaper-like texture. One Mississippian sherd that was either check stamped or rectilinear complicated stamped was also recovered. The analysts could not assign a specific type. In addition, there were eight sherds of an indeterminate type and 21 small residual sherds were also recovered.

Shovel testing indicated that the site, in some places, extended beyond the reach of the shovel (over 3 feet). In at least one shovel test, a lens of mussel shells was found as well as well preserved animal bone. Backhoe Trench 1 provided the best view of stratigraphy at the site. A recent dark grayish brown historic alluvium was approximately 2.0 feet deep. A buried brown silty sand A horizon was found beneath this to a depth of a little over 4.0 feet. This A horizon contained ceramics and lithic debitage. Beneath this was a sterile strong brown silty clayey sand B horizon to a depth of about 5.5 feet. A second brown silty sand A horizon was found containing ceramics and lithics to

about 6.5 feet. A sterile brownish yellow sandy lamella layer was found beneath this. The backhoe took the trench further down to about 8 feet. In the last two buckets of spoil a number of pieces of lithic debitage were found. No ceramics were identified in the spoil, suggesting it likely dates to the Archaic Period. The present of a Middle Archaic small Guilford-like point indicates an early occupation in this area.

The soils are likely part of the Tawcaw and Shell Bluff association, which is found in the floodplain of the Savannah River. Soil profile is described above in the discussion of Trench 1. The central UTM coordinates are N3668289 E429327 (NAD 27).

Site 9BK423 is recommended as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The backhoe trenching illustrated that the site has separable stratigraphy. Shovel testing revealed the presence of shell lenses with good bone preservation. Although some pot holes have been excavated at the site by looters, they are relatively shallow and do not appear to have caused enough damage to negate the site's research potential.

Discussions with Southern Company indicate that the site will be avoided. As per New South's recommendations, they plan to fence in the site. A buffer of 20 feet beyond the edges of the bench is recommended. However, along the riverfront there is no room for a buffer. In that area, it is simply recommended that the fence be constructed off of the bench as to not directly impact the site. The fence should be erected prior to construction of the intake structure. It will not only serve to protect the site during construction, but will also prevent future efforts to loot the site.

# ISOLATED FINDS

Seven isolated occurrences of artifacts (referred to as IFs) were found during the survey and they are presented in Table 8. Their locations are illustrated in Figures 7 and 8.

IF#. Location	Count	Description	Northing	Easting
1 Temp Haul Road	1	Plain White Granite	3667304	426815
2 Temp Haul Road	1	CPC flake fragment	3667296	427775
3 New T-line	1	CPC flake	3667072	429929
4 New T-line	3	CPC flakes	3667224	429863
5 New T-line	2	CPC flakes	3667270	429853
6 Access Road/Water Line	1	Prehistoric Sherd	3668329	428602
7 Access Road/Water Line	1	CPC flake	3668431	428608

#### Table 8. List of Isolated Finds and their Locations

IF 1 consisted of an isolated piece of late 19<sup>th</sup> to mid 20<sup>th</sup> century plain white graniteware pottery. IF 2 through 5 consisted of isolated surface occurrences of Coastal Plain chert debitage. IF 6 consisted of one prehistoric sherd (broken into two pieces) recovered from a transect along the access road and water line for the intake structure (T1ST13). IF 7 consisted of one small piece of chert debitage, also recovered from a transect along the access road and water line for the intake structure (T2ST6). Further shovel testing and surface survey in conjunction with these finds yielded no additional artifacts.

# VI. GEOMORPHOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION

# **PURPOSE**

A geomorphology investigation was conducted to assess the potential for deeply buried cultural deposits, interpret site stratigraphy and study site formation processes on Savannah River terraces and the river bluff (Figure 20). This investigation provides a description of site stratigraphy, sedimentology and pedogenesis and an interpretation of the Late Pleistocene and Holocene geomorphology along this portion of the Savannah River. A paleontological assessment of geologic formations was conducted at the proposed river intake structure and access road. The goal of this task is to assess the potential for encountering paleontological resources similar to the Middle Eocene whale (*Georgiacetus vogtlensis*) previously discovered at the facility.

# METHODS

Geomorphology of the area is described from topographic maps, aerial photographs and field observations. Backhoe trenches were excavated to investigate the potential for deeply buried cultural horizons along the river bluff, T1 terrace and floodplain of the Savannah River. Ten soil profiles were described from the backhoe trenches (Figure 21a&b). These descriptions used standard soil taxonomy (Birkeland 1999; and Schoeneberger et al. 1998) and geological descriptive methods.

Particle size analyses were completed for 35 sediment samples collected from select pedogenic horizons recorded in the soil profiles. This included drying, splitting, and weighing each sample using a digital torsion balance. Samples were then placed in a sodium metaphosphate solution and dispersed using a sonic dismembrator. Each sample was wet sieved through a 63-micron sieve and the sand fraction retained on the sieve was then dried and weighed. Weight of the sand fraction is divided by total dry weight of each sample to determine percent sand. Sand was dry sieved and each one-half phi size fraction was weighed and recorded. The phi grade scale ( $\phi =$ log<sub>2</sub>d, where d is grain diameter in mm) is used for grain size measurements. A larger phi size represents smaller grain sizes as 4 phi is the boundary between sand and silt and -1 phi is the boundary between sand and gravel. This scale facilitates the application of conventional statistical practices to the sedimentology data (Folk, 1980). This analysis determined percent sand and fines (silt and clay) as well as the distribution of the sand fraction (Table 9). Sedimentology logs were prepared showing changes in particle size distribution with depth for each profile.

Particle size distribution is used to determine sedimentary processes active in these geomorphic settings during the Late Pleistocene and Holocene. This can provide an understanding of how archaeological sites were buried and the effect of burial on site integrity. Distinct stratigraphic horizons can be difficult to recognize in the field because of subtle changes in sedimentology between strata and the development of pedogenic horizons that can obscure stratigraphic contacts.

Figure 20 U.S.G.S. 7.5 Minute Quadrangle of Savannah River Valley along Project Area. Map shows wide flat terraces north of the river and steep bluff to the south.



Figure 21

ield Logs of Profile Descriptions for Trenches Excavated During the Geomorphology Investigation. A. Trenches excavated on river bluff B. Trenches excavated into T1 terrace of the Savannah River



		Wel S	eve	, Dry	bieving:-V	Veight pe	rcent of s	and fraction	oniremain	ing on ea	ch sieve /	sieve size	shown in	phi
Sample ID		With Cardina	SH-9/ 10 04	10000	··^·C	17.044 A 446	1000 SC-71	Less Ary	and the state of the second	Sugar Contra	ALL AND A POINT		2000 CON CONTRA	A CONTRACTOR
		Ser Sunda	Fines	tohi.	⇔o.o.	phi	phi	phi /	phi	phi i	phi -	P phi	phi (	phi
T-1 9BK416	60	0.89	0.11	·0.00	0.11	0.68	2.54	10.10	18.82	18.69	19.40	16.78	10.04	2.84
T-1 9BK416	· 80	0.90	0.10	0.08	0.22	1.03	3.38	11.38	19.25	18.16	18.49.	16.17	9.05	2.78
T-1 9BK416	100	0.90	0.10	0.07	0.28	0.95	3.30	11.40	19.47	17.78	18.59	15.56	9.92	2.68
T-1 9BK416	120	0.90	0.10	0.03	0.30	1.18	3.63	11.43	19.51	17.86	18.34	15.89	9.26	2.56
T-1 98K416	140	0.91	0.09	0.07	0.33	1.22	3.47	11.37	-19.65	17.55	18.55	15.82	9.25	2.73
T-1 98K416	160	0.93	0.07	0,09	0.25	1.58	4.15	11.80	19.01	17.27	18.56	15.74	8.99	2.55
T-1 9BK416	180	0.93	0.07	0.08	0.32	1.24	3.69	11.37	18.89	17.32	19.05	15.88	9.62	2.53
T-1 98K416	200	0.84	0.16	0.00	0.27	1.29	4.12	11.65	18.97	16.72	19.30	15.72	9.34	2.61
T-3 98K416	40	0.90	0.10	0.05	0.29	1.47	2.87	8.90	13.26	23.86	26.31	12.14	8.15	2,71
T-3 9BK416	60	0.92	0.07	0.29	0.42	1.06	2.59	10.51	12.19	23.55	26.26	12.42	8.12	2.59
T-3 9BK416	80	0.89	0.11	0.09	0.41	1.29	_3.08	8.27	12.08	23.68	26.92	13,13	8.42	2.65
T-3 9BK416	100	0.90	0.10	0.09	0.46	1.49	2.96	8.15	11.89	24.39	26.61	13.11	8.08	2.77
T-3 98K416	120	0.90	0.10	0.00	0.63	1.35	2.80	7.52	11.18	24.04	27.48	13.66	8.68	2.66
T-3 98K416	140	0.93	0.06	0.10	0.57	1.57	2.96	7.46	10.86	24.39	27.08	13.64	8,68	2.70
T-4 9BK416	20	0.88	0.12	0.17	0.40	1.13	3.23	10.79	15.07	18.11	20.90	. 14.32	11.99	3.89
T-4 9BK416	40	0.87	0.13	0.16	0.39	1.37	3.87	11.00.	15.46	18.36	20.23	13.69	11.58	3.89
T-4 9BK416	60	0.88	0.12	0.19	0.38	1.22	3.74	10.67	14.58	18.12	20.38	14.43	12.44	3.84
T-4 9BK416	80	0.72	0.27	1.04	0.57	1.44	4.19	10.65	13.94	17.65	20.78	15.01	11.28	3.44
T-4 9BK416	100	0.82	0.14	5.38	0.54	1.41	3.60	9.83	13.02	16.73	19.70	14.30	11.83	3.66
T-5 9BK416	40	0.89	0,11	0.07	0.18	0.92	3.34	11.93	15.72	18.60	21.19	14.69	10.34	3.01
T-5 98K416	80	0.88	0.12	0.04	0.36	1.00	3.96	12.44	15:48	18.38	21.14	14.38	9.78	3.04
T-5 98K416	120	0.69	0.31	0.00	0.41	1.55	4.43	11.74	14.15	16.89	20.96	15.43	11.09	3.34
T-5 S 98K416	40	0.88	0.12	0.22	0.19	0.83	3.34	11.88	15.88	18.16	21.36	14.88	9.94	3.33
T-5 S 98K416	80	0.91	0.09	0.13	0.24	1.23	4.08	12.34	15.60	20.56	19.90	13.42	9.44	3.05
T-5 S 98K416	120	0.88	0.12	0.00	0.35	1.61	3.90	11.16	14.06	17.40	21.15	15.49	11.05	3.81 <sup>-</sup>
T-5 S 98K416	160	0.92	0.08	0.04	0.39	1.62	4.02	11.92	14.77	17.59	20.65	14.91	10.70	3.37
1.7	30	0.89	0.11 .	0.04	0.17	1.58	4.58	14.04	19.13	17.81	20.43	12.39	7,65	2.18
1.7	70	0.88	0.12	0.07	0.15	1.77	4.87	14.01	17.22	17.85	21.07	13.12	7.66	2.22
1.7	110	0.89	0,11	0.00	0.30	2.57	5.93	14.96	16.26	16.75	.20.89	13.03	7,33	1.97
T-1 9BK423	30	0.86	0.13	1.15	2.42	4.64	7.81	15.62	15.82	15.75	19.34	12.34	3.68	1.43
T-1 98K423	80	0.92	0.08	0.52	2.09	5.42	9.77	17.33	16.43	15.28	17.71	10.95	3.24	1.26
T-1 9BK423	110	0.90	0.10	0.27 ·	2.11	5.65	9.91	17.36	16.30	15.43	17.90	10.75	3.10	1.22
T-1 9BK423	150	0.89	0.11	0.62	1.04	3.85	8.11	15,43	17.47	17.16	19.28	11.11	4.31	1.62
T-1 9BK423	180	0.91	0.09	0.19	1.38	3.88	8.22	15.95	18.45	17.41	18.26	10.24	4.37	1.65
T-1 98K423	215	0.89	0.11	0.33	1.11	3.46	8.23	14.95	17.76	17.99	19,10	10.71	4.68	1.67

Table 9 Results of Particle Size Analyses

Changes in particle size distribution with depth can be used to delineate stratigraphic boundaries not recognized in the field. Cumulative frequency curves were plotted for the particle size distribution data. The phi size of the 5<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup> 84<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentile on the cumulative frequency curves were recorded and used to calculate statistical measures of mean grain size, inclusive graphical standard deviation and skewness (Table 10) (Folk 1980). Bivariate plots of mean grain size with standard deviation and skewness are used to identify populations of samples deposited by fluvial, marine and aeolian processes.

# GEOLOGIC SETTING AND SITE GEOMORPHOLOGY

The proposed development at Plant Vogtle is located on the Upper Coastal Plain of the Savannah River Valley. The boundary between the Coastal Plain and the Piedmont physiographic provinces occurs along the Fall Line that is located about 40 kilometers northwest of Plant Vogtle (Georgia Geologic Survey 1976). Summerour et al. (1994) prepared a recent Geologic map of eastern Burke County that shows the surficial Coastal Plain formations at Plant Vogtle (Figure 22). Huddlestun and Hetrick (1986) describe geologic sections from Mallard Pond and the excavation for the foundations of the existing Plant Vogtle facilities (Figure 24). These descriptions and our fieldwork were used to draft a simplified geologic column for the Coastal Plain formations at Plant Vogtle (Figure 23). The Coastal Plain formations are marine sand, mud and limestone deposited in an ancient sea during the Eocene Series, a time period ranging from 38 to 54 million years ago. They include the Tobacco Road, Dry Branch, Clinchfield and Lisbon Formations (Figures 22 and 23). The uplands are capped by the Tobacco Road sand, a formation described as a pebbly, poorly sorted medium to coarse sand (Summerour et al. 1994; Huddleston and Summerour 1996). Although rare, this formation can include areas of fine to medium-grained, well-sorted sand. Below this is the Dry Branch formation with members (sedimentary units) that include the Irwinton sand, Griffins Landing and Twigs Clay (Figure 23). Sand beds of the Tobacco Road and Dry Branch Formations were observed in ravines along the bluff edge and the tributary stream that drains from Mallard Pond.

The Utley Limestone is a discontinuous member of the Clinchfield Formation that is the stratum below the Dry Branch Formation. The type locality of the Utley Limestone is Utley's Cave at the upper end of Mallard Pond on the Plant Vogtle property (Huddlestun and Hetrick 1986). The only known outcrops of this limestone occur at Utley's cave and Utley's point (Figure 24). This limestone was deposited only in topographic depressions and is known to form dissolution caverns such as Utley's cave. Lithology of this limestone it is described as a sandy, muddy, fossiliferous limestone. At Utley's Point on the Savannah River it is a fossiliferous limestone. This limestone is a discontinuous sedimentary deposit, but it probably forms the core of the uplands that extends from Hancock Landing to the present Plant Vogtle facility.

The Blue Buff member of the Lisbon Formation is the lowest stratum exposed at Plant Vogtle (Figure 23) (Huddleston and Summerour 1996). The type section is along Blue Bluff, just south of the existing river intake structure (Figure 25). Lithology of the Blue Bluff Marl is described as a clay and calcite that varies from "very calcareous clay (marl) to very argillaceous limestone (marl)" with minor fine-grained quartz sand (Huddleston and Summerour 1996). The skeleton of *Georgiacetus vogtlensis* (hereafter referred to as the "Vogtle Whale") was recovered from this Blue Bluff Marl. The fossil was discovered in an excavation adjacent to the existing river intake structure (Figure 25).

	Cumulative Frequency Curve Data % of sample coarser than particle diameter (in phi)									
Somple ID	(cm)	5% *	*¥6%;	: 50%	*84%	<b>95%</b>	Median Grain Size	Meon GrainSize	Inclusive Graphic Standard	Graphic
T-1 416	60	0.63		2	20	3 33	2.00	2.00	0 100	-0.01
T1 416	80	0.52			2.83	3.33	2.00	1.00	0.379	-0.07
T-1 416	100	0.53		1.91	2.87	3.3	191	193	0.433	0.02
T-1, 416	120	0.49	0.98	1.9	2.84	3.31	1.90	1.91	0.433	0.01
T-1, 416	140	0.49	0.99	1.9	2.88	3.3	1.90	1.92	0.444	0.02
T-1, 416	160	0.40	0.94	1.9	2.83	3.31	1.90	1.89	0.433	-0.02
T-1, 416	180	0.5	0,96	1.9	2.86	3.32	1,90	1.91.	0.433	0.01
T-1, 416	, 200	0.47	0.97	1.92	2.83	3,31	1.92	1.91	0.420	-0.02
T-3, 416	40	0.52	1.1	· 2	2.78	3.3	2.00	1.96	0.385	-0.07
T-3, 416	60	0.53	1.05	2	2.8	3.32	2.00	1.95	0.380	-0.07
T-3, 416	80	0.53 ·	1.13	2.02	2.82	3.3	2.02	1.99	0.393	-0.06
T-3, 416	100	0.50	1.14	2.03	2.78	3.32	2.03	1.98	0.385 .	-0.09
T-3, 416	120	0.51	1.2	2.06	2.8	3.32	2.06	2.02	0.388	-0.09
T-3, 416	140	0.46	1.17	2.04	2.78	3.3	2.04	2.00	0.390	-0.10
T-4, 416	20	0.50	1.02	2.03	3	3.44	2.03	2.02	0.435	-0.03
T-4, 416	40	0.43	0.96	2	2.97	3.4	2.00	1.98	0.433	-0.05
T-4, 416	60	0.47		2.04	3.01	3.42	2.04	2.02	0.430	-0.05
T-4, 416	80	0.26	0.95	2	2.97	3.39	2.00	1.97	0.454	-0,08
T-4, 416	100	0.00	0.8	1.98	2.97	3.4	1.98	1.92	0:471	-0.13
T-5N,416	40	0.55	0.99	1.98	2.69	3.36	1.98	-1.89	0.343	-0.09
T-5N,416	80	0.50	0.93	1.99	2.88	3.35	1.99	1.93	0.388	-0.07
T-5N,416	120	0,39	0.93	2.03	2.93	3.39	2.03	1.96	0.405	-0.10
T-55,416	40	0.51	1_1_	2	2.91	3.37	2.00	1,97	0.410	-0.04
T-55,416	-80	0.43	0.92	1.9	2.83	3.36	1.90	1.88	0.431	-0,01
T-55,416	120	0.40	0.97	2.03	2.95	3.42	2.03	1.98	0.422	-0.08
T-55,416	160	0.40	0.92	1.99	2.91	3.31	1.99	1.94	0.403	-0.08
1.7	30	0.40	0.88	1.81	2.71	3.26	1.81	1.80	0.425	0.00
T-7	70-	0.37	0.87	1.84	2.73	3.24	1.84	1.81	0.413	-0.03
1.7	110	0.23	0.77	1.8	2.71	3.22	1.80	1.76	0.422	-0,06
<u>T-1, 423</u>		-0.3	0.5	1.58	2.57	3.02	1.58	1.55	0.481	-0.09
T-1, 423	80	-0.33	0.42	1.48	2.47	2.95	1.48	1.46	0.480	-0.07
1-1, 423	110	-0.33	0.4	1.46	2.49	2.96	1.46	1.45	0.491	-0.05
1-1, 423	150	-0.08	0.57	1.5	2.57	3.08	1.50	1.55	0.514	0.03
1-1, 423	180	-0.05	0.61	1.54	2.49	3.1	1.54	1.55	0.483	0.00

•

Table 10 Statistical Measures Calculated from Culmulative Frequency Curves

Figure 22 Geologic Map of the Coastal Plain Formations in the Vicinity of the Project Area (after Summerour et al. 1994)



Blue Bluff Marl	Utley Limestone	Twiggs Clay	Irwinton Sand	· · ·	Member
Lisbon	Clinchfield	Dry Branch		Tobacco Road	Formation
Middle Eocene		Upp	Series (age)		

8

Figure 23

Geologic Column of Project Area Listing the Age, Formation Name and Lithologic Member (after Huddleston and Hetrick, 1986) Site 9BK416 on the river bluff is formed in recent aeolian sand that caps the Tobacco Road sand. Site 9BK423 on the T1 terrace is deposited in alluvial sand that overlies the Utley Limestone along the river channel.



Figure 24 Map Showing Outcrops of Utley Limestone and Location of Geologic Profiles recorded by Huddleston and Hetrick (1986)



Figure 25 Aerial Photograph of the River Valley along the Project Area. Photograph shows geomorphic landforms, referance points discussed in the in text and reported location of the Vogtle Whale



Huddlestun and Hetrick (1986) described four profiles in the foundation excavation for the existing Plant Vogtle facility (Figure 24). These profiles documented that the sedimentary facies in these Coastal Plain formations can changed over a short distance. We observed similar changes during our field reconnaissance. For example, the Blue Bluff marl outcrops in the river bluff south of the existing river intake structure. At Utley's Point, less than 400 m north of the existing river intake structure the Blue Bluff marl is absent and an outcrop of the Utley Limestone forms the base of the river bluff (Figure 25).

The Savannah River channel meanders across a large floodplain 2-3 kilometers wide as it flows past Plant Vogtle (Figure 20). The project area is located on the southwest side of the valley. The southwest margin of the valley is a steep vertical river bluff that rises from less than 90 feet in elevation up to 250 feet at some locations. The study area focused on the river bluff and floodplain from a tributary stream at Hancock Landing south to the existing river intake structure. The floodplain or T<sub>0</sub> terrace narrows from 200 m wide at the tributary stream to only a couple of meters wide at Utley Point (Figures 20 and 25). A small T<sub>1</sub> terrace has formed just upstream of the bedrock outcrop at Utley Point (Figure 25).

The slope of the river bluff is vertical in most areas with large ravines eroded into the slope in at several locations. One distinct bench occurs below the crest of the bluff. The top of the bluff has an undulating surface that slopes from an elevation of about 230 feet above Utley Point down to about 210 feet before descending down to the tributary stream. The highest elevation is about 260 feet at a location 300 m west of the bluff edge (Figure 20).

Alluvium on the T<sub>1</sub> terrace is medium to coarse sand and sediment on the river bluff is fine to medium sand and silty sand (sandy loam). Soils on the floodplain are mapped as the Tawcaw Shellbluff Association (Natural Resources Conservation Service 1992). This soil association developed in alluvial sand and mud. Soils on top of the river bluff are mapped as the Troup fine sand and the Lucy fine sand (Natural Resources Conservation Service 1992). Soil profiles on the floodplain were not described because the water table was less than 0.5 m below the floodplain surface. Soil profiles on the river bluff consisted of an organic-rich A-horizon over an illuvial horizon varying from several lamellae to an illuvial Bt-horizon.

#### **PROFILE DESCRIPTIONS**

#### **RIVER BLUFF**

Six backhoe trenches were excavated along the top of the river bluff. The land surface along the top of the bluff is hummocky and several shallow ditches transect the bluff. This disturbance is probably related to logging or other historic activity. Trench 1 was excavated at site 9BK416 along an elevated portion of the bluff above Utley Point. The soil profile consisted of a weakly developed Bw-Horizon directly below the A-horizon (Figure 21a). A lamella horizon was recorded at a depth of 165 cm to 200 cm. The sediment in this trench contained very little silt and clay, as it is 84% to 93% sand (Table 7). This sand is primarily a fine to medium sand (Figure 26). The sedimentology of the bluff sediment is very consistent and does not vary with depth. Artifacts were recorded in the upper portion of the trench profile. A distinct horizon of lithic debitage was also recorded in the base of this trench at a depth of 120 cm.



Figure 26 Sedimentology Logs for Trenches 1 and 3 at Site 9BK416 on the River Bluff

One sample of charred wood was collected from a depth of 135 cm for radiometric dating. The purpose of dating this sample was to investigate the age of the deep lithic debitage horizon at a depth of 120 cm. The sample was submitted to Beta Analytical, Inc. for AMS <sup>14</sup>C dating.

Trenches 2 and 3 were excavated along the bluff to the south and north of Trench 1, respectively. These trench locations were selected to assess sedimentology and pedogenesis along the Bluff and to determine the extent of the deeply buried lithic debitage horizon. Soil development and sedimentology in these trenches was very similar to Trench 1. A weakly developed Bw-horizon was recorded below the A-horizon (Figure 21a). The horizon of lamella was recorded in the base of Trench 2 that was excavated deeper than Trench 3 (Figure 21a). Sediment in these trenches was a fine to medium sand with only 7% to 11% fines (Table 7 and Figure 26). Artifacts were recorded in the upper portion of these trenches, but there was no evidence of a deeply buried lithic debitage horizon.

Trenches 4 and 5 were excavated at the northern end of site 9BK416 where the proposed access road and water line are to cross the bluff and descend down to the new river intake facility. Trench 4 was excavated along the buff edge on a slope down toward the river. Trench 4 consisted of a fine to medium sand with 12% to 27% fines (Table 7 and Figure 27). Rounded pebbles were recorded in the profile below a depth of 100 cm. The A-horizon was only 10 cm thick consisting of modern roots and organic material. A Bt-horizon was recorded below a depth of 70 cm (Figure 21a). This Bt-horizon has a subangular blocky structure and a noticeable increase in clay content. The particle size distribution analyses confirmed this higher percentage of fines in the Bt-horizon (Figure 27).

Trench 5 was excavated further from the bluff edge. This trench was extended to show a long profile across the bluff. The soil horizons changed between the northern and southern end of the trench, so two soil profiles were recorded (Figure 21a). Both profiles consisted of a fine to medium sand. Silty sand was recorded in the base of the northern profile, but this could be pedogenic silt and clay translocated down through the profile into the Bt-horizon. An A-, E-, and Bt-horizon soil profile was recorded in the northern end of the trench. The Bt-horizon showed a subangular blocky structure and evidence of clay bridges on the soil peds. Fe/Mn nodules were recorded in the Bt-horizon. The southern profile included a weak Bw-horizon below the A-horizon similar to Trenches 1, 2 and 3 (Figure 21a). The base of the trench did not show any evidence of pedogenesis in contrast to the well-developed Bt-horizon recorded in the northern portion of the trench.

Trench 6 was excavated west of Trench 5 along the proposed access road and adjacent to a gulley that had eroded into the bluff. Sediment in trench 6 was a fine to medium sand. The soil profile included an A-, E-, and Bthorizon similar to trenches 4 and 5 (Figure 21a). Trench 7 was excavated along the proposed access road along the proposed access road on an upland portion of the ridge about 200 m southwest of the bluff edge. The deposits in this trench consisted of a fine to medium sand with 11% to 12% fines (Table 7 and Figure 27). The Bt-horizon appeared to have a higher percentage of clay than the deposits above 60 cm. The B-horizon occurred directly below the A-horizon and was very red in color (7.5YR 5/8) (Figure 21a).

Figure 27 Sedimentology Logs for Trench 4 at Site 9BK416 on the River Bluff and Trench 7 Excavated on the Upland Ridge





Figure 28 Sedimentology Logs for Trenches 5 North and 5 South at the Site 9BK416 on the River Bluff

#### T<sub>1</sub> TERRACE ON THE SAVANNAH RIVER

A T<sub>1</sub> terrace formed upstream of Utley Point where bedrock extends out to the river channel. This terrace was deposited behind a ridge of the limestone outcrop. The T<sub>1</sub> terrace is 2 m to 3 m above the floodplain (TO Terrace). Several large looter pits had been excavated into the surface of the terrace. Trench 1 was excavated into the southwestern portion of the terrace adjacent to the slope that extends up to the bluff. The upper 60 cm of the profile consisted of a silty sand with gravel and cobbles (Figure 21b). Alluvium below this was a medium to coarse sand (Table 7 and Figure 29). Two buried A-horizons were recorded below the upper 60 cm of silty sand (Figure 21b). The lower buried A-horizon extended to a depth of 195 cm and a ceramic sherd was recorded in the top of this horizon. The excavation was deepened after describing the profile to assess the depth of alluvium on this terrace. The excavation could not be extended below a depth of about 2.5 m because the loose sand caved into the excavation. Lithic debitage was recovered from the back dirt excavated from this depth.

A second stepped trench (Trench 2) was excavated into the edge of the terrace to assess alluvium in the base of the terrace. Trench 2 was excavated through medium sand to a depth of 265 cm where a bed of coarse sand was recorded (Figure 21b). A thick A-horizon extended from the terrace surface to a depth of 55 cm. An incipient B-horizon consisting of lamellae was recorded between 105 and 185 cm. These lamellae thickened with depth until they began to fuse into one another. A weakly developed buried Bw-horizon was recorded below the lamella at a depth of 185 to 265 cm (Figure 21b). A bifacial stone tool was recorded at a depth of 180 cm.

The  $T_1$  terrace deposits extended to about 3 m below the terrace surface. A ridge of Utley Limestone extends along the northeast edge of the terrace forming a natural bedrock barrier or wall between the river and the terrace alluvium. Portions of this limestone wall are higher than the terrace surface. The terrace alluvium was deposited in a depression or protected cove between the Utley Limestone outcrop and the river bluff.

# INTERPRETATION

#### PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Blue Bluff marl shows up in site soil borings generally between elevations 137 and 74 feet (amsl). The whale skeleton and associated fossils were recovered in situ within the Blue Bluff marl at a reported elevation of 30 m or 98.4 feet above mean sea level (amsl), meaning that it was found approximately in the middle of the strata (Figure 24) (Hulbert et al. 1998). These Coastal Plain formations have a very gentle slope on the order of less than 10 feet per mile (Huddleston and Summerour, 1996). The elevation of this whale bearing horizon within the Blue Bluff marl would be within one or two feet of 98 ft amsl across the Plant Vogtle property. The floodplain along the base of the river bluff is 87.5 ft amsl. The fossil-bearing horizon would be about 10 feet above the base of the slope.

The Blue Bluff marl outcrops south of the existing river intake structure. North of the river intake structure the bluff slope is covered with colluvium, sediment that has slumped down from above. This is the condition of the slope up to Utley Point where the Blue Bluff marl is absent and outcrops of the Utley Limestone form the bluff slope. North of Utley Point the base of the slope is covered



Figure 29 Sedimentology Logs for Trench 1 at Site 9BK423 on the T1 Terrace with colluvium. A backhoe was used to cut into the base of the bluff north of Utley point and the fossiliferous Utley limestone was encountered. Float or cobbles and boulders of Utley Limestone were observed along the base of the slope to a point about 100 m south of Trench 4 at Site 9BK416 on the top of the bluff. This shows that the Blue Bluff formation is absent from a large portion of the bluff north of the existing river intake structure. The Utley Limestone is found in its stratigraphic position.

Nine meters (~30 feet) of Blue Bluff marl is exposed along the bluff south of the existing river intake structure. This marl was deposited as a broad layer on a flat sea floor. It is during deposition of this marl that the Vogtle whale died and settled into the mud on the sea floor. After deposition of this marl an erosional event removed a section of this marl from the area around Utley Point (sometime between Middle and Late Eocene time). The younger Utley Limestone was then deposited in the depression formed by this erosion.

A backhoe trench was excavated into the TO terrace of the Savannah River in the vicinity of the proposed water intake structure. The water table was encountered between one and two feet. This excavation encountered a blue sandy mud at a depth of 10 to 12 feet below the terrace surface that is interpreted to be part of the Blue Bluff marl (~75 feet MSL). A low concentration of fossil shell was observed in this marl.

The Vogtle whale is associated with middle Eocene deposits at an elevation of 98.4 feet. These whale fossils are typically isolated deposits formed when a whale carcass settles to the sea floor and is buried in the soft muddy bottom. The Blue Bluff marl underlying the TO terrace is an older portion of this formation, not associated with the whale fossil. Bone is poorly preserved below the water table. Typically it is soft and disintegrates shortly after being excavated from saturated sediment.

The proposed access road and water line to the new river intake structure show the road crossing the bluff edge at Trench 4 and then slowly descending the bluff back toward the south. Based on this plan, the proposed access road and water line would cross the 98 ft amsl elevation primarily along a portion of the bluff underlain be the Utley Limestone and not the Blue Bluff marl. Therefore, the construction work for the new river intake structure, access road and water line would not encounter the whale-bearing horizon (98 ft amsl) of the Blue Bluff marl.

#### RIVER BLUFF TRENCHES

Soil development at Trench 1 shows at least two different periods of pedogenesis. The Bw-horizon directly below the A-horizon probably represents a Late Holocene period of soil development (Figure 21a). This Bw-horizon occurs directly below the A-horizon because of historic erosion. The horizon of lamella at a depth of 165 cm to 200 cm represents an earlier period of soil development perhaps during the Early to middle Holocene (Figure 21a). Formation of these lamellae could correlate with deposition of the lithic debitage horizon at a depth of 120 cm. The two periods of pedogenesis are separated by a period of sedimentation on the bluff. The only process that could deposit sand in this geomorphic setting is aeolian sedimentation (wind transported sediment).

Sedimentology and pedogenesis are similar in trenches 2 and 3 along the bluff in the southern and central portion of Site 9BK416. This includes evidence of two periods of soil formation separated

by a period of sedimentation. The aeolian sedimentation formed a thin cap of sand along this portion of the bluff. These deposits are thinner at Trenches 2 and 3 than at Trench 1.

The lithic debitage horizon recorded in Trench 1 is a buried cultural horizon. Cultural horizons can be buried by deposition of sediment on top of a cultural deposit or through mixing of the soil profile by bioturbation. The upper 1 to 2 m of the soil profile is bioturbated or mixed by burrowing rodents and insects and through the intrusion of roots. If the lithic debitage horizon was buried by bioturbation, these lithics would have migrated down from the zone of artifacts recorded in the upper portion of the profile. Artifacts were recorded in the upper portion of the profile in trenches 1, 2, and 3 (Figure 21a), but the lithic debitage horizon was only recorded in Trench 1. The absence of artifacts at depth in Trenches 2 and 3 indicates that bioturbation is not the process that buried the lithic horizon in Trench 1. The deep lithic debitage horizon in Trench 1 is interpreted to be buried by aeolian sedimentation based on this observation and the pedogenic evidence of sedimentation on the bluff.

Trench 4 was excavated on the edge of the bluff where the surface begins to slope down to the river. This is an eroded area of the bluff as indicated by the thin A-horizon. The sand below a depth of 100 cm contained rounded pebbles indicating that this part of the profile is on older Eocene Coastal Plain formations such as the Tobacco Road sand.

Soil development in the northern end of Trench 5 shows an older Bt-horizon in the base of the trench similar to Trench 4. The southern end of this trench included a younger Bw-horizon below the Ahorizon as was observed in Trenches 1, 2 and 3 (Figure 21a). The change in soil development across this small portion of the bluff is difficult to explain. The older B-horizon could have been disturbed in the southern end of the trench. Disturbance of a soil profile can occur due to a tree throw where the tree roots pull up portion of the soil profile.

Soil development in Trenches 6 and 7 included the older B-horizon observed in trenches 4 and the northern profile of Trench 5. Trench 6 probably has some younger aeolian deposits in the upper portion of the profile. In contrast, trench 7 is interpreted to have developed in the eroded sands of the Tobacco Road Formation. This trench was excavated into an upland ridge; an erosional setting that would not contain buried cultural horizons.

Surface water runoff from recent rainstorms has eroded into the side of the gully adjacent to Trench 6. There were good exposures of the Eocene Coastal Plain sediment that from the top of this bluff. The bedded sand in the gully walls near the top of the bluff is the Tobacco Road sand. These are the marine sands recorded in the base of several of the trenches. This sand was probably encountered in the base of Trenches 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Sedimentology of sediment samples collected from the river bluff trenches is very consistent, especially in the distribution of the sand fraction (Figures 26, 27, and 28). These samples are interpreted to include aeolian sand deposited along the bluff edge as well as marine sand from the Eocene Tobacco Road Formation. The sediment source for aeolian deposits has a strong influence on the resulting sedimentology for aeolian or wind transported sediment. This is why the aeolian deposits on the bluff have a similar sedimentology to the older Eocene marine sands. Deposits formed by aeolian, marine and fluvial depositional processes can be distinguished using statistical measures of particle size distribution, grain shape and surface micro textures.

Mean grain size is plotted with standard deviation and skewness for all sediment samples analyzed (Figure 30) and for just the samples from Trench 1 at Site 9BK416 (Figure 31). Three populations of the river bluff samples, the upland ridge samples and the  $T_1$  terrace samples form separate populations on the graphs in Figure 31. The River Bluff samples have the finest mean grain size and the  $T_1$  terrace samples are the coarsest. The upland ridge samples were collected from Trench 7 on the ridge crest. Although the  $T_1$  terrace samples are differentiated from the other populations primarily on their coarse mean grain size, they also tended to be less well sorted (higher standard deviation).

The aeolian sand along the bluff profile can be distinguished from the underlying marine sand in the data from Trench 1 at Site 9BK416 (Figure 31). Our goal is to determine if the deeply buried cultural horizon at 120 cm was buried by aeolian deposition or by bioturbation. Sediment in the upper meter of Trench 1 has a finer mean grain size, is better sorted and tends to be more negatively skewed than the underlying deposits (Figure 31).

These are all characteristics of aeolian sand deposits. The exact contact between aeolian and marine sand is uncertain, but the shallower 60 cm and 80 cm samples are interpreted to be within the aeolian sand. The 100 cm and 120 cm samples plot with the deeper samples interpreted to be marine sand of the Tobacco Road and Dry Branch Formations. Bioturbation affects all of these deposits to some extent so there is probably some mixing along the contact of these two deposits. The deeply buried cultural horizon at site 9BK416 was deposited on top of the Tobacco Road sand formation. This horizon of lithic debitage was buried by aeolian sand and bioturbation could have resulted in some downward movement into the top of the Tobacco Road sand. The depth of this contact between marine sand and the aeolian sand can be more accurately defined through a 5 cm sampling interval along with grain shape and surface micro texture descriptions, if data recovery is performed at Site 9BK416.

Radiometric dating of the charcoal sample collected from a depth of 135 cm in Trench 1 at Site 9BK416 determined that the sample contained more <sup>14</sup>C than did the modern (AD 1950) reference standard. The source of extra <sup>14</sup>C in the atmosphere is thermo-nuclear bomb testing in the 1950s (BETA Analytical Laboratory report). The presence of this modern carbon indicates that the charred material was part of a plant that was respiring carbon after the onset of thermo-nuclear bomb testing. The charcoal sample was probably a piece of a charred root from a fire that occurred since 1950.

# T<sub>1</sub> TERRACE ON THE SAVANNAH RIVER

The Utley Limestone extends out into the floodplain from the side of the bluff forming a recess in the outcrop or a small cove. The origin of this cove is likely to be a collapsed karst depression or cave as the Utley Limestone is known for forming collapse features and caves. The alluvium that formed this terrace was deposited in this recess and was protected from erosion. The upper 60 cm of silty sand with gravel and cobbles in Trench 1 is colluvium probably deposited as a result of historic erosion along the bluff. This deposit has sealed the prehistoric alluvium along the southwestern edge of the terrace. The loose nature of the sand in Trench 1 and the two buried A-horizons



Figure 30 Bivariate Plots of Mean Grain Size with Standard Deviation and Skewness for all Sediment Samples Analyzed during this Study



Figure 31 Bivariate Plots of Mean Grain Size with Standard Deviation and Skewness for Sediment Samples Collected from Trench 1 at Site 9BK416



indicate rapid sedimentation with little Late Holocene soil development. The lamella in Trenches 1 and 2 and the Bw-horizon in Trench 2 represent two periods of pedogenesis (Figure 21b). Periods of soil formation are typically associated with lower sedimentation rates and a relatively stable land surface. The coarse sand below 265 cm represents deposition by higher velocity currents.

There is excellent potential for the burial and preservation of stratified cultural horizons on the T<sub>1</sub> terrace at Utley Point. Rapid sedimentation buries cultural horizons quickly reducing the possibility of disturbance due to bioturbation. These higher sedimentation rates can separate each period of occupation into a distinct stratigraphic horizon. The terrace alluvium is a traction deposit formed as sand is swept across the terrace surface by flood currents. This can redistribute smaller artifacts such as flakes and small sherds. However, there is a good possibility that cultural features have been preserved in this terrace by the high sedimentation rates.

Particle size data for the six sediment samples analyzed indicates at least three separate strata in the terrace deposits. Artifact concentrations in buried cultural horizons will correlate with contacts between sedimentary strata on terraces along the Savannah River (Brooks and Sassaman 1990).

The number of particle size analyses was limited in this Phase I survey of the upper two meters of the Site 9BK423. Sampling and analysis of samples at 5 cm intervals is recommended to delineate strata boundaries within the terrace deposits if data recovery is performed at Site 9BK423.

# DISCUSSION

A thin deposit of aeolian sediment, up to 1-1.5 m thick, caps the edge of the terrace bluff. The thickness of the aeolian sediment varies along the bluff edge. Upland ridges away from the bluff appear to be eroded soils with Eocene marine sand at a relatively shallow depth. The floodplain along the Savannah River is a low wetland surface with a narrow levee. The water table is high and this would not have been a surface favorable for occupation except during dryer climatic periods.

The  $T_1$  terrace at Utley Point formed in a unique geomorphic setting along the Savannah River. The configuration of the Limestone outcrop formed a protected cove. The rapid sedimentation preserved at least three cultural horizons extending to depths of ~2.5 m in the southwestern portion of the terrace and 1.80 m at along the northern terrace edge.

The whale-bearing horizon of the Blue Bluff marl was eroded from the area around Utley Point and for several hundred meters to the north. The Utley Limestone was deposited in the depression left by this erosional event. The proposed location of the access road and water line should encounter the Utley Limestone when it crosses the 98 ft amsl elevation where the Vogtle whale was recovered during the previous construction work.

The Blue Bluff marl underlying the TO terrace is an older portion of this formation, not associated with the whale fossil. Bone is poorly preserved below the water table. Typically it is soft and disintegrates shortly after being excavated from saturated sediment. There is little concern that this excavation work will encounter valuable paleontological resources such as the Vogtle whale for the following reasons:

• The lower Blue Bluff marl beds below the TO terrace are not associated with the Vogtle whale;

• Any fossil bone material encountered will not be well preserved, even though some fossil shell material will likely be present in this sandy mud; and

• These whale fossils are typically isolated deposits.

# VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the archaeological survey of proposed expansion areas at Plant Vogtle in Burke County, Georgia 10 new archaeological sites were identified as well as five isolated finds. None of the sites recorded by Nick Honerkamp in 1973 were encountered.

Of the 10 sites identified, two (9BK419 and 9BK420) are recommended as potentially eligible and two (9BK416 and 9BK423) are recommended as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The remaining six sites are recommended as ineligible since they have very little integrity and/or cannot address any significant research questions regarding the history or prehistory of the middle Savannah River Valley. The isolated finds are insignificant and ineligible for inclusion in the National Register. Recommendations for the sites recommended as potentially eligible or eligible are provided below.

Site 9BK416 is a very large multi-component prehistoric site containing Early Archaic, Early Woodland, and Middle Woodland artifacts. It is situated on the bluff of the river between the barge landing and an unnamed creek south of Hancock Landing. The site is approximately 450 by 2800 feet in size and has not been entirely delineated, particularly away from the edge of the bluff. Geomorphological work at the site identified a cultural layer sealed by Aeolian sand deposits. The site contained evidence of deep stratified deposits and can likely address significant research questions regarding the prehistoric occupation of the Savannah River Valley.

Very little work has been done on sites in this environmental setting in the Middle Savannah River Valley. The most comparable is the G.S. Lewis-East site located on the Savannah River Site in Aiken County, South Carolina. Although few organic artifacts were recovered, the G.S. Lewis-East site produced a dense array of artifacts dating primarily from the Early Archaic and Late Archaic Periods providing excellent information on site structure during the two time periods. Site 9BK416 is known to date from the Early Archaic and Woodland Periods, although other components may be there that went unrecognized. This site is very likely to provide similar kinds of data, therefore testing out conclusions made from work at G.S. Lewis-East as well as adding new information about Woodland Period settlements along the Savannah River. In addition, the undiagnostic lithic layer that was found sealed in Trench 1 has the potential to provide very early data, perhaps even dating to the Paleoindian Period. Buried Paleoindian deposits are rarely found and, if present at 9BK416, can provide important information regarding this poorly understood period of time.

Southern Nuclear intends to avoid impacting the site by keeping construction for the intake structure off the top of the bluff and by moving the access road and intake line slightly north of its current alignment.

Site 9BK419 is an Early to Middle Woodland prehistoric camp located on a ridge nose overlooking springs that feed directly into the Savannah River swamp. The site is minimally 100 by 300 feet in size and has not been completely delineated along its southern boarder. Deposits were found to be deep (2.2 feet). The site exists within and on either side of the Wilson transmission line. Since the survey was completed, it has been decided that the new line will not be built and the site will not be further impacted.

Site 9BK420 is an undiagnostic lithic scatter located on a landform overlooking the Savannah River. It measures 200 by 400 feet in size. Deposits were found to be deep (2.2 feet). The site exists within and on either side of the Wilson transmission line. Since the survey was completed, it has been decided that the new line will not be built and the site will not be further impacted.

Site 9BK423 is a small prehistoric camp measuring approximately 75 by 150 feet. It is situated on a small bench about 10 feet above the Savannah River floodplain. Shovel testing and backhoe trenching recovered artifacts dating from Middle Archaic, Early to Middle Woodland, and the Mississippian Periods. These artifacts were found in depths up to 8 feet. The site is stratified with sterile soil levels between. Although looters have damaged the site, the damage is not severe enough to negate the site's research potential.

Southern Nuclear intends to avoid the site and erect a fence around it prior to construction of the intake structure in order to avoid damaging the archaeological deposits. This fence will also serve to prevent further looting at the site.

Observations made during the paleontological investigation along the bluff and lower river terraces concluded that it is unlikely that important fossil remains will be encountered since the Blue Bluff marl that encompassed the Vogtle whale is found beneath the TO terrace. The marl here is not associated with the whale and consists of a wet, muddy clay. Any fossils that may be found will be poorly preserved since they do not preserve well below the water table.

# **REFERENCES CITED**

Anderson, D. G.

1992 The Mattassee Lake Ceramic Artifact Assemblage. In *Mattassee Lake: Archaeological Investigations Along the Lower Santee River in the Coastal Plain of South Carolina*, edited by D. G. Anderson, C. E. Cantley, and A. L. Novick, pp. 207-322. Atlanta Interagency Archaeological Services Division, Special Publication.

Anderson, D. G. and J. W. Joseph

1988 Prehistory and History Along the Upper Savannah River: Technical Synthesis of Cultural Resource Investigations, Richard B. Russell Multiple Resource Area. Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia.

## Anonymous

n.d. Jenkins County. Millen Chamber of Commerce, Millen.

#### Battle, D.

1996 Personal Communication, Georgia Site Files, Athens.

#### Benson, R.

1994 Fort Gordon Revisited: Cultural Resources Survey of the Final 28,784 Acres. Southeastern Archeological Services, Athens, GA.

#### Binford, L. R.

1980 Willow Smoke and Dog's Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation. *American Antiquity* 45:4-20.

#### Birkeland, P.W.

1999 Soils and Geomorphology. Oxford University Press, New York.

#### Blanton, D.

1985 CRM: Vogtle-Effingham-Thalmann 500 KV Electric Transmission Line. Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta, GA.

#### Braley, C. O.

- 1991 Surveys in the Sandhills: Some Initial Results. Paper presented at the Spring Meeting of the Society for Georgia Archaeology, Augusta.
- 1994a Historic Indian Archaeology of Georgia's Coastal Plain (Draft), Georgia Archaeological Research Design Paper, University of Georgia, Athens.
- 1994b Cultural Resources Survey of Selected (FY 91) Timber Harvest Areas on Ft. Gordon, Richmond and McDuffie Counties, Georgia. Southeastern Archeological Services, Athens.

### Braley, C. O. and T. J. Price

1991 Cultural Resources Survey of Selected (FY 90) Timber Harvesting Areas, Fort Gordon, Richmond and Columbia Counties, Georgia. Southeastern Archeological Services, Athens. Braun, L.

1950 Deciduous Forests of Eastern North America. Hafner, New York.

Brockington, P.

1971 A Preliminary Investigation of an Early Knapping Site in Southeastern Georgia. *Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, The Notebook* 3(2), University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Brooks, M. J.

1980 Late Holocene Sea Level Variability and Prehistoric Adaptations in the Lower Coastal Plain of South Carolina. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe.

Brooks, M.J. and Sassaman, K.E.

1990 Point Bar Geoarchaeology in the Upper Coastal Plain of the Savannah River Valley, South Carolina; A case study. In Lasca, N.P. and Donahue, J., eds., *Archaeological Geology of North America*, Geological Society of America, Centennial Special Volume 4, Boulder, pp. 183-197.

Brooks, R.D. and D.C. Crass

1991 A Desperate Poor Country: History and Settlement Patterning on the Savannah River Site, Aiken and Barnwell Counties, South Carolina. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 2. Occasional Papers of the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Brooks, R.D., M.D. Groover, S.C. Smith

2000 Living On The Edge: The Archaeology of Cattle Raisers in the South Carolina Backcountry. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 10. Occasional Papers of the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia

#### Brown, J. R.

1968 Soil Survey of Jenkins County, Georgia. USDA, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

Cabak, M.A. and M.D. Groover

2005 Plantations without Pillars: Archaeology, Wealth, and Material Life at Bush Hill. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 11. Occasional Papers of the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Cabak, M.A. and M.M. Inkrot

1997 Old Farm, New Farm: An Archaeology of Rural Modernization in the Aiken Plateau, 1875-1950. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 9. Occasional Papers of the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Cantley, C.E., T. Raymer, T. Hamby, and J. Joseph

1991 Archaeological Test Excavations at the Proposed Dry Boat Storage Facility and Archaeological Survey of the Neal Road Extension Corridor, Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Alabama. New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Carter, H.

1969 Climates of the States: Georgia. In Climatography of the United States, No. 60-9. U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington.

Chapman, J.

1977 Archaic Period Research in the Lower Little Tennessee River Valley. The University of Tennessee Department of Anthropology Report of Investigations 18. Tennessee Valley Authority,

#### Claflin, W. H., Jr.

1931 The Stalling's Island Mound, Columbia County, Georgia. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 14(1). Harvard University, Cambridge.

Clark, W. Z. and A. C. Zisa

1976 Physiographic Map of Georgia. Department of Natural Resources, Atlanta.

#### Coleman, K., ed.

1977 A History of Georgia. University of Georgia, Athens.

#### Crook, M. R., Jr.

1994

1985

1990 Rae's Creek: A Multicomponent Archaeological Site in the Central Savannah River Valley. Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta.

#### Daniel, I. R.

Hardaway Revisited: Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeast. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Delcourt, H. R. and P. A. Delcourt

Quaternary Palynology and Vegetational History of the Southeastern United States. In Pollen Records of Late Quaternary North American Sediments, edited by V. M. Bryant and R. G. Holloway, pp. 1-37. The American Association of Stratigraphic Palynologists Foundation, Washington D.C.

#### De Pratter, C.B.

1991 W.P.A. Archaeological Excavations in Chatham County, Georgia: 1937-1942. University of Georgia, Laboratory of Archaeology Series Report Number 29, Athens.

Eberhard, K., K. E. Sassaman, and M. J. Brooks

1994 Crosby Bay (38AK682): Paleoindian and Early Archaic Occupations at a Carolina Bay in Aiken County, South Carolina. *South Carolina Antiquities* 26:33-46.

#### Elliott, D.

- 1986 CRM: Vogtle Effingham Thalmann 500 KV Electric Transmission Line, GP-SN-08: Data Recovery. Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.
- 1988 Ebenezer: An Alpine Village in the Georgia Swamp. Georgia Salzburger Society, Rincon.

1994 Data Recovery at Lovers Lane, Phinizy Swamp and the Old Dike Sites, Bobby Jones Expressway Extension Corridor, Augusta, Georgia. Southeastern Archeological Services, Inc., Athens.

## Elliott, D. T. and R. F. Elliott,

1990 Mount Pleasant, An Eighteenth-Century Yuchi Town, British Trader Outpost and Military Garrison in Georgia. LAMAR Institute, Watkinsville.

#### Elliott, D. and R. Doyon

1981 Archaeology and Historical Geography of the Savannah River Floodplain Near Augusta, Georgia. *Laboratory of Archeology Series* No. 22, University of Georgia, Athens.

#### Elliott, D. and L. O'Steen

1987 Anatomy of the Brier Creek Archaic. Paper presented at the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Charleston, SC.

#### Elliott, D. and R. F. Elliott

1990 Mount Pleasant, An Eighteenth-Century Yuchi Town, British Trader Outpost, and Military Garrison in Georgia. LAMAR Institute, Watkinsville, Ga.

#### Elliott, R.F.

- 1993 Cultural Resources Survey of Georgia Highway 21 Widening, Effingham County, Georgia. Southeastern Archeological Services, Athens.
- 1994 Cultural Resources Survey of SR 21 from Rincon to Millen, Effingham and Screven Counties, Georgia. New South Associates, Stone Mountain.

#### Entorf, R.F.

1987 An Archaeological Survey of the Savannah River Parkway. GDOT, Atlanta.

#### Espenshade, C.T.

1986 CRM: Vogtle-Effingham-Thalmann 500 KV Electric Transmission Line GP-SN13: Data Recovery. Submitted to Georgia Power Company, Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.

## Espenshade, C. T. and M. D. Roberts

1993 Archaeological Survey of the SR 21 Millen to Sylvania Corridor, Jenkins and Screven Counties, Georgia. Brockington and Associates, Atlanta.

#### Fish, P.

1976 Patterns of Prehistoric Site Distribution in Effingham and Screven Counties, Georgia. University of Georgia Archaeology Series, Report No. 11. Athens.

# Folk, R.L.

1980 Petrology of Sedimentary Rocks. Hemphill's Book Store, Austin, Texas.

#### Garrow, P. H., ed.

1984 Cultural Resource Management Vogtle-Effingham-Thalmann Transmission Line, Burke, Screven, Effingham, Chatham, Bryan, Liberty, Long, McIntosh, and Glynn Counties, Georgia. Resource Inventory II: Final Report. Garrow and Associates, Atlanta. Report on file, Georgia Power Company, Atlanta.
Georgia Geologic Survey

1976 *Geologic Map of Georgia.* Georgia Derpartment of Natural Resources, Geologic and Water resources Division. Reprinted in 1997, Atlanta, Georgia.

#### Georgia Historical Society

Goad, S.

1979 Middle Woodland Exchange in the Prehistoric Southeast. In *Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by D. S. Brose and N. Gerber, pp. 238-436. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.

#### Griffin, J.B.

1985 "Changing Concepts of the Prehistoric Mississippian Cultures of the Eastern United States", in Alabama and the Borderlands: From Prehistory to Statehood. University of Alabama, Birmingham.

#### Hanson, G. T., Jr., R. D. Brooks, and J. W. White

1981 The Human Occupation Along the Steel Creek Floodplain: Results of an Intensive Archeological Survey for the L Area Reactivation Project, Savannah River Plant, Barnwell County, South Carolina. *Research Manuscript Series No. 173*. The Institute for Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

#### Hillestad, H.O.

1977 An Ecological Survey of Proposed Corridor Alignments G/S-3, G/S-5, and S/C5 of the Augusta Railroad Demonstration Project. Southeastern Wildlife Services, Inc., Athens.

#### Hillhouse, Albert M.

1985 History of Burke County, Georgia, 1777-1950. Reprint Company, Spartanburg, S.C.

#### Hollingsworth, D., ed.

1989 The History of Screven County, Georgia. Curtis Media Corporation, Dallas.

#### Honerkamp, Nicholas

1973 Archaeological Field Survey of the Alvin W. Vogtle Nuclear Plant Property in Burke County, Georgia. Submitted to Lewis H. Larson, Jr., Georgia State Archaeologist.

#### Huddleston, P.F. and Summerour, J.H.

1996 The Lithostratigraphic Framework of the Uppermost Cretaceous and Lower Tertiary of Eastern Burke County, Georgia. *Georgia Geologic Survey Bulletin* 127, Atlanta, Georgia.

#### Huddleston P.F. and Hetrick, J.H.

1986 Upper Eocene Stratigraphy of Central and Eastern Georgia. *Georgia Geologic Survey* Bulletin 95, Atlanta, Georgia.

#### Joseph, J.W.

1985 CRM: Vogtle-Effingham-Thalmann 500 KV Electric Transmission Line GP-SN-13, GP-SN-15, and GP-SN-22: Resource Testing and Data Recovery Planning. Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.

Langley, T. M. and W. L. Marter

1973 The Savannah River Plant Site. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Report DP-1323.

<sup>1981</sup> The Counties of the State of Georgia. The Georgia Historical Society, Savannah.

92

#### Lawton, D.E.

1977 Geologic Map of Georgia. Department of Natural Resources, Atlanta.

#### Ledbetter, R.J.

1988 The Pig Pen Site: Archeological Investigations at 9RI158, Richmond County, Georgia. Southeastern Archeological Services, Inc., Athens.

#### McKee, G., ed.

1984 A Guide to the Georgia Coast. The Georgia Conservancy. Miller, Jacksonville, Fla.

#### Miers, E.S.

1951 The General who Marched to Hell. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

#### Miller, G.

1980 Classification and Economic Scaling of 19th Century Ceramics. *Historical Archaeology* 14:1-40.

#### Miller, J. J., M. L. Fryman, J. W. Griffin, C. D. Lee, and D. E. Swindell

1983 A Historical and Architectural Survey of Fort Stewart Military Reservation, Georgia. Prepared for the National Park Service, Southeast Regional Office, Atlanta, Professional Analysts, Inc.

#### Mulcahey, A. M.

1991 The Possible Archaeological Significance of Carolina Bays. M.A. thesis, Department of Anthroplogy, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

#### Natural Resources Conservation Service

1992 Web Soil Survey. <u>URL:http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.gov</u>

#### O'Steen, L.

1986 CRM: Vogtle, Effingham, Thalmann 500 KV Electric Transmission Line, GP-SN-03 Data Recovery. Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.

#### O'Steen, L.

1994 The Bear Creek Site (38FA204/205): Paleoindian and Archaic Occupation in the Lower Piedmont of South Carolina. Southeastren Archaeological Services, Inc., Athens.

#### O'Steen, L. and C. T. Espenshade

1985 Archaeological Testing of Two Cultural Properties, GP-SN-03 and GP-SN-05, in Screven County, Georgia on the Proposed Vogtle-Effingham-Thalmann Electric Transmission Line. Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.

#### Paulk, H.

- 1981 Soil Survey of Richmond County, Georgia. USDA, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, Washington, D.C.
- 1986 Soil Survey of Burke County, Georgia. USDA, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

#### Reese, T. R.

1963 Colonial Georgia: A Study in British Imperial Policy in the Eighteenth Century. University of Georgia, Athens.

Rogers, G. A. and R. F. Saunders

1981 Camp Lawton Stockade, Millen, Georgia, C.S.A. Atlanta Historical Society Journal Winter: 80-93.

Sassaman, K.E.

1993 Early Woodland Settlement in the Aiken Plateau: Archaeological Investigations at 38AK157, Savannah River Site, Aiken County, South Carolina. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 3. Occasional Papers of the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Sassaman, K. E., M. J. Brooks, G. T. Hanson, and D. G. Anderson

1990 Native American Prehistory of the Middle Savannah River Valley: A Synthesis of Archaeological Investigations on the Savannah River Site, Aiken and Barnwell Counties, South Carolina. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 1, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Sassaman, K.E., I.R. Daniel, Jr., and C.R. Moore

2002 G.S. Lewis-East: Early and Late Archaic Occupations Along the Savannah River, Aiken County, South Carolina. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 12, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Schnell, F. T. and N. O. Wright, Jr.

1993 Mississippi Period Archaeology of the Georgia Coastal Plain. Georgia Archaeological Research Design Paper No. 3, University of Georgia, Athens.

Schoeneberger, P.J., D.A. Wysocki, E.C. Benham, and W.D. Broderson

1998 *Field Book for Describing and Sampling Soils*. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, National Soil Survey Center, Lincoln.

Semenov, S. A.

1973 Prehistoric Technology, 3rd edition. Adams and Dart, Bath, England.

South, S .

1977 Method and Theory in Historical Archeology. Academic Press, New York.

Stoltman, J.B.

1974 Groton Plantation: An Archaeological Study of a South Carolina Locality. Monographs of the Peabody Museum, No. 1, Harvard University, Cambridge.

Summermour, J.H., Shapiro, E.A., Lineback, J.A., Huddlestun, P.F., and Hughes, A.C.

1994 An investigation of tritium in the Gordon and others aquifer in Burke County, Georgia. Georgia Geologic Survey Information Circular 95.

The Hudgins Company

1909 Map of Burke and Jenkins Counties. Atlanta.

Townsend, B.

1975 Camp Lawton: Magnolia Springs State Park. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Atlanta.

United States Corps of Engineers

1919 Map of Burke and Jenkins Counties. Atlanta.

United States Department of the Interior

1991 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. National Register Bulletin 15:1-54.

United States Geological Survey

1950 Waynesboro Quadrangle. 7.5 minute Topographic Map.

1964 Idlewood Quadrangle. 7.5 minute Topographic Map.

1978 Millen Quadrangle. 7.5 minute Topographic Map.

1978 Perkins Quadrangle. 7.5 minute Topographic Map.

1989 Shell Bluff Landing. 7.5 minute Topographic Map.

United States House of Representatives

1893 The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Government Printing Office, Washington.

Veatch, O., and L. W. Stephenson

1911 Preliminary Report on the Geology of the Coastal Plain in Georgia. Bulletin 26. Geological Survey of Georgia, Atlanta.

Wharton, C.H.

1977 The Natural Environments of Georgia. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Atlanta.

Wheaton, T., T. H. Klein, L. Stoutenberg, B. Gantt, M. Bracken, and D. Babson

1982 Cultural Resource Survey and Testing of the Proposed Vogtle-Wadley Transmission Line, Burke and Jefferson Counties, Georgia. Soil Systems, Inc., Atlanta.

Wilmsen, E. N.

1970 Lithic Analysis and Cultural Inference: A Paleo-Indian Case. Anthropological Paper 16. University of Arizona, Tucson.

- Wood, W. D., D. Elliott, J. Rudolph, and D. Blanton
  - 1986 Prehistory in the Richard B. Russell Reservoir: The Archaic and Woodland Periods of the Upper Savannah River. Russell Papers. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District and National Park Service, Atlanta.

White, George

1849 *S* 

Statistics of the State of Georgia. W. Thorne Williams, Savannah.

### APPENDIX A. ARTIFACT CATALOG

						•	•
•							
1.	State Site	Prov	No	Field Site	Provenience	N_	Artifact Description
	9BK 00-(F1	1104.	58	IF1	Surface		Plain White Granite
<u> </u>	9BK 00-IF2		59	IF2	Surface	<u>  i</u>	Coastal Plain Flake Fraament
	9BK00-IF3	1	60	IF3	Surface	1	Coastal Plain Primary Flake Fragment
	9BK 00-IF4		61	IF4	Surface near STP 38	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
				<u>,</u>	Surface near		
	9BK00-IF4	·	61	IF4	STP 38	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
	9BK00-IF4		61	IF4	Surface near STP 38	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial Thinning Fragment
	9BK00-IF5		62	IF5	Transect 37, STP 31	2	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
				15.5	Transect 37,		
	9BK 00-IF5		62	15	SIP 31	<u>  · 1</u>	Unidentified Shell
	9BK00-IF6		110	IF6	13	2	with quartz inclusions (mend)
	9BK00-IF7		111	IF7	Iransect 2, SIP	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
	9BK414		3	1	STP N450 E500	1	Clear Machine Made Bottle Glass
	9BK414		3	1	STP N450 E500	3	Clear Bottle Glass
	ORKALA		3	. 1	STP N450		Glass Jamp Body
	0016414				STP N450	<u>'</u>	
	98K414		. · J	<b>_</b>	1500 STP N450	<u>                                      </u>	Aqua Bottle Glass
り	9BK414		3	1	E500	1	Unmeasured Flat Glass
	9BK414		7	1	E550 -	1	Light Green Bottle Glass
	9BK414		. 7	• 1	E550	1	Clear Bottle Glass
	9BK414		8	· · ·	STP N500 E600	2	Slag
	9BK414		8	1	STP N500	1	Clear Bottle Glass
	9BK414		8	<u>.</u> 1	STP N500		Metal Table Knife
		· · · ·	5	<u>'</u> 1	STP N550	<u>'</u>	A mothy at Color Pottle Class
	7DF\414			<u> </u>	STP N550	<u> </u>	
	9BK414	ļ	5	. 1	E500 STP N550		Light Green Bottle Glass
•	9BK414		5	·1	E500	11	Clear Bottle Glass
	9BK414 .		5	1	E500	<u>  1</u>	Other Glass Tableware
	9BK414		5	1	E500	1	2.75 to 3.0 Wire Common Nail 10 Penny
	9BK414		5	1	STP N550 E500	1	2.0 to 2.25 Wire Common Nail 7 Penny
	9BK414		5	1	STP N550 E500	1	3.0 to 3.25 Wire Common Nail 12 Penny
				 1	Surface N440		Plain White Granita
U)		L				<u>1</u>	
					·		
						•	

	·				
• •			•		
State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
9BK414	2	1	Surface N440 E510	2	Colored Refined Earthenware (Yellow, Pink, etc.)
9BK414	2	1	Surface N440 E510	1	Light Green Bottle Glass
9BK414	2	1	Surface N440 E510	1	Red/Green/Purple Underglaze Stippled Trans. Print
9BK414	4	1	Transect 28, STP N500 E500 (0-11cm)		Clear Bottle Glass
			Transect 28, STP N500		
9BK414	4	11	E500 (0-11cm)	1	Olive Green Spirit Bottle Glass
9BK414	6	1	STP N600 E500	1	Plain White Granite
9BK414	6	. 1	STP N600 STP N600	1	Other Glass Tableware
9BK414	6	1	Transect 28, STP N600 E500		Amethyst Color Bottle Glass
			Transect 28,	·	
9BK414	. 6	1	E500	1	Unidentified Brick
9BK414	1	. 1	Transect 28, Surface	1	Unidentified Brick
9BK415	10	2	ISTP N550 1E500	1	Clear Bottle Glass
9BK415	9	2	Surface	1	Cobalt Blue Machine Made Bottle Glass
9BK415	.9	2	Surface	1	Clear Machine Made Bottle Glass
9BK415	9	2	Surface	1	Auto Part
9BK415	9	. 2	Surface	1	Plain White Granite
9BK415	9	2	Surface	1	Stove Part
9BK416	106	3A	STP N300 E600	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
9BK416	106	3A	STP N300 E600	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
9BK416	106	3A	STP N300 E600	. 1	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
9BK416	106	3A	STP N300 E600	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
9BK416	. 106	3A	STP N300 E600	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
9BK416	106	3A	STP N300 E600	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
9BK416	12	3	STP N350 E300	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake
9BK416	12	3	STP N350 E300	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	12	3	STP N350 E300	1	Hawthorne Bifacial thinning flake
9BK416	102	3A	STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2	White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment

-

•

 $\bigcirc$ 

9BK416   102   3A     9BK416   102   3A	STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416   102   3A	STP N350       E600 (0-3.4 ft)       STP N350       E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416   102   3A	STP N350       E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416   102   3A	STP N350       E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416   102   3A	STP N350       E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A	E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A	E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	White Fossileterous Chert, Flake Fragment     Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment     Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A	E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A	E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2 2 2	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A	E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2 2	White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fragment Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A	E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2 2 2	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chart, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A   9BK416 102 3A   9BK416 102 3A   9BK416 102 3A	E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft) E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A 9BK416 102 3A	STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft) STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2	White Fossilaferous Chart Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A	STP N350	1 1	vvinie i ossileleloos Chen, huke i rugileni
		2	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416   102 3A	STP N350 E600 (0-3.4 ft)	2	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416 102 3A	STP N350 E600 (0-3,4 ft)	2	White Fossileferous Chert, Flake Fraament
9BK416 102 3A	STP N350 F600 (0-3 4 ft)	2	Cream Colored Chert, Elake Fragment
9BK /16 102 3A	STP N350	2	Coastal Plain Chort, Flake Fragment
	STP N400		
	STP N400	10	Coastal Plain Interior Plake Fragment
	STP N400	12	
9BN410 13	STP N400	3	Coasial Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
YBF 410 13	31E300 STP N400	2	Coastal Plain Shatter
9BK416 13	3 E300  STP N400		Coastal Plain Flake Fragment Heat Treated Coastal Plain Interior Flake
98K416 13	3 E300  STP N400		Fragment Heat Treated Cream Colored Chert Bifacial
9BK416 13	3 E300 STP N400		thinning Deptford Cord Marked, Body & Rim Sherd
98K416 13	3 E300	1	Medium Sand Temper
9BK416 100 3A	E600	2	Residual
9BK416 100 3A	E600	4	temper

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N-	Artifact Description
OBKAIA	100	34	STP N400	2	Residual
7DK410	1 100	37	STP N400		Deptford Cord Marked Body sherd, coarse sand
9BK416	100	3A	E600	4	temper
9BK416	100	3A	E600	2	Residual
OPVAIA	100	24	STP N400		Deptford Cord Marked Body sherd, coarse sand
7DK410	100	34	STP N400		
9BK416	100	3A	E600	2	Residual
9BK416	100	3A ·	E600	4	temper
OBKA16	100	34	STP N400	2	Residual
701410	100		STP N400		Deptford Cord Marked Body sherd, coarse sand
9BK416	. 100	3A	1575 N/100	4	temper
9BK416	100	3A -	E600	2	Residual
	100	34	STP N400		Deptford Cord Marked Body sherd, coarse sand
			STP N450		
9BK416	14		3 E300   STP N450	3	Heat Treated Chert Primary Flake
9BK416	14		3 E300	2	Coastal Plain Shatter
9BK416	14		3 E300	13	Coastal Plain Flake Fraament
		•	STP N450		
9BK410	14	·	STP N450	19	Coastal Plain Bitacial thinning flake tragment
9BK416	. 14		3 E300	8	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	14		3 E300	3	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
	14		STP N450		Indeterminate Eroded, Base sherd, Coarse sand
	14	•	STP N450		
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8H)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	8	Fragment
9BK416	107	3A	STP N450	5	Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
			STP N450		White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	10/	3A	E550 (0-3.8#)	5	Fragment
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
	107	2.4	STP N450	1,	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary
701410	10/	<u>3A</u>	STP N450	+	
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	107	3Å	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
	. 107	34	STP N450	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert Flake Ergament
			12000 10 0.011	<u> </u>	
•		•			

9BK416   107   3A     9BK416   107   3A	STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft)	8 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 5 5 1	Coastal Plain Chert, Bitacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416   107   3A	STP N450       E550 (0-3.8ft)       STP N45	5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 5 5 1	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK410   107   3A     9BK416   107   3A	L350 (0-3.8ft)       STP N450       E550 (0	5   1	White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake     Fragment     Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter     Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary     Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake     Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake     Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment     Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416   107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft)	5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 5 5 1	Fragment     Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter     Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary     Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment     Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake     Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake     Fragment     Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416   107   3A	E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 8 5 5 5 1	Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416   107   3A	STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft)	1 1 1 1 1 1 8 5 5 5 1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416   107   3A	STP N450       E550 (0-3.8ft)	1 1 1 1 8 5 5 5 1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416   107   3A	STP N450       E550 (0-3.8ft)	1 1 1 8 5 5 1	Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
78K416   107   3A	E550 (0-3.8ff) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft)	1 1 8 5 5 1	Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450	1 1 8 5 5 1	White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment     Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake     Fragment     Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment     White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake     Fragment     Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450	1 8 5 5 1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450	8 5 5	Coastal Plain Chert, Bitacial Thinning Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450	5 5 1	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450	5	White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A   PBK416 107 3A   PBK416 107 3A   PBK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450	5	Fragment Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A   PBK416 107 3A   PBK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft) STP N450	1	Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
2BK416. 107 3A 2BK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	
BK416 107 3A	ISTP N450	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary
	STP N450		
BK410 10/ 3A	STP N450		Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
BK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	8	Fragment
BK416 107 3A	STP N450	5	Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
	STP N450		White Fossileferous Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
<u>BK416 107/3A</u>	E550 (0-3.8H)	5	Fragment
BK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Unidentified Chert, Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
2BK416 107/3A	STP N450 E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment
DBK 416 107 24	STP N450		Coastal Plain Chart Interior Fights Frances
	STP N450		Coasial riain Chert, interior riake fragment
<u>28K416 107 3A</u>	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
PBK416 107 3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment

State Site		Field Site	Provenience		
No.	Prov. No.	No.	Description	<u>N=</u>	Artifact Description
			STP N450		Coastal Plain Chert, Biłacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8H)	8	Fragment
			STP N450		
9BK416	10/	3A	E550 (0-3.8ff)	<u> </u>	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
001/17/	107	<b>A A</b>	ISIP N450	r	White Fossileterous Chert, Bitacial Thinning Flake
9BK410	10/	3A	E350 (0-3.8ff)	<u>                                     </u>	ragment
001/11/	107	2.4	51P N450	1	Ulaidentified Chart Flake Fragment
9BK410	10/	3A	E350 (0-3.011)	<u>                                      </u>	Unidenimed Cherr, Flake Fragmeni
OPVAIA	107	34	51F N430	1 1	Coastal Plain Chort Shatter
7DN410	10/		STP N/450	<u> </u>	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert Secondary
OBKA16	107 I	34	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Flake Fragment
7010410	107	<u> </u>	STP N450	<u>├</u>	
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fraament
			STP N450	1	
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
			STP N450		
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
	•	•	STP N450		Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	8	Fragment
			STP N450		
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8H)	5	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
			SIP N450	_	White Fossileterous Chert, Bitacial Thinning Flake
9BK410	10/	3A	E550 (0-3.8ff)	<u> </u>	ragment
ODVALA	107	21	517 N450	1	Unidentified Chart Elaka Ergamont
90K410	10/	<u> 3A</u>	STD N/450	<u>                                     </u>	Omdenimed Gherr, Hake Hagmenn
OBKAIA	107	34	E550 (0-3 8ft)	1	Coastal Plain Chert Shatter
701(410	10/	0/1	STP N450		Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary
9BK416	107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Flake Fragment
70.000			STP N450	<u> </u>	
9BK416	. <sup>.</sup> 107	3A	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
			STP N450		
9BK416	107	3A .	E550 (0-3.8ft)	1	White Fossileferous Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
			STP N500		Deptford Cord Marked Body & Rim Sherd,
9BK416	15	3	E300	1	medium sand
			STP N500		Indeterminate Check Stamped Body Sherd,
9BK416	15	3	E300	1	Medium Sand temper
	1 10		151P N500		Deptford Cord Marked Body Sherd, Medium
9BK410	15	3	EJUU		Sana temper
ODK 414	16	· ·	151P N500	1 1	Shardlat (Pacidual)
9BK410	15	3	STP NI500		
ORVAIA	105	34	51F NJ00	1 1	Coastal Plain Chert Shatter
7DK410	105	<u> </u>	STP N500	┼──└	Coastal Plain Chert, Bilacial Thinning Elake
OBKAIA	105	34	F450	1	Fragment
7010410	100	<u> </u>	STP N500	<u> </u>	
9BK416	105	3A	E450	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
			STP N500		Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	105	3A	E450	1	Fragment
			STP N500		
9BK416	105	3A	E450	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
			STP N500		Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	105	3A	E450	1	Fragment
		•			

· . .

•

(

. 、

.

•

•

State Site No	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N-	Artifact Description
001/11/	105		STP N500	<u> </u>	
YBK_410	105	JA	12450 ISTP NI500		Coastal Plain Chert, Shafter
9BK416	105	3A -	E450	1	Fragment
0014114	105	<u>.</u>	STP N500	Ι.	
9BK410	105	3A -	12450 ISTP N1500	<u> </u>	Coastal Plain Chert, Shafter
9BK416	105	3A	E450	1	Fragment
0016414	105	0.4	STP N500	1,	
98K.410	105	<u>3</u> A	1510 N500		Coastal Plain Chert, Shafter
9BK416	· 105	3A .	E450	1	Fragment
	104	2 4	STP N500		
YBK 410	104	<u>3A</u>	ISTP N500	- '	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragmen
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	2	Coastal Plain Shatter
OPKA16	104	24	STP N500	1	Constal Plaia Flake Francest
9DF 410 ·	104	3A	ISTP N500	┨────	Coasial Flain Flake Fragment
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	Chalcedony Flake Fragment
OPKAIA	104	2.4	STP N500		Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thining flake
7DN410	104	54	ISTP N500	4	
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragment
OBKAIA	104	34	STP N500	1 2	Coastal Plain Shattor
701(410			STP N500		
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	104	34	E550 (0-2 6ft)	1	Chalcedony Flake Fragment
1010410			STP N500	╎───	Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thining flake
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	4	fragment
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fraament
			STP N500		g
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6#)	<u>  2</u>	Coastal Plain Shatter
9BK416	104	3A .	E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
	104		STP N500		
YBK410	. 104	<u>3A</u>	ISTP N500		Coastal Plain Chert Bifacial Thining flake
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	4	fragment
OPKAIA	104	3 1	STP N500	1,	Constal Plain Chart Interior Eleka Frances
9DF\410	104	<u> </u>	ISTP N500	<u>                                     </u>	Codsidi Fidiri Cherrinienor Fidke Fragmeni
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	2	Coastal Plain Shatter
OBK/16	104	34	STP N500	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
7DI\410		<u> </u>	STP N500	<del> </del>	Cousial Fiail Flake Flagment
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	Chalcedony Flake Fragment
9BK/16	104	34	151P N500 15550 10-2 AM		Coastal Plain Chert, Bitacial Thining flake
7011410	104		STP N500	+	
		2 4	15550 100 460	1 1	

. .

·

·

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description	()
9BK416	104	3A .	STP N500 E550 (0-2.6ft)	2	2 Coastal Plain Shatter	ý
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
9BK416	104	3A	STP N500 E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	1 Chalcedony Flake Fragment	
9BK416	104	3A	STP N500 E550 (0-2.6ft)	4	Coastal Plain Chert, Bitacial Thining tlake 4 fragment	
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragment	
9BK416	104	3A	E550 (0-2.6ft)	2	2 Coastal Plain Shatter	
9BK416	104	3A	STP N500 E550 (0-2.6ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
9BK416	104	3A .	STP N500 E550 (0-2.6ft)	· 1	1 Chalcedony Flake Fragment	
9BK416 .	104	3A	STP N500 E550 (0-2.6ft)	4	Coastal Plain Chert, Bitacial Thining tlake 4 fragment	
9BK416	18	3	STP N500 E650	1	1 Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment	
9BK416	19	3	STP N550 E300	2	2 Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
9BK416	19	3	STP N550 E300	1	1 Coastal Plain Interior flake fragment	
9BK416	19	3	STP N550 E300	6	6 Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment	<i>i</i>
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	. 1	1 Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain, Bifacial thinning Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Deptford Plain Body Sherd, Medium sand temper	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain, Bifacial thinning Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Deptford Plain Body Sherd, Medium sand temper	•
9BK416	103	ЗА	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain, Bifacial thinning Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Deptford Plain Body Sherd, Medium sand temper	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain, Bifacial thinning Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Deptford Plain Body Sherd, Medium sand temper	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	1 Coastal Plain, Bifacial thinning Flake Fragment	()
<u></u>						

· ·

<u>NO.</u>	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	Deptford Plain Body Sherd, Medium sand temper
BK416	103	3A <sup>.</sup>	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	Coastal Plain, Bifacial thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	103	3A	STP N550 E500 (1-1.9ft)	1	Deptford Plain Body Sherd, Medium sand temper
9BK416	21	3	E600	2	Coastal Plain shatter
9BK416	21		E600	2	Fort Payne Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	21	3	E600	<u>  1</u>	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	21	3	E600	3	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	21	·3	E600	4	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning Flake Complete
9BK416	21	3	E600	5	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	22	3	E300	1	Coastal Plain Shatter
9BK416	23	3	E600	4	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	23	3	E600	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	23	3	E600	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake complete
9BK416	23	3	E600 STP N700	2	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	24	. 3	E400 STP N700	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	24	3	E400 STP N700		Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	. 24	3	E400 STP N700	<u>  1</u>	Cord Marked residual Body Sherd, Medium Sand
9BK416	25	3	E500 STP N700	1	Cream Colored Chert Interior Flake
9BK416	25	3	E500 STP N700	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial Thinning Flake Complete
9BK416	25	3	E500 STP N700	3	Coastal Plain Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	25	3	E500 STP N700		Coastal Plain Shatter
<u>98K416</u>	25	3	E500 STP N700		Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
		] 3	E600		Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	26	3	Surface	· · ·	

State Site	Prov. No.	Field Site	Provenience Description	N.	Artifact Description
	11011 1101		Surface found		
			halt way up bluff near trench		
9BK416	87	3	two.	1	Coastal Plain Biface
		•	Surface near		Kirk Corner Notched PPK, Coastal Plain Base and
9BK416	70	3	2	1	HW.1.7 cm; T.0.6 cm)
			Surface near		
9BK416	70	3	2	1	Coastal Plain bifacial thinning flake fragment
			Surface near		
9BK416	70	· 3	2	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
001/16	00	2	Surface power	1	W/hite Fossilferous flake framment
901410	00	3	Surface power	<b>'</b>	while rossilierous licke tragment
9BK416	88	3	line	3	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	88	3	line	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning
001/14	00		Surface power	· ·	Overta Elaka Ernement
900410	00	3	Surface Trench		
9BK416	81	3	2	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
		•	Transect 3, STP		Coastal Plain Chert Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	3	Fragment
		•	Transect 3, STP		White Fossileferous chert Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	3	fragment
			Transect 3, STP		
9BK416	99	3A ·	6 (N500 E500)	2	Hawthorne chert Interior flake fragment
			Transect 3, STP		
9BK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	1	Residual rim sherd
			Transect 3, STP		
9BK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	]	Quartz Flake Fragment
			Transect 3, STP		· · · ·
2BK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	6	Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
			Transect 3, STP		
PBK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake
			Transect 3, STP		Coastal Plain Chert Bifacial Thinning Flake
PBK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	3	Fragment
			Transect 3, STP		White Fossileferous chert Bifacial Thinning Flake
PBK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	3	tragment
			Transect 3, STP		
PBK416	99	3A	6 (N500 E500)	2	Hawthorne chert Interior flake fragment

· · ·

No-	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N-	Artifact Description
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Residual rim sherd
9BK416	. 99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Quartz Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	6	Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	3	Coastal Plain Chert Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	3	White Fossileferous chert Bifacial Thinning Flake fragment
9BK416	. 99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	2	Hawthorne chert Interior flake fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Residual rim sherd
9BK416	. 99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Quartz Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	6	Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
9BK416	. 99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake
9BK416	. 99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	3	Coastal Plain Chert Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	. 99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	_3	White Fossileferous chert Bifacial Thinning Flake fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	2	Hawthorne chert Interior flake fragment
9BK416	99	<u>3A</u>	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Residual rim sherd
9BK416	. 99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Quartz Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	<u>3A</u>	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	6	Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	. 1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake

.

•

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	3	Coastal Plain Chert Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	3	White Fossileferous chert Bifacial Thinning Flake fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	2	Hawthorne chert Interior flake fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Residual rim sherd
9BK416	. 99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Quartz Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	6	Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	3	Coastal Plain Chert Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	3	White Fossileferous chert Bifacial Thinning Flake fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	2	Hawthorne chert Interior flake fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Residual rim sherd
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Quartz Flake Fragment
9BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	6	Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
<u>9</u> BK416	99	3A	Transect 3, STP 6 (N500 E500)	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake
9BK416	27	3	N750 E600	5	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	27	3	N750 E600	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	27	3	Transect 33, N750 E600	1	Coastal Plain Shatter
9BK416	27	3	Transect 33, N750 E600	2	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	17	3	Transect 33, STP 3	3	Chert Shatter
9BK416	20	3	Transect 33, STP 6	3	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
•					

BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410	5 5 5 5	Prov. N	<b>15</b> 15 15 15	Field Site No.	Provenience Description Transect 33, STP N500 E300 Transect 33, STP N500 E300 Transect 33, STP N500 E300	<b>N-</b> 1	Artifact Description Quartzite Interior Flake
BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410	5 5 5 5		15 15 15 15	3	Transect 33, STP N500 E300 Transect 33, STP N500 E300 Transect 33, STP N500 E300	1	Quartzite Interior Flake
BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410	5 5 5 5		15 15 15 15	3	E300 Transect 33, STP N500 E300 Transect 33, STP N500 E300	1	Quartzite Interior Flake
BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410	5 5 5		15 15 15	3	Transect 33, STP N500 E300 Transect 33, STP N500	8	
BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410	5 5 5		15 15 15	3	E300 Transect 33, STP N500	8	
BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410	5 5	· · .	15 15		STP N500		Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
BK410 BK410 BK410 BK410	5	•	15 15	3			
BK410 BK410 BK410	<u>5</u>	• .	15		11	2	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
BK410 BK410 BK410	5		15		STP N500		
BK410 BK410	5			3	E300	1	Coastal Plain Shatter
BK410 BK410	5				STP N500		
BK410			15		E300	9	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
BK410					STP N500		
	5	·	15		I E300		Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
	,		1.6		STP N500		
<u>BK410</u>	<u> </u>		15	· · ·	Transect 33,		Kirk Corner Notched PPK, coastal plain chert,
0611	<u>د</u>				STP N500	,	complete (L. 5.4 cm; BL. 4.0 cm; BW. 2.8 cm;
<u>DK410</u>	<u>,</u>	·	10		Transect 33,		(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)
BK11	4	•	16		STP N500	2	  Isotronic chert Bifacial thinning flake fragment
	,			<b>`</b>	Transect 33,	<u> </u>	
RK /1/	ς.	-	16		STP N500	3	Cream Colored Bifacial thinning Elake fragment
	5				Transect 33,		
BK410	5		16	3	ISTP N500 BIE350	1	Cream Colored Bifacial thinning Flake complete
					Transect 33,	.  .	
BK410	5		16	3	E350	1	complete
					Transect 33,		
BK410	5		16	3	E350	1	Coastal Plain shatter
					Transect 33, STP N500	·	•
BK410	5		16	3	E350	2	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
•					STP N500		
BK410	5 <sup>·</sup>		.16	3	E350	6	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
					STP N500		
BK410	5		16		E350	2	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
					STP N500		
BK410	5		16	3	E350	$\frac{2}{2}$	Coastal Plain Interior flake fragment
<u>BK41</u>	5	· · ·	69	3		1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
BK410	5	_	69	3	Iransect A, STP	3	  Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
	I	L			· · ·		V
							. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

	· ·		·.		
State Site No.	Proy. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
9BK416	69	3	Transect A, STP 1	1	Coastal Plain Primary Flake
9BK416	69	3	Iransect A, SIP 1	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	69	3	Transect A, STP	3	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	67	3	Transect A, STP 2	1	Coastal Plain Primary flake
9BK416	67	3	Transect A, STP	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake
9BK416	67	3	Iransect A, SIP 2	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	67	3	Iransect A, SIP 2	6	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	67	3	Iransect A, SIP	3	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	68	. 3	Iransect A, SIP	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake
9BK416	68	3	Iransect A, SIP	e	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	68	3	Iransect A, SIP	6	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	68	. 3	Iransect A, SIP	1	fragment
9BK416	67	3	STP2	<u>  1</u>	Temper
9BK416	71	3	STP 1-6	1	Coastal Plain Utilized flake fragment
9BK416	71	3	STP 1-6	. 5	Coastal Plain Interior Flake fragment
9BK416	71	3	STP 1-6	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake fragment Complete
9BK416	71	3	STP 1-6	3	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	71	3	STP 1-6	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	72	3	1	1	Quartz Bifacial thinning flake
9BK416	72	3	1 1	1	Coastal Plain bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	72	· 3	1	2	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	73	3	2	4	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	73	3	2	1	Coastal Plain Shatter
9BK416	73	3	2	1	Coastal Plain Interior flake fragment
9BK416	73	3	2	. 3	Coastal Plain bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	73	3	2	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake fragment
9BK416	73	3	2	1	Charcoal

.

.

State Site	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N-	Artifact Description
BK416	74	3	Iransect B, SIP	1	Secondary Flake fragment
PBK 416	74	3	Transect B, STP	1	Heat Treated Secondary Elake Fragment
	74	0	Transect B, STP	╞──┆	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake
/BK_410	/4	3	Transect B, STP	<u> </u>	tragment
PBK416	74	3	3 Transect B_STP	3	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK416	74	3	3	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK416	74	. 3	3	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
?BK416	75	3	Transect B, STP	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
2BK/16	75	3	Transect B, STP	1	Cream Colored Chert Bifacial thinning flake
	75		Transect B, STP		Constal Plaia Elako francest
<u>/BK410</u>	/5	<u>_</u>	Transect B, STP	<u>.</u> 2	Coastal Plain Flake tragment
2BK416	76	3	5 Transect B. STP	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
2BK416	77	3		12	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
PBK416	77	3	6	1	Quartzite Secondary Flake fragment
PBK416	77	3	Transect B, STP 6	10	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
	78	3	Trench 1 from	1	Coastal Plain Biface undefined
	70		Trench 1 from	· ·	
/BK410	/8	3	Trench 1 from		Coastal Plain Primary flake tragment
<u>28K416</u>	78	3	spoil Trench 1 from	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake
PBK416	78	3	spoil Tronch 1 from	1	Coastal Plain bifacial thinning flake fragment
BK416	- 78	3	spoil	5	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
PBK416	78	3	spoil	5	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
2BK416	79	3	Trench 1 from spoil	1	Coastal Plain Hammerstone
			Trench 1 from		
PBK416	80	3	120cm)	1	Coastal Plain flake fragment
			trench V trom		
<u>PBK416</u>	80	3	120cm) Trench 1 from	1	Coastal Plain Shatter
28 <b>K∕</b> 1A	80	2	trench wall (90-	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake fragment
			Trench 1, 60-		
/DF 410	82	3	Trench 2, from	-2	Coasial Plain Interior Plake tragment
PBK416	83	3	East Profile	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
	•				
· .					

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
9BK416	83	3	East Profile	4	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning fragment
98K416	84	3	Trench 3, from	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fraament
001/16	04	2	Trench 3, from		Coastal Plain Flake Ecomont
7DK410	04		Trench 3, from		
9BK416	84	. 3	Trench 3, from	2	Coastal Plain Bitacial thinning flake tragment
9BK416	84	3	wall	2	Coastal Plain Interior flake fragment
001/14	05		surface and		Constal Plain Utilized Elabor Engrand
9DN410		<u>_</u>	Trench 3,		Coasial Flain Onlized Flake Fragment
001/11/			spoil from	1,	
9BK416	85	3	Trench Trench 3,		Quartzite Hammerstone
9BK416	. 85	3	surface and spoil from trench	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
			Trench 3, surface and spoil from		
9BK416	85	3	trench Trench 3		Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
	, ,		surface and		
9BK416	85	3	trench	3	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	108	3A 3A	Irench 4	$\frac{1}{1}$	Unidentified Shell tragments
701410	100				Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	108	3A	Irench 4	$\frac{2}{7}$	Fragment
DRKAIA	108	34	Trench 4	$+\frac{1}{2}$	Unidentified Shall fragments
9BK416	108	34	Trench 4	$\frac{2}{1}$	Coastal Plain Chert Shatter
	100	2.4	Treach 4	· · ·	Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
28K416	108	34	Trench 4	7	Coastal Plain Chert Elake Fragment
2BK416	108	3A	Trench 4	$\frac{1}{2}$	Unidentified Shell fragments
9BK416	108	3A	Trench 4	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
9BK416	108	3A .	Trench 4	2	Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	108	3A .	Trench 4	7	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416	108	3A	Trench 4	2	Unidentified Shell fragments
9BK416	108	3A	Trench 4	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
9BK416	108	3A	Trench 4	2	Fragment
78K416	108	3A	Irench 4	<u>  /</u>	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
98K416 98K416	108	3A 34	Trench 4	$\frac{2}{1}$	Unidentified Shell tragments
	1	<u></u>		<u> </u>	

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
9BK416	108	3A -	Trench 4	2	Fragment
9BK 416	108	3A	Trench 4	7	Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416	108	3A	Trench 4	2	Unidentified Shell fragments
9BK416	108	3A	Trench 4	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
	100	2.4	T 14		Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
98K410	108	3A 2A	Trench 4		Coastal Plain Chart Elaka Fragment
7DN410	100	34	Trench 4		Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Utilitized Flake
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Fragment
9BK:416	109	3A	Trench 5	2	Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	2	Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	$\frac{1}{1}$	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	ЗА	Trench 5	2	Fraament
				<u>+</u>	Heat Treated Unidentified Chert, Bifacial Thinning
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Flake Fragment
OPK 116	100	24	Tropph 5		Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Bitacial
90K410	109	34	Trench 5	5	Cream Colored Chert Elake Fragment
////				<b></b>	
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	3	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	+	Agate, Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Temper with quartz inclusions
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Depttord Decorated Rim Sherd, Coarse Sand Temper
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Deptford Oblique Overlapping Cordmarked Rim Sherd, coarse sand temper with quartz inclusions
9BK/416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Utilitized Flake
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	2	Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	2	Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	2	Cream Colored Chert, Bitacial Thinning Flake Fragment
 9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Heat Treated Unidentified Chert, Bilacial Thinning Flake Fragment
					Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	<u> </u>	I hinning Flake Fragment
YBK 410	109	JA	Irench 5	+ 5	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	3	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fraament
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Agate, Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Deptford Decorated Body Sherd, Coarse Sand Temper with quartz inclusions
 9BK416	109	3A -	Trench 5	1	Deptford Decorated Rim Sherd, Coarse Sand Temper
ORKIIA	100	34	Trench 5	1,	Deptford Oblique Overlapping Cordmarked Rim
701-410	<u>                                     </u>	<u>07</u>		_ <u> </u>	Touera' course source temper with dranz inclusions

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
ORKAIA	100	34	Trench 5	· ,	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Utilitized Flake
OBK / 16	107	30	Trench 5	<u> </u>	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Elake Fragment
OBK 416	107	34	Trench 5	+	Coastal Plain Chert, Merlor Hake Fragment
OBKA16	107	34	Trench 5		Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Place Programment
70(410		<u> </u>			Cream Colored Chert, Bitacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	2	Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Heat Treated Unidentified Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
					Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	7	Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	5	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment
OBKAIA	100	34	Tronch 5	2	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chart Elako Fragmeni
0BK416	107	34	Trench 5	+	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Nake Magneria
98K/16	109	34	Trench 5	<del> </del> 1	Agate Secondary Elake Fragment
701(410	107	07	Trench 5		Deptford Decorated Body Sherd Coarse Sand
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Temper with quartz inclusions
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Deptford Decorated Rim Sherd, Coarse Sand Temper
	100	<u>.</u>	- 1 c	Ι.	Deptford Oblique Overlapping Cordmarked Rim
9BK416	109	3A	Irench 5	+	Sherd, coarse sand temper with quartz inclusions
OBKAIA	100	34	Trench 5	1,	Fragment
<u>98K416</u>	107	34	Trench 5		Coastal Plain Chert Interior Elake Fragment
90K410	109	34	Trench 5		Coastal Plain Chert, Merlor Hake Fragment
<u>98K/16</u>	109	34	Trench 5		Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Hake Pragment
701(410	107	<u> </u>	inencii o		Cream Colored Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	109	3A .	Trench 5	2	Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Heat Treated Unidentified Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
	100	~ ^			Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Bitacial
9BK410	109	3A	Trench 5		Cream Caland Chart Elaka Fragment
9DN410	109	3A	Irench 5		Cream Colored Cherr, Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	3	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	$+$ $\overline{1}$	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Shatter
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	+i	Aggte, Secondary Flake Fragment
				-{	Deptford Decorated Body Sherd, Coarse Sand
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Temper with quartz inclusions
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Deptford Decorated Rim Sherd, Coarse Sand Temper
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	<u>  1</u>	Depttord Oblique Overlapping Cordmarked Rim Sherd, coarse sand temper with quartz inclusions
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Frequent Coasial Flain Cherr, Utilitizea Flake
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1 2	Coastal Plain Chert. Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	$\frac{1}{2}$	Coastal Plain Chert, Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	$\frac{1}{1}$	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fraament
				<u> </u>	Cream Colored Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
9BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	2	Fragment
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

. .

· · · · ·

State Site	D	Field Site	Provenience	<u> </u>	
	Proy. No.	<b>NO.</b>	Description		Heat Treated Unidentified Chert, Bifacial Thinning
9BK-410	109	3A	Irench 3		Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Bifacial
PBK-416	109	3A -	Trench 5	7	Thinning Flake Fragment
BK 416	109	3A	Trench 5	5	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment
BKIIA	109	34	Trench 5	1.3	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert Flake Fragment
BK 116	107	34	Trench 5	+	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Nake Haghern
BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	+	Agate, Secondary Flake Fragment
					Deptford Decorated Body Sherd, Coarse Sand
PBK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Temper with quartz inclusions
BK 116	100	37 .	Trench 5	1	Depttord Decorated Kim Sherd, Coarse Sand
	107	54		┽╧╌╧	Deptford Oblique Overlapping Cordmarked Rim
BK416	109	3A .	Trench 5	1	Sherd, coarse sand temper with quartz inclusions
	. 100		T	Ι,	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Utilitized Flake
BK410	109	3A 2A	Trench 5	$\frac{1}{2}$	Fragment
DR 410	107	34	Trench 5	$\frac{2}{2}$	Coastal Plain Chert, Interior Hake Fragment
DIC410	107	34	Trench 5	$\frac{1}{1}$	Coastal Plain Chert, Primary Flake Fragment
				+	Cream Colored Chert, Bifacial Thinning Flake
PBK416	109	3A .	Trench 5	2	Fragment
	100	2.4	Transh 6	Ϊ.,	Heat Treated Unidentified Chert, Bifacial Thinning
<u>/bh410</u>	109	JA	Trench 3		Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert Bitacial
PBK416	109	3A ·	Trench 5	7	Thinning Flake Fragment
PBK416	109	3A	Trench 5	5	Cream Colored Chert, Flake Fragment
	100		T LE	, i	
BK410	109	3A	Trench S	$\frac{1}{1}$	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Chert, Flake Fragment
DRK 116	109	34	Trench 5	+	Agate Secondary Elake Fragment
01(410			·	+-	Deptford Decorated Body Sherd, Coarse Sand
PBK416	109	3A	Trench 5	1	Temper with quartz inclusions
	100	24	Transh E		Deptford Decorated Rim Sherd, Coarse Sand
DN 410	109	3A	Trench 3	<u> </u>	Deptford Oblique Overlapping Cordmarked Rim
BK416	109	3A	Trench 5	.1	Sherd, coarse sand temper with quartz inclusions
	101	0.4	STP N400	<b>1</b>	Constal Plain Secondary Flate Forement
BK410	. 101	3A	STP NIADO		Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
BK416	101	3A	E550	1	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragment
		<u></u>	STP N400	1.	
'BK416	101	3A	1550	1-1	Coastal Plain Chert Shaffer
PBK416	·101	3A	1517 1N400	1	Quartz Shatter
<u></u>			STP N400	1	
PBK416	101	3A	E550	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
	101	34	ISIP N400	1	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragment
	101		STP N400	+	
PBK416	101	3A	E550	1	Coastal Plain Chert Shatter
		0.4	STP N400	Γ.	
/BK416	101	JA	1520		Quartz Shatter
· _			•		

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N-	Artifact Description
9BK416	101	3A	STP N400 E550	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	101	3A	STP N400 E550	<u> </u> 1	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	101	3A	STP N400 E550	1	Coastal Plain Chert Shatter
9BK416	101	3A	STP N400 E550	1	Quartz Shatter
9BK416	101	3A	STP N400 E550	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	101	3A	STP N400 E550	1	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	· 101	3A	STP N400 E550 ~	1	Coastal Plain Chert Shatter
9BK416	101	3A	E550	1	Quartz Shatter
9BK416	101	3A	E550	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	101	3A	E550	1	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	101	ЗА	E550	1	Coastal Plain Chert Shatter
9BK416	101	3A	E550	1	Quartz Shatter
9BK416	101	3A	E550	<u></u> 1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK416	101	3A	E550	1	Coastal Plain Chert Interior Flake Fragment
9BK416	101	3A	E550	<u>  · 1</u>	Coastal Plain Chert Shatter
9BK416	101	3A	E550	<u> </u> 1	Quartz Shatter
9BK418	30	4	5 E500	<u>  1</u>	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK418	30	4	5 E500	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK418	30		5 E500	<u> </u>	Agate Primary Flake
9BK418	29		5 E500	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK418	31		5 E450	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK418	31	· .	5 E450	1	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Interior Flake fragment
9BK418	33	4	5 E500	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK418	33		5 E500	2	Coastal Plain bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK418	33		5 E500	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK418	32	4	5 E600	1	Quartz Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK418	32		5E600	1	Coastal Plain Primary Flake

 $\bigcirc$ 

·

. .

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N-	Artifact Description
9BK418	32	5	E600	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial Thinning Flake Fragment
9BK418	28	5	Surface	16	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake
9BK418	28	5	Surface	1	Coastal Plain Primary Flake
9BK418	28	5	Surface	1	Quartzite Flake Fragment
<u>98K418</u>	28	5	Surface	4	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake
<u>98K418</u>	28	5	Surface		Coastal Plain Interior Flake
9BK418	28	<u> </u>	SURACE	32	Coastal Plain Flake Pragment
9BK419	54	6	E500	1	Cream colored Bifacial thinning flake fragment
		,	STP N450		
<u>98K419</u>	54	. 6	ESUU	<u> </u>	Agale Secondary Flake
9BK419	53	6	E350	1	Coastal Plain Interior flake
· · · · · · · · ·			STP N500		
9BK419	53	6	E350	2	Coastal Plain Bitacial thinning tlake tragment
9BK419	53	6	E350	5	Coastal Plain Flake Fraament
			STP N500	<u> </u>	Heat Treated Coastal Plain Interior Flake
9BK419	48	6	E450	1	Fragment
9BK419	48	: 6	F450	. 2	Coastal Plain Interior flake fragment
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	STP N500	1	
9BK419	48	6	E450	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake
0BK/10	18	· 6	51P N500	5	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake
	-40		STP N500		
9BK419	48	6	E450	4	Coastal Plain flake-fragment
OBK/10			ISTP N500	1	Coartal Plain Shattor
701(417	40	0	STP N500	+	
9BK419	51	6	E500	1	Coastal Plain PPK base fragment
	51	. 	STP N500		Constal Plain Pifanial thinning flaks fragment
7DFX417	51	0	STP N500	4	Coasial Fiain Bilacial infining liake tragment
9BK419	51	6	E500	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake fragment
OBK/10	51	6	STP N500	1	Cream Colored Interior flake fragment
701(417			STP N500		
9BK419	49	6	E550	1	Coastal Plain Primary Flake
98K/10	10	4	512 N500	2	Coastal Plain flake fragment
7 01 1417	47		STP N500		
9BK419	49	6	E550	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning fragment
ORK/10	10		SIP N500		coastal plain shatter
7011417	47		STP N500	<u> </u>	
9BK419	47	6	E600	1	Coastal Plain flake fragment
	17	4	STP N500	1	Hagt Troated Coastal Plain flats fragment
7011417	4/	0	STP N500		neur neureu Cousiar Flain liake fragment
9BK419	·47	. 6	E600	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake fragment
•			· ·		

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N-	Artifact Description
			STP N500		Heat Treated Coastal Plain bifacial thinning fl
<u>98K419</u>	40	0	STR NISOO	<u> </u>	fragment
98K/19	46	6	F650	1	l Coastal Plain hifacial thinning flake fragment
701(417	40	<b>~</b>	STP N560	+	
9BK419	50	6	E400	1	Coastal Plain flake fragment
			STP N560		
9BK419	50	6	E400	1	Coastal Plain shatter
0014 (100		•			Deptford Cord Marked Body Sherd, fine sand
<u>98K419</u>	63	6	Surface		temper
9BK419	52	6	Surface	4	Coastal Plain Primary Flake Fragment
9BK419	52	6	Surface	1	Cream Colored Interior Flake Complete
9BK419	52	6	Surface	2	Coastal Plain bifacial thinning flake complete
	50		<b>C C</b>		
9BK419	52	6	Surface		Heat Treated Coastal Plain Interior flake tragr
<u>98K419</u>	52	0	Surface	12	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment
9BK419	52	6	Surface		Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK419	52	6	Surface	7	Coastal Plain Bitacial thinning tlake tragment
00410	50	2	C[		Eroded Decorated residual Body Sherd, Medi
9BK419	52	0	Surrace		Danta temper
9BK419	52	6	Surface	1	temper
9BK419	52	· 6	Surface	1	Deptford Plain Body Sherd, Medium sand tem
			Surface Btw		
			9BK419 &		
9BK419	63	6	9BK420		Coastal Plain Interior tlake
			Surface Btw		· · ·
OBKAIO	63	6	9BK420	1	Coastal Plain Primary Flake Fragment
///////////////////////////////////////	00	<u> </u>	Surface Btw	<u>+</u>	
			9BK419 &		
9BK419	63	6	9BK420	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake
			Surface Btw		
		,	9BK419 &		
9BK419	63	0	9BK420	4	Coastal Plain Flake tragment
			SURFACE BIW		
98K419	63	6	9BK420	1	Coastal Plain shatter
		<u> </u>	STP N150		
9BK420	43	. 7	E400	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake
			STP N250		
9BK420	36	7	E300	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
		· .	STP N250		
9BK420	37	7	E400	11	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
			SIP N250		
YDK420	3/	/			Coastal Plain Bitacial thinning flake tragment
OBKADO	27	7	517 IN250 F/00		Coastal Plain Shatter
/ DIN+20		'	STP N350	┼──┤	
9BK420	64	· 7	E250	1	Coastal Plain flake fraament
	<u>  </u>		STP N350	┽╧╹	
9BK120	1 64	7	F250	1 1	Coastal Plain Primary Elake Fragment

Ų.

 $\bigcirc$ 

• •

•

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N-	Artifact Description	].
9BK420	35	7	STP N400 E500	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment	·
9BK420	41	. 7	STP N450 E350	1	Coastal Plain flake fragment	1
9BK420	41	7	STP N450 E350	1	cream colored bifacial thinning flake fragment	1
 2BK420	41	7	STP N450 E350	1	Coastal Plain bifacial thinning flake fragment	1
2BK420	. 40	) 7	STP N450	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment	1
2BK 120	40	7	STP N450	2	Coastal Plain Elake Ergament	
DRK 120	. 3/	7	STP N450	1	Coastal Plain Interior Elako fraemont	1
DIX 420			STP N450			1
	34		STP N450		Coastal riain riake rragment	
/BK_420	42	/	STP N450		Coastal Plain bitacial thinning flake tragment	
<u>78K420</u>	42		STP N450		Coastal Plain rejuvination flake complete	- - - -
<u>28K420</u>	42		E500 STP N450		Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	-
2BK420	38	7	E550 STP N450	5	Coastal Plain Bitacial thinning flake fragment	
PBK420	38	· 7	E550 STP N450		Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
PBK420	38	7	E550 STP N450		Coastal Plain Secondary Flake	
PBK420	39	7	E600 STP N450	. 1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake	$\frac{1}{2}$
PBK420	. 39	7	E600 STP N450	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment	$\left\{ \right.$
РВК420	· 39	7	E600 STP N500	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Complete	4
PBK420	45	7	E500 STP N500	1	Cream Colored Interior Flake Fragment	-
PBK420	45	7	E500 STP N500	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment	
BK420	45	7	E500	1	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake Fragment	4
BK420	44	7	Surface	+	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Complete	┨.
PBK420	44	7	Surface	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment	]
PBK421	55	. 8	STP N500 E400	5	Coastal Plain flake Fragment	
PBK421	55	8	STP N500 E400	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment	
9BK421	57	8	STP N500 E400	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment	
PBK421	57	8	STP N500 E400	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake complete	
PBK421	57	8	STP N500 E400	1	Coastal plain shatter	
98K421 98K421 98K421	57 57 57	8	E400 STP N500 E400 STP N500 E400	1	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake complete Coastal plain shatter	

·					
State Site	Prov. No.	Field Site	Provenience	N-	Artifact Description
			STP N500		
9BK421	57	8	E400	4	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
			STP N500		Heat Treated Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake
9BK421	5/	8	12400		fragment
9BK121	56		E500	1 2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
		ļ	STP N500		
9BK421	56	8	E500	1	Coastal Plain flake fragment
	1		Surface near		
			Transect 53,		Constal Dista flate formers
YBK4ZZ	. 00	<u> </u>	Surface pear	<u> </u>	Coastal Plain flake fragment
			Transect 53		· · ·
9BK422	66	9	STP 4	2	Plaster
			Surface on	1-	
0014400			Transect 53,	.	
9BK422	65	9	ISIP 4	<u> </u>	Coastal Plain Bitacial thinning tlake tragment
<u>98K423</u>	89	10	Judge I	<u> </u>	Residual Sherd, Medium Sand temper
9BK423	89	10	ludae 1	1	temper
/ 011-120		<u>_</u>	<u></u>	- <u> </u>	Deptford Check Stamped Body Sherd, Medium
9BK423	89	· 10	Judge 1	1	Sand temper
9BK423	89	10	Judge 1	1	Savannah Plain Body Sherd, fine sand temper
		10			Savannah Plain Body Sherd, fine sand (crushed
9BK423	89	10	Judge I		Quartz inclusions)
9BK423	89	10	ludae 1	1.1	lemper
////				+	ISavannah Burnished Body Sherd, medium sand
9BK423	89	10	Judge 1	1	temper
				Ι.	
9BK423	89	10	Judge I		Savannah Plain Body Sherd, medium sand temper
7BK423	89	10		3	Sherdlet (Kesidual)
7BK423	89	10	Juage I		Forr Payne cherr Biracial minning Flake
9BK423	90	10	ludae 2	2	sand temper
7BK423	90	10	Judge 2	$+\overline{1}$	Incised Residual Sherd, medium sand temper
9BK423	90	10	Judge 2	1	Plain Rim Residual Sherd, medium sand temper
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Savannah Check stamped Body Sherd, Medium
9BK423	90	10	Judge 2	1	sand
9BK423	90	10	Judge 2	2	Plain Residual Body Sherd, medium sand temper
ODVADD		10	ludae 2	,	Savannah Burnished Body Sherd, tine sand
7DN423	90				Savannah Plain Rody Shard agains and torrage
70N423	92	10			Savannah Plain Body Sherd, Coarse sana temper
DRK102	72	10	Judge 4	+	Savannah Plain Body Sherd, fine sand temper
701423		10			Indeterminate decorated Body Sherd medium
9BK423	92	10	Judge 4	1	sand temper
9BK423	92	10	Judge 4	1	Residual sherd
9BK423	92	10	Judge 4	1	Eroded Residual Rim Sherd, fine sand temper
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	Savannah Check Stamped Body Sherd, medium
9BK423	92	10	Judge 4	1	sand temper
002400		10	ludes A		Indeterminant Decorated Body Sherd, coarse
70K423	92	10	Juage 4	2	sana temper

· · ·

.

.

·

•

ر ب

.

•	•				
State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
9BK423	92	10	Judae 4	1	Mississippian Rectilinear Complicated Rim Sherd, medium sand temper
001/102		10	ludae A	<u> </u>	Deptford Cord Marked Body Sherd, Medium
7DK423	92	10	Judge 4		Sand Temper
2BK 423	93	10	Judge 5	$\frac{3}{1}$	Residual Rim Sherd, medium sand temper
· DI\420		···		┼──	Savannah Check Stamped Body Sherd, medium
9BK423	93	10	Judge 5	2	sand temper
9BK423	93	10	Judae 5	3	temper
9BK423	93	10	Judge 5	2	Residual sherd Fine sand temper
9BK423	89	10	Judgemental 1	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake fragment
9BK423	89	. 10	Judgemental 1	1	Coastal Plain Primary Flake
PBK423	89	10	Judgemental 1	4	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK423	. 89	10	Judgemental 1	5	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
7BK423	89	10	Judgemental 1	1	Coastal Plain Preform
9BK423	90	10	Judgemental 2		Cream Colored Flake Fragment
9BK423	90	10	Judgemental 2	4-4	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
7BK423	90	10	Judgemental 2	$\frac{3}{1}$	Coastal Plain Bitacial finning flake fragment
7DK423	90	10	Judgemental 2	+	Coasial Flain Interior Flake tragment
2BK /23	91	10	Judgemental 3	<u> </u>	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
7BK423	91	10	Judgemental 3		Coastal Plain Interior flake fragment
7BK423	92	10	Judgemental 4	2	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
PBK423	92	10	Judgemental 4	2	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
7BK423	93	10	Judgemental 5	6	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
9BK423	93	10	Judgemental 5	1	Quartz shatter
PBK423	93	10	Judgemental 5	1	Chalcedony shatter
YBK423	93	10	Judgemental 5		Coastal Plain shafter
70N423	73	10	Judgemental 5		Coastal Plain Bracial minning ficke fragment
701(420	75	i	Judgemental J		Cream Colored Chert bifacial thinning Flake
9BK423	93	10	Judgemental 5	11	Fragment
PBK423	93	10	Judgemental 5	1	Coastal Plain Interior Flake fragment
PBK423	93	10	Judgemental 5	$\frac{1}{1}$	Fort Payne Flake tragment
/BK423	93	10	Surface down	┼╌╵	Chalcedony flake fragment
9BK423	86	10	by the river	1	(L. 4.6 cm; BW. 2.2 cm; T. 1.1 cm)
			Surface down	- I	
9BK423	86	10	by the river	<u>                                     </u>	Coastal Plain Secondary Flake fragment
9BK423	86	10	by the river	7	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK423	86	10	Surtace down by the river	10	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK423	86	10	Surface down	17	Coastal Plain Flake Fragment
, 01 1420	1		Surface down	<u> </u>	
9BK423	86	10	by the river	1	Coastal Plain Shatter
9BK423	86	10	by the river	1	White Fossileferous shatter
					· · ·

State Site No.	Prov. No.	Field Site No.	Provenience Description	N=	Artifact Description
001/ 400	·	10	Surface down	1,	Constal Plain Cons
7DN423	00	10	Dy me river		Coastal Plain Core
9DN423		10	irench i wali		Indeterminate Cord Marked Pim Shord Medium
9BK423	94	10	Trench 1 wall	2	Sand temper
				+	Savannah Cord Marked (Oblique Overlapping)
9BK423	94	10	Trench 1 wall	1	Body Sherd, Medium sand temper
					Savannah Check stamped Body Sherd, Medium
9BK423	94	10	Trench 1 wall	1	sand temper
9BK423	95	10	Trench 1, 7-8ft	1	Coastal Plain Shatter
9BK423	95	10	Trench 1, 7-8ft	5	Coastal Plain Interior Flake Fragment
9BK423	95	10	Trench 1, 7-8ft	1	Coastal Plain Bifacial thinning flake fragment
9BK423	. 95	10	Trench 1, 7-8ft	1	Coastal Plain Utilized flake fragment
		10	Trench 2 Spoil	,	Savannah Check stamped Body Sherd, medium
YDK423		10	pile	<u>                                      </u>	Isana temper
9BK423	96	10	two feet	1	temper
9BK423	96	10	Trench 2, 1-2ft	$\frac{1}{1}$	Coastal Plain Primary Flake Fragment
9BK423	96	10	Trench 2, 1-2ft	$\frac{1}{1}$	Fort Payne Interior Flake Fragment
9BK423	96	10	Trench 2, 1-2ft	<u>† 1</u>	Coastal Plain Utilized flke fragment
/ 011120			Trench 2,		
9BK423	97	10	180cm	1	Coastal Plain Preform fragment
					•
		•			
					· ·
				• •	

.

· ·

# APPENDIX B. RESUME FOR NATALIE P. ADAMS

NEW SOUTH ASSOCIATES

PROVIDING PERSPECTIVES ON THE PAST

A WOMAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS

NATALIE P. ADAMS, RPA PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR NEW SOUTH ASSOCIATES, INC. 1534 Leesburg Road Columbia, South Carolina 29209 803.647.5983 (Phone) 803.647.5987 (Fax) npadams@newsouthassoc.com

#### **EDUCATION:**

M.A., Public Service Archaeology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, 1990 B.A., Anthropology and History, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, 1987

**YEARS EXPERIENCE: 16** 

#### SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE:

Ms. Adams serves New South Associates as a Principal Investigator and Project Manager in the firm's Columbia, South Carolina office. Ms. Adams is a Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) and is past president of the Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists (COSCAPA). She has 16 years of professional archeological experience and has authored or co-authored over 120 technical reports and publications. She has directed research for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Jacksonville, Savannah, Wilmington, and Fort Worth Districts; the North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia Departments of Transportation; the Tennessee Valley Authority; the US Forest Service; and a number of private clients. She has experience in historical archaeology, coastal Woodland Period archaeology, preservation planning, and GIS. Ms. Adams' areas of expertise include:

• Southern History

Plantation Archaeology

- African-American Archaeology
- Colonial Backcountry Archaeology
- Coastal Woodland Period Archaeology

• Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

#### **KEY SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE:**

- 2006 Project Manager. Archaeological Survey of Expansion Areas at Plant Vogtle, Burke County Georgia. Work performed for Tetra Tech NUS and Southern Company.
- 2005 Project Manager. The Free Cabin Site; A Postbellum Tenant Community near Hephzibah, Georgia. Work performed for Earthtech and Georgia DOT.
- 2003 Project Manager. Archaeological Resources Overview of Shaw Air Force Base and Poinsett Electronic Combat Range, Sumter County, South Carolina. Work performed for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Ft. Worth District.
- 2001 Project Manager. Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Rifle Range at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina. Work performed for the U.S. Army

Corps of Engineers, Savannah.

2000

Project Manager. Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of 4,219 Acres, Lake Thurmond, Mcduffie, Lincoln, Wilkes, And Columbia Counties, Georgia And Mccormick County, South Carolina. Work performed for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District.

1996 – 1998 Project Manager. Nottely and Chatuge Reservoirs Shoreline Survey, Georgia and North Carolina. Phase I archeological survey was conducted of approximately 59 linear miles along the Nottely Reservoir shoreline and approximately 60 linear miles along the Chatuge Reservoir shoreline. Work conducted for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

#### SELECTED REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS:

- 2005 Adams, Natalie P., Mark Swanson, Leslie Raymer, Lisa D. O'Steen, J. W. Joseph and Arthur Cohen. The Free Cabin Site (9Ri1036): Archaeological Examination of a Postbellum Tenant Occupation near Hephzibah, Richmond County, Georgia. Report submitted to EarthTech and GDOT.
- 2004 Adams, Natalie P. Cultural Resource Management Plan for the Cooper River Drainage, Berkeley County, South Carolina. Report submitted to SC Department of Health and Environmental Control.
- 2003 Adams, Natalie P. Archaeological Resources Overview of Shaw Air Force Base and Poinsett Electronic Combat Range, Sumter County, South Carolina. Report submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Ft. Worth District.
- 2003 Adams, Natalie P. Archaeological Reconnaissance of Approximately 2,200 Acres at the Cliffs Keowee Tract, Oconee County, South Carolina. Report submitted to the Cliffs Communities.
- 2002 A Pattern of Living: A View of the African American Slave Experience in the Pine Forests of the Lower Cape Fear. In Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies, edited by J. W. Joseph and Martha Zierden, pp. 65-78. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa and London.
- 2001 Adams, Natalie P. Archaeological Data Recovery at 38BU1186 Proposed Swimming Pool Location, Bray's Island, Beaufort County, South Carolina. Report submitted to Brays Island Plantation.
- 2000 Adams, Natalie P., Leslie E. Raymer, J.W. Joseph, and Bonnie Frick. *Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of 4,219 Acres, Lake Thurmond, McDuffie, Lincoln, Wilkes, And Columbia Counties, Georgia And McCormick County, South Carolina.* Report submitted to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District.
- 2000 Adams, Natalie P. et al. Carolinas Pipeline Cultural Resources Overview and Survey Report. Report for Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation.
- 1998 Adams, Natalie P. Archaeological Survey of 603 Acres Adjacent to Chatuge Reservoir: Addendum to Archaeological Survey of Approximately 60 Linear Miles of the Chatuge Reservoir Shoreline Management Zone, Towns County, Georgia and Clay County, North Carolina. Report submitted to Tennessee Valley Authority.

- 1998 Langdale, Jennifer P. and Natalie P. Adams Cultural Resource Assessment of the Proposed U.S. Courthouse, Dade County, Miami, Florida. Report submitted to Radian Corporation and the General Services Administration.
- 1997 Adams, Natalie P. and Denise Messick. Archaeological Survey of Approximately 60 Linear Miles of the Chatuge Reservoir Shoreline Management Zone, Towns County, Georgia and Clay County, North Carolina. Report submitted to Tennessee Valley Authority.
- 1997 Abbott, Lawrence E. and Natalie P. Adams. Archaeological Data Recovery Excavations at 31Cb110\*\* and 31Cb114, Columbus County, North Carolina Management Summary. Report submitted to International Paper.
- 1996 Adams, Natalie P. Archaeological Testing of 31Dv533 and 31Dv536\*\*, Davidson County, North Carolina. Report submitted to Black & Veatch.
- 1995 A Good One in a Pleasant Neighborhood: Broom Hall Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina. Chicora Foundation Research Series, edited by M. Trinkley, Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia, South Carolina.
- 1995 In the Shadow of the Big House: Domestic Slaves at Stony/Baynard Plantation (with M. Trinkley and D. Hacker). Chicora Foundation Research Contribution 40. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia, South Carolina.
- 1994 Middle and Late Woodland Life at Old House Creek, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina (with M. Trinkley). Chicora Foundation Research Series 42. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia, South Carolina.
- 1993 Archaeological Investigations at 38GE377: Examinations of a Deep Creek Phase Site and A Portion of the Eighteenth Century Midway Plantation. Chicora Foundation Research Series 37. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia, South Carolina.

#### ADDITIONAL PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

Author or co-author of one hundred and twenty-four (124) cultural resource management reports; two (2) cultural resource management plans; one (1) historic preservation plan; one (1) statewide historic context; nine (9) presented papers and symposia; and contributing author of one (1) research manuscript.

#### **MEMBERSHIPS AND REGISTRATIONS:**

Registered Professional Archaeologists (RPA)

Member, Society for Historical Archaeology

Member, Council of South Carolina Professional Archeologists (Secretary 2002-2003; President 2004-2005)

Member, Southeastern Archaeological Conference

Member, Southern Historical Association

Member, Archeological Society of South Carolina (Current Editor of South Carolina Antiquities)

## APPENDIX C. RESUME FOR KEITH C. SERAMUR

· · ·

Ű

•

.

•
# Keith C. Seramur, P.G.

#### **EDUCATION**

M.S. Sedimentology - Northern Illinois University; 1989 B.S. Geology - University of Wisconsin; 1985

#### REGISTRATION

Registered Geologist - Georgia, License # 001587 Licensed Geologist - North Carolina, License # 1136 Reg. Prof. Geologist - Tennessee, License # TN2246 Professional Geologist - South Carolina, License # 2063 Professional Geologist - Virginia, License # 2801 001262 Professional Geologist - Florida, License # 1901 Alabama – Interim Permit on Project Basis

#### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Deep Testing Surveys for buried cultural horizons Interpretation of Site Formation Processes in Colluvial, Alluvial and Aeolian Depositonal Settings Interpretation of Geophysical surveys Geomorphology of Holocene and Pleistocene Landscapes High Resolution Seismic Stratigraphy Interpreting Holocene Depositional History

Interpreting Holocene Depositional History

Modeling Geomorphic Distribution of Archaeology Sites

Process Sedimentology

Stratigraphic Correlation of Coastal Plain Formations

Stratigraphic Interpretation of Fluvial and Marine Holocene Deposits Scanning Electron Microscopy

#### WORK EXPERIENCE

- 2002 Present Keith Seramur, P.G., PC; Geomorphology and geoarchaeological investigations and, Phase I and Phase II deep testing surveys.
- 1993 Present Appalachian State University, Dept. of Geology, Adjunct Research Associate; Participating in geomorphology, geoarchaeology and sedimentology research programs.

Page 2

- investigations, geomorphology assessments, managed environmental consulting projects, assessment and remediation of contaminated soil and groundwater, directed projects from North Carolina office.
- 1992 1994 Engineering and Environmental Services, Project Geologist; Responsible for the development of a geology branch within an environmental and engineering consulting firm. Supervision of geological investigations and report preparation.
- 1990 1992 Law Environmental, Inc., Project Geologist; Performed geologic investigation of sensitive sites. Managed Phase I and Phase II environmental assessment projects. Site geologist for a proposed low-level radioactive waste facility in Richmond County, North Carolina. Responsible for supervision of field work, logging cores, data analysis, and quality control of geologic samples. Field work included geologic mapping, soil descriptions, geologic logging and geomorphology of modern landforms.
- 1989 Appalachian State University, Instructor; Instructor in the Department of Geology.
- 1989 Northern Illinois University, Lecturer/Faculty Assistant; Lecturer in the Geology Department and sedimentology laboratory coordinator.

# TECHNICAL REPORTS (2005 and 2006)

- Seramur, K.C., 2006, Geomorphology of 9PU20 at the Highway 230 Bridge replacement at Big Tucsawhatchee Creek, Pulaski County, GA. Tech. Rept. Prepared for Edwards-Pitman Environmental and the Georgia Department of Transportation.
- Seramur, K.C., 2006, Geomorphology of Sites 40RH166, 40RH167 and 40RH282 for a residential development at Cottonport, Chickamauga Reservoir, Rhea County, Tennessee. Tech. Rept. prepared for Alexander Archaeological Associates and the Tennessee Valley Authority.
- Seramur, K.C., 2006, Geomorphology of the Catawba River Crossing of U.S. Hwy 21 Rock Hill, Hamilton County, South Carolina. Tech. Rept. prepared for Edwards-Pittman Environmental and the South Carolina Dept. of Transportation.
- Seramur, K.C., 2006, Geomorphology of a Proposed 2.5 Acre Development Parcel at Tennessee River Mile 464.5R in Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tennessee. Tech. Rept. prepared for Alexander Archaeological Associates and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

- Seramur, K.C., 2005, Geomorphology of Sites 1MS467 and 1MS468 Lindsey Harbor Development Guntersville Reservoir, Marshall County, Alabama. Tech. Rept. prepared for Alexander Archaeological Associates and the Tennessee Valley Authority.
- Seramur, K.C., 2005, Geomorphology of Site 31PR92, Person County, North Carolina. Tech. Rept. prepared for Environmental Services, Inc. and the NC State Historic Preservation Office.
- Seramur, K.C., 2005, Geomorphology of the Bent Creek Archaeology Site
   31BN335, Buncombe County, North Carolina. Tech Report Prepared for ASU
   Laboratories of Archaeological Science and National Forests in NC.
- Seramur, K.C., 2005, Report of Geomorphology at Site 31YD2 Baltimore Church Road crossing of Deep Creek, Yadkin County, North Carolina. Tech. Report prepared for Legacy Associates and the NC Dept. of Transportation.
- Seramur, K.C., 2005, Geomorphology of Site 40KN262, Seven Islands Wildlife Refuge, Knox County, TN. Tech. Report Prepared for Duvall & Associates and the Tennessee Valley Authority.
- Seramur, K.C., 2005, Evaluating a Potential Sediment Source for Ceramics at Site 44YO1028 Using Scanning Electron Microscopy and Energy Dispersive Xray Spectroscopy. Tech. Report Prepared for Coastal Carolina Research and the Virginia Dept. of Historic Preservation.

#### <u>ABSTRACTS</u>

- Seramur, K.C., Cowan, E.A., Lautzenheiser L. and Bamann, S.E., 2006, Geomorphology at archaeological site 31WK223 in the Reddies River drainage basin: an example of Holocene stratigraphic preservation on the Blue Ridge escarpment.. Program and Abstracts of the Southeastern Geological Society of America Meeting, Knoxville, TN.
- Seramur, K.C., Cowan, E.A. and Abbott, L.E., 2005, Geoarchaeology of 31HT435: An example of Aeolian burial in the Sandhills of the North Carolina Inner Coastal Plain. Program and Abstracts of the 62<sup>nd</sup> Annual Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Bulletin 48, p. 57.
- Daniel Jr., I.R., Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., 2003. North Carolina Coastal Plain Chronology, Typology, and Geoarchaeology at the Barber Creek Site. Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Abstracts of the 60<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Bulletin 46, SCIAA, USC, p. 45.

- Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., Hettinger, D.J. and Daniel, I.R., Jr. 2003. Interpreting Site Formation Processes at a Stratified Archaeology Site in a Sand Dune on the Atlantic Coastal Plain. 33<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference, Program with Abstracts, P. 42.
- Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., 2002. Site Formation Processes and the Depositional History of a Buried Cultural Horizon on the Floodplain of Kimberling Creek. 2002 Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia, Volume 58, No.1 p.55.
- Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., 2002. Deep Testing at the Buzzard Rock Complex, Interpreting Prehistoric Environments of a Modified Urban Floodplain. 32<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference, Program with Abstracts, P. 46.
- Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., Nov., 2001. (Invited Paper ) Late Pleistocene and Holocene Stratigraphic Record of the Davidson River in the Blue Ridge Physiographic Province. Southern Appalachian Man and Biosphere 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference, Program with Abstracts, p. 26.
- Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., April, 2001. Late Pleistocene and Holocene Stratigraphic Record of the Davidson River in the Blue Ridge Physiographic Province *in* Southeastern Section Geological Society of America Annual Meeting, Abstracts with Program, p.A-31.
- Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., 2000. Geoarchaeology of Aeolian and Marine Deposits at the Long Point Archaeological Site, Croatan National Forest, North Carolina. Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Abstracts of the 57<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Bulletin 43, SCIAA, USC, p. 45.
- Seramur, K.C., Cowan, E.A., Schumate, M.S. and Evans-Schumate, P., 2000, An example of land use change resulting from Holocene sea level rise at the Long Point Archaeological Site, SE USA. American Quaternary Association meeting Program and Abstracts of the 16<sup>th</sup> Biennial Meeting, p. 99.
- Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., 1999. Regional chronostratigraphic record and geomorphology of archaeological sites along the Deep River in central North Carolina *in* Southeastern Section Geological Society of America Annual Meeting, Abstracts with Program, Vol. 31, No. 3 p.A-66.
- Seramur, K.C., Eastman, J.A., 1999. Deep Testing as a means of Identifying and Evaluating Archaeological Sites in Piedmont Floodplains: An Example from

- Peterson, S, Eastman, J.A., and Seramur, K.C., 1999, Chronostratigraphy and the Landscape History of the Deep River Drainage Basin. Uwharrie Lithics Conference, February 24- 26, 1999, Randolph Community College, Asheboro, NC.
- Spurgeon V.L., Seramur, K.C., Kite, J.S. and Cowan, E.A., 1998.
  Sedimentology of historic and prehistoric deposits in the drainage basin of Deep River and Muddy Creek on the Piedmont of North Carolina *in* Geological Society of America, Abstracts with Program, Vol. 30, No. 7 p.A-219.
- Seramur, K.C. and Cowan, E.A., 1997. Geologic Controls on the Distribution and Preservation of Archaeological Sites in a Piedmont Drainage Basin of the Southeastern U.S. *in* Geological Society of America, Abstracts with Program, Vol. 29.
- Seramur, K.C., Cowan, E.A., Eastman, J.A. and Lautzenheiser, L., 1997. Flood
  Plain Lithofacies and their Archaeological Significance in Piedmont Drainage
  Basins of the Southeastern U.S. Third International Conference on Soils,
  Geomorphology and Archaeology, Program and Abstracts. Thunderbird
  Research Corp., Woodstock, VA.
- Cowan, E.A., Cai, J., and Powel, R.D., Seramur, K.C., 1996. Identification of daily, seasonal, and annual sediment packages in glacimarine sediment of coastal Alaska. *in* Geological Society of America, Abstracts with Program, Vol. 28, No. 7 p. 506.
- Spurgeon V.L., Seramur, K.C., Cowan, E.A., and Powell, R.D., 1995. Rhythmic glacimarine sediments: a record of annual meltwater discharge and tidal variations in Muir Inlet, Southeast Alaska. *in* Geological Society of America, Abstracts with Program, Vol. 27, No. 6 p. 61.
- Kayen, R.E., Clark, J.A., Cowan, E.A., Seramur, K.C., and Powell, R.D., 1995.
  Rheologic properties of ice-proximal fine grained sediment near Muir Glacier, Glacier Bay N.P., Alaska. in EOS, Transactions, American Geophysical Union 1995 Fall Meeting, Vol. 76, No. 46, p. 290.

Seramur, K.C., Kayen, R.E., Cowan, E.A., and Powell, R.D., 1994. Lithologic and geotechnical characteristics of grounding-line sediments: implications for interpretation of seismic reflection profiles. Geological Society of America, Abstracts with Program, Annual Meeting, Vol. 7, No. 7, p. 474.

- Seramur, K.C., Powell, R.D., and Cowan, E.A., 1990. Submarine deposits formed during deglaciation following the Neoglacial maximum, Glacier Bay, Alaska.
  Geological Society of America Northeastern Section Annual Meeting, Abstracts with Program, Vol. 22, No. 2, p. 69.
- Cowan, E.A., and Seramur, K.C., 1990. Controls on basin infilling during deglaciation from the Neoglacial maximum, Glacier Bay, Alaska. Geological Society of America Northeastern Section Meeting, Abstracts with Program, Vol. 22, No. 2, p. 69.

#### PUBLICATIONS

- Seramur K.C. and Cowan E.A., Lautzenheiser, L. and Eastman, J.M., in review. A Model for Distribution and Preservation of Archaeological Sites along Piedmont Streams Developed From a Geoarchaeology Survey Along the Deep River in North Carolina, Submitted to Southeastern Archaeology.
- Seramur K.C. and Cowan E.A., 2003, Site Formation Processes of Buried Cultural Horizons in the Sandhills of North Carolina: An Example from the Horses Grazing Site (31MR205): North Carolina Archaeology, Vol. 52 p. 101-118.
- Cowan, E.A., Seramur, K.C., Cai, J., and Powel, R.D., 1999, Cyclic sedimentation produced by fluctuation in meltwater discharge, tides and marine productivity in an Alaskan fjord: Sedimentology, 46, p.1109-1126.
- Seramur, K.C., and Cowan, E.A., 1998. Contaminant Migration through a Diamicton/Saprolite Aquifer on the Footslopes of Rich Mountain, Northwestern North Carolina. *in* Deposits and Landforms on the Piedmont Slopes of Roan, Rich, and Snake Mountains, Northwestern North Carolina and Northeastern Tennessee, Southeastern Friends of the Pleistocene Field Trip Guidebook, Hugh Mills ed., p. 83-91.
- Cowan, E.A., Cai, J., Powel, R.D., Seramur, K.C., and Spurgeon, V.L., 1998. Modern tidal rhythmites deposited in a deep-water estuary: Geomarine Letters, Vol. 18, p. 40-48.
- Seramur, K.C., Powell, R.D., and Carlson, P.R., 1997. Evaluation of conditions along the grounding line of temperate marine glaciers: an example from Muir Inlet, Glacier Bay, Alaska: Marine Geology, Vol. 140, p. 307-327.

- Seramur, K.C., Powell, R.D., Carlson, P.R., and Cowan, E.A. 1997. Muir Inlet Morainal Bank Complex, Glacier Bay, S.E. Alaska *in* Acoustic Images of Glaciated Continental Margins, Davies, T.A. et al. eds. Chapman and Hall, London, p. 92-93.
- Seramur, K.C., Cowan, E.A. Powell, R.D. and Carlson, P.R., 1997. Growth of a grounding-line fan at Muir Glacier, Southeast Alaska *in* Acoustic Images of Glaciated Continental Margins, Davies, T.A. et al. eds. Chapman and Hall, London, p. 194-197.
- Cowan, E.A., Powel, R.D., Carlson, P.R., Kayen, R.E., Cai, J., Seramur, K.C. and Zellers, S.D., 1994. Cruise Report: *R/V Alpha Helix Cruise* - 173 to western Prince William Sound, Yakutat Bay and Glacier Bay National Park, northeastern Gulf of Alaska, Aug.17-Sept. 3, 1993: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report OF-94-258, 176p.

South Carolina Department of Corrections.



# Institutions

Agency History **Ernployee Information** Employment FA0's Fugitives Information for Family Members In mate Search Institutions Organization/Contacts Prison Industries **Procurement** Public Information Related Sites Statistical Reports Victim Services



# **SCDC Institutions**

The S. C. Department of Corrections' twenty-nine prisons are categorized into four distinct security levels: high security (level 3), medium security (level 2), minimum security (level 1B) and community-based prerelease/work centers (level 1A). The architectural design of the institution, type of housing, operational procedures, and the level of security staffing determine an institution's security level. Inmates are assigned to institutions to meet their specific security, programming, medical, educational, and work requirements.

#### LEVEL 1-A (L1-A)

Level 1-A facilities are community-based pre-release/work centers that house minimum-security non-violent inmates who are within 36 months of release. These units are work and program oriented, providing intensive specialized programs that prepare the inmates for release to the community. Housing is mainly double bunk, open-bay wards with unfenced perimeters.

#### LEVEL 1-B (L1-B)

Level 1-B institutions are minimum-security facilities that house inmates with relatively short sentences or time to serve. Housing is mainly double bunk cubicles with unfenced perimeters. Operational procedures at Level 1-B facilities impart a higher level of security compared to level 1-A facilities.

#### LEVEL 2 (L2)

Level 2 facilities are medium-security institutions. Housing is primarily double bunk, cell type with some institutions having double-bunk cubicles. With single fenced perimeters and electronic surveillance, level 2 institutions provide a higher level of security than level 1 facilities.

#### LEVEL 3 (L3)

Level 3 facilities are high-security institutions designed primarily to house violent offenders with longer sentences, and inmates who exhibit behavioral problems. Housing consists of single and double cells, and all perimeters are double-fenced with extensive electronic surveillance. Inmates at level 3 facilities are closely supervised and their activities and movement within the institution are highly restricted.

#### INSTITUTIONAL LISTING

http://www.doc.sc.gov/InstitutionPages/Institutions.htm

7/7/2005

Headquarters P. O. Box 21787/4444 Broad River Road Columbia, SC 29210 803-896-8500 corrections.info@doc.state.sc.us

Allendale Correctional Institution (L2) George Hagan, Warden P.O. Box 1151, Highway 47 Fairfax, SC 29827 803-734-0653 or 803-632-2561

Broad River Correctional Institution (L3) William White, Warden 4460 Broad River Road Columbia, Sc 29210 803-896-2200

<u>Camille Griffin Graham Correctional Institution</u> (Women L3) Judy Anderson, Warden 4450 Broad River Road

Columbia, SC 29210 803-896-8590

<u>Campbell Pre-Release Center</u> (L1-A) Carl Frederick, Acting Warden 4530 Broad River Road Columbia, SC 29210 803-896-8560

<u>Catawba Pre-Release Center</u> (L1-A) Glenn Stone, Warden 1030 Milling Road Rock Hill, SC 29730 803-734-9946 or 803-324-5361

Coastal Pre-Release Center (L1-A) Mildred Hudson, Warden 3765 Leeds Avenue Charleston, SC 29405 843-740-1630 or 843-792-4173

Evans Correctional Institution (L3) Willie Eagleton, Warden P.O. 2951202 Bennettsville, SC 29512 803-896-4900 or 843-479-4181

<u>Goodman Correctional Institution</u> (Women L1-B) Jannita Gaston, Warden 4456 Broad River Road Columbia, SC 29210 803-896-8565

Kershaw Correctional Institution (L2) Oscar Faulkenberry, Warden 4848 Goldmine Highway Lower Savannah Pre-Release Center (L1-A) John McCall, Warden 361 Wire Road Aiken, SC 29801 803-648-8865

<u>MacDougall Correctional Institution</u> (L2) Edsel Taylor, Warden 1516 Old Gilliard Road Ridgeville, SC 29472 803-737-3036 or 843-688-5251

Manning Correctional Institution (L1-B) Raymond Reed, Interim Warden 502 Beckman Drive Columbia, SC 29203 803-935-7248

McCormick Correctional Institution (L3) Colie Rushton, Warden 386 Redemption Way McCormick, SC 29899 803-734-0330 or 864-443-2114

Northside Correctional Institution (L1-B) Robert Mauney, Warden 504 Broadcast Drive Spartanburg, SC 29303 864-594-4915 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 580 Una, SC 29378

Palmer Pre-Release Center (L1-A) David Dunlap, Warden 2012 Pisgah Road Florence, SC 29501 803-734-9487 or 843-661-4770

Perry Correctional Institution (L3) Richard Bazzle, Warden 430 Oaklawn Road Pelzer, SC 29669 803-737-1752 or 864-243-4700

Ridgeland Correctional Institution (L2) P. Douglas Taylor, Warden P. O. Box 2039 Ridgeland, SC 29936 803-896-3200

<u>Stevenson Correctional Institution</u> (L1-B) Elaine Robinson, Warden 4546 Broad River Road Columbia, SC 29210 803-896-8575

Trenton Correctional Institution (L2)

http://www.doc.sc.gov/InstitutionPages/Institutions.htm

7/7/2005

Kershaw, SC 29067 803-896-3301 or 803-475-5770

<u>Kirkland Reception and Evaluation Center</u> (L3) Bernard McKie, Warden 4344 Broad River Road Columbia, SC 29210 803-896-8572

Leath Correctional Institution (Women L3) Catherine Kendall, Warden 2809 Airport Road Greenwood, SC 29649 803-896-1000 or 864-229-5709

Lee Correctional Institution (L3) Anthony Padula, Warden 990 Wisacky Highway Bishopville, SC 29010 803-896-2400 or 803-428-2800

Lieber Correctional Institution (L3) Stan Burtt, Warden 136 Wilborn Avenue P.O. Box 205 Ridgeville, SC 29472 803-896-3700 or 843-875-3332

Livesay Pre-Release Center (L1-A) Robert Mauney, Warden 104 Broadcast Drive Spartanburg, SC 29303 803-734-1375 or 864-594-4920 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 580 Una, SC 29378 Robert Bollinger, Warden 84 Greenhouse Road Box 1000 Trenton, SC 29847 803-896-3000

<u>Turbeville Correctional Institution</u> (L2) Mike Sheedy, Warden P. O. Box 252 Turbeville, SC 29162 803-896-3100 or 843-659-4800

<u>Tyger River Correctional Institution</u> (L2) Tim Riley, Warden 100-200 Prison Road Enoree, SC 29355 803-896-3601 or 803-896-3501 864-583-6056 or 864-596-1600

<u>Walden Correctional Institution</u> (L1-B) Elaine Pinson, Warden 4340 Broad River Road Columbia, SC 29210 803-896-8580

Wateree River Correctional Institution (L2) Joel Anderson, Warden P. O. Box 189 Rembert, SC 29128 803-896-3400 or 803-432-6191

Watkins Pre-Release Center (L1-A) Carl Frederick, Acting Warden 1700 St. Andrews Terrace Columbia, SC 29210 803-896-8584

http://www.doc.sc.gov/InstitutionPages/Institutions.htm

#### Husinghi ALC: N

WMA Program Through the cooperative effort of private landowners, the U.S. Forest Service and the SCDNR, Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) are provided for the enjoyment of all wildlife enthusiasts. Funds generated from the sale of WMA permits enables DNR to lease approximately 1.2 million acres of land for wildlife conservation and management.

Heritage Preserves are properties acquired by SCDNR for the primary purpose of protecting habitat for rare and endangered species. Some Heritage Preserves offer game hunting opportunities, and, therefore, are included in the WMA Program.

All persons using WMA lands are reminded that only U.S. Forest Service lands and those areas marked by WMA signs are open to the public. Lands not posted with these signs are the property of private individuals, and landowner permission must be obtained.

20059

General locations of the areas described below are shown on the map on pages 38 and 39. For detailed maps showing these and other WMA lands write WMA MAPS, SCDNR, P.O. Box 167, Columbia, SC, 29202 or call 803-734-3886.

WMA properties should be marked with these yellow and	Open begin	dates for each season are listed in th ning on page 40 of this book. Note:	e Hunt Seasons section * indicates SCDNR Prop	erty.	ъ 2 2 2 3	Hogs	Turkey	Dove	Ountil		Rabbir	Raccool	For
Wildlife Management Area	Acreset	County	. <b>T</b>	elephone		Hu	iting (	)ppoi	rtuni	ties l	Avail	able	•
Bear Island*	12.021	Colleton	18	43-844-8957	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ť		¥ I	Ŧ	1+	1.	T
Bonneau Ferry	10,700	Berkeley .		43-825-3387	Ŧ	Ť	┤╤	-	<u>-</u>			1÷	+
Canal	2.491	Berkelev	8	43-825-3387	Ē	-+-	Ť	T	-+-		+-	+-	┿
Cartwheel Bay Heritage Preserve	568	Horry	8	43-546-9489		+	┤╤	1-1	+	+	╈	+;	+
Central Piedmont Hunt Unit	183,706	Cherokee, Chester, Fairfield Newberry, Spartanburg, Uni				•			•		-   x	x	x
Crackerneck	10,470	Aiken	Blisse	. Daf	1	$\sim$	10	~.			1		+
Donnellev	8,048	Colleton			- [	$\langle \cdot \rangle$	r	i u	، مع	•	+	1,	+-
Draper", McConnells", Ross"	1,360	York		•		<i>.</i>							
Dungannon Hentage Preserve*	643	Charleston	· · · · ·	1 at at	·						+	+	+
Edisto River	1.375	Dorchester	Spillin	Rocar	r	•					+		;+-
Francis Marion National Forest	250,000	Berkeley, Charleston	•	U	•	1			•		t	H.	+-
Great Pee Dee Heritage Preserve*	2.725	Darlington	ا ـ ـ اسلا	L 1. 1:13	'h.	ie	S	tth	en	n	f	H	+-
Hatchery	2.400	Berkeley	13 proper	rs (uni		-2	<u> </u>				+-	ť	<u>`</u>
Hickory Top	1.105	Clarendon	PENTA	10 abase	શ	io	in	sc			+	+	+-
Lewis Ocean Bay Heritage Preserve*	9.393	Horry	c3010								H	H	÷÷
Line Pee Dee Herizare Preserve* Complex	10 226	Horry Marion	up.	uperine	下	n ·	Jec.	ua	.n.	•	ť	+	÷÷÷
Landerf Pine Heringe Preserve*	843		•••	U	0						ť	+	4-
Longica I nic I strange Liberte	291	. IT as		······································							H		╋
Manchastas State Forest	23 135	Cumber	• -	$\cap$		1.	_				H		+-
March Europieuro	8 731	Marian		- Sn	s-	,u					ť		÷÷
MaRase A nonlive Concernade	1 194	Charmefuld	Condat			V	$\mathcal{O}$				- F		<u>+</u>
Maulaia	9 490	Bastralau	Coper	D		(~	1	•			H		#
Mountie Hunt Ilait	167 472	Anderen Gremille Onne		•							÷E	×	47
	2000	Anderson, Greenville, Ocorie	• • •	NO 005 0007	1 1	1	1	1		т	-	4	42
Pulukusele	6 757				1×			X	1×		<u>-</u>	<b>X</b>	43
P. H. Jackeria Brief	0,757	Flampton, Jasper		A3-623-3209 ·	Ě	-	<b>_</b>	<del>ب</del>	<u>۲</u>	-	4	<u> </u>	쑤
Pair Flydroelecult Floject	2 701	Famerica, Newberry		242-441-4769	÷		-+:	+	L A		-	<u>-</u>	4
Net I'll Platiale Maine Present	201	Vod		77 221 4760	1 <del>2</del>						4	4	4
Rock Fill Blackacks Heinige Heselve	11509	Commun	_~	AJ-001-4/00		-		+-	÷		-+-		+
Samworth	1,300	Chargetown		043-340-3403	1	<del>ام</del>		+×	<b>X</b>		-	-	+
Sand Fills State Forst	9165	Chesternein, Darnington		043-001-4/08 ·	1 <u>×</u>		-+*	<u> .</u>	X	×	千	쥐	千
Sandy Island	7,103	Georgetown		843-340-7487	X	X	-+-	+-		$\left  \cdot \right $	$\rightarrow$	-+	
Santre Coastal	24,000	Charleston, Georgetown		643-540-8003	X	×		+	X	×	×	<u>×</u> +	千
Santee Cooper	3,144	Orangeburg		843-825-3387	X			1×	X.	×	<u>×</u>	즤	¥-
Santee Dam	5/5	Clarendon	· [8	803-825-3387	<u>  x</u>	×	-12	1×	ļ	X	<u>×</u>	×	<u>치</u>
Santee-Delta	1,722	Georgetown	· [8	843-546-9489	×	×		Ļ.	×	$\square$	_	÷1	4
St. Helena Sound Heritage Preserve	10,302	Beaufort	<u>}</u>	843-844-8957	x			$\bot$	X		_		$ \rightarrow $
Tillman Sand Ridge Heritage Preserve	1,422	· J25per	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	803-625-3569	x	×	2	X	X	X	x	<u>x</u>	<u>×</u>
Turtle Island*	1,700	Jasper		803-625-3569	1_	<u> </u>			x				<u>.</u>
Victoria Bluff Heritage Preserve*	1,111	Beaufort	·	803-625-3569	X			x	x	X	x	x	x
Waccamaw River Heritage Preserve*	5.347	Нопту		843-546-9489	x			x	X		x		x
Webb*	5,866	Hampton		803-625-3569	X	x	;	X	x	x	X	x	x
Wee Tee	12,439	Williamsburg, Georgetown		843-825-3387	x		3				x		x
Western Piedmont Hunt Unit	146,561	Abbeville, Edgefield, Greenv Saluda	rood, McCormick,	864-223-2731	x		,	x	x	x	x	x	x
Mr. d. Manuschie	1 643	Vork		843-661-4768	7		1	1.	T.	-	-	1	JF

SCDNR South Carolina Rules & Regulations 2005-2006

36

www.anr. Slak.sc. usletel rules regs | paf / wmos. pof.



	f Aeronautics	s V-	393	Ć	(SCDOC	2005)	Section	2.5.2.
			HE	3.C DIXIS				TIGS -
E A-Z INDE	X BTAFF	Соммів		PUBLICATIONS	AIRPORTS	LINKB	FLIGHT DE	PARTMEN
							L	
HOPE YOU ENJ Y COMMENTS O r Mission: Foster te's public use air 'ernment and bus	OY YOUR VIS N THE SITE. ing air comme ports and prov iness prospects	TIMENT	ASE LET eing the s lable air t OF C ONAL	US KNOW IF YOU H afety and developme ransportation for stat	HAVE Int of the re	2553 West 2917 PO B Colui 2922 (803 (800	Airport Blvd Columbia, So 0 ox 280068 mbia, South C 8-0068 ) 896-6260 or ) 922-0574	outh Carolina arolina

http://www.scaeronautics.com/default.asp

SITE DEVELOPED BY USC CONTRACTUAL SERVICES GROUP

T	Тн	E <b>5C</b>	DIVISION OF	AERONAUTIC
DME A-Z INDE	C BTAFF COMMISSION	ERS PU	BLICATIONS AIRPORT	S UNKS FLIGHT DE
AIRPORT	DATA			
AIRPORTS	RUNWAY ŔEMARKS	AERIAL	PASSENGERS & CARGO	REPORTS DRAV
AIRPORT 5010 D	ATABASE (EFFECTIVE INFO	) DATE: 7/	7/2005)	•
FAAID: Name: Associated: County:	636 EDGEFIELD COUNTY TRENTON EDGEFIELD		Elevation: Acreage: OwnerType: UseType:	610 90 PU PU
Dwner: Address: Phone:	EDGEFIELD COUNTY 215 JETER ST EDGEFIELD, SC 29824 803-637-4000	•	Manager: Address: Phone:	JOHNNY ANDERSON PO BOX 237, 215 JETER TRENTON, SC 29847 B03-279-4138
Tower: Unicom: CTAF:	N 122.900		Aero Chart: FSS: FSS Phone:	ATLANTA ANDERSON 1-800-WX-BRIEF
Air Carrier Ops: Commuter Ops: Air Taxi Ops: GA Local Ops: GA Itnrnt Ops: Military Ops:	0 0 0 10000 500 0	• • •	Single Engine: Multi Engine: Jet: Helicopter: Military: Glider/Ultralight:	14 0 0 0 0 0 0/12
Right Traffic: Attend Sch: Lighting Sch: Beacon Color: Seg Circle: Wind Ind:	NO UNATNDD Y Y		Frame Repair: Engine Repair: Oxygen Bottle: Oxygen Bulk: Landing Fee: Fuel:	N N N N N N
Latitude: Longitude:	33-44-12.4900N 081-49-10.3950	· ·	Magnetic Var:	04W

SITE DEVELOPED BY USC CONTRACTUAL SERVICES GROUP

http://www.scaeronautics.com/airportdata.asp?FAAID=6J6

7/15/2005

Page 1 of 1

3

ەنى..ە

THE SC DIVISION OF AERONAUTIC 10000 HOME A-Z INDEX AIRPORTS COMMISSIONERS PUBLICATIONS STAFF UNKS FUGHT DEF AIRPORT DATA AIRPORTS RUNWAY . REMARKS AERIAL PASSENGER8 & CARGO REPORTS DRAW > AIRPORT 5010 DATABASE (EFFECTIVE INFO DATE: 7/7/2005) FAAID: BNL Elevation: - 246 **BARNWELL COUNTY** Acreage: Name: 1163 Associated: BARNWELL OwnerType: ΡU BARNWELL UseType: PU **County: BARNWELL COUNTY** WENDALL GIBSON **Owner:** Manager: 155 AIRPORT RD., PO BO> BARNWELL, SC 29812 COUNTY COURTHOUSE BARNWELL, SC 29812 Address: Address: 803-541-1000 803-259-1090 **Phone:** Phone: Tower: N Aero Chart: ATLANTA Unicom: 122.800 FSS: ANDERSON CTAF: 122.800 **FSS Phone:** 1-800-WX-BRIEF **Air Carrier Ops:** n Single Engine: 18 **Commuter Ops:** 0 **Multi Engine:** 2 Air Taxi Ops: Δ Jet: 1 GA Local Ops: 7800 Helicopter: 0 GA Itnrnt Ops: 8000 ... Military: 0 500 Glider/Ultralight: **Military Ops:** 0/2 05, 17 Y **Right Traffic:** Frame Repair: 0900-1700 Attend Sch: Engine Repair: Y **Lighting Sch:** CTAF **Oxygen Bottle:** Ν Beacon Color: CG **Oxygen Bulk:** Ν Seg Circle: Landing Fee: N Y Y-L Wind Ind: Fuel: 100LL JET A Latitude: 33-15-28.0000N Magnetic Var: 04W · Longitude: 081-23-18.0000

SITE DEVELOPED BY USE CONTRACTUAL SERVICES GROUP

7/15/2005

Page 1 of 1

1.1

.....

Page 1 of 1

OME A-Z INDE	X, STAFF COMMISS	IONERS PU	BLICATIONS AIRPORT	TE LINKS FLIC	нт
	· ·				
AIRPORT	DATA	•	:		
AIRPORTS	RUNWAY REMARK	S AERIAL	PASSENGERS & CARG	O REPORTS	DR
		NEO DATE. 8			•
AIRPORT 5010 L	DATABASE (EFFECTIVE I	INFO DATE: 77			-
FAAID:	88J .		Elevation:	161	•
Name:	ALLENDALE COUN	TY	Acreage:	95	•
Associated:	ALLENDALE		OwnerType:	PU	
County:	ALLENDALE		UseType:	PU .	
Owner:	ALLENDALE COUNT	Y	Manager:	CATHERINE THAT	RIN
Address:	PO BOX 677		Address:	989 WATER ST	•
	ALLENDALE, SC 298	310	•	ALLENDALE, SC	298i0
Phone:	803-584-3438		Phone:	803-584-3434	• •
Tower:	N		Aero Chart:	ATLANTA	
Unicom:	122.800		FSS:	ANDERSON	
CTAF:	122.800		FSS Phone:	1-800-WX-BRIEF	
Air Carrier Ops:	0		Single Engine:	9	
Commuter Ops:	0	•	Multi Engine:	0	• .
Air Taxi Ops:	450		Jet:	0	•
GA Local Ops:	7000		Hellcopter:	0	•
GA Itnrnt Ops:	4500		Military:	0	
Military Ops:	200		Glider/Ultralight:	0/0	
Right Traffic:	NO		Frame Repair:	• N	
Attend Sch:	0800-1800		Engine Repair:	N	÷
Lighting Sch:	CTAF	· .	Oxygen Bottle:	N	
Beacon Color:	CG	·	Oxygen Bulk:	N	
Seg Circle:	Y ·		Landing Fee:	N	
Wind Ind:	Y-L		Fuel:	100LL JET A	
			Magnetic Ver		
tatitude:	. 32-59-42.40hUN		I MAGNELIC VAL		

SITE DEVELOPED BY USC COPTRACTURE FARVICLE SPOUR

7/15/2005

Page 1 of 1

DME A-Z INDEX	STAFF COMMISSIONERS PUB	ICATIONS AIRPOR	TS LINKS FUGHT DEF
	- <b>ATA</b>	• •	
AIRFORT			
		•	
AIRPORTS	RUNWAY REMARKS AERIAL	PASSENGERS & CARG	O REPORTS DRAW
AIRPORT 5010 DA	TABASE (EFFECTIVE INFO DATE: 7/7/	(2005) I	
AAID:	330	Elevation:	113
lame:	HAMPTON-VARNVILLE	Acreage:	50
ssociated:	HAMPTON	OwnerType:	PU
county:	HAMPTON	UseType:	PU
)wner:	HAMPTON COUNTY	Manager:	LEE ELLIS
ddress:	201 JACKSON STREET WEST	Address:	701 JACKSON STREET WE
	HAMPTON, SC 29924		HAMPTON, SC 29924
'hone:	803-943-7500	Phone:	803-943-2911
ower:	N	Aero Chart:	ATLANTA
Inicom:	• • •	FSS:	ANDERSON
TAF:	122.900	FSS Phone:	1-800-WX-BRIEF
Ir Carrier Ops:	0	Single Englne:	4
commuter Ops:	0	Multi Engine:	0
lir Taxi Ops:	0	Jet:	0
iA Local Ops:	750	Helicopter:	0
iA Itnrnt Ops:	1100	Military:	. <b>`O</b>
Allitary Ops:	0	Gilder/Ultralight:	0/1
light Traffic:	NO	Frame Repair:	N
ttend Sch:	UNATNDD	Engine Repair:	N
ighting Sch:	DUSK-DAWN	Oxygen Bottle:	N
leacon Color:	CG	Oxygen Bulk:	N
ieg Circle:	N	Landing Fee:	N
Vind Ind:	Y	Fuel:	N
atitude:	32-52-03.5970N	Magnetic Var:	04W

STIT DEVELOPED BY USD CONTRACT, AL SERVICES GROUP

( )

http://www.scaeronautics.com/airportdata.asp?FAAID=3J0

7/15/2005

•

.....

Page 1 of 1

· martine	and the second sec			Men
ME ATZ INDE	STAFF COMMISSION	NERS PUI	SLICATIONS AIRPOR	TE LINKS FLIGHT
	DATA		• ·	:
				•
AIRPORTS	RUNWAY REMARKS	AERIAL	PASSENGERS & CARG	O REPORTS DI
AIRPORT 5010 D	ATABASE (EFFECTIVE INF	O DATE: 7/3	7/2005)	
AAID:	99N		Elevation:	231
lame:	BAMBERG COUNTY		Acreage:	94 .
ssociated:	BAMBERG		OwnerType:	PU
ounty:	BAMBERG		UseType:	PU
wner:	BAMBERG COUNTY		Manager:	BOOKER PATRICK
ddress:	PO BOX 149		Address:	PO BOX 149
_	BAMBERG, SC 29003	:		BAMBERG, SC 29003
hone:	803-245-5191		Phone:	803-245-2377
ower:	N		Aero Chart:	ATLANTA
Inicom:	122.800		FSS:	ANDERSON
.TAF:	122.800		FSS Phone:	1-800-WX-BRIEF
ir Carrier Ops:	0		Single Engine:	4
Commuter Ops:	. 0		Multi Engine:	1
lr Taxi Ops:	0		Jet:	0
iA Local Ops: 🕤	2250		Helicopter:	0
GA Itnrnt Ops:	2150		Military:	0
Ailitary Ops:	0		Glider/Ultralight:	0/0
light Traffic:	NO		Frame Repair:	Ň
ttend Sch:	UNATNDD		Engine Repair:	N
ighting Sch:	CTAF	· .	Oxygen Bottle:	N
Seacon Color:	CG		Oxygen Bulk:	N .
ieg Circle:	Y		Landing Fee:	N
Vind Ind:	· <b>Y</b>		Fuel:	N
atitude:	33-18-16.3000N	•	Magnetic Var:	04W
	081-06-30 3000			

SITE DEVELOPED BY UNLIKED SATDUM ILLENDER, GROUP I

# http://www.scaeronautics.com/airportdata.asp?FAAID=99N

7/15/2005





# Message from the President

#### SRS continues to meet our nation's needs

For more than half a century, the Savannah River Site has met the needs of this nation, South Carolina and the surrounding communities. Today, I am pleased to report that in Fiscal Year 2004, we continued our tradition of accomplishment.

The following pages highlight much of the success of our site during the past year. For instance, we witnessed the Savannah River Technology Center becoming the Savannah River National Laboratory, a significant designation that opens new doors for our researchers. As a matter of fact, we are featuring their work throughout this Annual Report. However, we've also met many milestones in many other areas. For example, we shipped the 10,000<sup>th</sup> drum of transuranic waste out of South Carolina—12 years ahead of the original schedule. The SRS accelerated cleanup decommissioning and demolition effort has eliminated over 100 unnecessary, unused buildings, saving taxpayers' money. Through it all, we kept safety first.

All of our achievements are the direct results of the expertise and innovation of our people. While important facilities and infrastructure play a significant factor in properly doing our work, it's our employees who make the difference every day.

Our past and present demonstrate our abilities to safely meet missions now and in the future. This Annual Report underscores that fact, marking SRS as a top performer in the DOE Complex. We will continue to meet our nation's needs; our focus will not stray.

Bob Pedde, President Westinghouse Savannah River Company

WESTINGHOUSE SAVANNAH RIVER COMPANY ANNUAL REPORT 2004

Page J of 24

T L

WESTINGHOUSE SAVANNAH RIVER COMPANY ANNUAL REPORT 2004

Page 2 of 24

# Contents

Page 3 of 24

Safety/Environmental Monitoring		4
Savannah River National Laboratory America's Newest National Laboratory Energy Security: Hydrogen—Ruelling Hite Ruture Keeplug Our Nation Securation(Repaired Sharing Our Expertise		G
Cleaning Up the Site		10
Eliminating Risk		12
Environmantal/Cleanup		ාය.
Shipping Waste Out of South Carolin	B	15
Transforming Waster Into Glass		17 -
Supporting the Nation's Work		18
Proceeding the Nation		19
National Defense Work		20
Future Missions		- 22
Helping the Community		23

# Safety Remains Top Priority

In FY04, WSRC Team employees achieved another. safety milestone by surpassing 10 million hours without an injury that required an employee to miss a day from work. This is the fourth consecutive year (2001, 2002; 2003, 2004) WSRC Team employees have achieved over 10 million hours worked without a lost time injury. Although the overall injury



and illness rates for the last five fiscal years appear to be improving, the WSRC Team employees remain committed to challenging at-risk work practices and conditions.

# שישוביה שופטל עיפיי שיפהצ בשוייברא פהואפיה שואו ובטהבהה היא אויד

the potential impact of the Savannah Raver Site (SRS): on the public continues to be fair below the U/S (bepartment of Energy (DOE); all pathway dose standard or (00 millirein (mem) per year, according to the bitest: SRS Environmental Report.

The largest radiation dose that my single offsite individual contributive received from SRS operations in 2003 is estimated robe 0.19 mem (animem is a standard uniof measure for radiation exposure), which is only 0.19 percent of the 100-mem DOE standard. This estimated dose is well inder the natural average dose of about 200 miem per year to people in the United States—and just slightly more in and the 2002 dose of 0.18 mem.

### Monitoring Waterways

SRSthad a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System: (NPDES) compliance rate of 99.7 percent in 2008 The NPDES program protects streams, reservoirs and other wellands by limiting all nonradiological releases Discharge limits are set for each heilify to ensure that SRS operations donoi degrade wate quality.

Billion& non-torng and environmental surveillance are conducted extensively within a 2000-square-mile network receiving 25 miles from SRS—with some monitoring performed as the as 400 miles from the site, moluding the Savannah River. The area includes neighboring cities,

WESTINGHOUSE SAVANNAH RIVER COMPANY ANNUAL REPORT 2004

1486 F 0/ 24

The site's Construction Department once again attained . a remarkable safety achievement during this fiscal year. They broke a record set in July 1988 for the number of man-hours worked without an injury requiring an employee to miss a day from work. The overall injury and illness rates for the previous five fiscal years have continued to



mprove resulting in no Days Away, Restricted or Transferred (DART) injuries for FY04. The Construction Depart-

iowns, and counties in Georgia and South Carolina. Thousands of samples of air rainwater, surfaces when, danking water, around water, food products, wildlife, soil, sediment and segeration were collected and analyzed for rationelise and nonredioderive containfrants. Still, we know we can and must continue to improve. The July tragic death of a vendor employee was a setback for all who work at the site, and a difficult reminder of why safety must remain our most important value. We only truly succeed when every person is free from injury each day, a standard that will remain our shared goal.

The potential impact of Savannah River Site radiological operations on the off-site public continues to be consistent with recent years, which have shown the lowest levels in site history and are well within DOE and EPA standards.

Page 5 of 24.

Savannah River National Laboratory

# **America's Newest National Laboratory**

In May 2004, Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham designated the Savannah River Site's applied research and development laboratory as the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL). While the national laboratory designation is new, SRNL has a half-century tradition of serving the nation's research and development needs.

Achieving national laboratory status will benefit SRNL and SRS by providing a national program focus for Energy and Defense, giving the lab an enhanced ability to compete for DOE and other government missions, expanding recruitment ability and giving SRNL raised stature.

Originally called the Savannah River Laboratory, the lab changed its name to Savannah River Technology Center in 1992 as its scope expanded to better meet the challenges of the era. Historically, the laboratory has provided the applied research and development support needed to start up and operate SRS. Over the decades, the lab's work expanded to other offices in DOE and other federal agencies that could benefit from the expertise developed here.

#### SRNL Today

Today, about half of SRNL's work is funded by SRS. The other half is work on behalf of—and funded by—DOE Environmental Management, DOE Office of Science, National Nuclear Security Administration, Hanford River Protection Project, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Army, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and other customers.

To ensure that its customers benefit from the best science and technology for their needs, SRNL collaborates with universities and other laboratories in partnerships that make use of each institution's areas of expertise. In 2004, SRNL signed agreements with Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the University of South Carolina, the Medical College of Georgia and South Carolina State University to look for opportunities to combine their expertise to meet pressing regional and national technology needs.

"President Bush and I are proud of the scientific and technical work ongoing at the Department of Energy's national laboratories. And today, we are even more proud to designate this new laboratory and make it a full partner in the critical missions performed by DOE facilities." —Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham

SAVANNAH RIVER NATIONAL LABORATORY

Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham (left) congratulates South Carolina Governor Mark Sanford on the National Laboratory designation

Page 7 of 24

# Energy Security: Hydrogen—Fueling the Future

The Savannah River National Laboratory's half-century of support for SRS' tritium programs has resulted in unmatched expertise in the handling, processing and storage of tritium and other forms of hydrogen. That expertise is finding new uses, as America prepares to move toward the use of hydrogen as a significant energy source for our cars, homes and industries.

SRNL collaborates with universities and industry to advance hydrogen technology. Aiken County's new Center for Hydrogen Research, which broke ground in 2004 at the Savannah River **Research Campus** adjacent to SRS, will advance those collaborations. SRNL will lease half of the facility from the County; the other half will



The new Center for Hydrogen Research will provide world-class laboratories for the work being performed by SRNL researchers, while acting as a catalyst to draw universities and industries conducting hydrogen research

be available for lease by universities, automotive industry and others conducting related hydrogen research, allowing for the kind of collaboration that leads to practicable results.

SRNL's hydrogen research takes on some of the most challenging issues facing the new "hydrogen economy." Among the issues SRNL is working on:

- How do we safely, cost-effectively and practically store hydrogen for use in cars, homes and industry? SRNL is working on various technologies for the safe storage of hydrogen, including light-weight specialty materials, as well as the use of glass microspheres (combining the lab's skill in glass technology with its hydrogen expertise).
- How do we produce enough hydrogen to meet the need? SRNL has just completed the first phase of a study that shows that producing hydrogen from water by using heat produced by a nuclear reactor can be a practical part of an overall future energy strategy.

Savannah River National Laboratory

# **Keeping Our Nation Secured and Prepared**

Quietly, over the Savannah River National Laboratory's 50-year history, the lab has contributed to the nation's security in a number of ways. Traditionally, the lab has provided the research and development support needed to continuously improve the production, processing, storage and handling of tritium for our national defense; to safely package, transport and store nuclear materials; and to advance nuclear nonproliferation goals.

More recently, SRNL researchers are applying their expertise—in fields ranging from robotics development to highly sensitive chemical and radiological detection and analysis—to a wide range of security-related needs.

- At the request of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, SRNL developed a mobile robot designed to disable or disarm Improvised Explosive Devices in Iraq and other military theaters. Two prototype robots have been deployed in Iraq.
- SRNL has developed a portable device that combines a radiation detector with a global positioning system to allow the identification and location of potential threats.
- The laboratory assisted the National Institute of Justice in identifying the technology needs for urban search and rescue efforts.
- SRNL developed a hand-held radiation detector for use by ship-boarding personnel to survey containers stacked on cargo ships.
- SRNL conducts numerous training courses for personnel from the FBI, Coast Guard, Customs and Border Protection and other security-related agencies on topics that include packaging of radioactive and hazardous evidence, detection of contraband materials for weapons of mass destruction, radiological crime scene processing and others.
- The laboratory assists the FBI in the areas of radioactive crime scene processing, hazardous evidence packaging and forensic examination of radioactively contaminated evidence.
- The laboratory has developed many specialized sample collection devices. The ACE (Atmospheric Contaminant Extractor) sampler—which collects

all aerosols, including chemical agents; radioactive particles; microorganisms (such as spores, bacteria, and fungi); and residual substances from explosives—is proving to have usefulness beyond homeland security purposes. It was chosen by NASA for surrogate tests of Martian type landscapes and to test the air quality on the Space Station.

SRNL has recently partnered with other national labs in testing and evaluating radiation detection systems for the protection of U.S. ports and transportation centers.



A tmospheric Contaminant Extractor in the desert simulating an extraterrestrial landscape

# **Sharing Our Expertise**

The Savannah River National Laboratory conducts research and development for a number of non-SRS customers, especially customers across the DOE Complex, making use of the same skills and expertise that support SRS operations.

The largest of these contracts—totaling over \$11 million in FY04—is the work for the Hanford River Protection Project. Using much of the same SRNL expertise that has made the design, startup and operation of DWPF possible, along with the expertise that is supporting the closure of SRS' high-level waste tanks, the laboratory is conducting numerous projects to design, develop and test processes for closing Hanford's high-level radioactive waste tanks and treating its waste.

SRNL conducts pilot-scale testing of Hanford's waste pretreatment system, including the evaporator system

SRNL is also leading a DOE complex-wide initiative to study the ways in which the earth is capable of repairing environmental damage on its own. Results of this three-year Monitored Natural Attenuation project are expected to accelerate cleanup by a minimum of 10 years for DOE sites that have groundwater plumes contaminated with chlorinated solvents.

As part of DOE's Risk Reduction Technical Assistance Program, SRNL is providing environmental technical assistance to cleanup projects at the Oak Ridge Reservation and to sites undergoing closure by the DOE Ohio Field Office, including the Fernald, Miamisburg (Mound) and Ashtabula sites. This assistance includes developing recommendations on how these sites can characterize and clean up soil and groundwater contamination.

SRNL developed two different laboratory bench-scale methods to demonstrate Fluidized Bed Steam Reforming, a technology that destroys organic components in waste. This technology is being considered for low-activity waste (LAW) at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, for LAW at Hanford, for SRS Tank 48 waste and for SRNL High Activity Drain wastes.

SRNL has demonstrated a unique capability to build, certify, train and install high precision coulometry systems for the precise measurement of nuclear material, with over 10 systems throughout the world. The most recent systems were delivered to DOE's New Brunswick Laboratory to upgrade their high reliability nuclear material assay measurement programs.

Page 9 of 24

# **Accelerating Cleanup Today and Tomorrow**

SRS's skyline is changing dramatically, with more than 100 buildings gone. Work is concentrated in a few key areas and projects: Demolition in T, D, M, A and F areas; R Area Disassembly Basin evaporation; and the 247-F Closure Project.

### Area Updates

T Area (TNX) is now a field of empty concrete slabs, and the area is undergoing final soil and groundwater remediation.

In D Area, demolition work is well ahead of schedule, with 29 buildings down. All that will remain standing after 2006 is the power plant, which is operated by South Carolina Electric & Gas.

M Area's fuel fabrication facilities, where the site's production process once began, are gone. The ambitious Six Pack project—the demolition

10 of 24

		•••••	•	
HITACHI				
THE PARTY OF				
	•=			с. В <b>Г</b> е
				XEN/
				e and a second

Building 313-M is one of more than 100 buildings demolished so far

of six buildings encompassing 150,000 square feet—was completed this year well ahead of schedule. Many more buildings have been completed as well, for a total of 13 facilities demolished in the area.

By the end of 2006, more than 250 facilities will be demolished.

In A Area, Building 708-A—which once housed the main cafeteria and credit union—has been removed. Some buildings have been dismantled and removed by the economic development organization Southern Carolina Alliance, for future use elsewhere.

R Area's disassembly basin, which once served R Reactor, is being emptied via evaporation and shipping of the water to the Effluent Treatment Project. This two-pronged approach will continue until 3 million gallons have been removed. Then, the remaining water will be grouted in place, and the disassembly basin building will be demolished.

Work in the 247-F Closure Project is also well ahead of schedule, with 43 of 84 core zones complete. Zone deactivation is expected to be complete in 2005, with demolition complete in 2006. In the end, five complex radiological buildings will be demolished down to the slab.

In all, aggressive, safe cleanup continues ahead of schedule and under budget at SRS. As the site continues to successfully reduce risk, workforce restructuring in FY04 allowed SRS to place resources where necessary, while also reducing the number of employees. As a result of continued risk reduction, WSRC expects more workforce restructuring in FY05. Still, there is important site work scheduled to continue until 2025.

Ridler	Completerin 2006	To(Co	Completion Date
10 <u>%</u> [)	~3 million square resident of shed	$\pi^{-2}$ million square feat	2025
Tank closures	-it tanks closed	48 (anics	2020
Salesolution dispositioned	3-million gallons	82milliongallous	2019
Soil & groundwater remediation	64percent-01 waste sites	36 percent	2025
Weste solidification	$\approx 2,200$ eanisters poured.	~2,800 camsiers	2019
Hicanyon and HBLine	<u>∭hin(ain co</u>	nthumgprocessing expability.	

WESTINGHOUSE SAVANNAH RIVER COMPANY ANNUAL REPORT 2004

Page 11 of 24

# F Area Closure Remains on Schedule

Deactivation work in F Canyon and FB Line is continuing to make excellent progress, and is nearly 50 percent complete.

F Canyon's work is being accomplished safely by disciplined, multi-talented teams, each containing all the skills and experience needed to get the work done.

#### The Future

Although FB Line workers are already beginning deactiva-

tion, the main goal in that facility is finishing its plutonium stabilization mission and emptying the facility. As of the end of FY04, FB Line had completed and shipped 858 containers, each containing one bagless can, and is three months ahead of its deinventory schedule. Deinventory was scheduled to be complete in June 2005; it is now expected to be complete in March 2005.

F Canyon

Part of F Canyon deactivation is emptying its former operating systems, shipping legacy materials out and relocating necessary F Area functions to other areas. Solvents, which represented the most significant fire hazard in the area, are now removed from F Area and are being steadily dispositioned from SRS. Emergency responsibilities have been transferred to the F/H Area Laboratories, which will continue operating to support other facilities across the site.

Work continues ahead of schedule to deactivate systems and facilities in F Area, with an overall goal of reaching a cold, dark and dry state in F Canyon and FB Line by the end of 2006.

# **Reducing the Inventory of Liquid Waste**



In 2004, SRS made steady strides toward managing space and reducing inventory in its 49 high-level waste tanks, which are essential to continued successful operation of site facilities.

SRS waste disposition benefited in 2004 when Congress and the President settled the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing issue. This resolution opens the door to reducing the site's waste inventory.

Facilities such as the Defense Waste Processing Facility, H Canyon and F Canyon must be able to send waste materials into the tank farms—the collection of tanks holding the waste—or they cannot operate. Currently, those tanks contain about 36 million gallons of liquid waste that is destined for processing in one of several site facilities.

### Work Accomplished

DWPF gets its feed directly from the tanks in the form of sludge. In 2004, the third batch of sludge—each of which can take years to process—was completed and transferred to DWPF's feed tank.

Another facility, the Effluent Treatment Project (ETP), is instrumental in keeping the waste volume as low as possible by treating the liquid portion of the waste and sending clean water to the Savannah River. In 2004, ETP received and processed all legacy aqueous PUREX waste, a result of decades of canyon operations that had been stored in the tank farms.

Tank farms continue to serve area facilities by accepting wastes—both routine transfers and specific, unusual transfers.

Across the tank farm complex, especially in F Area, there is considerable focus on risk reduction through deactivation. In F Tank Farm in 2004, the DOE Complex's first high-level waste evaporator was deactivated.

During the year, tank farm employees also worked toward the future, converting an existing facility for use in removing actinides from waste and completing conceptual design for a second small-scale facility, to be used for salt processing until a full-scale Salt Waste Processing Facility is operational.

In 2004, H Tank Farm accepted the first transfer of neptunium from H Canyon.

Page 13 of 24

# Final Closure Rests With Soil and Groundwater Cleanup

Cleanup of SRS soil and groundwater continues under an aggressive, integrated, area-by-area approach that will see one site area completely closed by the end of FY06 and another in the active process of being closed. Working closely with the site's Decommissioning and Demolition (D&D) organization, Soil & Groundwater Closure Projects (SGCP) will clean up and close SRS areas sequentially.

Of 515 waste sites at SRS, 311 have been completed and another 52 are in remediation.



Workers install equipment in preparation for another grout pour at the Old Radioactive Waste Burial Ground solvent tank closure project

In FY04, all demolition work in T Area was completed. SGCP final remediation work to support an Area Closure in FY06 was initiated in the summer of FY04. That final remediation will remove contaminated soils from the T Area Outfall Delta and cover the waste units and several concrete slabs from demolished facilities in T Area with soil, then capping the area and planting grass over it. This work is on schedule to be complete by the end of FY06.

M Area and R Area are the next two areas targeted for final closure. An operation known as the Dynamic Underground Stripping system is being installed in M Area, which will make great strides toward completing final groundwater cleanup. M Area closure is planned in FY10.

Underground barrier walls are being built in F and H areas, with the final wall in F Area completed and wall construction in H Area under way. The walls are being built to reduce the spread of groundwater contamination from the closed F and H Area Seepage Basins to Fourmile Branch. The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control has required that the installation be complete by March 31, 2005.

# **Permanently Disposing of Waste**

Since 2001, the site has been sending portions of its low-level radioactive waste to the Nevada Test Site and Envirocare of Utah, mixed waste to Envirocare and transuranic waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico.

# Transuranic (TRU) Waste

The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) is the Department of Energy's facility for disposing of transuranic (TRU) waste from across the DOE Complex. SRS began shipping its TRU waste to WIPP in 2001, initially making about one shipment a month.

In 2004, SRS again dramatically accelerated its TRU waste shipping schedule. SRS is now making 24 shipments per month, compared to 15 per month the previous year. At this rate, the site expects to finish shipping the remaining 16,100 drums by 2006. This date, compared to the original target date of 2014, saves taxpayers approximately \$100 million.

When the Ship to WIPP program began, there were approximately 30,000 drums containing TRU waste in storage at SRS. In FY04, 239 shipments (which included shipment of the 10,000<sup>th</sup> drum of TRU waste) were made to WIPP. This number reflects approximately 50 percent of drum shipments, a milestone achieved significantly earlier than the original baseline schedule. A total of 447 shipments (13,900 drums) have been made since the Ship to WIPP Program began.

### Low-Level Waste

Due to the acceleration of excess facilities decommissioning, SRS disposed of over 26,000 cubic meters of low-level waste (LLW), an increase of 60 percent over the previous year. In addition, 1,512 cubic meters of legacy LLW was disposed resulting in essentially a zero backlog of LLW. This legacy was disposed of well ahead of the FY06 goal and is included in the above total. LLW shipments are sent to DOE's Nevada Test Site and to Envirocare of Utah.



Loading TRUPACT II containers on TRU Pad 3 Burial Ground

An important part of SRS' strategy for safely and cost-effectively managing wastes is the use of qualified off-site treatment and disposal facilities for wastes that are technically or economically unsuitable for on-site disposal.

Page 15 of 24

Shipping Waste Out of South Carolina (continued)

# **Permanently Disposing of Waste**

# **Depleted Uranium**

Depleted uranium (DU) liquids and oxides continued to leave South Carolina in 2004.

Depleted uranyl nitrate (DUN) is shipped from F Area to Permafix in Tennessee, where it is treated and turned into a grout material. From there, it is sent to the Nevada Test Site for final disposition. In FY04, 16 of 40 total shipments were made to Nevada, with the remainder expected to be completed in FY05 and FY06, depending on funding.

Depleted uranium oxide (DUO), a powder-like, low-level radioactive material that is stored in more than 33,000 55-gallon drums, is being sent by rail to Envirocare of Utah. About 10 percent of the shipments—3,270 drums—were completed in FY03, with another 2,024 drums completed in FY04.

Shipments are expected to be complete by about 2008.

DUN and DUO are uranium byproducts of the F Area process. They are safely stored until disposition can be completed.

## **Mixed Low Level Waste**

In 2004, SRS completed characterization, manifesting and shipment of 285.9 cubic meters of mixed waste for treatment and disposal. (Mixed Low Level Waste is waste that is both radioactive and hazardous.) Fifteen truckloads of waste were shipped to Envirocare of Utah for treatment by macroencapulation or stabilization.



A worker moves a drum containing depleted uranium oxide into a railcar

# **Dispositioning Waste through DWPF**

The Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF), the largest radioactive waste vitrification plant in the world, has produced 6.7 million pounds of glass, containing 1.9 million pounds of waste, in 8½ years of radioactive operations.



The Defense Waste Processing Facility has been operating since 1996

In FY04, the facility staff took steps to increase the amount of waste contained in each canister by 20 percent, which will result in about 1,000 fewer canisters over the life of the facility and a savings to taxpayers of about \$1 billion.

By the end of the fiscal year, DWPF had produced more than 1,700 canisters of glassified high-level waste—but those canisters contained as much waste as 1,800 previous canisters. Canister production remains ahead of schedule, with facility workers focusing on increasing the rate of waste loading still further.

Melter 2, which has been in service since spring 2003, continues to perform even better than its predecessor, which functioned four times longer than its design life. DWPF's third melter has been completed and is ready when needed. The process has begun to build Melter 4—which may be the last one the facility will need to complete its mission.

The Glass Waste Storage Building, which is used to hold canisters until they can be shipped to a national repository, is expected to exhaust its storage capacity before a national repository is ready. Therefore, a second building is under construction.

The Saltstone Facility, which converts the low-level portion of the site's liquid wastes into grout for permanent on-site disposition, is preparing to restart in the summer of 2005, when feed is available. Modifications are successfully ongoing to enable the facility to process additional materials in the future.

Savannah River National Laboratory developed a new frit—the sand-like material that is mixed with the waste to form glass—that maximizes melt rate and waste loading in DWPF.
# H Canyon/HB Line Stabilize Legacy Materials

H Canyon and HB Line saw major milestones in 2004, completing SRS spent nuclear fuel processing and beginning another campaign that will see the United States' last neptunium materials stabilized and shipped off site.

H Canyon finished processing SRS's last spent nuclear fuel in January 2004, and began processing SRS's unirradiated fuels—those that had not yet been placed in SRS's reactors when the Cold War ended in 1991. Highly enriched uranium (HEU) is recovered in H Canyon, then blended with natural uranium to form low enriched uranium (LEU). The LEU is sent to Tennessee to be converted into materials suitable for use in the



H Canyon

Tennessee Valley Authority's commercial power reactors. HEU dissolution and LEU shipments are proceeding well ahead of schedule, with operations expected to be completed in late 2006.

In 2004, H Canyon also supported F Canyon deactivation by successfully starting up two operations previously performed by F Canyon—processing of lab sample returns and supplying bulk chemicals to other site facilities.

In HB Line, which sits atop the canyon, workers completed stabilization of materials from Idaho nine months ahead of schedule.

Also in HB Line, neptunium processing began ahead of schedule. The neptunium solutions, which have been stored in H Canyon since the 1980s, represent the last of the United States' neptunium inventory. The solution is being converted into an oxide form in HB Line's Phase II facility, then shipped to Idaho for eventual use in the space program.

Neptunium from SRS will be converted to Pu-238 and used to power the nation's deep-space probes for the next 20-30 years.

The Safety Analysis Report for Packaging that the Savannah River National Laboratory prepared led to the certification of the 9975 package for the shipment of neptunium oxide, a necessary part of this important program.

WESTINGHOUSE SAVANNAH RIVER COMPANY ANNUAL REPORT 2004

20.00

# Safe, Secure Storage for the Nation's Nuclear Materials



The KArea Materials Storage Facility (KAMS) is located in the building that housed K Reactor

SRS is working to reduce risks nationwide by safely storing some of the nation's excess plutonium in preparation for final disposition.

The Foreign Research Reactor and the Domestic Research Reactor programs are scheduled to continue until 2014 and 2019, respectively.

Nuclear Materials Management, which includes buildings 105-K and 235-F, has the role to safely store, manage and protect the nation's plutonium until it can be processed through the future Mixed Oxide Fuel (MOX) Y Fabrication Facility or another disposition

process.

A significant accomplishment during the year was that 235-F Limited Extent Surveillance Facility was declared operaional. The facility provides interim surveillance capability until the Storage and Surveillance Capability Line Item roject is complete. This achievement now decouples FB Line from 3013 surveillance, enabling SRS to complete deactivation activities in FB Line.

FY04 was an important year for Nuclear Materials Management, seeing such achievements as:

- Providing input to support DOE's proposed Plutonium Vitrification Facility as an alternative immobilization strategy for plutonium that cannot be sent to the MOX facility.
- Transferring design authority responsibility for surveillance of all DOE complex plutonium packages to SRS from the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Work is under way on establishing the surveillance baseline.
- Successfully transferring unirradiated Mk-22 fuel assemblies to H Area, where they will be dissolved, blended down and sent to Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) vendors to fabricate TVA power reactor fuel.



235-F Facility, future home of the 3013 Container Storage and Surveillance Capability Project

Page 19 of 24

# New Tritium Facility Complete

The Savannah River Site's Tritium Modernization and Consolidation Project Team overcame numerous challenges throughout the sevenyear project life to complete the project within the schedule and under budget, at a cost of \$138.6 million.

In August 2004, Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham recognized the team's accomplishments by awarding the project the Secretary's Award of Achievement at the Secretary of Energy's fourth annual Project Management Awards. The award acknowledges outstanding performance based on successful completion, or near completion, of a project and overall management of the project or program.

In addition, as part of 232-H Deactivation, the Tritium Facility's Cryogenic Distillation Column, used to purify tritium used in nuclear weapons, was placed in cold standby. Cryogenic Distillation has been the means of purifying tritium for the weapons for the past 37 years. It separates the different

isotopes of hydrogen, which are protium, deuterium and tritium. The Cryogenic Distillation technology has been replaced with hydride separations technology.

### Award Received

20 of 24

The Defense Programs' SRS Tritium Hot Calibration Laboratory received the 2004 National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Pollution Prevention Award for Environmental Stewardship, recognizing both its initiative and its success in reducing the amount of radioactively contaminated waste requiring disposal. NNSA Administrator Linton Brooks



SRS Tritium Facilities

presented the award to the WSRC Team during a visit to the SRS Tritium Facilities.

Also in FY04, a Scanning Electron Microscope was installed as a capability upgrade in the Inert Metallography Laboratory. This new state-of-the-art microscope has allowed surveillance examination of a system that had not previously been studied due to equipment limitations. This technology upgrade improves SRS's capability to support the national laboratories.

## **Protecting the Nation's Nuclear Deterrent**

An important enduring mission at the Savannah River Site is to supply tritium, a radioactive form of hydrogen necessary for the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile, to the Department of Defense. The decay of existing tritium supplies requires a new source. For this reason, WSRC is building the Tritium Extraction Facility (TEF), which will

be used to process materials irradiated in a Tennessee Valley Authority nuclear power reactor.

Since 1988, when the last production reactor at SRS ceased operation, the nation has had no source of new tritium. Current stockpile requirements have been met by recovering the gas from dismantled nuclear weapons and from routine tritium reservoir exchanges from the existing nuclear stockpile.

Construction of TEF began in 2000. Inert gas testing will begin in FY05 with normal operations expected to be authorized in FY07.

At the end of FY04, TEF was 83 percent complete. The Target Rod Preparation equipment, gloveboxes, furnaces and containment modules were completed and installed in the facility. Of 82 systems in the facility, 50 have been turned over to startup and are undergoing tests.

-Control Room work was completed in September, and the Process Control System (among other items) was turned over by Construction. Construction also achieved mechanical completion of the Tritium Support Building.

WSRC is forecasting completion 10 months ahead of schedule.



TEF Extraction Furnace in the facility's Remote Handling Area

Page 21 of 24

# **Turning Surplus Weapons Material Into a Source for Energy**

SRS has been designated as the site for the National Nuclear Security Administration's future plutonium disposition missions, which will convert surplus weapons plutonium to a fuel suitable for use in commercial nuclear power reactors.

The two key facilities will be the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility (MFFF), which will blend plutonium oxide with uranium oxide to form a mixed oxide fuel, and the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility (PDCF), which will supply most of the feed for the MFFF by disassembling surplus nuclear weapons pits and converting the weapons-usable plutonium to oxide. WSRC provides the Design Authority function for the PDCF project and will eventually operate and maintain the facility. A consortium called DCS formed by Duke Project Services Group; COGEMA, Inc.; and Stone & Webster has a contract to design and license the MFFF, with future options to construct, operate, and deactivate the facility, as well as use the MOX fuel in Duke's commercial reactors.

- By the end of FY04, DCS was nearing completion of the MFFF design. Fuel production is expected to begin about 2009 and continue for approximately 12 years. Site clearing on MFFF is expected to begin in FY05.
- Development and testing of process equipment for the PDCF continued at Los Alamos National Laboratory.



The Future Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility

Design work continues to progress on the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility. This design is being performed by Washington Group International.

# SRS Recognizes Employees Serving In Military

Last year, SRS employees were recognized for their military service since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States.

While most service men and women were in attendance at a special ceremony, some were still on active military duty.

The event honored the 72 SRS employees and their families with a barbecue dinner and a patriotic program. In addition to the honorees and their families, those in attendance included local elected officials, business owners, community and civic leaders, and other SRS stakeholders.

The honorees were given plaques to recognize their "dedicated military service defending our country, our citizens here at home and in other critical locations around the world."

Making the presentations were Jeff Allison, U.S. Department of Energy-Savannah River Manager; Bob Pedde, WSRC President; Gary Stanley, Bechtel Savannah River, Inc. Vice President; and Larry Brede, Wackenhut Services Inc.-Savannah River General Manager.

Also, Mr. Pedde received on behalf of WSRC he Seven Seals Award from Brigadier General Aitchell Willoughby, Assistant Adjutant General S.C. Army National Guard, and Luther Beason, S.C. Committee for Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve. The award is given to organizations that support its employees while they are serving on active duty.



SRS employees who are serving in the military were recognized for their service to the country

Page 23 of 24

Helping the Community (continued)

# Working in Our Communities

## Employee Volunteerism

Last year, site employees continued to generously support the United Way, giving more than \$2.1 million-raising the amount given to the United Way to more than \$42 million since the mid-1950s. Also, additional contributions of more than \$12.6 million have been sent to communities through the WSRC corporate philanthropy program since 1989. During the year's SRS blood drives, over 1,180 units of blood were donated. Employees last year donated the equivalent of 164,564 pounds of food in the Site's Holiday Food Drive. Also, WSRC reached over 62,000 students the past year through various programs aimed to encourage learning, especially science and math. Finally, WSRC helped about 700 teachers with their classroom presentations.



SRS employees also give time to the community

### Economic Impact

The site's economic impact makes a significant contribution across the South Carolina-Georgia area. SRS employs more than 12,000 people, and the site's overall budget is approximately \$1.6 billion. Of that, nearly \$1 billion is payroll. Last year, the site purchased over \$200 million in goods and services in South Carolina and Georgia combined. The site's overall economic impact to the area is about \$2.4 billion a year.



Employees by county in South Carolina and Georgia

The WSRC Community Giving Program contributed \$650,000 last year to nonprofit and charitable organizations that support the arts, education and assist the community at large within the Central Savannah River Area.



The WSRC Team: Westinghouse Savannah River Company LLC • Bechtel Savannah River, Inc. • BNFL Savannah River Corporation BWXT Savannah River Company • CH2 Savannah River Company • Polestar Savannah River Company

# United States - 2004 Year End Wind Pear Capacity (MW)



http://www.eere.energy.gov/windandhydro/windpoweringamerica/images/windmaps/installed\_capacity\_2004.jpg

7/6/2005

rage 1 of 1



# Georgia Population Projections Table of Contents 2010-2015

Coordina 2016 Devulation Device time Highlights	1
Georgia's 2015 Population Projections Highlights	ן יסי
Coordination Clowin on Ocorgia by 2015	2
Georgia's Growin Continues	2
County Size and Growth	4
Metropolitan/Micropolitan Statistical Areas	5
Components of Growth	5
Natural Increase	5
Net Migration	6
Growth by Race and Ethnicity	7
Language Issues	9
Age Issues	
The Elderly Population	9
The Youth Population	9
Georgia Residential Population Projections	11
Appendix	•
What is the Difference Between a Population Estimate and Projection?	14
How is Growth Computed?	14
What is the difference between Residential and Household Population?	14
What are Group Quarters and how do they affect the Population Projection?	14
Fertility	15
Life Expectancy	15
What are metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas?	15
Migration	15
How do OPB projections compare to the US Census Bureau estimates and	
the Atlanta Regional Commission projections?	16
the retainer regionar commission projections:	10

For a printer friendly version of this document click HERE.

To view all associated tables for this document click HERE.

All questions and inquiries can be addressed via email to:

Robert Giacomini Research Director

> Judy Hadley Statistical Research Analyst

## Georgia 2015 Population Projections

## Highlights: Forecasts based on current trends

At current growth rates, Georgia's population will grow 34% between 2000 and 2015 to 10,813,573.

Georgia will likely become the eighth largest state in the nation in 2015, moving from its current ninth place, past the State of Michigan.

Twelve counties are expected to grow by 75% or more between 2000 and 2015.

By 2015, half of the state's population will reside in 12 counties: Gwinnett, Fulton, Cobb, DeKalb, Clayton, Henry, Cherokee, Chatham, Forsyth, Hall, Richmond and Muscogee.

By 2015, one out of eleven Georgians will reside in Gwinnett County. Gwinnett County's 2015 population of 1,030,700 will be larger than the total population of the 79 smallest Georgia counties *combined*.

Twenty-three counties are expected to lose population between 2000 and 2015.

In 2015, seven counties are expected to have a population less than 5,000: Taliaferro, Webster, Quitman, Glascock, Clay, Stewart, and Schley.

Georgia's African American population is currently the fourth largest in the nation behind New York, Texas and Florida. By 2015, only New York will have a significantly larger African American population than Georgia.

As a percentage of the total state population, Georgia will likely have the largest percentage of African American residents among the ten largest states by 2015.

At least four out of ten people moving to Georgia are international migrants. For thirteen of the last fourteen years, domestic and international migration has accounted for more than half of Georgia's annual population growth.

By 2015, approximately 10% of Georgia's population will be Hispanic, 28% African-American/Black, 59% Non-Hispanic White and 3% other minorities.

Georgia's Hispanic population is expected to increase 143% between 2000 and 2015. The African-American and Non-Hispanic White populations are each expected to increase about 25% during the same time period.

In 2000, 10% or more residents speak a language other than English at home in fifteen Georgia counties. In Echols, Gwinnett, Habersham, Hall, and Whitefield Counties, one in five residents speak a foreign language at home.

By 2015 13.6% of Georgia's population will be age 65 and older. Over 80% of this age group will be Non-Hispanic Whites.

By 2015, one in three Georgians will be under 20 years of age. About half of this age group will likely be Hispanic, African American or other minorities.

Just over half of Georgia's 2015 population will be considered of working age (20-64). This population of approximately 5 1/2 million will likely be comprised of 59% White, 9% Hispanic and 32% African American and other minorities.

The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (OPB) periodically produces population projections for the state and each county.

5/11/2005

OPB, PPT

## Impact of Population Growth on Georgia by 2015

#### YOUTH

Georgia will gain more than 1.25 million children (under age 20) between 2000 and 2015.

The state currently spends approximately \$4,581 on each new student for education.

In current dollars, an increase in students in grades K-12 of approximately 1 million would cost the state an additional \$4.6 billion annually at current funding levels.

One million new students would require almost 44,000 new classrooms to be constructed with an average class size of 23.

The state currently spends \$5,236 for each new child in construction costs.

In current dollars, building classrooms for one million new students would cost \$5.3 billion.

#### The ELDERLY

Between 2000 and 2015, the highest growth rate in the 65 and older category will be among those citizens 85 and older. This population should number more than 290,000 in 2015, a 341% growth over 2000.

Over the next decade the baby boom generation with enter their retirement years. This will significantly change the demand for both private and government services.

The population 85 and older requires significantly more health services than the population 65 to 84. The cost of medical care increases greatly in the years just prior to death.

#### MOTOR VEHICLES

- 1

1.2

Georgia's increasing population will also place additional demands on the state infrastructure. The number of vehicles on the state highways could increase from 7.3 million in 2000 to at least 9 million in 2015.

If motor vehicles increase at rates similar to those in the 1990s, the number could be as much as 10 million vehicles in Georgia.

The number of vehicles traveling on each lane mile of freeway in Atlanta could increase from 18,700 per day to almost 25,000 per day, if vehicle travel increases as fast as the population.

#### CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

At current incarceration rates, the state's prison population will increase from 43,270 in 2000 to 53,291 in 2015.

Current daily cost is approximately \$50 per prisoner or about \$18,250 a year. An additional 10,000 prisoners would cost the state \$182,500,000 annually.

#### REPRESENTATION

Depending on total population growth nationwide and Georgia's population share compared to other states, Georgia may pick up an additional congressional seat following the 2010 Census.

5/11/2005

## Georgia's Growth Continues

Georgia's resident population increased 26% between 1990 and 2000. This was the fastest growth of any decade this century. Georgia's population more than doubled between 1950 and 2000, increasing 256%.



In spite of the recession of the past few years, Georgia's growth has continued. The US Census Bureau estimates that Georgia grew by more than 642,930 people between 2000 and 2004, more than all but three states (California, Florida and Texas). Georgia's growth rate of 7.9 percent between 2000 and 2004 was the fifth fastest growing state in the nation.<sup>i</sup>

The US Census Bureau estimated that Georgia had an average population increase of about 2% per year between 2000 and 2004 or about 160,700 people per year. This rate would give Georgia an estimated growth of 20% between 2000 and 2010.

Georgia and US Population Characteristics US Census Bureau Estimates 2003					
Population	Georgia	U.S.	· State Rank		
Population 2003 Census Estimates	8,676,460	290,788,976	9		
% of Population Age 17 and Under	26.4%	25.0%	7		
% of Population 65 and Older	9.6%	12.4%	48		
Percentage of Population by Race	•				
% of PopulationAfrican American/Black	28.7%	12.8%	5		
% of Population Asian/Pacific Islander	2.5%	4.3%	21		
% of Population All Other/Multiple Races	1.3%	2.4%	43		
% of Population Hispanic/Latino	6.2%	13.7%	22 · .		
% of Population Non-Hispanic White 61.8% 67.9% 42					
*Rank is based on 1 being the highest	using US Cens	sus 2000-2004 E	stimates		

OPB, PPT

5/11/2005

## County Size and Growth

#### **Fastest Growing Counties**

Twelve counties are expected to increase their residential population by 75% or more between 2000 and 2015: Forsyth:137%, Henry:135%, Newton:121%, Paulding:117%, Cherokee:91%, Lee:91%, Pickens:90%, Butts:88%, Dawson:87%, Barrow:84%, Walton:75% and Gwinnett:75%.

An additional 36 counties will grow more than 34% between 2000 and 2015.

According to the Census Bureau, Georgia had 5 of the top 10 fastest growing counties in the US for April 1 2000 to July 1 2003. There are more than 3,000 counties in the US. Georgia also had 20 of the top 100 fastest growing counties for this time period. In addition to the twelve counties listed above, the US Census Bureau's list of Georgia's 20 fastest growing counties included Bryan, Chattahoochee, Carroll, Coweta, Effingham, Hall, Jackson and White Counties.<sup>ii</sup>

### **Counties Losing Population**

Twenty-three counties are expected to lose population between 2000 and 2015. Taliaferro, Stewart, Randolph, Calhoun, Warren, Quitman, Webster, and Liberty counties are expected to lose more than 10% of their residential population between 2000 and 2015. It is quite possible that troop movement from the military base influences the projected decrease in Liberty County's population<sup>iii</sup>.

#### Show me the MAP

### Largest County Populations

By 2015, half of the state's population will reside in 12 counties: Gwinnett, Fulton, Cobb, DeKalb, Clayton, Henry, Cherokee, Chatham, Forsyth, Hall, Richmond and Muscogee. 57% of Georgians will live in the 28 county metropolitan Atlanta area. Roughly 75% of the state's population will reside in 21% of the state's total land area.

#### Smallest County Populations

100 Georgia counties have populations less than 35,000 but cover 62% of the total land area. To place this in perspective, Turner Field in Atlanta could hold the entire population of any of the smallest 100 counties.

#### **Population Density**

In 2000, Georgia had a population density of 141 people per square land mile. Five Georgia counties have 1,000 people or more per square land mile: Dekalb, Fulton, Clayton, Cobb and Gwinnett. Of the ten largest states in population, only Texas will have a lower population density than Georgia. In the Southeast, Florida, North Carolina and Virginia will likely continue to have higher populations per square mile than Georgia.

By 2015, Georgia is expected to have 187 people per square land mile. Nine counties are expected to have 1,000 people or more per square land mile by 2015, adding Forsyth County to the above list of five. In spite of Gwinnett County's rapid growth, it will not have the highest population density. DeKalb, Clayton and Cobb Counties are all expected to have more people per square mile of land area.

Show me the MAP

A complete table of population projections for Georgia Counties may be found on page 11 of this report.

OPB, PPT

5/11/2005

## Metropolitan / Micropolitan Statistical Areas

According to the February 2004 US Census Bureau listing, Georgia now has 15 Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Each metropolitan statistical area must have at least one urbanized area of 50,000 or more inhabitants. Georgia also has 28 micropolitan statistical areas, which have at least one urban cluster of at least 10,000 but less than 50,000 population. Additional "outlying counties" are included in the statistical area if they meet specified requirements of commuting to or from the central counties.<sup>1V</sup>

As areas grow toward each other, the area may become a "Combined Statistical Area". Georgia has 5 Combined Statistical Areas: Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville GA-AL, Chattanooga-Cleveland-Athens TN-GA, Columbus-Auburn-Opelika GA-AL, Macon-Warner Robins-Fort Valley, and Savannah-Hinesville-Fort Stewart.

Show me the Metropolitan MAP

Show me the Micropolitan MAP

## **Components of Growth**

An area's population grows by natural increase and net migration. With the exception of 2003, less than half of Georgia's growth has been due to natural increase (more births than deaths). The relative decline in domestic migration may be due in part to the economic recession.





### Natural increase

Georgia's natural increase has been rising since the mid-1990s. Natural increase is computed as births minus deaths.

There are usually slightly more than two births for each death. However, there are several Georgia counties that have more deaths than births.

According to Georgia Vital Records, Brooks, Fannin, Glascock, Lincoln, Randolph, Stewart, Talbot, Taliaferro, Towns, Union, Upson and Webster Counties all had more deaths than births between 2000 and 2003.

> Show me the MAP Page 5

### Net migration

Net migration is the number of people. moving into the area minus the number of people moving out of an area.

100%

90%

80%

70%

In the last four years three states, only Arizona, Florida, and Nevada, have gained more people from other states than Georgia.

Georgia considered one America's international

2

.

60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0% 1996 2002 2003 1991 2001 2004 is now ■ % Domestic ■ % International of

Net Migration by Place of Origin - Georgia 1991-2004

gateways. At least four out of ten people moving to Georgia are international migrants. An estimated yearly average of 37,500 people moved to Georgia from another country between 2001 and 2004.

This ranks Georgia as the seventh most popular state for international migrants. In the Southeast only Florida has higher migration levels.

This number does not capture the number of foreigners who enter the United States at a different gateway and then move to Georgia at a later time. For example, the person may enter the country in New York, California, or Texas and then move to Georgia.

The graph above also indicates how domestic migration slowed during the recession. While not back to the 2001 numbers, the 2004 estimated domestic migration is considerably higher than it was in 2003.

Census estimates do not allow for detailed analysis on the region of origin of migrants. However, Census 2000 provides more detailed information. The following table shows the race and Hispanic origin of both domestic and international migrants to Georgia between 1995 and 2000.

Hispanics, Blacks and Asians were a majority of both domestic and international migrants during this period and constituted two out of every three persons moving into the state.



## Growth by Race and Ethnicity

In the following discussion White, African Americans, and other minority projections do not include Hispanics. Hispanics may be of any race. Over 90% of Non-Whites are African Americans or Black. The remainders are Asians, Alaskan Natives, American Indians and Pacific Islanders. At the 2000 Census, the majority of Georgia's resident population was Non-Hispanic White. This is expected to remain true for 2015. In the 2015 OPB population projections, 134 counties are expected to have 50% or more White residents. Twenty counties are expected to have 50% or more African American or other non-white residents, and 4 counties are expected to have 20% or more Hispanic residents.

By 2015, the OPB projections indicate that about 40% of the resident population will be minority that is either non-white or Hispanic.

The US Census Bureau's 2003 estimates have Georgia's Hispanic population growing by 24 percent between 2000 and 2003, from 435,277 to 541,123. Georgia ranks 10<sup>th</sup> among the 50 States in the percentage of minority residents (38%).

2000-2015 Georgia Residential Population by Race/Ethnicity						
	2000 Census	Race / Ethnicity % 2000	2010 Projection	Race / Ethnicity % 2010	2015 Projection	Race / Ethnicity % 2015
White	5,128,663	62.6%	5,944,068	60.3%	6,424,856	59.4%
African American & Other Minorities	2,623,728	32.0%	3,029,371	30.7%	3,329,862	30.8%
Hispanic Any Race	434,062	5.3%	891,531	9.0%	1,058,855	9.8%
Totals	8,186,453	100.0%	9,864,970	100.0%	10,813,573	100.0%

The percentage of Hispanics in Georgia's 2015 resident population is expected to grow from 5.3% to 9.8%. The number of Whites, African Americans, and other minorities will also grow but their percentage of the total population will drop about 2% each.

The number of Whites, African Americans, and other minorities will increase about 25% each between 2000 and 2015. However, the number of Hispanics is expected to increase about 143% between 2000 and 2015.

2000-2015 Georgia Residential Population Numeric Growth of Race/Ethnic Groups							
	Numeric Growth 2000 - 2010% Growth 2000 - 2010Numeric 						
White	815,405	15.9%	1,296,193	25.3%			
African American & Other Minorities	405,643	15.5%	706,134	26.9%			
Hispanic Any Race	457,469	105.4%	624,793	143.9%			
Total	1,678,517	20.5%	2,627,120	32.1%			

OPB, PPT

5/11/2005



The age spread is not uniform across the racial/ethnic groups. The White population has a lower percentage of youth (under 20 years of age) and a higher percentage of elderly (age 65 and older) than the other two groups.

Age Group Shift By Race/Ethnicity 2000 - 2015								
Age Group	2000	2015	2000	2015	2000	2015		
Race / Ethnicity	White	White	African American & Other Minority	African American & Other Minority	Hispanic	Hispanic		
Age < 20	26.1%	29.1%	35.1%	39.6%	36.3%	46.1%		
Age 20-64	62.0%	51.9%	58.6%	54.2%	61.7%	50.6%		
Age 65+	11.9%	19.1%	6.3%	6.2%	1.9%	3.3%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Across all race and ethnic groups, the percentage of the working age population will decline as the percentage of youth and elderly increase.

7

At the 2000 Census, the genders were almost equal in the White population. Females out numbered males in African American and other minority populations. Hispanic males far outnumbered the Hispanic females. In 2000, 59% of Hispanics were male. However the proportion as well as the number of Hispanic females is expected to increase. By 2015, about 43% of Hispanics are expected to be female.



### Language Issues

English as a Second Language is becoming more prevalent as Georgia becomes more and more diverse. 10% or more residents in 15 Georgia counties speak a language other than English at home. In Echols, Gwinnett, Habersham, Hall, and Whitefield Counties, one in five residents speak a foreign language at home. This does not necessarily mean that they are not proficient in English.

These counties are Atkinson (16%), Chattahoochee (14%), Clarke (12%), Colquitt (11%), Clayton (15%), Cobb (15%), DeKalb (17%), Echols (22%), Fulton (13%), Gwinnett (21%), Habersham (21%), Hall (21%), Liberty (13%), Toombs (10%) and Whitfield (22%).

The majority of these residents speak Spanish but many other languages are also represented. Some school systems have as many as 30 languages being spoken at one school.

#### Show me the MAP

## Age

#### The Elderly Population

Georgia has a lower percentage of the population aged 65 and over than all but two states. The 2004 US Census Bureau estimates that 12.4% of the population is age 65 and over. The 2004 US Census Bureau estimates have 9.6% of Georgia residents at age 65 and over.

The 2015 OPB population projection expects that 13.6% of the state residents will be age 65 and older. Thirtyfive counties are expected to have at least 20% of their county population age 65 or older. Six counties are expected to have at least 25% of their county population age 65 or older.

There are 3 major concentrations of elderly population. The north Georgia mountains, the lower southwest counties along the state line and central Georgia counties which include Taliaferro, Wilkes, Lincoln, Greene, and Putnam Counties.

#### Show me the MAP

### The Youth Population

Georgia has a slightly higher percentage of young persons age 19 and under than the national average. In 2004, an estimated 25% of the nation was under age 20 while 26% of Georgia residents were estimated to be under age 20 and under.

The 2015 OPB population projection expects 34% of Georgia residents to be under age 20. Twenty-seven counties are expected to have 35% or more young people. Seven counties are expected the have 37% or more young people. Note that college students and young military personnel influence the resident populations in some counties. Additionally, many immigrants are young and just starting their families. Counties with large immigrant populations are quite likely to see an increase in the number of county births.

#### Show me the MAP

# Georgia 2010-2015 Residential Population Projection Alphabetic County List

Georgia Residential Population Projections	2000 Residential Census	2010 Residential Projection	2015 Houschold Projection	Group Quarters Projection	2015 Residential Projection	2000-2015 Projected Residential Growth %
Georgia	8 186 453	9 864 970	10 554 171	259 402	10 813 573	32 1%
Appling	17 419	18 724	19 112	235,402	19 394	11.3%
Atkinson	7,609	8 755	• 9317	41	9,358	23.0%
Bacon	10 103	10 263	10 1 59	162	10.321	2 2%
Baker	4.074	4,848	5.301	14	5.315	30.5%
Baldwin	44,700	46.063	38.326	8.188	46.514	4.1%
Banks	14.422	18,006	20.047	30	20.077	39.2%
Barrow	46.144	70.553	84.176	487	84,663	83.5%
Bartow	76.019	105.241	121.005	950	121,955	60.4%
Ben Hill	17,484	16.655	16.003	367	16,370	-6.4%
Berrien	16,235	17,133	17,460	145	17,605	8.4%
Bibb	153,887	154,889	149,678	5,562	155,240	0.9%
Bleckley	11,666	12,483	12,130	750	12,880	10.4%
Brantley	14,629	16,921	18,193	81	18,274	24.9%
Brooks	16,450	15,819	15,023	482	15,505	-5.7%
Bryan	23,417	33,135	38,603	143	38,746	65.5% <sup>-</sup>
Bulloch	55,983	64,275	64,335	3,900	68,235	21.9%
Burke	22,243	24,561	25,471	294	25,765	15.8%
Butts	19,522	31,817	30,930	5,830	36,760	88.3%
Calhoun	6,320	5,715	4,059	1,319	5,378	-14.9%
Camden	43,664	49,896	50,597	2,227	52,824	21.0%
Candler	9,577	11,226	11,744	: 423	12,167	. 27.0%
Carroll	87,268	125,109	140,966	3,200	144,166	65.2%
Catoosa	53,282	69,356	78,280	450	78,730	47.8%
Charlton	10,282	12,142	11,336	1,600	12,936	25.8%
Chatham	232,048	244,446	. 239,959	9,621	249,580	7.6%
Chattahoochee	14,882	23,556	15,481	10,000	25,481	71.2%
Chattooga	25,470	28,722	28,952	1,670	30,622	20.2%
Cherokee	141,903	224,238	270,115	1,400	271,515	91.3%
Clarke	101,489	110,647	108,463	7,407	115,870	14.2%
.Clay	3,357	3,394	3,366	52	3,418	1.8%
Clayton	236,517	314,086	·354,370	3,152	357,522	51.2%
Clinch	6,878	7,327	7,096	425	7,521	9.3%
Cobb	607,751	735,922	801,883	9,246	811,129	33.5%
Coffee	37,413	42,743	43,416	1,942	45,358	21.2%
Colquitt	42,053	1 45,442	45,684	1,445	47,129	12.1%
Columbia	89,288	116,642	131,578	725	132,303	48.2%
Cook	15,771	16,827	17,120	262	17,382	10.2%
Coweta	89,215	129,899	152,694	755	153,449	72.0%
Crawford	12,495	. 12,829	12,890	. 119	13,009	4.1%
Crisp	21,996	21,983	21,552	467	22,019	0.1%
Dade	15,154	17,582	18,053	878	18,931	24.9%
Dawson	15,999	24,757	29,736	122	29,858	. 86.6%
Decatur	28,240	28,281	27,699	643	28,342	0.4%

OPB, PPT

..

1

5/11/2005

	•				:	
Georgia Residential Population Projections	2000 Residential Census	2010 Residential Projection	2015 Houschold Projection	Group Quarters Projection	2015 Residential Projection	2000-2015 Projected Residentia Growth %
DeKalb	665,865	711,604	711,451	14,607	726,058	9.0%
Dodge	19,171	20,204	18,861	1,841	20,702	8.0%
Dooly	11,525	11,606	10,312	1,310	11.622	0.8%
Dougherty	96,065	94,404	88,968	4,639	93.607	-2.6%
Douglas	92,174	125,065	142.885	1.000	143.885	56.1%
Early	12,354	11,978	• 11,603	250	11.853	-4.1%
Echols	3,754	. 4,585	5,061	· 0	5,061	34.8%
Effingham	37,535	54,807	64,619	255	64,874	72.8%
Elbert	20,511	20,966	20,982	252	21.234	3.5%
Emanuel	21,837	21,983	21.248	814	22.062	1.0%
Evans .	10,495	13.315	14.282	623	14,905	42.0%
Fannin	19.798	24.626	27.361	151	27.512	39.0%
Fayette	91.263	116.659	130.880	612	131.492	44 1%
Floyd	90.565	100.288	101.270	4.200	105.470	16 5%
Forsyth	98,407	183,430	232,229	719	232.948	136 7%
Franklin	20.285	23,280	24,493	564	25.057	23 5%
Fulton	816.006	826 843	802 464	30.287	832 751	23.57
Gilmer	23,456	31 752	36 367	202	36 560	55 0%
Glascock	2,556	2 822	2 889	104	2 003	17 10/
Glynn	67 568	76 330	70 405	1 627	81 122	20.1%
Gordon	44 104	56 512	63 092	427	63 510	20.17
Grady	23 659	25 435	26.086	284	26 370	11 50/
Greene	14 406	17 248	18 711	204	19 010	21 20/
Gwinnett	588 448	870.611	1 024 006	6 694	1 030 700	75 20/
Habersham	35 902	44 362	47 230	1 955	1,030,700	37.0%
Hall	139 277	194 861	773 737	2 501	49,105	57.0%
Hancock	10 076	11 221	223,132 8 257	2,501	11 157	02.4%
Haralson	25 690	31 506	0,237	2,900	11,157	10.7%
Harris	23,090	. 30.075	34,005	240	35,005	40.3%
Hart	23,095	. 24 459	24,901	524	35,230	48.7%
Heard	11 012	11 494	24,601	534	25,335	10.2%
Henry	110 241	221 174	11,074	109	11,783	/.0%
Houston	110 765	142 626	158 020	2 660	<u>280,080</u> 160 600	135.2%
Invin	0 031	10 413	10217	2,009	100,098	45.1%
Jackson	41 580	50 721	60 / 0/	<u> </u>	10,080	· /.0%
lasner	11 426	15 212	17 267	650	17 421	57.67
Jeff Davis	12 624	12 57/	17,502	07	1/,431	52.0%
Jefferson	17 266	16 220	15,745	<u> </u>	14,035	10.7%
Tenking	. 17,200	0.175	13,303	4/4	10,037	-/.1%
Johnson	0,373	<u> </u>	y,300	130	9,501	10.8%
Tonos	0,500	9,38/	8,278	1,430	9,708	13.4%
Jones	23,039	29,634	32,706	398	33,104	40.0%
	15,912	17,723	17,974	815	18,789	18.1%
Lanier	7,241	7,665	7,629	. 268	7,897	9.1%
Laurens	44,874	49,790	51,373	1,200	52,573	17.2%
Lee	24,757	36,790	46,392	841	47,233	90.8%
Liberty	61,610	55,431	49,097	5,100	54,197	-12.0%
Lincoln	8,348	8,944	· 9,247	74	9,321	11.7%

OPB, PPT

:

5/11/2005

Page 11

1

Georgia Residential Population Projections	2000 Residential Census	2010 Residential Projection	2015 Houschold Projection	Group Quarters Projection	2015 Residential Projection	2000-2015 Projected Residentia Growth %
Long	10.304	11.881	12,729	0	12,729	23.5%
Lowndes	92,115	100,565	97,780	6.987	104.767	13.7%
Lumpkin	21.016	28,222	30,356	1 447	31.803	51.3%
Macon	14.074	14,455	12,884	1,500	14,384	2.2%
Madison	25,730	30,358	32,830	162	32.992	28.2%
Marion	· 7.144	7.258	7.235	86	7,321	2.5%
McDuffie	21.231	21,939	21.932	341	22.273	4.9%
McIntosh	10.847	11.427	11.719	65	11.784	8.6%
Meriwether	22.534	23.223	23.083	490	23.573	4.6%
Miller	6,383	6,200	5,948	140	6.088	-4.6%
Mitchell	23,932	23,774	21,828	1,918	23.746	-0.8%
Monroe	21.757	26,788	28,908	750	29.658	36.3%
Montgomerv	8.270	10.159	9.786	1.200	10.986	32.8%
Morgan	15.457	19.798	22.124	. 194	22.318	44.4%
Murrav	36.506	46.293	51.608	214	51.822	42.0%
Muscogee	186.291	183.614	172.878	9.489	182.367	-2.1%
Newton	62.001	109.345	135,750	1.200	136.950	120.9%
Oconee	26.225	32,402	36.852	246	37.098	41.5%
Oglethorpe	12.635	15.051	16.299	138	16.437	30.1%
Paulding	81.678	142 388	176,783	722	177,505	117 3%
Peach	23.668	25,960	26 193	1 023	27.216	15.0%
Pickens	22,983	36 039	43 524	227	43,751	90.4%
Pierce	15 636	17 961	19,521	130	19 201	23 4%
Pike	13,688	18 072	20 378	276	20.654	50.9%
Polk	38,127	43 643	45 832	862	46 694	. 22.5%
Pulaski	9 588	10 162	9 3 0 4	1 165	10 469	9.2%
Putnam	18 812	21 505	22 770	268	23 038	22 50/
Quitman	2 598	21,505	22,770	0.	23,038	
Rahun	15,050	17 598	19.066	275	19 341	28.5%
Randolph	7 791	6 628	6 103	368	6 471	-16.9%
Richmond	100 775	103 014	180 454	11 100	101 563	-10.37
Rockdale	70.111	86,162	95,599	1,109	96.708	37 0%
Schley	3.766	4,490	4,900	9	4.909	30.4%
Screven	15.374	15.576	15.212	492	15.704	2.1%
Seminole	9.369	9.527	9.418	314	9.732	3.9%
Spalding	58.417	65.238	68.923	1.040	69.963	19.8%
Stephens	25.435	25.739	25.085	863	25,948	2.0%
Stewart	5.252	4,450	3,931	273	4.204	-20.0%
Sumter	33.200	32.954	31.247	1.648	32.895	-0.9%
Talbot	6.498	6.693	6.798	18	6.816	4.9%
Taliaferro	2.077	1.708	1.621	23	1.644	-20.8%
Tattnall	22.305	23.094	19.749	3.800	23.549	5.6%
Tavlor	8,815	9,120	8,809	464	9,273	5.0%
Telfair	11,794	11.076	9 389	1 461	10.850	-8 0%
Terrell	10 970	10 566	10 155	214	10,050	-0.070
Thomas	42 727	10,000	46 825	1 224	10,303	17 40/
TIA	72,131	40.001	40,025	1,200	40,111	12.0%

OPB, PPT

.

5/11/2005

			•			
Georgia Residential Population Projections	2000 Residential Census	2010 Residential Projection	2015 Household Projection	Group Quarters Projection	2015 Residential Projection	2000-2015 Projected Residential Growth %
Toombs	26,067	27,489	27,777	442	28,219	8.3%
Towns	9,319	11,469	12,268	650	12,918	38.6%
Treutlen	6,854	7,691	. 7,023	875	7,898	15.2%
Troup	58,779	63,974	65,039	1,677	66,716	13.5%
Turner	9,504	9,708	9,666	173	9,839	3.5%
Twiggs	10,590	10,224	10,166	121	10,287	-2.9%
Union ·	17,289	23,349	26,562	462	27,024	56.3%
Upson	27,597	28,849	29,182	454	29,636	7.4%
Walker	61,053	66,425	68,201	1,223	69,424	13.7%
Walton	60,687	89,688	105,751	700	106,451	75.4%
Ware	35,483	36,408	33,504	3,000	36,504	2.9%
Warren	6,336	5,651	5,298	114	5,412	-14.6%
· Washington	21,176	20,172	18,616	1,473	20,089	-5.1%
Wayne	26,565	29,960	. 29,324	2,400	31,724	19.4%
Webster	2,390	2,071	2,090	2	2,092	-12.5%
Wheeler	6,179	8,096	7,438	1,526	8,964	45.1%
White	19,944	29,343	34,356	531	34,887	74.9%
Whitfield	83,525	96,930	103,578	781	104,359	24.9%
Wilcox	8,577	· 9,061	• 7,659	1,604	9,263	8.0%
Wilkes	10,687	10,678	10,538	145	10,683	0.0%
Wilkinson	10,220	10,345	10,291	92	10,383	1.6%
Worth	21,967	21,560	21,170	212	21,382	-2.7%

Source: Georgia Governor's Office of Planning and Budget 2015 Population Projections as of 12/04

# Appendix

### What is the Difference Between a Population Estimate and a Population Projection?

Estimates usually are for the present and the past, while projections are estimates of the population for future dates. This document includes some US Census Bureau population estimate data as well as the OPB 2010-2015 population projections.

### How is Growth Computed?

The 2010-2015 OPB population projections by age, race, and sex for Georgia counties were developed using the cohort-survival model (also known as the cohort-component model). The method uses the following demographic equation:

Population  $_{1}$  = Population  $_{0}$  + Births - Deaths + Net Migration 2015 population = 2000 population + expected births - expected deaths + expected migration

The existing OPB population projections were updated with the most recent census data as well as the actual birth and death data for 1990 through 2003. Additionally, a comparison was made to the US Census 2003 population estimates, which include the most recent migration data.<sup>v</sup>

Projections were produced for males and females using 3 racial/ethnic groupings, non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Non-Whites and Hispanics of any race. The 2010-2015 population projection is the first time that OPB has produced Hispanic population projections.

#### What is the difference between residential and household populations?

#### Household population

The household population is the population residing in homes, apartments and other normal family dwellings. The household population is computed first, and then the group quarters population is added to create the resident population.

#### **Resident** population

OPB, PPT

The residential population is the household population plus the group quarters population.

### What are Group Quarters and how do they affect the population projections?

The group quarters population is the population residing in college dorms, nursing homes, prisons, military barracks and other non-household settings. The group quarters population for a county does not usually vary much unless a new facility is built, the existing facility capacity is changed or a facility closes.

The group quarters population is expected to grow by at least 25,580 between 2000 and 2015. The change includes some expected construction and some counting changes. No doubt, other construction will be announced later in the decade and increase this estimate.<sup>vi</sup>

OPB surveys the group quarters facilities annually and reports the facility population to the US Census Bureau. This annual report enables the US Census Bureau to track the facility changes between the decennial census reports.

Show me the MAP

5/11/2005

### Fertility

For fertility calculations, women aged 15–44 years are considered of childbearing age. Fertility rates vary considerably by race and ethnicity.

<u>Fertility rate = number or births of a specific race/ethnicity / number of women age 14-44 of that specific race/ethnicity.</u>

The fertility rates used in these projections are a combination of the national fertility rates published by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) and a computed county fertility rate.

For more details, see the August 2003 NCHS report: New Report Revises Birth and Fertility Rates for the 1990s Uses 2000 Census Population Estimates to Improve Accuracy http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/03facts/revisesrates.htm.

#### Life expectancy

The life expectancy/survival rates used in this projection are taken from those published by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). For more details, see the NCHS Mortality Tables website: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/datawh/statab/unpubd/mortabs.htm.

### What are metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas?

Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas are metropolitan areas (MAs) that are not closely associated with other MAs. These areas typically are surrounded by nonmetropolitan counties.

Each metropolitan statistical area must have at least one urbanized area of 50,000 or more inhabitants. Each micropolitan statistical area must have at least one urban cluster of at least 10,000 but less than 50,000 population. Additional "outlying counties" are included in the statistical area if they meet specified requirements of commuting to or from the central counties. <sup>vii</sup>

#### Migration

The population is classified as movers or non-movers depending on where they move. If a family moves to a different home within the same county, they are non-movers for migration calculations (intra-county). If they move across county lines, they are movers at the county level but non-movers at the state level (inter-county). If they move to another state, they are movers at both state and county levels (inter-state and inter-county).

Internal or domestic migration calculates people who move within the United States. International migration calculates people who move into or away from the United States.

One of the main reasons people move to an area is for work. The job market has suffered during the 2001-2003 recession years. It is probable that as the job market picks up, there will be increased migration into Georgia.

The US Census Bureau supplies in-migration and out-migration data. They collect data from a variety of sources including the Internal Revenue Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The estimated yearly migration rate in this projection is an average of the net county migration from 2000 to 2003. There are no age/race/sex details in the Census migration data; therefore it is distributed in each county according to that county's characteristics.

How do the OPB projections compare to the US Census estimates and the Atlanta Regional Commission projections?

The OPB population projections are in line with the US Census Bureau estimates for 8 of the 10 Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) counties. The OPB projections are higher than the US Census Bureau estimates for Fulton and DeKalb counties.

The ARC projections are generally lower than either the OPB projections or the US Census Bureau estimates. ARC has a much higher projections for Fulton County than either the OPB projections or the US Census Bureau estimates. The ARC DeKalb County projection is in line with the OPB DeKalb County Projection.

The OPB projections, the US Census estimates and the Atlanta Regional Commission projections all use different methodology. They will never have an exact match. There are many different calculations done by each group. For example, the OPB population projection primarily uses the cohort component method. The US Census' estimates include residuals in addition to the cohort component method to make the total estimate add up to a preset national total. The Atlanta Regional Commission projection uses an econometric module to produce employment data in addition to the cohort component method.

<sup>1</sup><u>http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/003153.html</u> <sup>1</sup>CB04-57 US Census Bureau, April 4, 2004. Data for 2004 county growth is not available at this time. <u>http://www.census.gov/Press-</u> <u>Release/www/releases/archives/population/001758.html</u>

<sup>iii</sup> The US Census Bureau shows a high yearly out-migration for Liberty County population. It appears that the military personnel are being counted when they move out but not when they move in. The Census Bureau plans to change the way migration is calculated before the 2010

" OMB BULLETIN NO. 04-03 Feb. 2004, http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/bulletins/b03-04\_attach.pdf.

census. It is expected that this change will influence future net migration estimates.

OPB, PPT

<sup>v</sup> The 2001-2003 data used for the 2010 projection reflects the recent slow economy. If there were a strong economic recovery in the next few years, the population projections would change.

<sup>11</sup> GQ note: Fort Benning has barracks in both Muscogee and Chattahoochee Counties. They report a higher occupancy to OPB than the US Census Bureau uses. OPB is using the larger figure. In general, the group quarters population is constant unless and new facility is opened or closed. It is impossible to determine future development at this time. Therefore, the 2010 group quarters number is being carried forward to 2015.

<sup>4</sup> US Census Bureau website Metropolitan Statistical Area, <u>http://www.census.gov/geo/www/cob/ma\_metadata.html#msa</u>.

5/11/2005



Quick Tables - American FactFinder Section 2.5.2,6 (USCB 1990) Page 1 of 8 Census Bureau .S. American FactFinder DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990 Data Set: 1990 Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data Geographic Area: Burke County, Georgia NOTE: For Information on confidentiality, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expstf190.htm. Subject Number **Total population** 20,579 SEX Male 9,714 Female · 10,865 AGE Under 5 years 1,870 5 to 17 years 4,959 18 to 20 years 902 1,099 21 to 24 years 25 to 44 years 5,973 45 to 54 years 1,854 797 55 to 59 years 60 to 64 years 774 65 to 74 years 1,349 75 to 84 years · 770 85 years and over 232 Under 18 years 6,829 65 years and over 2,351

	• • •	•
OUSEHOLDS BY TYPE		
Total households		7,037
Family households (families)		5,288
Married-couple families		3,482
Other family, male householder	· · · ·	263
Other family, female householder	•	1,543
Nonfamily households		1,749
Householder living alone		1,573
Householder 65 years and over	•••	738
Persons living in households		20,363
Persons per household		2.89
		· ·
ROUP QUARTERS		•
Persons living in group quarters		216
Institutionalized persons		216
Other persons in group quarters		0
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
ACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN		
White	1	9,762
Black		10,756
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut		13
Asian or Pacific Islander	. !	. 27
Other race		21
<u> </u>	. 1	· · ·

67

Hispanic origin (of any race)

(

- 19

## Quick Tables - American FactFinder

Page 2 of 8

ISubject	Numi
Total housing units	. 8.3
OCCUPANCY AND TENURE	•
Occupied housing units	7.0
Owner occupied	4.9
Renter occupied	2.0
Vacant housing units	1.
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	
Homeowner vacancy rate	· · ·
Rental vacancy rate	. 1
	······
Persons per owner-occupied unit	2
Persons per renter-occupied unit	2
Units with over 1 person per room	
LINITS IN STRUCTURE	
1-unit detached	
1-unit attached	<u></u>
2 to 4 units	
10 or more units	
Mobile home trailer or other	
	······
Specified owner-occupied bousing units	
Less than \$50,000	Z,
\$50,000 to \$99,999	
\$100,000 to \$149,999	
\$150,000 to \$199,009	· · ·
\$200 000 to \$290 000	
\$200,000 10 \$239,935	
	`
Madian (dollars)	
	43,
Specified renter-occupied housing upite powing each rest	
Lace than \$250	
\$250 to \$400	
\$500 to \$749	
\$750 to \$900	
\$1 000 or more	·····
Median (dollars)	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Occupied nousing units	<u> </u>
White Dials	
Black	· 3,
Amencan Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	· · · ·
Aslan or Pacific Islander	
Other race	
	1

(X) Not applicable Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1 (100% Data) Matrices P1, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P15, P16, P23, H1, H2, H3, H5, H8, H10, H18A, H21, H23, H23B, H32, H32B,

H41.

N 12.14

<u>DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990</u> Data Set: <u>1990 Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data</u> Geographic Area: **Columbia County, Georgia** 

NOTE: For information on confidentiality, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expstf190.htm</u>.

Subject	Number
	66,031
SEX.	
Mala	32 017
Female	33 114
Linder 5 years	5 404
5 to 17 years	14 740
18 to 20 years	2 789
21 to 24 years	3 099
25 to 44 years	24,593
45 to 54 years	7,295
55 to 59 years	2.359
60 to 64 years	1.880
65 to 74 years	2.583
75 to 84 years	1.037
. 85 years and over	252
Under 18 years	20,144
65 years and over	3,872
	· ·
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE	· · · ·
Total households	21,841
Family households (families)	18,315
Married-couple families /	. 15,649
Other family, male householder	612
Other family, female householder	2,054
Nonfamily households .	3,526
Householder living alone	2,939
Householder 65 years and over	832
Persons living in households	64,929
Persons per household	2.97
GROUP QUARTERS	1.100
Persons living in group quarters	1,102
	948
Other persons in group quarters	154
	EC 795
Diade	30,703
Diduk	1,202
Aniencan Indian, Eskino, of Aleot	150
Asian of Pacific Islander	1,347
	201
Hispanic origin (of any race)	000
רווטאמווע טוואוו (טרמווא ומטפ)	962
Total housing units	02.745
	23,745

## Quick Tables - American FactFinder

Page 4 of 8

	·····
Subject	Number
Cocuried housing units	21 841
Owner occupied	17 322
Bonter occupied	17,522
Vegaget beurging units	4,519
	1,904
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	309
Homeowner vacancy rate	2.4
Hental vacancy rate	
	2.01
Persons per owner-occupied unit	3.01
Persons per renter-occupied unit	2.82
Units with over 1 person per room	533
UNITS IN STRUCTURE	
1-unit detached	18,120
1-unit attached	414
2 to 4 units	1,046
5 to 9 units	257
10 or more units	211
Mobile home, trailer, or other	3,697
VALUE	· .
Specified owner-occupied housing units	13,816
Less than \$50,000	1,525
\$50,000 to \$99,999	7,923
\$100,000 to \$149,999	2.429
\$150.000 to \$199,999	1.279
\$200,000 to \$299,999	516
\$300,000 or more	144
Median (dollars)	83,700
Specified renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent	A 124
Lees than \$250	4,154
\$250 to \$400	2 207
\$250 to \$455	
\$300 to \$745	033
\$1,000 or more	81
\$1,000 01 mole	42
Median (dellare)	
	362
White	21,841
	19,170
Black	2,140
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	67
Asian or Pacific Islander	384
Other race	
Hispanic origin (of any race)	. 272]

(X) Not applicable Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Ceńsus of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1 (100% Data) Matrices P1, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P15, P16, P23, H1, H2, H3, H5, H8, H10, H18A, H21, H23, H23B, H32, H32B,

H41.

DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990 Data Set: <u>1990 Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data</u>

### Geographic Area: Richmond County, Georgia

NOTE: For information on confidentiality, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsti190.htm</u>.

Subject	Number
Total population	189,719
SEX	
Male	92,098
Female	97,621
AGE	· ·
Linder 5 years	15,248
5 to 17 years	36 225
18 to 20 years	11 253
21 to 24 years	12 977
25 to 44 years	62 218
45 to 54 years	17 615
55 to 59 years	7 741
SO to 54 years	7,741
65 to 74 years	11,542
	. 11,000
75 to 64 years	
85 years and over	1,/26
	<u> </u>
Under 18 years	51,473
65 years and over	19,100
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE	
Total households	68,675
Family households (families)	47,685
Married-couple families	32,988
Other family, male householder	2,313
Other family, female householder	12,384
Nonfamily households	<u>`</u> 20,990
Householder living alone	17,907
Householder 65 years and over	5,732
Persons living in households	179,514
Persons per household	2.61
	· ·
GROUP QUARTERS	· ·
Persons living In group quarters	10,205
Institutionalized persons	3,423
Other persons in group quarters	. 6.782
RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN	
White	104 612
Black	79 639
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	529
Asian or Pacific Islander	3 317
Other race	3,317
	1,022
Hispanic origin (of any race)	0 707
	3,707
	77,288
	l
OCCUPANCY AND LENURE	
Occupied housing units	68,675
Owner occupied	38,762
Renter occupied	29,913
Vacant housing units	8,613
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	120

## Quick Tables - American FactFinder

Subject	Number
Homeowner vacancy rate	2.3
Rental vacancy rate	9.9
Persons per owner-occupied unit	2.74
Persons per renter-occupied unit	2.45
Linits with over 1 person per room	3 1 1 4
UNITS IN STRUCTURE	•.
1-unit detached	46,281
1-unit attached	2.514
2 to 4 units	8 326
5 to 9 units	7.360
10 or more units	5,600
Mobile home trailer or other	7 205
Specified owner-occupied housing units	32 286
Less than \$50,000	11 517
\$50 000 to \$99 999	17 155
\$100,000 to \$149,999	2 141
\$150,000 to \$199,909	730
\$100,000 to \$100,000	100
\$200,000 to \$200,000	274
Median (dollars)	58 500
	38,300
Specified renter-occupied housing units paving cash rent	28.263
Less than \$250	9 729
\$250 to \$499	17 129
\$500 to \$749	1 295
\$750 to \$999	88
\$1 000 or more	2
	<u>_</u>
Median (dollars)	30
BACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER	
Occupied housing units	E0 675
White	
Riack	41,078
American Indian Eskimo or Aleut	10/
Asian or Pacific Islander	192
Other mea	854
	+02

(X) Not applicable

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1 (100% Data) Matrices P1, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P15, P16, P23, H1, H2, H3, H5, H8, H10, H18A, H21, H23, H23B, H32, H32B,

H41.

DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990 Data Set: <u>1990 Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data</u> Geographic Area( Screven County, Georgia

NOTE: For information on confidentiality, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expstf190.htm</u>.

Subject	Number
Total population	13,842
	1
Male	
Female	7,277
AGE	
Linder 5 vears	1 100
	1,100
5 to 17 years	2,953
18 to 20 years	558
21 to 24 years	678
25 to 44 years	4.015
45 to 54 years	1 290
E to EQuare	E00
55 to 59 years	548
60 to 64 years	638
65 to 74 years	1,175
75 to 84 years	666
85 years and over	220
	1
Under 18 years	4,053
•	
65 years and over	2,061
	· · ·
NODSEROLDS BTTTPE	
Total households	5,048
Family households (families)	3,698
Married-couple families	2,660
Other family, male householder	173
Other family, female bouseholder	
Onfer la heye helde	1 050
	1,350
Householder living alone	1,238
Householder 65 years and over	618
Persons living in households	13 613
Parcons par bousehold	270
reisons per nousenoid	2.10
GROUP QUARTERS	
Persons living in group quarters	229
Institutionalized persons	204
Other persons in group quarters	
HACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN	_
White	7,598
Black	6,209
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	1.
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Asian of Facility Islander	1
Hispanic origin (of any race)	5
Total housing units	
	3,00
	<u></u>
OCCUPANCY AND TENURE	
Occupied housing units	5,04
Owner occupied	371
Benter occupied	1 22
	1,030
vacani nousing units	
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	117
Homeowner vacancy rate	1 11
Pontal vacancy rate	1
Incinal valatily fale	<u> </u>
1	

# Quick Tables - American FactFinder

Sublect	Number
Persons per owner-occupied unit	2.72
Persons per renter-occupied unit	2.62
Units with over 1 person per room	320
	· · ·
UNITS IN STRUCTURE	
1-unit detached	3,650
1-unit attached	70
2 to 4 units	304
5 to 9 units	. 67
10 or more units	9
Mobile home, trailer, or other	1,761
VALUE	
Specified owner-occupied housing units	1,760
Less than \$50,000	1,090
\$50,000 to \$99,999	578
\$100,000 to \$149,999	76
\$150,000 to \$199,999	
\$200,000 to \$299,999	6
\$300,000 or more	· 1
Median (dollars)	41,800
CONTRACT RENT	
Specified renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent	988
Less than \$250	867
\$250 to \$499	120
\$500 to \$749	1
\$750 to \$999	0
\$1,000 or more	0
	· ·
Median (dollars)	160
RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER	
Occupied housing units	5.048
White	3.052
Black	1,983
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2
Other race	
Hispanic origin (of any race)	15

(X) Not applicable Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1 (100% Data) Matrices P1, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P15, P16, P23, H1, H2, H3, H5, H8, H10, H18A, H21, H23, H23B, H32, H32B,
Aiken County, South Carolina - DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1... Page 1 of 2

🕤 U.S. Census Bureau

American FactFinder

DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990 Data Set: <u>1990 Supermary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data</u> Geographic Area: Aiken County, South Carolina

NOTE: For information on confidentiality, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst/190.htm.

Subject	Number
Total population	120,940
SEX	
Male	58,596
Female	62,344
AGE	
Under 5 years	9,029
5 to 17 years	23,990
18 to 20 years	5,323
21 to 24 years	. 6,637
25 to 44 years	38,547
45 to 54 years	12,517
55 to 59 years	5,601
60 to 64 years	5,500
65 to 74 years	8,729
75 to 84 years	4,154
85 years and over	913
	·
Under 18 years	33,019
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
65 years and over	13,796
-	
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE	
Total households	44,883
Family households (families)	33,450
Married-couple families	26,436
Other family, male householder	1,400
Other family, female householder	. 5,614
Nonfamily households	11,433
Householder living alone	10,113
Householder 65 years and over	3,814
Persons living in households	119,250
Persons per household	2.66
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
GROUP QUARTERS	
Persons living in group quarters	1,690
Institutionalized persons	1,272
Other persons in group quarters	. 418
RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN	
White	90,684
Black	29,241
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	218
Asian or Pacific Islander	545
Other race	252
Hispanic origin (of any race)	867

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\_bm=y&-context=qt&-qr\_name=DEC\_1990... 6/27/

6/27/2005

	Number
Subject	194MUNA
Total housing units	49,266
	·
	44 883
	44,803
Boster occupied	11 302
Vacant housing units	4 383
For seasonal recreational or occasional use	224
Homeowner vacancy rate	22
Bental vacancy rate	
Persons per owner-occupied unit	2.72
Persons per renter-occupied unit	2.47
Lipits with over 1 person per room	1.569
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
LINITS IN STRUCTURE	
1-unit detached	33,341
1-unit attached	. 700
2 to 4 units	2,623
5 to 9 units	1,627
10 or more units	892
Mobile home, trailer, or other	10,083
VALUE	·····
Specified owner-occupied housing units	23,997
Less than \$50,000	8,663
\$50,000 to \$99,999	10,992
\$100,000 to \$149,999	2,820
\$150,000 to \$199,999	914
\$200,000 to \$299,999	445
\$300,000 or more	163
Median (dollars)	61,700
	······································
CONTRACT RENT	
Specified renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent	10,016
Less than \$250	4,532
\$250 to \$499	4,743
\$500 to \$749	654
\$750 to \$999	68
\$1,000 or more	19
Median (dollars)	200
	44,000
- Winte	0.499
Black	9,400
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	. 85
Asian or Pacific Islander	. 180
Other race	85

(X) Not applicable
 Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1 (100% Data)
 Matrices P1, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P15, P16, P23, H1, H2, H3, H5, H8, H10, H18A, H21, H23, H23B, H32, H32B,

H41.

an as filesan

34 C.

# U.S. Census Bureau

American FactFinder

CONTROLOGICAL SPORT AND SPACE

<u>DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990</u> Data Set: <u>1990 Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data</u> Geographic Area: Millen city, Georgia

NOTE: For information on confidentiality, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expstf190.htm</u>.

Subject	Number
Total population	3,808
	0,000
SEX	
Male	1.742
Female	2.066
	• •
AGE	
Under 5 years	313
5 to 17 years	835
18 to 20 years	160
21 to 24 years	170
25 to 44 years	1,022
45 to 54 years	332
55 to 59 years	174
60 to 64 years	192
65 to 74 years	359
75 to 84 years	196
-85 years and over	. 55
Under 18 years	1,148
	-
65 years and over	• 610
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE	
Total households	1,369
Family households (families)	· 970
Married-couple families	566
Other family, male householder	55
Other family, female householder	
Nonfamily nousenoids	399
Householder living alone	362
Householder 65 years and over	183
) 	
Persons living in nousenolos	3,698
Persons per nousenoid	2.70
GROUP QUARTERS	·
Persons living in group quarters	· 110
Other persens in group guodere	99
	11
	1.500
Mind Black	1,580
American Indian, Eskimo, or Alaut	2,217
Acian or Pacific Islander	3
Asian or record	8
	U
Hispanic origin (of any race)	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\_bm=y&-context=qt&-qr\_name=DEC\_1990\_... 7/1/2005

Subject	Number
Total housing units	1,496
CCUPANCY AND TENURE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Occupied housing units	1,369
Owner occupied	896
Renter occupied	473
Vacant housing units	127
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	.12
	· · ·
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.2
Rental vacancy rate	9.0
Persons per owner-occupied unit	2.74
Persons per renter-occupied unit	2.62
Units with over 1 person per room	. 115
NITS IN STRUCTURE	
1-unit datachad	1.059
1-unit attachad	1,030
	100
	17
Mobile nome, trailer, or other	204
A1110	
	·····
Specified owner-occupied nousing units	688
Less Inan \$50,000	467
\$50,000 to \$99,999	
\$100,000 to \$149,999	19
\$150,000 to \$199,999	
\$200,000 to \$299,999	
\$300,000 or more	
Median (dollars)	
ONTRACT RENT	
Specified renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent	• 424
Less than \$250	401
\$250 to \$499	22
\$500 to \$749	1
\$750 to \$999	
\$1,000 or more	
Median (dollars)	101
	1
ACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER	
Occupied housing units	1.369
White	200
Riack	720
American Indian Eckima ar Aldut	/30
American Indian, ESKINO, OF Aleut	
Asian or Facilic Islander	
Uther race	
Hispanic origin (of any race)	

(X) Not applicable Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1 (100% Data) Matrices P1, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P15, P16, P23, H1, H2, H3, H5, H8, H10, H18A, H21, H23, H23B, H32, H32B, H41.

## <u>DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics</u>; 1990 Data Set: <u>1990 Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data</u> Geographic Area: Sylvania city, Georgia

NOTE: For information on confidentiality, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst/190.htm</u>.

Subject	Number
Total population	2,871
SEX	
Male	1,302
Female	1,569
AGE	
Under 5 years	· 187
5 to 17 years	486
18 to 20 years	102
21 to 24 years	131
25 to 44 years	. 746
45 to 54 years	• 268
55 to 59 years	125
60 to 64 years	157
65 to 74 years	332
75 to 84 years	235
85 years and over	102
Under 18 years	673
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
65 years and over	· 669
	·
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE	
Total households	1,147
Family households (families)	740
Married-couple families	501
Other family, male householder	30
Other family, female householder	209
Nonfamily households	· 407
Householder living alone	381
Householder 65 years and over	· 214
	· · ·
Persons living in households	2,720
Persons per household	2.37
GROUP QUARTERS	
Persons living in group quarters	151
Institutionalized persons	151
Other persons in group quarters	· 0
RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN	·
White	1,603
Black	1,256
American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut	. 9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3
Other race	0
	•
Hispanic origin (of any race)	3
Total housing units	1,237
OCCUPANCY AND TENURE	

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\_bm=y&-context=qt&-qr\_name=DEC\_1990\_... 7/1/2005

Subject	Number
Cocupled housing units	1 147
Coopies not and	711
Panter occupied	/11
Vegee hereing uite	430
vacant housing units	
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	3
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.8
Rental vacancy rate	6.0
Persons per owner-occupied unit	2.40
Persons per renter-occupied unit	2.32
Units with over 1 person per room	56
1 unit debed	014
f -unit officiated	914
	. 33
	194
5 to 9 units	
10 or more units	4
Mobile home, trailer, or other	71
	•
VALUE	
Specified owner-occupied housing units	607
Less than \$50,000	328
\$50,000 to \$99,999	234
\$100,000 to \$149,999	35
\$150,000 to \$199,999	5
\$200,000 to \$299,999	4
\$300,000 or more	. 1
/	
Modian (dollare)	. 45 200
Median (conars)	+8,200
CONTRACT HENT	
Specified renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent	395
Less than \$250	. 348
\$250 to \$499	. 47
\$500 to \$749	0
\$750 to \$999	. 0
\$1,000 or more	0
Median (dollars)	156
RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER	
Occupied housing units	1 147
· White	· 607
Rlack	
American Indian Eskimo or Algut	443
Anion or Papific Islandor	
	0
Uther race	0
Hispanic origin (of any race)	1

(X) Not applicable Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1 (100% Data) Matrices P1, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P15, P16, P23, H1, H2, H3, H5, H8, H10, H18A, H21, H23, H23B, H32, H32B,

H41.

DP-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics 1990 Data Set: 1990 Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data

# Geographic Area: Waynesboro city, Georgia

Subject	Number
Total population	5,701
	2 520
Female	3,181
AGE	
Under 5 years	536
5 to 17 years	. 1,396
18 to 20 years	. 240
21 to 24 years	. 303
25 to 44 years	1,464
45 10 54 years	437
60 to 64 years	213
65 to 74 years	462
75 to 84 years	305
85 years and over	120
	· · · · ·
Under 18 years	1,932
65 years and over	887
	······
	0.010
Family households (families)	2,018
Married-couple families	816
Other family, male householder	56
Other family, female householder	587
Nonfamily households	559
Householder living alone	506
Householder 65 years and over	285
Deserve livies is households	
Persons living in nousehold	2 75
GROUP QUARTERS	
Persons living in group quarters	153
Institutionalized persons	. 153
Other persons in group quarters	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN	
White	2,360
Black	3,320
Acian or Paolific Islander	5
	10
Hispanic origin (of any race)	
	· · · ·
Total housing units	. 2.223
DCCUPANCY AND TENURE	
Occupied housing units	2,018
Owner occupied	1,176
Renter occupied	
Vacant housing units	205
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	1

Page 6 of 6

_	Subject	Number
	Homeowner vacancy rate	1.7
V	Rental vacancy rate	8.0
	Persons per owner-occupied unit	2.77
	Persons per renter-occupied unit	2.72
	Units with over 1 person per room	166
_	TINITS IN STRUCTURE	
	1-tinit detached	1,480
	1-unit attached	63
	2 to 4 units	416
	5 to 9 units	98
	10 or more units	26
	Mobile home trailer or other	140
	VALITE	•
	Specified owner-occupied housing units	1.017
	Less than \$50,000	580
	\$50,000 to \$99,999	358
	\$100 000 to \$149 999	62
	\$150,000 to \$199,999	
	\$200,000 to \$200,000	12
	\$300.000 or more	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
•	Median (dollars)	46 300
		40,000
	CONTRACT RENT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	CONTRACT ACM	770
	Specified remeroccupied housing times paying cash rem	115
,	\$250 to \$400	106
)	\$200 10 \$495	108
	\$300 10 \$743	0
	\$1.000 or more	0
		······
	Madion (dollaro)	100
		130
·	RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN OF HOUSEHOLDER	
		2,018
		913
	Black	1,097
·	Anendan Inulah, Eskino, Ur Aldul	2
	Asian or Facilic Islander	. 5
	Unerrace	1
•		
		11

(X) Not applicable Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 1 (100% Data) Matrices P1, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P15, P16, P23, H1, H2, H3, H5, H8, H10, H18A, H21, H23, H23B, H32, H32B,

H41.

Section 2.5.1 (USCB 1995)

3/27/95

GEORGIA

Population of Counties by Decennial Census: 1900 to 1990 compiled and edited by Richard L. Forstall Population Division US Bureau of the Census Washington, DC 20233

Please see file, 1900-90.doc for explanatory notes and documentation.

·						• ,
	FIPS	1990	1980	· 1970	· 1960	
	00000	248709873	226545805	203211926	179323175	United States
	13000	6478216	5463105	4589575	39/3116	Georgia
	13000	15744	15565	12726	13246	Appling County
	13001	6213	6141	5879	6188	Atkinson County
	13005	9566	0370	. 8033	9359	Record Country
	13005	3615	. 3000	3975	4543	Bacon County
	13007	39530	34686	3/2/0	. 34064	Baldwin County
	13011	10308	8702	6833	6497	Bartawin County
	13013	29721	21354	16859	14485	Barrow County
	13015	55911	40760	32663	28267	Bartow County
	13017	16245	16000	13171	13633	Ben Hill County
	13019	14153	13525	11556	12038	Berrien County
	13021	149967	150256	143418	141249	Bibb County
	13023	10430	10767	10291	9642	Bleckley County
	13025	11077	8701	5940	5891	Brantley County
	13027	15398	15255	13739	15292	Brooks County
	13029	15438	10175	6539	1 6226	Bryan County
	13031	43125	35785	31585	24263	Bulloch County
l	V13033	20579	19349	18255	20596	Burke County
	13035	15326	13665	10560	8976	Butts County
$\sim$	13037	5013	5717	6606	7341	Calbour County
$\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}$	13039	30167	13371	11334	9975	Camden County
$\sim$	13041					Campbell County
11	13043	7744	7518	6412	6672	Candler County
_!	13045	71422	56346	45404	36451	Carroll County
>	13047	42464	36991	28271	21101	Catoosa County
	13049	8496	7343	5680	5313	Charlton County
•	13051	216935	202226	187767	188299	Chatham County
	13053	16934	21732	25813	13011	Chattahoochee County
	13055	22242	21856	20541	19954	Chattooga County
	13057	90204	51699	31059	23001	Cherokee County
	13059	87594	74498	65177	45363	Clarke County
	13061	3364	3553	3636	4551	Clay County
	13063	182052	150357	98043	46365	Clayton County
	13065	6160	6660	6405	6545	Clinch County
	13067	447745	297718	196793	114174	Cobb County
	13069	29592	26894	22828	21953	Coffee County
	13071	36645	35376	32200	. 34048	Colquitt County
	13073	66031	40118	22327	13423	Columbia County
	13075	13456	13490	12129	11822	Cook County
	13077	53853	39268	32310	28893	Coweta County
	13079	8991	7684	5748	5816	Crawford County
	13081	20011	19489	18087	17768	Crisp County
	13083	13147	12318	9910	8666	Dade County
	13085	9429	4774	3639	3590	Dawson County
Ĺ	13087	25511	25495	22310	25203	Decatur County
. 4	13089	545837	483024	415387	256782	DeKalb County

http://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/ga190090.txt

1 age 1 01 7

13091         17607         16955         15658         16463         Dodge County           13093         96311         100718         89639         75680         Douglas County           13097         71120         54573         28659         16741         Douglas County           13101         2334         2297         1924         1876         Echols County           13103         2567         18321         16141         Echols County           13105         18949         18758         17815         Enancel County           13107         20546         20795         18189         17815         Enancel County           13113         62415         29043         11344         8199         Fayette County           13113         62451         29040         13344         81357         13620         Fannin County           13113         64651         58954         69725         556326         Furch County           13123         13368         11110         8956         8922         Gilascock County           13123         13368         11110         8956         8922         Gilascock County           13123         13072         12645	•					•
13093         9901         10026         10044         11474         Dooly County           13097         71120         54573         28659         16741         Douglact Scouty           13097         71120         54573         28659         16741         Douglact Scouty           13103         2334         2297         1924         1876         Echols County           13103         25687         18327         13632         10144         Effingham County           13107         20546         20795         18169         17815         Enanuel County           13113         62415         29043         11354         8199         Fayette County           13113         62415         29043         1364         8199         Fayette County           13117         44083         27958         16528         12170         Forsyth County           13121         648951         589904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13123         1368         11100         8956         9972         Glascock Count           13121         64951         58920         2070         19228         Gordon County           13132         1279	1309İ	17607	16955	15658	16483	Dodge County
13095         96311         100718         89639         75680         Dougherty Courty           13097         71120         54573         28659         16741         Douglas Courty           13101         2334         2297         1924         1875         Echols County           13105         18949         18758         17262         17835         Elbert County           13107         20546         20795         18189         17815         Emanuel County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199         Fayette County           13113         62415         29043         13274         69130         Floyd County           13114         15650         15185         12784         13274         Franklin County           13121         648951         58904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13122         13364         11110         8956         8922         Glamer County           13123         35072         30070         23570         19228         Gordon County           13133         11793         11391         10212         1193         Greene County           13133         11793	13093	9901	10826	10404	11474	Dooly County
13097         71120         54573         28659         16741         Douglas         County           13101         2334         2297         1924         1876         Erhols County           13103         25687         18327         13632         10144         Effingham County           13107         20546         20795         18189         17815         Enantel County           13101         1592         14748         13357         13620         Famin County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199         Fayette County           13117         44083         27958         16928         12170         Forsyth County           13121         648951         58904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13123         13368         11110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13123         13364         11110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13123         1327         52496         54981         50528         41954         Glyma County           13133         11793         13391         10212         1193         Greene County           13133 </td <td>13095</td> <td>96311</td> <td>100718</td> <td>89639</td> <td>75680</td> <td>Dougherty County</td>	13095	96311	100718	89639	75680	Dougherty County
1309         11854         13158         12682         13151         Early County           13101         2334         2297         1924         1876         Echols County           13103         25687         16327         13632         10144         Effingham County           13105         18949         18758         17262         17635         Elbert County           13107         20546         20795         18189         17815         Emanuel County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199         Fayatte County           13114         64951         589904         60752         556326         Filton County           13123         13368         11110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13123         13368         1110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13123         23577         2362         2260         2672         Glascock County           13131         2077         19645         17826         18015         Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Grade County           13133         20771         30070<	13,097	71120	54573	28659	16741	Douglas County
13101         2334         2297         1924         1876 Echols County           13103         25687         18327         13632         10144 Effingham Cour           13107         20546         20795         18189         17815 Enanuel County           13107         20546         20795         18189         17815 Enanuel County           13111         15992         14748         13357         13620 Fannin County           13113         62415         29043         13620 Fannin County         13117           13113         62415         29043         13620 Fannin County         13117           13119         16650         15185         12704 Franklin County         13123           13121         64951         589904         607592         556326 Fulton County           13123         1377         2486         12707         288607 do County           13131         10279         19845         17826         18015 Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193 Greene County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015 Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193 Gree	3099	11854	13158	12682	13151	Early County
13103         25687         18327         13632         10144         Effingham Cour           13105         18949         18758         17262         17835         Elbert County           13107         20546         20795         18199         17815         Emanuel County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199         Fayette County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199         Fayette County           13117         4063         27958         16928         12170         Forsyth County           13121         66650         15858         12784         13274         Franklin Count           13122         13368         11110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13123         1368         11110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13132         23572         30070         23570         19228         Gordon County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13133         20761	13101	2334	2297	1924	1876	Echols County
13105         1949         18758         17262         17835         Elbert County           13107         20546         20795         18189         17815         Emanuel County           13111         15992         14748         13357         13620         Famin County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199         Fayette County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199         Fayette County           13117         44083         27958         16928         12170         Forsythe County           13121         64851         58904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13125         2357         2382         2280         2672         Glascock County           13131         2079         19845         17826         18015         Grand County           13131         2079         19845         17826         18015         Grand County           13133         10793         11391         10212         11139         Greene County           13133         12791         19845         17826         18015         Grand County           13133         12791         1	13103	25687	18327	13632	10144	Effingham County
13107         20546         20795         18189         17815         Emanuel County           13109         8724         8428.         7290         6952         Evans County           13111         15992         14748         13357         13620         Fannin County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199         Fayette         County           13117         44083         27958         16928         12170         Forsyth County           13121         648951         589904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13125         2357         2382         2280         2672         Glascock County           13125         2357         2382         2280         2672         Glascock County           13131         20729         30070         23570         19228         Gordon County           13133         11793         11391         10212         1193         Greene County           13133         217621         2500         20691         9179         Hancock County           13133         21761         8464         1520         Harcock County           13143         21966         18422 </td <td>13105</td> <td>18949</td> <td>18758</td> <td>17262</td> <td>17835</td> <td>Elbert County</td>	13105	18949	18758	17262	17835	Elbert County
13109         8724         8428         7200         6952         Evans County           13111         15992         14748         13357         13620         Fannin County           13113         6215         29043         11364         8199         Fayette County           13115         81251         79800         73742         69130         Floyd County           13119         16650         15185         12784         13274         Franklin Count           13121         648951         589904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13125         2357         2382         2280         2672         Glascock County           13132         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glynn County           13133         11793         11391         10212         1193         Gread County           13133         11793         11391         10212         1193         Gread County           13133         127621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham Court           13143         2066         16422         15927         14543         Harris County           13143         12712         1856	13107	20546	20795	18189	.17815	Emanuel County
13111         15992         14748         13357         13620 Fannin County           13113         62415         29043         11364         8199 Fayette County           13115         61251         79800         73742         69130 Floyd County           13117         44083         27958         16928         12170 Forsyth County           13121         648951         589904         607592         556326 Fulton County           13123         13368         11110         8956         8922 Gilmer County           13123         13368         1110         8956         8922 Gilmer County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015 Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193 Greene County           13133         12791         19845         17826         18015 Grady County           13133         12792         20020         20691         18116 Habersham County           13133         12793         1412         16000         7349         43541 Gwinnett County           13141         8908         9466         9199         94860         0199         9479 Hancock County           13143         19762	13109	8724	8428.	7290	6952	Evans County
13113         62415         29043         11364         B199         Fayette County           13115         81251         79800         73742         69130         Floyd County           13119         16650         15185         1270         Forsyth County           13121         648951         589904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13122         13368         11110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13125         2357         2382         2280         2672         Glascock Count           13127         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glynn County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         1193         Greene County           13133         95428         75649         59405         49739         Hall County           13141         8908         9466         9019         9979         Hancock County           13143         21966         16422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13143         21966         16422         15927	13111	15992	14748	13357	13620	Fannin County
13115         81251         79800         73742         69130         Floyd County           13117         44083         27958         16928         12170         Forsyth County           13117         44083         27958         16928         12170         Forsyth County           13121         648951         589904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13123         13368         11110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13123         1326         5577         2382         2280         2672         Glascock County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Gready County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13135         352910         166903         7349         43541         Gounty           13143         21966         18422         15927         18164         Harcock County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Harcock County           13145         17788         15464         11520         11167         Harris County           13145         1	13113	62415	29043	11364	8199	Favette County
13117         44083         27958         16928         12170         Forsyth County           13119         16650         15185         12784         13274         Franklin County           13123         13368         1110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13125         2357         2382         2280         2672         Glascock County           13127         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glymn County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13135         352910         166903         72349         43541         Gwinnett County           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Harais County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Harais County           13143         19762         8545         15814         15229         Hatt County           13143         19712         <	13115	81251	79800	73742	69130	Floyd County
13119         16650         15185         12784         13274         Franklin County           13121         648951         589904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13125         2357         2382         2280         2672         Glascock County           13127         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glynn County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13133         327621         25020         26691         18116         Habersham Court           13137         27621         25020         26691         18117         Hounts         County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Harris County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Harris County           13143         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13147         1	13117	44083	27958	16928	12170	Forsyth County
13121         648951         589904         607592         556326         Fulton County           13123         13368         11110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13127         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glynn County           13127         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glynn County           13137         26279         19845         17826         18015         Gredon County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham Court           13141         8908         9466         9019         9979         Hancok County           13141         8906         6520         5354         5333         Hearls County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hatr County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13157         30005         253	13119	16650	15185	12784	13274	Franklin County
13123         13368         1110         8956         8922         Gilmer County           13125         2357         2382         2280         2672         Glascok County           13127         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glynn County           13129         35072         30070         23570         19228         Gordon County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grade County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grade County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13137         27621         25020         26691         18116         Habersham Court           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         3005         25	13121	648951	589904	607592	556326	Fulton County
13125         2357         2362         2280         2672         Glascock Count           13127         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glynn County           13129         35072         30070         23570         19228         Gordon County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham Court           13139         95428         75649         59405         49739         Hall County           13141         8908         9466         9019         9979         Hancock County           13143         1966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         9208         77605	13123	13368	11110	8956	8922	Gilmer County
13127         62496         54981         50528         41954         Glynn County           13129         35072         30070         23570         19228         Gordon County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham County           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13155         8649	13125	2357	2382	2280	2672	Glascock County
13129         35072         30070         23570         19228         Gordon County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13131         20279         19845         17826         18015         Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham Cour           13139         95428         75649         59405         49739         Hall County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13145         17788         15464         11520         Hart County           13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         89208         77605         69243         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13157         30005         25343         <	13127	62496	54981	50528	41954	Glyph County
13131         20279         19845         17826         18215         Grady County           13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County'           13135         352910         166903         72349         43541         Gwinnett County           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham County           13139         95428         75649         59405         49739         Hall County           13141         8908         9466         9019         9779         Hancock County           13143         1966         18422         15227         14543         Haralson County           13145         17788         15464         11520         11167         Harris County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13159         8453	13129	35072	30070	23570	19229	Gordon County
13133         11793         11391         10212         11193         Greene County           13135         352910         166903         72349         43541         Gwinnett Count           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham Cour           13139         95428         75649         59405         49739         Hall County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13143         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13161         12032         11473         9425         8914         Jeff Pavis Co           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jeff Pavis Co           13161         12032	12121	20279	19845	17826	18015	Grady County
13135         352910         166903         72349         43541         Gwinnett County           13137         27621         25020         20691         18116         Habersham Cour           13139         95428         75649         59405         49739         Hall County           13141         8908         9466         9019         9979         Hancock County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Harris County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13143         8628         6520         5354         5333         Heard County           13153         89208         7605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13161         12032         114	13133	11793	11391	10212	11103	Grace County
13137         27621         25037         25047         25047         25047         25047           13139         95428         75649         59405         49739         Hall County           13141         8908         9466         9019         9979         Hancock County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13145         17788         15464         11520         11167         Harris County           13149         8628         6520         5354         5333         Heard County           13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13153         89208         7553         5760         6135         Jasper County           13154         12032         11473         9425         8914         Jeff Pavis County           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jeff Pavis County           13165         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jenkins County           13165         8247	13135	352910	166903	723/9	135/1	Greene county
13139         95428         75649         59605         10110         Induct stand           13141         8908         9466         9019         9979         Hancock County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Harls County           13145         17788         15464         11520         11167         Harris County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13149         8628         6520         5354         5333         Heard County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13161         12032         11473         9425         8914         Jeff Davis Cou           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jefferson County           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jefferson County           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jefferson County           13161         12032 <td< td=""><td>13137</td><td>27621</td><td>25020</td><td>20691</td><td>19116</td><td>Haborcham County</td></td<>	13137	27621	25020	20691	19116	Haborcham County
13141         8908         9466         9019         9979         Hancock County           13143         21966         18422         15927         14543         Haralson County           13145         17788         15464         11520         11167         Harris County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13149         8628         6520         5354         5333         Heard County           13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jeff Davis County           13167         8329         8660         7727         8048         Johnson County           13169         20739         16579         12218         8468         Jones County           13171         13038         1221	13130	95428	75649	59405	10110	Hall County
13143         21965         1422         15127         14543         Haralson County           13145         17788         15464         11520         11167         Harris County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Hart County           13149         8628         6520         5354         5333         Heard County           13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13161         12032         11473         9425         8914         Jeff Davis County           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jeffron County           13167         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jenkins County           13167         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jenkins County           13167         13038         1221	131/1	8908	9466	9019	9739	Hangogk County
13145         17788         15424         13527         14354         11167         Harris County           13147         19712         18585         15814         15229         Harris County           13149         8628         6520         5354         5333         Heard County           13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13159         8453         7553         5760         6135         Jasper County           13161         12032         11473         9425         8914         Jeff Davis County           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jeff Davis County           13165         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jenkins County           13167         13038         12215         10688         10240         Lemar County           13171         13	131/3	21966	18422	15027	14543	Waralcon County
13147       19712       18585       15814       15229       Hart County         13149       8628       6520       5354       5333       Heard County         13151       58741       36309       23724       17619       Henry County         13153       89208       77605       62924       39154       Houston County         13153       89208       77605       62924       39154       Houston County         13157       30005       25343       21093       18499       Jackson County         13157       30005       25343       21093       18499       Jackson County         13161       12032       11473       9425       8914       Jeff Davis County         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jefferson County         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jefferson County         13165       8247       8441       8332       9148       Johnson County         13169       20739       16579       12218       8468       Jones County         13173       5531       5654       5031       5070       Laner County         13173       52745	13145	17788	15464	11520	14343	Haraison County
13149       8628       6520       5354       5333       Heard County         13151       58741       36309       23724       17619       Henry County         13153       89208       77605       62924       39154       Houston County         13153       89208       77605       62924       39154       Houston County         13157       30005       25343       21093       18499       Jackson County         13157       30005       25343       21093       18499       Jackson County         13159       8453       7553       5760       6135       Jasper County         13161       12032       11473       9425       8914       Jeff Davis Cou         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jefferson Courty         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jefferson Courty         13167       8329       8660       7727       8048       Johnson County         13167       13038       12215       10688       10240       Lamar County         13173       5531       5654       5031       5097       Lamier County         13175       39988	13147	19712	12525	1501/	15220	Harris County
13151         58741         36309         23724         17619         Henry County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13153         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13159         8453         7553         5760         6135         Jasper County           13161         12032         11473         9425         8914         Jeff Davis Cou           13163         17408         18603         17174         17468         Jefferson Courty           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jefferson Courty           13164         12032         11473         9425         8048         Johnson County           13165         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jefferson Courty           13165         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jenson County           13161         7408         12215         10688         10240         Lamar County           13173         5531         565	12140	8628	£520	12014	E222	Hart County
13151         30141         30505         23724         17615         Helly County           13155         89208         77605         62924         39154         Houston County           13155         8649         8988         8036         9211         Irwin County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13159         8453         7553         5760         6135         Jasper County           13161         12032         11473         9425         8914         Jeff Davis County           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jeff Pavis County           13165         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jenkins County           13165         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jenkins County           13165         8247         8841         8036         Jenkins County           13165         829         8660         7727         8048         Johnson County           13171         13038         12215         10688         Joeat         Lamer County           13177         16250         11684         7044	12151	587/1	36309	03034	17610	Heard County
13155         8649         8988         8036         9211         Irwin County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13157         30005         25343         21093         18499         Jackson County           13159         8453         7553         5760         6135         Jasper County           13161         12032         11473         9425         8914         Jeff Davis Cou           13163         17408         18403         17174         17468         Jefferson Cour           13165         8247         8841         8332         9148         Jenkins County           13169         20739         16579         12218         8468         Jones County           13171         13038         12215         10688         10240         Lamar County           13173         5531         5654         5031         5097         Lamar County           13177         16250         11684         7044         6204         Lee County           13179         52745         37583         17569         14487         Lincoln County           13181         7442         6716 <t< td=""><td>1 12152</td><td>89208</td><td>77605</td><td>62024</td><td>2015/</td><td>Henry County</td></t<>	1 12152	89208	77605	62024	2015/	Henry County
13157       30005       25343       21093       18499       Jackson County         13159       8453       7553       5760       6135       Jasper County         13161       12032       11473       9425       8914       Jeff Davis Cou         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jeff Davis Cou         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jeff Davis Cou         13165       8247       8841       8332       9148       Jeff Davis Cou         13165       8247       8841       8332       9148       Jeff Davis Cou         13167       8329       8660       7727       8048       Johnson County         13169       20739       16579       12218       8468       Jones County         13171       13038       12215       1068       10240       Lamar County         13173       5531       5654       5031       5097       Lanier County         13177       16250       11684       7044       6204       Lee County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202       4524	12155	8649	11007	02924	37134	Truin County
13157       5005       25343       21093       18499       5020000       Conty         13159       8453       7553       5760       6135       Jasper County         13161       12032       11473       9425       8914       Jeff Davis Cou         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jeff Davis Cou         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jeff Davis Cour         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jeff Davis Cour         13167       8329       8660       7727       8048       Johnson County         13169       20739       16579       12218       8468       Jones County         13171       13038       12215       10688       10240       Lamar County         13173       5531       5654       5031       5097       Lanier County         13173       39988       36990       32738       32313       Laurens County         13177       16250       11684       7044       6204       Lee County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202 <td>· 13155</td> <td>30005</td> <td>253/3</td> <td>21003</td> <td>19400</td> <td>Train County</td>	· 13155	30005	253/3	21003	19400	Train County
13150       12032       11473       9425       8914       Jeff Davis Cou         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jeff Davis Cou         13163       17408       18403       17174       17468       Jeff Davis Cou         13165       8247       8841       8332       9148       Jenkins County         13167       8329       8660       7727       8048       Johnson County         13169       20739       16579       12218       8468       Jones County         13171       13038       12215       10688       10240       Lamar County         13173       5531       5654       5031       5097       Lanier County         13173       5988       36990       32738       32313       Laurens County         13177       16250       11684       7044       6204       Lee County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13183       6202       4524       <	. 12150	8453	7553	5760	10499 6125	Jackson County
13161       11473       3425       13475       13425       1344       15425       1	13151	12032	11/73	9/25	0122	Joff Davia County
13103       17400       1803       17174       17408       Defilersion County         13165       8247       8841       8332       9148       Jenkins County         13167       8329       8660       7727       8048       Johnson County         13169       20739       16579       12218       8468       Jones County         13171       13038       12215       10688       10240       Lamar County         13173       5531       5654       5031       5097       Lanier County         13175       39988       36990       32738       32313       Laurens County         13177       16250       11684       7044       6204       Lee County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13185       75981       67972       55112       49270       Lowndes County         13187       14573       10762	13163	17408	19/03	17174	17/60	Jefferson County
13163       0241       0341       0342       9148       0600000000000000000000000000000000000	12165	8247	20405	T/T/4	1/400	Jonking Country
13169       20739       16579       12218       8468       Jones County         13171       13038       12215       10688       10240       Lamar County         13173       5531       5654       5031       5097       Lanier County         13175       39988       36990       32738       32313       Laurens County         13177       16250       11684       7044       6204       Lee County         13179       52745       37583       17569       14487       Liberty County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13185       75981       67972       55112       49270       Lowndes County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747 <td>13167</td> <td>. 8329</td> <td>8660</td> <td>7777</td> <td>9048</td> <td>Johnson County</td>	13167	. 8329	8660	7777	9048	Johnson County
13103       10373       10375       10210       10405 <td< td=""><td>13169</td><td>20739</td><td>16579</td><td>10010</td><td>- 0460</td><td>Jones Country</td></td<>	13169	20739	16579	10010	- 0460	Jones Country
131711500131735531565450315097Lanier County1317339988369903273832313Laurens County1317539988369903273832313Laurens County13177162501168470446204Lee County1317952745375831756914487Liberty County131817442671658955906Lincoln County131836202452437463874Long County1318575981679725511249270Lowndes County13187145731076287287241Lumpkin County1318920119185461527612627McDuffie County131918634804673716364McIntosh County1319313114140031293313170Macon County1319521050177471351711246Madison County1319922411212291946119756Meriwether County132016280703863976908Miller County13203Milton County13203Milton County1320717113146101099110495Monroe County132097163701160996284Montgomery County	13171	13038	12215	10688	10240	Lamar County
13175       39988       36990       32738       32313       Laurens County         13177       16250       11684       7044       6204       Lee County         13179       52745       37583       17569       14487       Liberty County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13185       75981       67972       55112       49270       Lowndes County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13191       8634       8046       7371       6364       McIntosh County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477       Marion County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13201       6280       70	13173	5531	5654	5031	5007	Lanier County
13177       16250       11684       7044       6204       Lee County         13179       52745       37583       17569       14487       Liberty County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13185       75981       67972       55112       49270       Lowndes County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13199       22411       21229       19461       19756       Meriwether Cou         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203 <td>13175</td> <td>39988</td> <td>36990</td> <td>32738</td> <td>32313</td> <td>Laurens County</td>	13175	39988	36990	32738	32313	Laurens County
13177       10230       1104       1044       1044         13179       52745       37583       17569       14487       Liberty County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13185       75981       67972       55112       49270       Lowndes County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13191       8634       8046       7371       6364       McIntosh County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13199       22411       21229       19461       19756       Meriwether Cou         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203          <	13177	16250	11684	7044	5201	
13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13181       7442       6716       5895       5906       Lincoln County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13185       75981       67972       55112       49270       Lowndes County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13191       8634       8046       7371       6364       McIntosh County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477       Marion County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County	13179	52745	37583	17569	1// 97	Liberty County
13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13183       6202       4524       3746       3874       Long County         13185       75981       67972       55112       49270       Lowndes County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13191       8634       8046       7371       6364       McIntosh County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477       Marion County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County         1	13181	7442	6716	5895	5906	Lincoln County
13185       75981       67972       55112       49270       Lowndes County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13191       8634       8046       7371       6364       McIntosh County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477       Marion County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652       Mitchell Count         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495       Monroe Cou	13183	. 6202	4524	37/6	3900	Long County
13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13187       14573       10762       8728       7241       Lumpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13191       8634       8046       7371       6364       McIntosh County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477       Marion County         13199       22411       21229       19461       19756       Meriwether County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County         13203          Milton County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652       Mitchell Count         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495       Montgom	13185	75981	67972	55112	19270	Lowndon County
13167       1377       1072       1724       Malpkin County         13189       20119       18546       15276       12627       McDuffie County         13191       8634       8046       7371       6364       McIntosh County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477       Marion County         13199       22411       21229       19461       19756       Meriwether Cou         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203          Milton County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652       Mitchell Count         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495       Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284       Montgomery Cou	13187	14573	10762	8728	72/1	Lumpkin County
13103       20113       10340       13270       12027       McDullie Count         13191       8634       8046       7371       6364       McIntosh Count         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170       Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246       Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477       Marion County         13199       22411       21229       19461       19756       Meriwether County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203          Milton County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652       Mitchell Count         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495       Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284       Montgomery Count	13189	20119	18546	15276	1241	MoDuffic County
13191       13114       14003       12933       13170 Macon County         13193       13114       14003       12933       13170 Macon County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246 Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477 Marion County         13199       22411       21229       19461       19756 Meriwether County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908 Miller County         13203          Milton County         13203       20275       21114       18956       19652 Mitchell County         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495 Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284 Montgomery County	13191	. 8634	8046	7371	12027	Melatoch County
13195       21050       17747       13517       11246 Madison County         13195       21050       17747       13517       11246 Madison County         13197       5590       5297       5099       5477 Marion County         13199       22411       21229       19461       19756 Meriwether County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908 Miller County         13203          Milton County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652 Mitchell County         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495 Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284 Montgomery County	13193	13114	14003	12933	13170	Macon County
13197       5590       5297       5099       5477 Marion County         13197       22411       21229       19461       19756 Meriwether County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908 Miller County         13203          Milton County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652 Mitchell County         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495 Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284 Montgomery County	. 13105	21050	177/7	12517	11216	Madison County
13199       22411       21229       19461       19756       Merion County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908       Miller County         13203          Millon County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652       Mitchell County         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495       Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284       Montgomery Cou	12107	5500	5907	2000	11240 5177	Marion Country
13195       22411       21225       19401       19756 Merlwether County         13201       6280       7038       6397       6908 Miller County         13203          Milton County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652 Mitchell County         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495 Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284 Montgomery County	12100	2220	2471	10/51	34// 10755	Moniverher County
13201       0200       7038       0397       0908 Miller County         13203          Miller County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652 Mitchell County         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495 Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284 Montgomery County	13201	£38U	· 7030	17401 2207	T3120	Millor County
13203         Milton County         13205       20275       21114       18956       19652 Mitchell County         13207       17113       14610       10991       10495 Monroe County         13209       7163       7011       6099       6284 Montgomery County	. 13003 TO70T	0200	1020	וענס .	. 8060	Milter County
13205 20275 21114 18956 19652 Mitchell Count 13207 17113 14610 10991 10495 Monroe County 13209 7163 7011 6099 6284 Montgomery Cou	T3502	 	21114	10050	.10000	Milton County
13209 7163 7011 6099 6284 Montgomery Cou	13205	202/3	21114	10001 10001	19652	Mitchell County
רטבנד איז איז איז איז איז אראבער איז געער איז	12207	1/113 7163	7401U	TOAAT	10495	Monroe County
	T3508	1703	1011	. 6099	6284	Montgomery County

http://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/ga190090.txt

	•			•	
13211	12883	11572	9904	10280	Morgan County
13213	26147	19685	12986	10447	Murray County
13215	179278	170108	167377	158623	Muscogee County
1.3217	41808	34489	26282	20999	Newton County
13219	17618	12427	7915	6304	Oconee County
13221	9763	8929	7598	7926	Oglethorpe County
13223	41611	26110	17520	13101	Paulding County
13225	21189	19151	15990	13846	Peach County
13227	14432	11652	9620	. 8903	Pickens County
13229	13328	11897	9281	9678	Pierce County
13231	10224	8937	7316	7138	Pike County.
13233	33815	32386	29656	28015	Polk County
13235	8108	· 8950	8066	8204	Pulaski County
13237	14137	10295	8394	7798	Putnam County
13239	· 2209	2357	2180	2432	Ouitman County
13241	11648	10466	8327	7456	Rabun County
13243	8023	9599	8734	11078	Randolph County
13245	189719	181629	162437	135601	Richmond County
13247	54091	36747	18152	10572	Rockdale County
13249	3588	3433	3097	· 3256	Schley County
13251	13842	14043	12591	14919	Screven County
13253	9010	9057	7059	6802	Seminole County
13255	54457	47899	39514	35404	Spalding County
13257	23257	21763	20331	18391	Stephens County
13259	5654	5896	6511	.7371	Stewart County
13261	30228	29360	26931	24652	Sumter County
13263	6524	6536	6625	7127	Talbot County
13265	1915	2032	2423	3370	Taliaferro County
13267	17722	18134	16557	15837	Tattnall County
13269	7642	7902	7865	8311	Taylor County
13271	11000	11445	11381	11715	Telfair County
13273	10653	12017	11416	12742	Terrell County
13275	38986	38098	34515	34319	Thomas County
13277	34998	32862	27288	23487	Tift County
13279	24072	22592	19151	16837	Toombs County .
13281	67.54	5638	4565	4538	Towns County
13283	5994	6087	5647	5874	Treutlen County
13285	55536	50003	44466	47189	Troup County
13287	8703	9510	8790	8439	Turner County
13289	9806	9354	8222	7935	Twiggs County
13291	11993	9390	6811	6510	Union County
13293	· 26300	25998	23505	23800	Upson County
13295	58340	56470	50691	45264	Walker County
13297	38586	31211	23404	20481	Walton County
13299	35471	37180	33525	34219	Ware County
13301	6078	6583	6669	7360	Warren County
13303	19112	18842	17480	18903	Washington County
13305	22356	20750	17858	17921	Wayne County
13307	2263	2341	2362	3247	Webster County
13309	4903	5155	4596	5342	Wheeler County
13311	13006	10120	7742	6935	White County
13313	72462	65789	55108	42109	Whitfield County
13315	7008	7682	6998	7905	Wilcox County
13317	10597	10951	10184	10961	Wilkes County
13319	10228	10368	9393	9250	Wilkinson County
13321	19745	18064	14770	16682	Worth County
		•			

FIPS 1950 1940 1930 1920 00000 151325798 132164569 123202624 106021537 United States

http://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/ga190090.txt

.

1.3.000	3444578	3123723	2908506 <sup>.</sup>	2895832	Georgia
13001	14003	14497	13314	10594	Appling County
1 1:3003	7362	7093	6894 .	7656	Atkinson County
13005	8940	8096	7055	6460	Bacon County
12007	· · 5050	7344	7010	0700	Pakor County
13007	5952	7344	7010	0290	Baker Councy
13009	29706	24190	22878	19/91.	Baldwin County
13011	6935	8733	9703	11814	Banks County
13013	13115	13064	12401	13188	Barrow County
13015	27370	25283	25364	24527	Bartow County
13017	14879	14523	13047	14599	Ben Hill County
13019	13966	15370	14646	15573	Berrien County
13021	114079	83783	77042	71304	Bibb County
13023	9218	9655	9133	10532	Bleckley County
13025	6207	. 5055	2122	10072	Breckley County
13025	0307	00/1	01000	04520	Branciey Councy
13027	18103	20497	21330	24538	Brooks County
13029	. 5965	6288	5952	6343	Bryan County
13031	24740	26010	26509	26133	Bulloch County
13033	23458	26520	29224	30836	Burke County
13035	9079	9182	9345	12327	Butts County
13037	8578	10438	10576	10225	Calhoun County
13039	7322	5910	6338	6969	Camden County
120/1			9903	11709	Campbell County
12041	0063	01.03	9903	11/09	Campberr Country
13043	. 8083	9103	8991	9228	Candler County
. 13045	34112	34156	34272	34752	Carroll County
13047	15146	12199	. 9421	6677	Catoosa County
13049	4821	5256	4381	4536	Charlton County
13051	151481	. 117970	105431	.100032	Chatham County
13053	12149	15138	8894	5266	Chattahoochee County
13055	21197	18532	15407	14312	Chattooga County
1 13057	20750	20126	20003	18569	Cherokee County
13059	36550	28398	25613	26111	Clarke County
12051	5811	7064	60/3	7557	Clay County
13001	20044	11655	10260	11150	Clay Councy
13063	. 22872	- TT022	10260	11159	Clayton County
13065	6007	6437	7015	7984	Clinch County
13067	61830	38272	35408	30437	Cobb County
13069	. 23961	21541	19739	18653	Coffee County
13071	33999	33012	30622	29332	Colquitt County
13073	9525	9433	8793	11718	Columbia County
13075	12201	11919	11311	11180	Cook County
13077	27786	26972	25127	29047	Coweta County
13079	6080	7128	7020	8893	Crawford County
13081	17663.	17540	17343	18914	Crisp County
12083	7364	5894	1116	3018	Dade County
12005	2710	4470	3500	4204	Date country
13085	3712	4417 •	3502	4204	Dawson Councy
13087	23620	22234	23622	31785	Decatur County
13089	136395	86942	· 70278	44051	DeKalb County
13091	·17865 ·	21022	21599	22540	Dodge County
13093	14159	16886	18025	20522	Dooly County
13095	43617	· 28565	22306	20063	Dougherty County
13097	12173	10053	9461	10477	Douglas County
13099	17413	18679	18273	18983	Early County
12101	2/0/	2964	20275	20202	Echols County
TOTOT	0133 ·	6504 0616		2272	Effination Country
. 13103	A 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9040	10104	- 7785	Ellingham County
13105	18282	19018	18485	23905	FIDELL COUNTY
13107	19789	23517	24101	25862	Emanuel County
13.109	6653	7401	7102	. 6594	Evans County
( 1.3111	15192	·14752	12969	12103	Fannin County
13113	7978	8170	8665	11396	Fayette County
13115	62899	56141	48667	39841	Flovd County

http://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/ga190090.txt

7/8/2005

•					•
- 13117	11005	11322	10624	11755	Forsyth County
13119	14446	15612	15902	19957	Franklin County
13121	473572	392886	318587	232606	Fulton County
.3123	9963	9001	7344	8406	Gilmer County
13125	3579	4547	4388	4192	Glascock County
13127	29046	21920	19400	19370	Glypp County
13129	18922	18445	16846	17736	Gordon County
13131	18928	19654	19200	20306	Grady Country
12122	12843	13700	12616	. 10072	Grady County
12125	20200	. 20007	12010	20302	Greene County
· 13137	16557	23007	2/000	30327	Gwinnett County
12120	10333	14//1 -	12/48	10/30	Habersham County
13139	40113	34822	30313	26822	Hall County
13141	11052	12764	13070	18357	Hancock County
13143	14663	. 14377	13263	14440	Haralson County
13145	11265	11428	11140	15775	Harris County
13147	14495.	15512	15174	17944	Hart County
13149	. 6975	. 8610	9102	11126	Heard County
13151	15857	.15119	15924	20420	Henry County
13153	20964	11303	11280	21964	Houston County
13155	11973	12936	12199	12670	Irwin County
13157	18997	· 20089	21609	24654	Jackson County
13159	7473	8772	8594	. 16362	Jasper County
13161	9299	8841	8118	· 7322	Jeff Davis County
13163	18855	20040	20727	22602	Jefferson County
13165	10264	11843	12908	14328	Jenkins County
· 13167	9893	12953	12681	13546	Johnson County
13169	7538	8331	-8992	13269	Jones County
13171	10242	10091	9745	10200	Lamar County
13173	5151	5632	5190		Janiar County
12175	33103	33606	32603	20605	Laurena County
U 13173	- 6671	22000	32093	10004	Laurens County
12170	0074	. 7037	0320	10904	Lee County
131/9	0444	7040	8123	12707	Liberty County
13181	0402	7042	/84/	9739	Lincoln County
13183	3598	4086	4180		Long County
13185	35211	31860	29994	- 26521	Lowndes County
13187	6574	6223	4927	5240	Lumpkin County
13189	11443	10878	9014	11509	McDuffie County
13191	-6008	- 5292	5763	5119	McIntosh County
13193	14213	15947	16643	17667	Macon County
13195	12238	13431	14921	18803	Madison County
13197	6521 /	6954	6968	7604	Marion County
13199	21055	22055	22437 <sup>·</sup>	26168	Meriwether County
13201	<sup>-</sup> 9023	9998	9076	9565	Miller County
13203		·	6730	6885	Milton County
13205	22528	23261	23620	25588	Mitchell County
13207	10523	10749	11606	. 20138	Monroe County
13209	7901	9668	10020	9167	Montgomery County
13211	11899	12713	12488	20143	Morgan County
13213	10676	11137	9215	9490	Murray County
13215	118028	75494	57558	44195	Muscogee County
13217	20185	18576	17290	21680	Newton County
13219	7009	7576	8082	11067	Oconee County
13001	· 9925	12/30	12022	. 20207	Oglothorno County
12002	11757	12420	- 10307 - 10307	2020/	Doulding County
13223	1170E ·	10270	10260	14025	Paulaing County
10007	TT/02	T0210	T0208		reach county
13227	8822	9136	9687	8222	Pickens County
13229	11112	11800	12522	11934	Pierce County
13231 L	8459	10375	10853	21212	Pike County
13233	30976	28467	25141	20357	Polk County
12025	8808	9829	9005	11587	Pulaski County

http://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/ga190090.txt

13237	7731	8514	8367	15151	Putnam County
13239	3015	3435	3820	3417	Ouitman County
13241	7424	7821	6331	5746	Rabun County
13243	13804	16609	17174	16721	Randolph County
13245	108876	81863	72000	63602	Randorph County
12243	200070	7724	72990	05092	Richmond County
12247	4036	F022	1241	· 9521	Rockdale County
13249	4036	5033	5347	5243	Schley County
13251	18000	20353	20503	23552	Screven County
13253	7904	8492	7389		Seminole County
13255	31045	28427	23495	21908	Spalding County
13257	16647·	12972	.11740	11215	Stephens County
13259	9194	10603	11114	12089	Stewart County
13261	24208	24502	26800	29640	Sumter County
13263	7687	8141	8458	11158	Talbot County
13265	4515	6278	6172	8841	Taliaferro County
13267	15939	16243	15411	14502	Tattnall County
13269	9113	10768	10617	11473	Taylor County
13271	13221	15145	14997	15291	Telfair County
13273	14314	16675	18290	19601	Terrell County
13275	33932	31289	32612	33044	Thomas County
13077	22645	18599	16068	1//07	Thomas country
12270	17202	16052	17165	12007	Till County
13279	17302	10332	1/105	13891	Toombs County
13281	4803	4925	4346	3937	Towns County
13283	6522	7632	7488	7664	Treutlen County
13285	49841	43879	36752	36097	Troup County
13287	10479	10846	11196	12466	Turner County
13289	8308	. 9117	· 8372	10407	Twiggs County
13,291	7318	7680	6340	6455	Union County
13293	25078	25064	19509	14786	Upson County
13295	38198	31024	26206	·23370	Walker County
13297	. 20230	20777	21118	24216	Walton County
13299 -	30289	27929-	26558	28361	Ware County
13301	8779	10236	· 11181	11828	Warren County
13303	21012	24230	25030	28147	Washington County
13305	14248	13122	12647	14381	Wayne County
13307	4081	4726	5032	5342	Webster County
13309	6712	8535	9149	9817	Wheeler County
13311	5951	6417	6056	6105	White County
13313	34432	26105	20808	16897	Whitfield County
13315	10167	12755	13/39	15511	Wilcox County
12217	12388	15094	150//	24210	Wilkon County
10010	12300	11004	10044	24210	wilkes county
13319	9701 10357	11025	10844	11310	Wilkinson County
13321	19221	21374	21094	23863	worth County
•					
		1000			
FIPS	1910	1900			
00000	92228496	76212168			United States
· · ·					· .
13000	2609121	2216331	•		Georgia
13001	12318	12336			Appling County
13003		<b></b> .			Atkinson County
13005	·				Bacon County
13007	7973	6704			Baker County
. 13009	18354	17768			Baldwin County
J 3011	11244	10545			Banks County
13013				χ.	Barrow County
12015	25388	20823	•.	•	Bartow County
13017	11263	20025			Pon Hill Country
12010	22000	10//0			Berrion County
12001	44114 56616'	エブチモリ	•		Berrien County
TROST	50040	504/3	. •		BIDD COUNTY

13023			
13025			
13027	23832	18606	
13029	6702	6122	
13031	26464	21377	
13033	27268	30165	
13035	13624	12805	
13037	11334	9274	
13039	7690	7669	
13041	10874	9518	
13043			
13045	30855	26576	
13047	7184	5823	۰.
13049	4722	3592	
13051	79690	71239	
13053	5586	5790	
13055	13608	12952	
13057	16661	15243	
13059	23273	17708	
13061	8960	8568	
13063	10453	9598	
13065	8424	8732	
13067	28397	. 24664	
13069	21953	16169	
13071	19789	13636	
13073	12328	10653	
13075			·
13077	28800	24980	
13079 ال	8310	10368	
13081	16423		
13083	4139	4578	
13085	4686	5442	
13087	29045	29454	
. 13089	27881	21112	
13091	20127	13975	
13093	20554	26567	
13095	16035	13679	
13097	8953	8745	
13099	18122	14828	
13101	3309	3209	
13103	9971	8334	
13105	24125	19729	
13107	25140	21219 .	
13109	12574	11014	
12112	10966	10114	
12115	10900	10114	
12117	119/0	11550	
13110	17894	17700	
13121	177733	117363	
12122	9237	10198	
13125	4669	4516	
13127	15720	14317	•
13129	15861	14119	
13131	18457		
12122	18512	16542	
13135	28824	25585	
12127	10134	13604	
13139	25730	20752	
13141	19189	18277	

Bleckley County Brantley County Brooks County Bryan County Bulloch County Burke County Butts County Calhoun County Camden County Campbell County Candler County Carroll County Catoosa County Charlton County Chatham County Chattahoochee County Chattooga County Cherokee County Clarke County Clay County Clayton County Clinch County Cobb County Coffee County Colquitt County Columbia County Cook County Coweta County Crawford County Crisp County Dade County Dawson County Decatur County DeKalb County Dodge County Dooly County Dougherty County Douglas County Early County Echols County Effingham County Elbert County Emanuel County Evans County Fannin County Fayette County Floyd County Forsyth County Franklin County Fulton County Gilmer County Glascock County Glynn County Gordon County Grady County Greene County Gwinnett County Habersham County Hall County Hancock County

. <b>.</b>	•
	Haralson County
	Harris County
•. •	Hart County
	Heard County
	Henry County
	Houston County
· .	Trwin County
	Jackson County
	Jackson County
	Joff David County
•	Jofforson County
	Jonking Country
	Johnson County
•	Tanag Gauphi
• • •	Longe County
	Lamar County
	Lanier County
	Laurens County
	Lee County
	Liberty County
	Lincoln County
	Long County
	Lowndes County
•	Lumpkin County
	McDuffie County
	Mcintosh County
	Macon County
	Madison County
	Marion County
	Meriwether County
	Miller County
•	Milton County
•	Mitchell County
	Monroe County
	Montgomery County
	Morgan County
	Murray County
· ·	Muscogee County
	Newton County
	Oconee County
	Oglethorpe County
•	Paulaing County
	Peach County
· ·	Pickens County
•	Pierce County
•,	Pike County
	FOIR COUNTY

Pulaski County

Putnam County

Quitman County

Randolph County

Richmond County

Rockdale County

Schley County

Screven County

Seminole County

Spalding County

Stephens County

Stewart County

Sumter County

Rabun County

13255:

\_ \_ \_

-----

---

\_\_\_

---

· -----

\_ \_ \_ \_

·8100

---

---

---

---

		·		•
.•	13263	11696	12197	
L	J3265	8766 <sup>.</sup>	7912	
for	13267	18569	20419	
	13269	· 10839 ·	9846	
	13271	13288	10083	
•	13273	22003	19023	•
	13275	29071	31076	
	13277	11487		_
	13279	11206		· · · .
	13281	3932	4748	· •
	13283			
	13285	26228	24002	· .
	13287	10075		
·	13289	10736	8716	
	13291	6918	8481	•
•	13293	12757	13670	
	13295	18692	15661	
	13297	25393	20942	
	13299	22957	13761	••
	13301	11860	11463	
	13303	28174	28227	. •
	13305	13069	9449	
	13307	6151	6618	
	13309	·		•
	13311	5110	5912	
•	13313	15934	14509	
	13315	13486	11097	
	13317	23441	20866	
L	13319 ر	10078	11440	•
مرجع	13321	19147	18664	

Talbot County Taliaferro County Tattnall County Taylor County Telfair County Terrell County Thomas County Tift County Toombs County Towns · County Treutlen County Troup County Turner County Twiggs County Union County Upson County Walker County Walton County Ware County . Warren County Washington County Wayne County Webster County Wheeler County White County Whitfield County Wilcox County Wilkes County Wilkinson County Worth County

Detaneu Tables - American Pactrinuci

5.

USCB 000a

U.S. Census Bureau

-239

American FactFinder

### P1. TOTAL POPULATION [1] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Burke County, Georgia	Columbia County, Georgia	Jefferson County, Georgia	Jenkins County, Georgia	Richmond County, Georgia	Screven County, Georgia	Aiken County, South Carolina	Augusta Rid County (ba Georg	chrond Jance), Na	Grovetown city, Georgia	Hephzibah · city, Georgia	
Total	22,243	89,288	17,266	8,575	199,775	15,374	142,552		95,18	2 6,089	3,880	
U.S. C Censu	ensus Bureau s 2000		•	•		· ·			1			

#### P12. SEX BY AGE [49] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For Information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

	Burke County, Georgia	Columbia County, Georgia	Jefferson County, Georgia	Jenkins County, Georgia	Richmond County, Georgia	Screven County, Georgia	Aiken County, South Carolina	Augusta-Richmond County (balance), Georgia	Grovetown city, Georgia	Hephzibah city, Georgia
Total:	22,243	89,288	17,266	8,575	199,775	15,374	142,552	195,182	6,089	3,880
Male:	10,556	43,630	8,127	4,109	96,375	7,343	68,667	94,141	3,035	1,872
Under 5 years	- 881	3,231	613	322	7,212	518	4,870	7,066	312	122
5 to 9 years	1,021	· 3,808	679	359	7,775	630	5,456	7,560	288	164
10 to 14 years	1,031	4,073	749	369	7,698	664	5,489	7,513	· 293	155
15 to 17 years	618	2,446	426	212	4,537	.381	3,244	4,417	164	. 104
18 and 19 years	344	1,230	256	' 134	4,209	214	1,856	4,135	103	64
20 years	153	486	134	50	1,844	111	949	1,808	45	· 35
21 years	120	423	122	64	1,714	98	889	1,685	53	28
22 to 24 years	362	1,164	292	130	4,836	254	2,404	4,771	120	55
25 to 29 years	606	2,327	531	252	7,841	374	4,146	7,708	277	109
30 to 34 years	674	. 2,935	517	226	6,778	. 484	4,576	. 6,613	298	136
35 to 39 years	724	3,887	634	·, 315	7,188	539	5,501	7,000	294	159
40 to 44 years	798	3,938	550	304	7,200	• 549	5,691	7,025	. 234	152
45 to 49 years	772	. 3,745	553	287	6,376	568	5,113	6,214	178	133
50 to 54 years	624	3,279	485	251	5,428	473	4,543	5,271	· 127	134
55 to 59 years	491	2,232	419	221	4,086	346	3,635	3,976	71	93
	1				1					

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?\_bm=y&-context=dt&-ds\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U&-CONTEXT=dt&-mt\_name... 6/15/2005

1-239

1 460 # VI T

(	•				λ.					(
						107	4 400			
60 and 61 years	162	649	128	76	1,388	127	1,186	1,345	. 27	36
62 10 64 years	235	846	167	96	1,847	162	1,552	1,800	26	40
65 and 66 years	121	509	120	53	1,117	99	977	: 1,090	. 32	22
67 to 69 years	189	612	161	76	1,676	148	1,483	1,632	25	36
70 to 74 years	261	819	217	122	2,313	242	2,183	2,257	46	47
75 to 79 years	202	504	201	86	1,792	178	1,548	1,760	12	24
80 to 84 years	95	287	107	64		115	865	971	6	19
85 years and over	. 72	200	· 66	40	529	<u>,</u> 69	511	524	4	. 5
Female:	11,687	45,658	9,139	4,466	103,400	8,031	73,885	101,041	3,054	2,008
Under 5 years	900	2,967	626	289	7,032	494	4,614	<u> </u>	264	129
5 to 9 years	951	3,696	667	342	7,470	608	5,204	7,291	311	140
10 to 14 years	944	3,921	711	337	7,552	680	5,261	7,334	259	182
15 to 17 years .	608	2,288	432	213	4,332	316	3,210	4,216	· · 154	97
18 and 19 years	334	1,120	227	137	3,159	228	2,001	3,097	. 98	53
20 years	162	447	107	. 69	1,624	95	937	1,599	48	25
21 years	138	394	117	61	1,563	105	887	<u> </u>	32	28
22 to 24 years	. 419	1,240	299	143	· 4,932	261	. 2,555	4,852	143	68
25 to 29 years	• 722	2,569	563	242	7,839	459	4,543	7,694	275	118
" 30 to 34 years	720	3,273	585	· 288	7,175	· 447	4,978	6,989	285	150
35 to 39 years	938	4,349	· 647	333	7,782	587	5,803	7,570	310	184
40 to 44 years	890	4,401	651	. : 307	7,883	637	5,942	· 7,696	236	167
45 to 49 years	· 843	4,016	658	323	7,186	570	5,473	7,006	169	156
50 to 54 years	667	3,088	533	291	6,086	479	4,785	5,944	102	· 120
55 to 59 years	567	2,150	447	· 195	4,732	· 417	3,885	4,611	99	107
60 and 61 years	161	653	155	84	1,629	142	1,235	1,587	26	39
62 to 64 years	· 247	887	229	90	2,197	202	1,852	· 2,151	49	. 38
65 and 66 years	.151	516	130	78	1,497	135	1,233	· 1,464	. 28	30
67 to 69 years	233	716	190	112	2,134	207	1,779	2,098	37	
70 to 74 years	· 335	1,025	356	187	· 3,335	· 303	.2,689	3,265	59	· 62
75 to 79 years	303	794	309	140	2,756	282	2,256	2,711	35	41
80 to 84 years	195	565	263	114	1,833	191	1,492	1,808	20	22
85 years and over	259	583	237	91	1,672	186	1,271	1,648	15	22

U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000

P17. AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE [1] - Universe: Households Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

	Burke County, Georgia	Columbia County, Georgia	Jefferson County, Georgia	Jenkins County, Georgia	Richmond County, Georgia	Screven County, Georgia	Aiken County, South Carolina	Augusta- Richmond County (balance), Georgia	Grovetown city, Georgia	Hephzibah city, Georgia
	· ·	· ·		1		}	· .			

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?\_bm=y&-context=dt&-ds\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U&-CONTEXT=dt&-mt\_name... 6/15/2005

i K							•. •				
Average household size	2.77	2.85	2.65	2	63	2.55	2.60	2.53	2.55	2.82	2.81
U.S. Census Bureau				:			•	• •		. •	
Census 2000	•			•			•	•			

#### H1. HOUSING UNITS [1] - Universe: Housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</u>.

	Burke County, Georgia	Columbia County, Georgia	Jefferson County, Georgia	Jenkins County, Georgia	Richmond County, Georgia	Screven County, Georgia	Aiken County, South Carolina	Augusta-Richmond County (balance), Georgia	Grovetown city, Georgia	Hephzibah city, Georgia
Total	8,842	33,321	7,221	3,907	82,312	6,853	61,987	80,481	2,473	1,570
U.S. C	ensus Bureau	•	•			•				

Census 2000

## H3. OCCUPANCY STATUS [3] - Universe: Housing units Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u>

# NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Burke County, Georgia	Columbia County, Georgia	Jefferson County, Georgia	Jenkins County, Georgia	Richmond County, Georgia	Screven County, Georgia	Aiken County, South Carolina	Augusta-Richmond County (balance), Georgia	Grovetown city, Georgia	Hephzibah <sup>-</sup> city, Georgia
Total:	8,842	33,321	7,221	·3,907	82,312	6,853	61,987	80,481	2,473	1,570
Occupied	7,934	31,120	6,339	3,214	73,920	5,797	55,587	72,307	2,159	1,374
Vacant	908	2,201	. 882	693	8,392	1,056	6,400	8,174	314	· 196

U.S. Census Bureau

Census 2000

## H4. TENURE [3] - Universe: Occupied housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</u>.

Burke	Columbia	Jefferson	Jenkins	Richmond	Screven	Aiken County,	Augusta-Richmond	Grovetown	Hephzibah
County,	County,	County,	County,	County,	County,	South	County (balance),	city, Georgia	city, Georgia

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?\_bm=y&-context=dt&-ds\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U&-CONTEXT=dt&-mt\_name... 6/15/2005

verance radios - American rade muci

				· · .		<b>C</b> ,		•	· · ·	
	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia	Carolina	Georgia		
Total:	7,934	31,120	6,339	3,214	73,920	5,797	55,587	72,307	2,159	1,374
Owner occupied	6,030	25,557	4,577	2,356	42,840	. 4,513	42,036	41,563	1,288	1,088
Renter occupied	1,904	5,563	1,762	858	31,080	1,284	13,551	30,744	871	286

U.S. Census Bureau

Census 2000

## H5. VACANCY STATUS [7] - Universe: Vacant housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

	Burke County, Georgia	Columbia County, Georgia	Jeffersion County, Georgia	Jenkins County, Georgia	Richmond County, Georgia	Screven County, Georgia	Aiken County, South Carolina	Augusta- Richmond County (balance), Georgia	Grovetown city, Georgia	Hephzibah city, Georgia
Total:	908	2,201	882	693	. 8,392	1,056	6,400	8,174	· 314	196
For rent	167	560	218	109	. 3,739	· 100	1,866	3,644	163	92
For sale only	77	• 760	64	37	1,160	77	1,062	1,124	.71	27
Rented or sold, not occupied	97	106	. 92	82	429	68	659	419	6	
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	108	338	78	186	288	164	494	280	3	8
For migrant workers	8	2	0	· 0	5	15	3	. 5	· 0	(
Other vacant	451	435	430	279	2,771	. 632	2,316	2,702	71	62

U.S. Census Bureau

Census 2000

Standard Error/Variance documentation for this dataset: Accuracy of the Data: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data (PDF 44KB)

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?\_bm=y&-context=dt&-ds\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U&-CONTEXT=dt&-mt\_name... 6/15/2005

# U.S. Census Bureau

#### P1. TOTAL POPULATION [1] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://lacifinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://lacifinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

	Ma CDP,	artinez , Georgia	Millen city; Georgia 🛩	Sardis town, Georgia	Sylvania city, Georgia	Waynesbo	ro city, la	Aiken city, South Carolina	Allendale town, South Carolina	Barnwell city, South Carolina	Belvedere CDP, South Carolina	Blackville town, South Carolina
Total		27,749	3,492	1,171	. 2,675	•	5,813	25,337	4,052	5,035	5,631	2,973
U.S.C	ensus	Bureau				•						

Census 2000

## P12. SEX BY AGE [49] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Martinez CDP, Georgia	Millen city, Georgia	Sardis town, Georgia	Sylvania city, Georgia	Waynesboro city, Georgia	Aiken city, South Carolina	Allendale town, South Carolina	Barnwell city, South Carolina	Belvedere CDP, South Carolina	Blackville town; South Carolina
Total:	27,749	3,492	1,171	2,675	5,813	25,337	4,052	5,035	5,631	2,973
Male:	13,547	1,560	537	1,175	2,562	11,803	1,861	· 2,340	2,697	1,392
Under 5 years	936	, 124	60	. 87	273	752	216	201	197	114
5 to 9 years	1,213	140	52	96	275	846	197	200	215	. 120
10 to 14 years	1,244	148	64	77	256	857	189	· 227	200	133
15 to 17 years	798	78	27	52	164	524	. 101	114	· 117	89
18 and 19 years	389	60	17	29	99	343	72	68	71	47
20 years	154	· 19	.3	19	43	184	26	26	30	31
21 years	110	. 20	11	. 19	. 31	201	29	28	40	10
22 to 24 years	365	43	. 9	46	89	. 405	53	· 87	103	
25 to 29 years	810	100	28	55	144	659	106	154	182	87
30 to 34 years	895	83	33	69	150	715	· 110	162	· 204	94
<ul> <li>35 to 39 years</li> </ul>	1,118	118	38	71	154	795	. 97	152	227	101
40 to 44 years	1,224	122	36		159	907	· 116	152	224	86
45 to 49 years	1,151	. 100	31	. 70	· 163	901	123	154	173	95
50 to 54 years	1,108	83	31	78	122	800	115	. 144	137	90
55 to 59 years	687	82	19	59	. 92	635	70	113	161	73
60 and 61 years	207	. 27	5	13	33	216	35	36	52	. 22
. 62 to 64 years	· 286	24	12	. 25	50	315	39	40	72	39

#### Detailed Tables - American ractringer

ſ

λ

E.	· ·				(L					
65 and 66 years	151	18	10	17	27	200	18	37	34	13
67 to 69 years	188	30	6	28	54	308	28	39	50	. 27
70 to 74 years	252	53	20	56	69	440	49	83	94	36
75 to 79 years	156	33	. 17	56	60	360	33	56	73	27
80 to 84 years	71	27	5	43	27	267	26	50	28	17
85 years and over	·34	28	3	26	· 28	173	13	17	13	3
Female:	14,202	1,932	<sup>·</sup> 634	1,500	3,251	13,534	2,191	2,695	2,934	1,581
Under 5 years	895	137	55	71	285	726	137	206	206	84
5 to 9 years	1,124	137	67	90	269	839	177	164	194	105
10 to 14 years	1,183	131	48	85	. 240	832	<u> </u>	204	198	142
15 to 17 years	743	95	29	. 49	173	510	116	116	106	81
18 and 19 years		59	16	38	100	433	65	65	72	35
20 years	151	32	18	27	40	· 215	31	25	. 41	20
21 years	127	35	7	15	48	· 185	21	34	. 39	24
22 to 24 years	·382	57	27	42	132	428	· 95	116	100	60
25 to 29 years	847	92	. 46	<u> </u>	197	748	133	194	185	74
30 to 34 years	1,018	103	41	68	184	749	127	161	233	. 108
35 to 39 years	1,302	129	36	90	212	894	144	204	218	118
40 to 44 years	1,372	122	41	. 103	228	997	139	212	217	122
45 to 49 years	1,396	128	43	. <u>91</u>	193	1,012	160	175	197	108
50 to 54 years	1,040	138	33	73	147	879	144	144	192	106
55 to 59 years	679	• 74	23	103	128	711	110	. 126	178	
60 and 61 years	232	40	8	26	32	246	35	44	59	22
62 to 64 years	257	34	11	· 36	. 80	363	53	44	70	34
65 and 66 years	162	38	. 5	20	50	244	33	53	50	22
67 to 69 years	225	57	. 15	46	82	379	44	78	75	41
70 to 74 years	319	91	21	90	· 118	621	. 66	96	117	. 66
75 to 79 years	211	71	21	99	108	600	82	99	104	49
80 to 84 years	. 115	· 65	10	82	84	453	. 39	73	46	38
85 years and over	94	67	13	84	· 121	470	· 51	62	37	28

U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000

# P17. AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE [1] - Universe: Households Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

	Martinez CDP, Georgia	Millen city, Georgia	Sardis town, Georgia	Syivania city, Georgia	Waynesboro city, Georgia	Aiken city, South Carolina	Allendale town, South Carolina	Barnwell city, South Carolina	Belvedere CDP, South Carolina	Blackville town, South Carolina
Average household size	2.80	2.55	2.79	2.32	2.62	2.34	2.61	2.42	2.51	2.60

U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000

DULAHOU LADIOS 7 FAIIDHUAH LAUL HUUL

#### H1. HOUSING UNITS [1] - Universe: Housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

# NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</u>.

	Martinez CDP, Georgia	Millen city, Georgia	Sardis town, Georgia	Sylvania city, Georgia	Waynesboro city, Georgia	Aiken city, South Carolina	Allendale town, South Carolina	Barnwell city, South Carolina	Beivedere CDP, South Carolina	Blackville town, South Carolina
Total	10,320	1,567	519	1,285	2,395	11,373	1,763	2,304	2,430	1,332
119.0	Soncue Buroau									

Census 2000

## H3. OCCUPANCY STATUS [3] - Universe: Housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

# NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</u>.

	Martinez CDP, Georgia	Millen city, Georgia	Sardis town, Georgia	Sylvania city, Georgia	Waynesboro city, Georgia	Aiken city, South Carolina	Allendale town, South Carolina	Barnwell city, South Carolina	Belvedere CDP, South Carolina	Blackville town, South Carolina
Total:	10,320	1,567	519	1,285	2,395	11,373	1,763	2,304	2,430	1,332
Occupied	9,886	1,321	419	1,088	2,151	10,287	1,542	2,035	2,245	- 1,145
Vacant	· 434	246	. 100	197	244	1,086	221	269	185	. 187

U.S. Census Bureau

# Census 2000

## H4. TENURE [3] - Universe: Occupied housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

# NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Martinez CDP, Georgia	Millen city, Georgia	Sardis town, Georgia	Sylvania city, Georgia	Waynesboro city, Georgia	Aiken city, South Carolina	Allendale town, South Carolina	Barnwell city, South Carolina	Belvedere CDP, South Carolina	Blackville town, South Carolina
Total:	9,886	1,321	419	1,088	2,151	10,287	1,542	2,035	2,245	1,145
Owner occupied	7,938	849	339	683	1,177	6,804	1,019	1,272	1,663	817
Renter occupied	1,948	472	80	405	974	3,483	. 523	763	. 582	328

Detalled Lauros - American Laur much

#### U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000

# H5. VACANCY STATUS [7] - Universe: Vacant housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://iactfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://iactfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

	Martinez CDP, Georgia	Millen city, Georgia	Sardis town, Georgia	Sylvania city, Georgia	Waynesboro city, Georgia	Aiken city, South Carolina	Allendale town, South Carolina	Barnwell city, South Carolina	Belvedere CDP, South Carolina	Blackville town, South Carolina
Total:	434	246	100	197	244	1,086	221	269	185	187
For rent	144	85	16	38	83	415	31	111	68	42
For sale only	163	· 29	11	25	17	219	49	15	42	17
Rented or sold, not occupied	27	15	4	-11	32	90	27	6	8	: 24
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	18	- 7	10	8	10	-113	17		• 2	14
For migrant workers	- 2	0	. 0	14	2	0	0	0	. 0	0
Other vacant	80	110	59	101	100	249	· 97	118	65	90

U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000

# Standard Error/Variance documentation for this dataset: Accuracy of the Data: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data (PDF 44KB)

Detailed 1 ables - American ractrinuer

1 ago 1 01 7

# S. Census Bureau

American FactFinder

## P1. TOTAL POPULATION [1] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://facilinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://facilinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Total	4,199	3,328	3,206	2,805	1,625	2,250	17,574	504	3,307
IIS C	ensus Bureau	•							

Census 2000

P12. SEX BY AGE [49] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Total:	4,199	3,328	3,206	2,805	1,625	2,250	17,574	504	3,307
Male:	2,020	1,535	2,062	1,362	789	1,077	8,252	230	1,538
Under 5 years	157	129	103	133	. 43	. 69	· 671	19	142
5 to 9 years	138	119	• 77	113	62	74	622	16	132
. 10 to 14 years	137	120	82	95	72	98	573	13	133
15 to 17 years	83	65	. 78	· 47	44	48	372	10	93
18 and 19 years	63	50	57	39	29	23	184	2	50
20 years	22	25	41	13	4	20	86	9	17
21 years	25	22	50	19	5	· 15	93	- O	18
22 to 24 years	79	69	133	63	19	26	321	4	43
25 to 29 years	146	- 96	266	102	29	59	· 577	16	85
30 to 34 years	151	88	220	. 86	40	65	654	· 10	88
35 to 39 years	164	88	230	116	59	84	689	12	· 112
40 to 44 years	173	96	195	· 97	· 75	. 86	668	16	107
45 to 49 years	125	131	148	90	58	88	595	16	108
50 to 54 years	140	101	121	88	55	67	500	. 11	87
55 to 59 years	114	84	65	77	37	57	383	15	80
60 and 61 years	. 37	28	24	26	12	.16	136	4	25

#### **U.S. Census Bureau** American FactFinde 1 600 1. 4 . 30 Sanch

# P1. TOTAL POPULATION [1] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm.

	Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Total	4,199	3,328	3,206	2,805	1,625	2,250	17,574	504	3,307
U.S. 0	Census Bureau		• •				. • · ·		

Census 2000

# P12. SEX BY AGE [49] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Total:	4,199	3,328	3,206	2,805	1,625	2,250	17,574	504	3,307
Male:	2,020	1,535	2,062	1,362	789	1,077	8,252	230	1,538
Under 5 years	157	129	103	133	43	69	671	19	142
5 to 9 years	138	119	77	113	62	74	622	16	132
10 to 14 years	137	120	82	95	72	· 98	573	13	133
15 to 17 years	83	65	78	47	44	. 48	· 372	. 10	· 93
18 and 19 years	63	50	57	39	29	23	184	2	50
20 years	22	. 25	· 41	13	4	20	86	9	17
21 years	. 25	22	50	19	5	15	93	· 0	18
22 to 24 years	. 79	. 69	133	63	19	26	321	4	43
25 to 29 years	146	96	266	102	29	59	577	16	85
/ 30 to 34 years	151	88	220	86	40	65	654	10	88
35 to 39 years	164	88	230	116	59	84	689	12	112
40 to 44 years	173	96	195	· 97	75	86	668	16	107
45 to 49 years	· 125	- 131	148	. 90	58	_88	595	16	108
50 to 54 years	140	101	121	88	55	. 67	500	11	87
55 to 59 years	114	84	. 65	77	37	57	383	· 15	. 80
60 and 61 years	37	28	24	26	12	16	136	• 4	25

Detailed Tables - American FactFinder

				(L					Ĩ.
62 to 64 years	52	44	26	31	13	16	167	10	27
65 and 66 years	33	23	15	23	11	20	100	9	19
67 to 69 years	. 45	34	16	32	24	28	167	• 10	34
70 to 74 years	68	54	46	31	60	. 65	265	13	61
75 to 79 years	40	. 37	31	18	21	31	223	3	37
. 80 to 84 years	• 19	22	23	20	12	13	125	4	25
85 years and over	9	10	. 15	. 3	5	9	. 81	. 8	15
Female:	2,179	1,793	1,144	1,443	. 836	1,173	9,322	274	1,769
Under 5 years	· 144	111	69	115	. 33	.56	611	· 14	104
5 to 9 years	155	115	88	. 107	48	77	634	• 10	-125
10 to 14 years	156	. 143	69	. 83	62	76	593	15	113
15 to 17 years	73	. 90	36	61	35	61	355	· 5	84
18 and 19 years	58	39	32	41	23	30	199	5	44
20 years	27	22	21	24	7	13	112	0	32
21 years	21	· 22	17	24	· 5	13	107	4	24
22 to 24 years	75	74	48	62	· 20	43	382	13	74
25 to 29 years	161	108	61	97	46	66	653	18	97
30 to 34 years	131	· 134	59		61	70	722	. 11	93
35 to 39 years	·177	92	. 78	108	52		736	17	· 135
40 to 44 years	149	121	78	94	94	· 93	720	13	139
45 to 49 years	139	129	82	92	47	90	666	17	121
50 to 54 years	130	107	79	98	· 54	. 69	· 524	19	86
<ul> <li>55 to 59 years</li> </ul>	126	110	56		. 30	68	446	17	· 83
60 and 61 years	44	25	17		13	31	137	6	37
62 to 64 years	68	43	37	43	38	34	190	20	52
65 and 66 years	52	26	. 14	18	26	28	149	· 7	39
67 to 69 years	59	· 63	34	31	30	49	206	· 11	44
70 to 74 years	92	81	46	49	·· 56	56	356	13	81
75 to 79 years	· 64	68	29	• 44	26	39	. 349	12	65
80 to 84 years	43	· 44	41	24	· 17	18	227	15	55
85 years and over	35	26	53	19	13	· 14	248	12	42

U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000

# P17. AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE [1] - Universe: Households Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://iaclfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://iaclfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Average household size	2.44	2.47	2.46	2.45	2.40	2.54	2.35	2.21	2,48

U.S. Census Bureau

## H1. HOUSING UNITS [1] - Universe: Housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

# NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</u>.

	Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Total	1,938	1,537	948	1,324	788	1,079	7,923	263	1,460

U.S. Census Bureau

Census 2000

# H3. OCCUPANCY STATUS [3] - Universe: Housing units

Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</u>.

•	Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Total:	1,938	1,537	. 948	1,324	788	1,079	7,923	263	1,460
Occupied	1,717	1,331	845	1,142	· 677	876	7,330	228	1,310
Vacant	221	206	103	182	111	203	593	35	· 150

U.S. Census Bureau

Census 2000

## H4. TENURE [3] - Universe: Occupied housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://iactfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://iactfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

		Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Ľ	Total:	1,717	1,331	845	1,142	677	876	7,330	228	1,310
F										

## Detailed Tables - American FactFinder

Ľ	Detailed Tables - 2	American Fa	ctFin	nder				•			Page 4 OI 4	
			•	· .	• •							
	Owner occupied	1,125		787	566	765	553	692	4,794	196	861	
l	Renter occupied	592	·	544	279	377	124	184	2,536	32	449	
	U.S. Census Bureau								•	•		
	Census 2000		•		•			·				
					•							

# H5. VACANCY STATUS [7] - Universe: Vacant housing units Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://lactlinder.census.gov/nome/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://lactlinder.census.gov/nome/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Clearwater CDP, South Carolina	Denmark city, South Carolina	Fairfax town, South Carolina	Gloverville CDP, South Carolina	Jackson town, South Carolina	New Ellenton town, South Carolina	North Augusta city, South Carolina	Springfield town, South Carolina	Williston town, South Carolina
Total:	221	· · 206	103	182	111	203	593	· 35	150
For rent	117	· 44	13	41	. 49	63	243	1	40
For sale only	23	31	15	19	-22	29	145	4	20
Rented or sold, not occupied	16	· 16	18	23	21	24	63	4	18
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	13	13	12	4	4	12	36	4	. 17
For migrant workers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other vacant	52	102	45	. 95	15	75	106	22	55

U.S. Census Bureau

Census 2000

Standard Error/Variance documentation for this dataset: Accuracy of the Data: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data (PDF 44KB)

# 🚭 U.S. Census Bureau

# American FactFinder

## P1. TOTAL POPULATION [1] - Universe: Total population Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	Girard town,	Hampton city,	Louisville city,	Statesboro city,	Swainsboro city,	Wadley city,	Edgefield town, South	Varnville town, South
	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia	Carolina	Carolina
Total	227	3,857	2,712	22,698	6,943	2,088	· 4,449	2,074

U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000

#### Standard Error/Variance documentation for this dataset: Accuracy of the Data: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data (PDF 44KB)

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?\_bm=y&-context=dt&-ds\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U&-mt\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_... 7/8/2005

#### U.S. **Census Bureau** American FactFinder 54 S S .... a the second second

LAKE I VI'U

USCB 2000

20000

Section 2.5.1

يستغتر

QT-P1. Age Groups and Sex: 2000 Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data Geographic Area: Georgia

# NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

	•	Number		•	Percent		
Age	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Males per 100 females
	1 S	-					
Total population	8,186,453	4,027,113	4,159,340	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.8
Under 5 years .	595,150	304,100	291,050	7.3	7.6	7.0	104.5
5 to 9 years	615,584	313,945	301,639	7.5	7.8	7.3	104.1
10 to 14 years	607,759	311,645	296,114	7.4	.7.7	7.1	105.2
15 to 19 years	596,277	309,814	286,463	7.3	7.7	6.9	108.2
20 to 24 years	592,196	306,463	285,733	7.2	7.6	6.9	107.3
25 to 29 years	641,750	· 325,750	316,000	7.8	8.1	7.6	103.1
30 to 34 years	657,506	330,797	326,709	8.0	8.2	7.9	101.3
35 to 39 years	. 698,735	347,792	· 350,943	8.5	. 8.6	8.4	99.1
40 to 44 years	654,773	322,711	. 332,062	8.0	8.0	8.0	97.2
45 to 49 years	573,017	278,549	294,468	7.0	6.9	7.1	94.6
50 to 54 years	506,975	. 246,401	260,574	6.2	6.1	6.3	94.6
55 to 59 years	375,651	182,321	193,330	4.6	4.5	4.6	94.3
60 to 64 years	285,805	135,594	150,211	3.5	3.4	3.6	90.3
65 to 69 years	236,634	107,826	128,808	2.9	2.7	3.1	83.7
70 to 74 years	199,061	84,861	114,200	2.4	2.1	2.7	. 74.3
75 to 79 years	157,569	60,768	96,801	1.9	1.5	2.3	62.8
80 to 84 years	104,154	35,388	68,766	1.3	0.9	1.7	51.5
85 to 89 years	58,215	16,082	42,133	0.7	0.4	1.0	38.2
90 years and over	29,642	6,306	23,336	0.4	0.2	0.6	27.0
Under 18 years	2,169,234	1,111,589	1,057,645	26.5	27.6	25.4	105.1
18 to 64 years	5,231,944	2,604,293	2,627,651	63.9	64.7	63.2	99.1
18 to 24 years	837,732	434,378	403,354	10.2	10.8	9.7	107.7
25 to 44 years	2,652,764	1,327,050	1,325,714	32.4	33.0	31.9	100.1
25 to 34 years	1,299,256	656,547	642,709	15.9	16.3	15.5	102.2
35 to 44 years	1,353,508	670,503	683,005	16.5	16.6	16.4	98.2
45 to 64 years	1,741,448	842,865	898,583	21.3	20.9	21.6	93.8
45 to 54 years	1,079,992	524,950	555,042	13.2	13.0	13.3	94.6
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·	·				

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\_bm=y&-context=qt&-qr\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U\_QTP1&-ds\_name=DEC\_20... 6/28/2005

			1 1	ł.				
				l				
Age	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Males per 100 females	
55 to 64 years	661,456	317,915	343,541	8.1	7.9	8.3	92.5	l
65 years and over	785,275	311,231	474,044	9.6	7.7	11.4	65.7	l
65 to 74 years	435,695	192,687	243,008	5.3	4.8	5.8	79.3	ŀ
75 to 84 years	261,723	96,156	165,567	3.2	2.4	4.0	58.1	
85 years and over	· 87,857	22,388	65,469	1.1	0.6	1.6	34.2	
16 years and over	6,250,708	3,036,726	3,213,982	76.4	75.4	77.3	94.5	
18 years and over	6,017,219	2,915,524	3,101,695	73.5	72.4	74.6	94.0	
21 years and over	5,646,535	2,722,560	2,923,975	69.0	67.6	70.3	93.1	
60 years and over	1,071,080	446,825	624,255	13.1	11.1	15.0	71.6	ĺ
62 years and over	948,821	388,284	560,537	11.6	9.6	13.5	69.3	l
67 years and over	685,867	265,502	420,365	8.4	6.6	10.1	63.2	
75 years and over	349,580	118,544	231,036	4.3	2.9	5.6	51.3	
Median age (years)	33.4	32.1	34.6	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	

(X) Not applicable. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices P13 and PCT12.

# <u>QT-P1. Age Groups and Sex: 2000</u> Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u> Geographic Area: **Burke County, Georgia**

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://lactfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://lactfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

Age	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Males per 100 females
Total population	22,243	10,556	11,687	. 100.0	100.0	100.0	90.3
Under 5 years	1,781	881	900	8.0	8.3	7.7	97.9
5 to 9 years	1,972	1,021	951	8.9	9.7	. 8.1	107.4
10 to 14 years	1,975	1,031	944	8.9	9.8	8.1	109.2
15 to 19 years	1,904	962	942	8.6	9.1	8.1	102.1
20 to 24 years	1,354	635	719	6.1	6.0	6.2	88.3
25 to 29 years	1,328	606	722	6.0	5.7	6.2	83.9
30 to 34 years	1,394	674	720	6.3	6.4	6.2	93.6
35 to 39 years	1,662	724	938	7.5	6.9	8.0	77.2
40 to 44 years	1,688	798	890	7.6	7.6	7.6	89.7

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\_bm=y&-context=qt&-qr\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U\_QTP1&-ds\_name=DEC\_20... 6/28/2005

rage 2 or o

		Number		Percent				
A	Polh cores	Mala	Female	Both	88-l-	Formato	Males per 100	
Age	DUII SEACS		remaie 040	30265		remaie	ot el	
50 to 54 years	1,013	604	043	7.3	7.3	- 1.2	91.0	
55 to 59 years	1,291	024	<u> </u>	5.0	5.9	. 0.1	93.0	
60 to 64 years	905	491	307	4.0	- 4.7	4.9	00.0	
65 to 60 years		397	400	3.0	3.0	3.5	97.3	
70 to 74 years		310	004	3.1	2.9	. 3.3		
75 to 70 years	590	201	335	2.1	2.5	2.9	- 11.9	
PD to PA voare		202	303	2.3	1.9	2.0	40.7	
100 10 04 years	290	93	195	1.3	0.9	1.7	40.7	
	220	00	10/	1.0	0.5	1.4	34.7	
90 years and over	100	14	92	0.5	<u> </u>	0.8	15.2	
Linder 18 years		9 554	· 0.402				104.0	
19 to 64 years	10,934	3,331	3,403	57.0	53.0	29.1	104.3	
18 to 24 years	12,073	0,000	0,000	57.9	57.5	50.3	03.1	
75 to 11 years	2,032	9/9	1,053	9.1	9.3	9.0	93.0	
25 to 24 years	0,0/2	2,002	3,270	27.3	20.0	20.0	00.7	
25 to 34 years	2,122	1,280	1,442	12.2	12.1	12.3	0.00	
	3,330	1,522	1,828	10.1	14.4	15.0	03,3	
45 to 64 years	4,709	2,284	2,485	21.4	21.0	21.3	91.9	
55 to 54 years	2,900	1,396	1,510	13.1	13.2	12.9	92.5	
SS 10 64 years	1,003	000	9/5	0.4 · 10.0	8.4	0.3	91.1	
65 years and over	2,410	940	1,4/0	10.9	8,9	12.0	03.7	
75 to 94 years	1,290	5/1	/19	0.0	5.4	0.2	79.4	
75 to 64 years	/95	297	490	3.0	2.8	4.3	07.0	
os years and over			209	1.5	0.7	2.2	27.6	
16 years and over	16 002	7 304	8698	72 3	70.0	74.4	85.0	
18 years and over	15,092	7,034	8 284	68.7	66.4	70.0	84.6	
21 years and over	14 206	6 509	7 799	64.2	617	66.6	83.6	
60 years and over	14,290	1 227	1,700	1/ 5	127	16.1	71 0	
62 years and over	2 200	1,007	1 722	12.0	11 1	14.7	68.2	
67 years and over	2,090	010	1,723	0.0	79	11 2	61 9	
75 years and over		019	757	5.0	1.0	6.6	49.7	
15 years and over			/5/		3.5	0.5	40./	
Median age (years)	33.0	31.0	34.7	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	

Page 3 of 0

(X) Not applicable. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices P13 and PCT12.

<u>QT-P1. Age Groups and Sex: 2000</u> Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u> Geographic Area: **Columbia County, Georgia** 

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\_bm=y&-context=qt&-qr\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U\_QTP1&-ds\_name=DEC\_20... 6/28/2005 NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

		Number				Percent			
Age	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Males per 100 females		
Total population	· 89,288	43,630	45,658	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.6		
Under 5 years	6,198	3,231	2,967	6.9	7.4	6.5	108.9		
5 to 9 years	7,504	3,808	3,696	.8.4	8.7	8.1	103.0		
10 to 14 years	. 7,994	4,073	3,921	9.0	9.3	8.6	103.9		
15 to 19 years	7,084	3,676	· 3,408	7.9	8.4	7.5	· 107.9		
20 to 24 years	4,154	2,073	2,081	4.7	4.8	4.6	99.6		
25 to 29 years	4,896	2,327	2,569	5.5	5.3	5.6	90.6		
30 to 34 years	6,208	2,935	3,273	7.0	6.7	7.2	89.7		
35 to 39 years	8,236	3,887	4,349	9.2	8.9	9.5	89.4		
40 to 44 years	8,339	3,938	4,401	· 9.3	9.0	9.6	89.5		
45 to 49 years	7,761	3,745	4,016	8.7	8.6	8.8	93.3		
50 to 54 years	6,367	3,279	3,088	7.1	7.5	6.8	106.2		
55 to 59 years	4,382	2,232	2,150	4.9	5.1	4.7	103.8		
60 to 64 years	3,035	1,495	1,540	3.4	3.4	3.4	97.1		
65 to 69 years	2,353	1,121	1,232	2.6	2.6	2.7	91.0		
70 to 74 years	1,844	819	1,025	2.1	1.9	2.2	79.9		
75 to 79 years	1,298	504	794	1.5	1.2	1.7	63.5		
80 to 84 years	852	. 287	565	1.0	0.7	1.2	50.8		
85 to 89 years	· 530	149	381	0.6	0.3	0.8	39.1		
90 years and over	253	51	202	0.3	0.1	0.4	25.2		
				1					
Under 18 years	26,430	13,558	12,872	29.6	31.1	28.2	105.3		
18 to 64 years	55,728	27,141	28,587	62.4	62.2	62.6	94.9		
18 to 24 years	6,504	3,303	3,201	7.3	7.6	7.0	103.2		
25 to 44 years	27,679	13,087	14,592	31.0	30.0	32.0	89.7		
25 to 34 years	11,104	5,262	5,842	12.4	12.1	12.8	90.1		
35 to 44 years	16,575	7,825	8,750	18.6	17.9	19.2	89.4		
45 to 64 years	21,545	10,751	10,794	24.1	24.6	23.6	99.6		
45 to 54 years	14,128	7,024	7,104	15.8	16.1	15.6	98.9		
55 to 64 years	7,417	3,727	3,690	8.3	8.5	8.1	101.0		
65 years and over	7,130	2,931	4,199	8.0	6.7	9.2	69.8		
65 to 74 years	4,197	1,940	· 2,257	4.7	4.4	4.9	86.0		
75 to 84 years	. 2,150	. 791	1,359	2.4	1.8	3.0	58.2		
85 years and over	783	200	583	0.9	0.5	1.3	34.3		
16 years and over	66,009	31,688	34,321	73.9	72.6	75.2	92.3		
18 years and over	62,858	30,072	32,786	70.4	68.9	71.8	91.7		
21 years and over	59,575	28,356	31,219	66.7	65.0	68.4	90.8		
60 years and over	10,165	4,426	5,739	11.4	10.1	12.6	77.1		
						•			

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\_bm=y&-context=qt&-qr\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U\_QTP1&-ds\_name=DEC\_20... 6/28/2005

Page 4 of 6

· • ·	•							
Age		Number				Percent		
	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Males per 100 females	
62 years and over	8,863	3,777	5,086	9.9	8.7	11.1	74.3	
67 years and over	6,105	2,422	3,683	6.8	. 5.6	8.1	65.8	
75 years and over	2,933	991	1,942	3.3	2.3	4.3	51.0	
		·	•••					
Median age (years)	35.4	34.5	36.0	(X)	(X)			

(X) Not applicable. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices P13 and PCT12.

# <u>QT-P1. Age Groups and Sex: 2000</u> Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u> Geographic Area: **Richmond County, Georgia**

# NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

	· ·				· · ·			
с		Number		Percent				
	,						Males	
				Both	·		per 100	
Age	Both sexes	Male	Female	sexes	Male	Female	females	
		·						
Total population	199,775	96,375	103,400	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.2	
Under 5 years	14,244	7,212	7,032	. 7.1	7.5	6.8	102.6	
5 to 9 years	15,245	7,775	7,470	7.6	8.1	7.2	104.1	
10 to 14 years	15,250	7,698	7,552	7.6	. 8.0	7.3	101.9	
15 to 19 years	16,237	8,746	7,491	8.1	9.1	7.2	116.8	
20 to 24 years	16,513	8,394	8,119	8.3	8.7	7.9	103.4	
25 to 29 years	15,680	7,841	7,839	7.8	8.1	7.6	100.0	
30 to 34 years	13,953	6,778	7,175	7.0	7.0	6.9	94.5	
35 to 39 years	14,970	7,188	7,782	7.5	7.5	7.5	92.4	
40 to 44 years	15,083	7,200	7,883	· 7.5	7.5	7.6	91.3	
45 to 49 years	13,562	6,376	7,186	6.8	6.6	6.9	88.7	
50 to 54 years	11,514	5,428	6,086	5.8	5.6	5.9	89.2	
55 to 59 years	8,818	4,086	4,732	4.4	4.2	4.6	86.3	
60 to 64 years	7,061	3,235	3,826	3.5	3.4	3.7	84.6	
65 to 69 years	6,424	2,793	3,631	3.2	2.9	3.5	76.9	
70 to 74 years	5,648	2,313	3,335	2.8	. 2.4	3.2	69.4	
75 to 79 years	4,548	1,792	2,756	2.3	1.9	2.7	65.0	
80 to 84 years	2,824	991	1,833	1.4	1.0	1.8	54.1	
85 to 89 years	1,452	386	1,066	0.7	0.4	1.0	36.2	
90 years and over	749	143	606	0.4	0.1	0.6	23.6	

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?\_bm=y&-context=qt&-qr\_name=DEC\_2000\_SF1\_U\_QTP1&-ds\_name=DEC\_20... 6/28/2005

rage 5 of 0
QUICK LADICS - AMERICAN FACIFINIUET

· ·		۰. ۱						
		Number			Percent			
Age	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female	Males per 100 females	
Under 18 years	53,608	27,222	26,386	26.8	28.2	25.5	103.2	
18 to 64 years	124,522	60,735	63,787	62.3	63.0	61.7	95.2	
18 to 24 years	23,881	12,603	11,278	12.0	13.1	10.9	111.7	
25 to 44 years	59,686	29,007	30,679	.29.9	30.1	29.7	94.6	
25 to 34 years	29,633	14,619	15,014	14.8	15.2	14.5	97.4	
35 to 44 years	30,053	14,388	15,665	15.0	14.9	15.1	91.8	l
45 to 64 years	40,955	19,125	· 21,830	20.5	19.8	21.1	87.6	
45 to 54 years	25,076	.11,804	13,272	12.6	12.2	12.8	88.9	
55 to 64 years	15,879	7,321	8,558	· 7.9	7.6	8.3	85.5	
65 years and over	21,645	8,418	13,227	10.8	8.7	12.8	63.6	
65 to 74 years	12,072	5,106	6,966	6.0	5.3	6.7	73.3	
75 to 84 years	7,372	2,783	: 4,589	3.7	2.9	4.4	60.6	
85 years and over	2,201	529	1,672	1.1	0.5	1.6	.31.6	
16 years and over	152,009	72,124	79,885	76.1	74.8	77.3	90.3	
18 years and over	146,167	69,153	· 77,014	73.2	71.8	74.5	89.8	ŕ
21 years and over	135,331	63,100	72,231	67.7	65.5	69.9	87.4	I
60 years and over	28,706	11,653	17,053	14.4	12.1	16.5	68.3	ł
62 years and over	25,689	10,265	15,424	12.9	10.7	14.9	66.6	1
67 years and over	19,031	7,301	11,730	9.5	7.6	11.3	62.2	· · ·
75 years and over	9,573	3,312	6,261	4.8	3.4	6.1	52.9	
Median age (years)	32.3	30.3	34.3	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	•

(X) Not applicable. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices P13 and PCT12.

Page b of b

Summary File 1: Census 2000

Page 1 of 2

for this reference

Census 2000 Gateway | Gloss

Tables and full data setAare located at V-208 (CD)

U.S. Census Bureau

Census 2000

Summary File 1 (SF 1)

Summary File 1 (SF 1) contains 286 <u>detailed tables</u> focusing on age, sex, households, families, and housing units. These tables provide in-depth figures by race and Hispanic origin; some tables are repeated for each of nine race/Latino groups. Counts also are provided for over forty American Indian and Alaska Native tribes and for groups within race categories. The race categories include eighteen Asian groups and twelve Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander groups. Counts of persons of Hispanic origin by country of origin (twenty-eight groups) are also shown.

Section 7.5.1 (USCB 20000

Summary File 1 presents data for the United States, the 50 states, and the District of Columbia in a hierarchical sequence down to the block level for many tabulations, but only to the census tract level for others. Summaries are included for other geographic areas such as ZIP Code Tabulation Areas (ZCTAs) and Congressional districts.

Geographic coverage for Puerto Rico is comparable to the 50 states. Data are presented in a hierarchical sequence down the block level for many tabulations, but only to the census tract level for others. Geographic areas include barrios, barrios-pueblo, subbarrios, places, census tracts, block groups, and blocks. Summaries also are included for other geographic areas such as ZIP Code Tabulation Areas (ZCTAs).

Summary File 1 detailed tables are identified according to geographic coverage:

- Population tables (Pn) are available to the block level
- Housing tables (Hn) available to the block level
- Population Census Tract tables (PCTn) are available to the census tract level only

Additional tables and maps have been derived from the detailed tables. For fast, easy access to all tables and maps in Summary File 1, go to the <u>Data Sets</u> page.

- 1 Demographic Profile (DP) covering many population and housing characteristics for a single geography at a time.
- 15 Quick Tables (QTn) that focus on a few population or housing characteristics for a single geo graphy.
- 15 Geographic Comparison Tables (GCTn) that focus on a few population or housing characteristics for many related geographic areas.
- Over 100 Thematic Maps that focus on a single characteristic for many geographic areas.

 Data:
 Access to all tables and maps in American FactFinder

 Purchase Products:
 Summary Files for sale through the Customer Services Center

 Product Support:
 Summary File 1 Disc Product Support

 Tutorial:
 Summary File 1 DVD

 FTP Download:
 All Files

 Documentation:
 Technical Documentation [PDF]

 - Comparing SF 3 Estimates with Corresponding Values in SF 1 and SF 2

- Same-Sex Unmarried Partner Data from the 1990 and 2000 Censuses Release dates



[PDF] or denotes a file in Adobe's Portable Document Format. To view the file, you will need the Adobe® Acrobat® Reader Available for free from Adobe.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Public Information Office

## Summary File 1: Census 2000

#### *(301) 763-3030 Author: <u>pio@census.gov</u> Last Revised: February 18, 2005 at 03:18:54 PM*

Census Bureau Links: Home · Search · Subjects A-Z · FAQs · Data Tools · Catalog · Census 2000 · Quality · Privacy Policy · Contact Us

> USCENSUSBUREAU Helping You Make Informed Decisions

Section 2.5.1 (USCB 2000d) Page 1 of 1 Census 2000: Demographic Profiles U.S. Census Bureau Census 2000 Gateway | Gloss Tables and full data set for this reference are located on. CD at V-208. United States Summary File 3 (SF 3) Summary File 3 consists of 813 detailed tables of Census 2000 social, economic and housing characteristics compiled fr of approximately 19 million housing units (about 1 in 6 households) that received the Census 2000 long-form questionna tables are repeated for nine major race and Hispanic or Latino groups: White alone; Black or African American alone; An Indian and Alaska Native alone; Asian alone; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone; Some other race alone; races; Hispanic or Latino; and White alone, not Hispanic or Latino. Summary File 3 presents data for the United States, the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico in a hierarch sequence down to the block group for many tabulations, but only to the census tract levels for others. Summaries are inc other geographic areas such as Zip Code Tabulation Areas (ZCTAs<sup>TM</sup>) and Congressional districts (106<sup>th</sup> Congress). Summary File 3 includes 484 population tables and 329 housing tables that are identified according to geographic cover. Population (P) and Housing (H) tables are available to the block group O Population (PCT) and Housing (HCT) tables are available to the census tract level only Data: Access to all tables and maps in American FactFinder Purchase Products: Summary Files for sale through Customer Services Center Product Support: Summary File 3 Disc Product Support FTP Download: FTP Read me (MSWord | WordPerfect | Text) All Files Documentation: Technical Documentation [PDF] (6M) - Comparing SF 3 Estimates with Corresponding Values in SF 1 and SF 2 Same-Sex Unmarried Partner Data from the 1990 and 2000 Censuses Release dates

> Source: U.S. Census Bureau Public Information Office (301) 763-3030 Author: <u>pio@census.gov</u> Last Revised: February 18, 2005 at 03:18:35 PM

Census Bureau Links: Home · Search · Subjects A-Z · FAQs · Data Tools · Catalog · Census 2000 · Quality · Privacy Policy · Contact Us

## USCENSUSBUREAU

Helping You Make Informed Decisions

urke County, Georgia - QT-H1. General Housing Characteristi	cs: 2000	Page 1 c
Section 2.5.2.6 (1	JSCB 2000	e)
🗇 🚰 🖓 U.S. Census Bureau		
American FactFinder		horseler victor (see
		na Carlon an ann an Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna An
QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000	· · ·	
Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SE-1) 100-Percent Data		
Geographic Area: Burke County, Georgia	•	
NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions	s. see	•
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm.		···
Subject	Number	Percent
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
OCCUPANCY STATUS	0.040	
Counted housing units	0,842 · 7 934	89.7
Vacant housing units	908	10.3
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
TENURE		
Occupied housing units	7,934	100.0
Senter-occupied housing units	1.904	24.0
in the second seco		
VACANCY STATUS		
Vacant housing units	908	100.0
For rent		18.4
Rented or sold, not occupied	97	10.7
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	108	11.9
For migratory workers	· 8	0.9
Other vacant	451	49.7
RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied housing units	7,934	100.0
Dne race	7,869	99.2
White	4,015	50.6
American Indian and Alaska Native	20	
Asian	15	0.2
Native Hawalian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0
Some other race	35	0.4
I WO OF MORE FACES	60	0.8
HISPANIC OR LATINO HOUSEHOLDER AND RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied housing units	7,934	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	. 84	1.1
Not Hispanic or Launo	7,850	98.9
	0,000	
AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied housing units	7,934	100.0
15 to 24 years	420	5.3
25 to 44 years	1,2/4	23.0
15 to 54 years	1,699	21.4
55 to 64 years	1,149	14.5
65 years and over	1,567	19.8
05 TO /4 Years	854  	10.8
85 years and over	182	23

1-250

(X) Not applicable. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H16.

1000

🕞 U.S. Census Bureau

American FactFinder

<u>QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000</u> Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u> Geographic Area: **Richmond County, Georgia** 

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <u>http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</u>.

Subject	Number	Percent
OCCUPANCY STATUS		
Total housing units	82,312	100.0
Occupied housing units	1 73,920	89.8
Vacant housing units	8,392	10.2
TENURE		· · · ·
Occupied housing units	73,920	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	42,840	58.0
Renter-occupied housing units	31,080	42.0
VACANCY STATUS	·	
Vacant housing units	8,392	100.0
For rent	3,739	44.6
For sale only	1,160	13.8
Rented or sold, not occupied	429	5.1
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	288	3.4
For migratory workers	5	0.1
Other vacant	2,771	33.0
		•
RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER	·	
Occupied housing units	73,920	100.0
One race	73,032	98.8
White	37,692	51.0
Black or African American	33,624	45.5
American Indian and Alaska Native	201	. 0.3
Asian	943	1.3
Native Hawalian and Other Pacific Islander	75	0.1
Some other race	497	0.7
Two or more races	888	1.2
HISPANIC OR LATINO HOUSEHOLDER AND RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER	• •	
Occupied housing units	73,920	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	1,536	2.1
Not Hispanic or Latino	72,384	97.9
White alone	36,968	50.0
AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER	•	
Occupied housing units	73,920	100.0
15 to 24 years	5,017	6.8
25 to 34 years	• 14,405	19.5
35 to 44 years	16,326	22.1
45 to 54 years	14,597	19.7
55 to 64 years	9,677	13.1
65 years and over	13,898	18.8
65 to 74 years	7,8611	. 10.6
75 to 84 years	4,8871	6.6
85 years and over	1,150	1.6

(X) Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H16.

1243023019

😳 U.S. Census Bureau

American FactFinder

and the statest with the statest states and a

#### <u>QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000</u> Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u> Geographic Area: **Columbia County, Georgia**

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm

Subject	Number	Percent
	<del></del>	
Total bousing units	33 321	100.0
Occupied bousing units	31 120	100.0
Vacant housing units	2,201	6.6
	•	
Occupied housing units	31,120	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	25,557	82.1
Renter-occupied housing units	5,563	17.9
VACANCY STATUS		
Vacant housing units	2 201	100.0
For rent	560	25.4
For sale only	760	34.5
Rented or sold, not occupied	106	4.8
For seasonal recreational or occasional use	338	
For migratory workers		10.4
Other vacant		10.0
		. 19.8
RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER	• •	
Occupied housing units	31,120	100.0
One race	30,829	99.1
White	26,337	84.6
Black or African American	3,368	10.8
American Indian and Alaska Native	107	0.3
Asian	819	2.6
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	28	0.1
Some other race	. 170	0.5
Two or more races	291	0.9
Occupied bausing units	21 100	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	51,120	· · · · · ·
Not Hispanic or Latino	20 402	2.0
White alone	25 941	90.0
AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER	· .	
Occupied housing units	31,120	100.0
15 to 24 years	935	3.0
25 to 34 years	5,020	16.1
35 to 44 years	8,709	28.0
45 to 54 years	7,872	25.3
55 to 64 years	4.380	14.1
65 years and over	4,204	13.5
65 to 74 years	2.569	8.3
75 to 84 years	1.289	41
85 years and over	346	1.1

(X) Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H16.

Sate and Second

U.S. Census Bureau

American FactFinder

ann a' Chean an Ann an 12 a' 19 a' 2000 19 ann

## QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000

Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

Geographic Area: Screven County, Georgia

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expst1u.htm</a>.

Subject	Number	Percent
	<b>N</b> .	
OCCUPANCY STATUS		
Total housing units	6,853	100.0
Occupied housing units	5,797	84.6
Vacant housing units	1,056	15.4
TENURE	•	
Occupied housing units	5,797	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	4,513	77.9
Renter-occupied housing units	1,284	22,1
VACANCY STATUS		
Vacant housing units	1.056	100.0
For rent	100	9.5
For sale only	77	7.3
Rented or sold, not occupied	68	6.4
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	164	15.5
For migratory workers	15	1.4
Other vacant	632	59.8
RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER	· ·	<u>.</u>
Occupied housing units	5.797	100.0
One race	· 5 776	0.001
White	3 366	58.1
Black or African American	2 385	41 1
American Indian and Alaska Native		
Asian	· 12	0.1
Native Hawalian and Other Pacific Islander		0.0
Some other race		· 0.0
Two or more races	21	0.1
HISPANIC OF LATING HOUSEHOLDER AND BACE OF HOUSEHOLDER	······	
Occupied housing units	E 797	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	3,797	100.0
Not Hispanic or Latino	5 767	0.5
White glong	3,707	53.5
	0,002	
Occupied housing units		100.0
15 to 24 years	5,7971	100.0
15 to 24 years	220	3.9
	629	14.3
	1,222	21.1
HO IN DH YEAIS	1,233	21.3
05 to 04 years	869	15.0
	1,418	24.5
b) ID /4 years	747	12.9
/5 to 84 years	525	9.1
85 years and over	146	2.5

(X) Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H16.

Page 1 of 2

ensus Bureau

nerican FactFindeř

#### QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000

Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

Geographic Area: Aiken County, South Carolina

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm.

Subject	Number	Percent
	· · ·	
Total housing units	61,987	100.0
Occupied housing units	. 55,587	
Vacant housing units	6,400	10.3
TENURE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Occupied housing units	55,587	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	42,036	75.6
Renter-occupied housing units	13,551	24.4
VACANCY STATUS		
Vacant housing units	6 400	100 0
For rent	1 866	29.2
	1,000	16.6
Rented or sold not occupied	659	10.0
For seasonal recreational or occasional use	404	77
For migratony workers	434	
Other vacant	2 216	36.0
	2,310	
RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER	·	
Occupied housing units	55,587	100.0
One race	55,110	99.1
White	41,282	74.3
Black or African American	13,013	23.4
American Indian and Alaska Native	207	0.4
Asian	. 291	. 0.5
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	9	0.0
Some other race	308	0.6
Two or more races	477	0.9
	·	
HISPANIC OR LATINO HOUSEHOLDER AND RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER	<u> </u>	<u>`</u>
Occupied housing units	55,587	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	834	1.5
Not Hispanic or Latino	54,753	. 98.5
White alone	40,866	73.5
	EE 607	100.0
	0,926	100.0
15 to 24 years	2,630	<u> </u>
120 IU 04 years	8,8081	15.8
	12,696	22.8
	11,454	20.6
	7,9221	14.3
	11,871	21.4
65 to 74 years	6,658	12.0
75 to 84 years	4,187	7.5
85 years and over	1,026	1.8

(X) Not applicable. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H16.

# Aiken County, South Carolina - QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000

Page 2 of 2

, U.S. Census Bureau

American FactFinder

NY AVANA AMARANA AMARAN

#### <u>QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000</u> Data Set: <u>Census 2000-Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u> Geographic Area: Millen city, Georgia

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

Subject	Number	Percent
		. c.bein
OCCUPANCY STATUS		
Total housing units	. 1.567	100.0
Occupied housing units	1.321	84.3
Vacant housing units	246	15.7
TENUBE		
Occupied housing units	1.321	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	849	64.3
Renter-occupied housing units	472	· · · 35.7
		•
VACANCY STATUS		
Vacant housing units	246	100.0
For rent	. 85	34.6
For sale only	. 29	11.8
Rented or sold, not occupied	15	6.1
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	7	2.8
For migratory workers	0	0.0
Other vacant	110	44.7
L		
RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied housing units	1,321	100.0
One race	1,307	98.9
White	. 573	. 43.4
Black or African American	. 719	54.4
American Indian and Alaska Native	1	0.1
Asian	2	0.2
Native Hawalian and Other Pacific Islander	· 2	0.2
Some other race	10	. 0.8
Two or more races	· 14	1.1
		,
HISPANIC OR LATINO HOUSEHOLDER AND RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER		· · · ·
Occupied housing units	1,321	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	27	2.0
Not Hispanic or Latino	1,294	98.0
White alone	564	42.7
AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied housing units	1,321	100.0
15 to 24 years	77	5.8
25 to 34 years	168	· 12.7
35 to 44 years	255	19.3
45 to 54 years	263	· 19.9
55 to 64 years	189	14.3
65 years and over	369	27.9
65 to 74 years	199	15.1
75 to 84 years	131	9.9
85 years and over	39	3.0

(X) Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H16.

<u>QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics</u> 2000 Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u> Geographic Area: Sylvania city, Georgia

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exps11.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exps11.htm</a>.

Subject	Number	Percent
Total housing units	1,285	100.0
Occupied housing units	1,088	84.7
Vacant housing units	197	15.3
TENURE		
Occupied housing units	1,088	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	683	62.8
Renter-occupied housing units	405	37.2
VACANCY STATUS		
Vacant housing units	197	100.0
For rent	38	19.3
For sale only	25	12.0
Bented or sold not occupied	11	5.6
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	8	4 1
For migratory workers		7.1
Other vacant	101	51.2
	101	51.5
RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied housing units	1,088	100.0
One race	1,085	99.7
White	660	60.7
Black or African American	418	<sup>.</sup> 38.4
American Indian and Alaska Native	1	0.1
Asian	· 4	0.4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0
Some other race	2	0.2
Two or more races	. 3	0.3
HISPANIC OR LATINO HOUSEHOLDER AND RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied housing units	1,088	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	.7	0.6
Not Hispanic or Latino	. 1,081	99.4
White alone	657	60.4
AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied nousing units	1,088	100.0
15 to 24 years	46	. 4.2
[25 to 34 years	129	11.9
35 to 44 years	196	18.0
45 to 54 years	175	16.1
155 to 64 years	168	15.4
65 years and over	374	34.4
65 to 74 years	167	15.3
75 to 84 years	· · 159	14.6
85 years and over	48	4.4

(X) Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H16.

# <u>QT-H1. General Housing Characteristics: 2000</u> Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u> Geographic Area: Waynesboro city, Georgia

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm</a>.

Subject	Number	Percent
OCCUPANCY STATUS		
Total housing units	2 3 9 5	100.0
Occupied housing units	2 151	89.8
Vacant housing units	244	10.2
		10.4
TENIIRE		
Occupied housing units	2 151	100.0
Owner-occupied housing units	1 177	
Benter-occupied housing units	974	45.3
VACANCY STATUS		······································
Vacant housing units	244	100.0
For rent	83	34.0
For sale only	17	7.0
Rented or sold, not occupied	32	13.1
For seasonal recreational or occasional use	10	/ 1
For migratory workers		4.1
Other vacant	100	41.0
	100	41.0
BACE OF HOUSEHOLDER	-	
Occupied housing units	2 151	100.0
	2,131	0.001
White	2,100	39.0
Black or African American	1 282	59.6
American Indian and Alaska Nativo	1,202	39.0
Acian		0,2
Native Hawalian and Other Pacific Islander		0.1
Some other race		0.0
		0,1
		1.0
HISPANIC OF LATING HOUSEHOLDER AND BACE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied bousing units	0.151	- 100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	2,131	0.7
Not Hispanic or Latino	2 126	0.7
White slope	2,100	39.3
White alone	630	30.9
AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER		
Occupied housing units	0.151	100.0
15 to 24 years	2,131	100.0
15 to 24 years	170	0.2
25 to 44 years		15.9
A5 to 54 years	437	20.3
	389	18.1
IS IN UM YEARS	262	12,2
	544	25.3
75 to 94 years		12.6
	193	9.0
by years and over	. 79	3.7

(X) Not applicable. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H16.

South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 1 of 11

Sert rien

1. . . .

**Census Bureau** erican FactFinder

ISCR

2000

## GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geographies ranked by total

population): 2000

-25

Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

Geographic Area: South Carolina -- Place

NOTE: For Information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm.

				Area in square miles			Density p mile of la	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
	South Carolina	4,012,012	1,753,670	32,020.20	1,910.73	30,109.47	133.2	58.2
						•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	Columbia city	116,278	46,142	127.72	2.49	125.22	928.6	368.5
	Lexington County (part)	402	231	0.58	0.00	0.58	697.8	401.0
	Richland County (part)	115,876	45,911	127.14	2.49	124.65	929.6	368.3
2	Charleston city	96,650	· 44,563	114.10	17.11	96.99	996.5	459.5
	Berkeley County (part)	1,122	429	37.95	5.30	32.65	34.4	13.1
·	Charleston County (part)	95,528	44,134	76.15	11.81	64.34	1,484.7	685.9
3	North Charleston city	79,641	33,631	62.08	3.54	58.54	1,360.6	574,5
	Charleston County (part)	76,244	32,454	54.10	3.48	50.62	1,506.1	641.1
	Dorchester County (part)	3,397	1,177	7.97	0.06	7.91	429.3	148.7
4	Greenville city, Greenville County	56,002	27,295	26.13	0.06	26.07	2,148.0	1,046.9
5	Rock Hill city, York County	49,765	20,287	31.06	· 0.03	31.03	1,603.8	653.8
6	Mount Pleasant town, Charleston County	47,609	20,197		7.65	41.89	1,136.5	482.1
7	Spartanburg city, Spartanburg County	39,673	17,696	19.25	0.09	19.15	2,071.2	923.9
8	Sumter city, Sumter County	39,643	16,032	26.75	0.16	26.59	1,491.2	603.0
9	Hilton Head Island town, Beaufort County	33,862	24,647	55.55	13.49	42.06	805.1	586.0
10	Florence city, Florence County	30,248	13,090	17.72	0.03	17.70	1,709.4	739.7
11	Goose Creek city	29,208	9,482	32.47	0.77	31.69	921.6	299.2
	Berkeley County (part)	29,208	9,482	32.37	0.77	31.60	924.4	300.1
L	Charleston County (part)	0	0	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.0	0.0
12	Summerville town	27,752	11,087	15.36	0.00	15.36	1,806.7	721.8
	Berkeley County (part)	945	313	1.80	0.00	1.80	525.9	1/4.2
┝	Derebector County (part)	20	10 766	10.00	0.00	1.06	18.9	7.0
13	Anderson city, Anderson	25,514	12,068	13.85	0.00	13.84	1,843.7	872.1
	Alken city Alken County		11 373	16 19	0.01	16.18	1 566 3	703 1
15	Myrtle Beach city, Horry	22,759	14,658	16.80	0.02	16.78	1,356.3	· 873.5
. 16	Greenwood city, Greenwood County	22,071	9,373	13.70	0.01	13.69	1,612.1	: 684.6
17	St. Andrews CDP, Richland County	21,814	11,398	6.89	0.01	6.89	3,167.8	1,655.2
18	Wade Hampton CDP, Greenville County	20,458	9,793	. 8.82	0.05	8.77	2,331.4	1,116.0
19	Taylors CDP, Greenville County	20,125	8,550	10.86	0.00	10.86	1,853.7	787.5
20	Easley city, Pickens County	17,754	7,932	10.64	0.00	10.64	1,668.8	745.6
	North Augusta city	Mate 17,574	7,923	17.56	0.36	17.20	1,021.7	460.6

South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 2 of 11

		·····					······································	
				Area	in square	miles	Density p mile of la	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
	"Alken County"(part) and a surger		7,892	16.93	0.36	16.57	1,055.6	476.4
	Edgefield County (part)	87	31	0.63	0.00	0.63	137.0	48.8
22	Greer city	16,843	7,386	16.13	0.00	16.13	1,044.5	458.0
	Greenville County (part)	10,966	4,890	8.14	0.00	8.14	1,348.0	601.1
	Spartanburg County (part)	5,877	2,496	7.99	0.00	7.99	735.5	312.4
23	Seven Oaks CDP, Lexington County	15,755	6,979	7.95	0.11	7.85	2,007.9	889.4
24	Mauldin city, Greenville County	15,224	6,500	8.62	0.00	8.62	1,767.1	754.5
25	Simpsonville city, Greenville County	14,352	. 5,636	6.22	0.00	6.22	2,306.1	. 905. <del>6</del>
26	Socastee CDP, Horry County	14,295	6,356	13.90	0.53	13.37	1,069.1	475.4
27	Berea CDP, Greenville County	14,158	· 5,994	7.85	0.24	7,61	1,861.6	788.1
28	Gantt CDP, Greenville County	13,962	5,793	10.06	0.00	10.06	1,387.5	575.7
29	Ladson CDP	13,264	4,863	8.61	0.00	8.61	1,540.9	.564.9
	Berkeley County (part)	10,435	3,828	5.88	• 0.00	5.88	1,775.1	651.2
	Charleston County (part)	2,829	1,035	2.73	0.00	2.73	1,036.5	379.2
30	West Columbia city, Lexington County	13,064	6,436	6.28	0.20	6.07	2,150.6	1,059.5
· 31	Dentsville CDP, Richland County	13,009	5,797	7.22	0.17	7.05	1,844.8	822.1
32	Gattney city, Cherokee County	12,968	5,765	7.89	0.03	7.86	1,649.7	733.4
33	Beaufort city, Beaufort County	12,950	5,080	23.43	4.82	18.61	695.7	272.9
34	Hanahan city, Berkeley County	12,937	5,698	10.69	0.62	10.07	1,284.7	565.8
35	Orangeburg city, Orangeburg County	12,765	5,168	8.30	. 0.01	8.29	1,539.0	623.1
36	Cayce city, Lexington County	12,150	5,517	11.26	0.36	10.90	1,114.6	506.1
	Clemson city	11,939	5,679	7.79	0.42	7.37	1,620.6	770.8
	Anderson County (part)	42	16	0.10	0.00	0.10	423.4	161.3
	Pickens County (part)	11,897	5,663	7.69	0.42	7.27	1,636.9	779.2
38	Conway city, Horry County	11,788	4,783	13.39	0.68	12.71	927.8	376.5
39	Imo town	11,039	4,066	4.13	0.00	4.13	2,670.2	983.5
	Lexington County (part)	4,071	1,540	1.76	0.00	1.76	2,309.5	873.7
	Richland County (part)	. 6,968	2,526	2.37	0.00	2.37	2,938.4	1,065.2
40	North Myrtle Beach city, Horry County	10,974	18,091	13.51	0.47	13.04	841.6	1,387.5
• 41	Parker CDP, Greenville County	10,760	4,824	6.90	0.00	.6.90	1,559.7	699.3
42	County	10,580	4,388	6.58	0.00	6.57	1,609.2	667.4
43	County	10,558	5,232	5.00	0.41	4.59	2,300.9	1,140.2
44 AE	Laurana city Laurana County	0.010	1 206	10.02	0.09	10.93	026.6	409.6
45 46	Lexington town, Lexington	9,793	4,025	· 5.77	0.00	5.68	1,724.4	415.2 708.7
47	Bennettsville city, Marlboro County	9,425	3,775	. 6.22	0.63	5.59	1,686.2	675.4
. 48	Garden City CDP, Horry County	9,357	7,995	5.46	0.10	5.36	1,745.1	1,491.1
49	Woodfield CDP, Richland County	9,238	3,957	2.82	0.03	2.79	3,312.5	1,418.9
50.	Georgetown city, Georgetown County	8,950	3,856	. 7.17	0.63	6.54	1,368.1	589.4
51	Red Bank CDP, Lexington County	8,811	3,498	12.13	0.23	11.90	740.6	294.0
52	Union city, Union County	8,793	4,240	7.96	0.00	7.96	1,105.0	532.9
. 53	Oak Grove CDP, Lexington County	8,183	3,626	6.78	0.04	6.74	1,214.2	538.0
		1 <sup>·</sup> 1			1	۱.	1 1	

South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 3 of 11

				Area in square miles		Density p	er square and area	
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housin unit
54	Lancaster city, Lancaster	8,177	3,778	5.90	0.08	5.81	1,406.2	649.
55	Clinton city, Laurens County	8.091	3.011	9.15	0.05	9.09	889.7	331.
56	Five Forks CDP, Greenville County	8,064	2,855	7.71	· 0.00	7.71	1,045.7	370.
57	Sans Souci CDP, Greenville County	7,836	3,705	3.40	0.03	3.37	2,325.5	1,099.
58	Seneca city, Oconee County	7,652	3,677	7.09	0.04	7.06	1,084.6	521
59	Fort Mill town, York County	7,587	3,063	4.62	0.06	4.56	1,662.7	671
60	County	7,556	3,499	5.01	0.03	4.98	1,516.9	702
61	Burton CDP, Beaufort County	7,180	2,690	11.14	0.11	11.04	650.7	243
62	Marion city, Marion County	7,042	3,081	4.33	0.00	4.33	1,627.5	712
63	County	7,027	4,715	10.82	0.36	10.46	671.9	450
64	York city, York County	6,985	2,766	7.94	0.07	7.87	887.6	351
65	Darlington city, Darlington	6.720	3,140	4.29	0.00	4.29	1,565.9	731
66	County Camden city, Kershaw County	6 682	3 283	9.77	0.12	9.65	692.2	340
67	Laurel Bay CDP, Beaufort	6,625	1 955	5.59	0.92	4.70	1 409 4	A15
68	County Lake City city, Florence	6.478	2 704	. 475	0.00	4.70	1,405.4	560
00	County Chaster County	0,470	0.774		0.01	4.75	1,000.0	
69 70	Welcome CDP, Greenville	6,476 6,390	2,774	4.61	0.00	<u> </u>	2,042.8	<u>875</u> 638
71	Homeland Park CDP, Anderson County	6,337	2,985	4.77	0.00	4.77	1,328.9	· 626
72	Dillon city, Dillon County	6,316	2,837	4.83	0.01	4.82	1,310.2	588
73	Lugoff CDP, Kershaw County	6,278	2,467	12.91	0.07	12.84	488.9	192
74	Fountain Inn city	6,017	2,465	5.51	0.00	5.51	1,091.6	447
	Laurens County (part)	4,637	1,961	3.99	0.00	3.99	1,162.0	49
75	Moncks Corner town, Berkeley County	5,952	2,334	4.46	0.00	4.46	1,333.1	-52
76	Abbeville city, Abbeville County	5,840	2,654	5.87	0.00	5.87	995.2	45
77	Belvedere CDP, Alken County	18 <sup>34</sup> 5,631	2,430	3.93	0.01	3.92	1,436.5	619
78	Cheraw town, Chesterfield County	5,524	2,568	4.64	0.03	4.61	1,197.6	556
79	Murrells Inlet CDP, Georgetown County	5,519	3,151	7.51	0.17	7.34	751.8	429
80	Batesburg-Leesville town	5,517	2,446	7.43	0.09	7.34	751.4	333
	Saluda County (part)	505	2,246	0.01	0.09	0.53	619.3	24
81	Powderville CDP, Anderson	5,362	2,133	13.95	0.00	<u> </u>	384.4	152
82	Centerville CDP, Anderson County	5,181	2,188	5.88	0.00	5.88	881.3	372
83	Walterboro city, Colleton County	5,153	2,362	4.96	· 0.00	4.96	1,038.0	47
84	Barnwell city, Barnwell County	5,035	s <sup>#</sup> 2,304	7.78	0.14	7.63	659.5	30
85 86	Parris Island CDP, Beaufort	<u>5,029</u> 4,841	2,312	<u> </u>	0.00 7.44	3.05	<u>1,647.8</u> 398.0	757
87	Brookdale CDP, Orangeburg	4,724	2,325	3.64	0.00	3.64	1,298.3	639
88	Piedmont CDP	4 684	1 002	8 75	0.16	8 59	545.6	000
0	Anderson County (part)	3.112	1.298	5.81	0.15	5.66	549.8	232
	Greenville County (part)	1,572	694	2.94	0.01	2.92	537.5	237
89	Isle of Palms city, Charleston County	4,583	3,881	5.55	1.09	4.47	1,025.9	. 868
_	1.	1 · ]	1 · 1					•

South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 4 of 11

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
				Area	in square	miles	Density p mile of la	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	. Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
90	Bolling Springs CDP,	4,544	1,801	6.81	0.00	6.81	666.9	264.3
91	Belton city, Anderson County	4,461	2,129	3.85	0.00	3.85	1,158.2	552.7
92"	Edgefield town, Edgefield	4,449	1,229	4.15	0.08	4.07	1,094.3	302.3
93	Surfside Beach town, Horry County	4,425	• 3,698	1.96	0.02	1.93	2,287.6	1,911.8
94	Woodruff city, Spartanburg County	4,229	1,869	3.68	_ 0.02	3.66	1,154.8	510.4
	Clearwater CDP, Alken	4199	1,938	4.29	0.02	4.27	983.8	454.1
96	Dunean CDP, Greenville County	4,158	1,999	1.66	0.00	1.66	2,499.0	1,201.4
97	Travelers Rest city, Greenville County	4,099	1,729	4.41	0.00	4.40	930.8 <sup>°</sup>	392.6
v <sup>utiv</sup> 98	Allendale town, Allendale	4,052	1,763	3.31	0.00	<sup>.</sup> 3.31	1,225.2	533.1
99	Tega Cay city, York County	4,044	1,577	3.15	0.67	2.48	1,630.0	635.7
100	Newport CDP, York County	4,033	1,437	8.95	0.00	8.95	450.4	160.5
101	County	4,025	1,727	· 2.41	0.00	2.41	1,671.1	717.0
102	Clover town, York County	4,014	1,635	2.81	0.01	2.80	1,433.5	583.9
103	Valley Falls CDP, Spartanburg County	3,990	1,694	5.23	0.03	· 5.20	767.9	326.0
104	Port Royal town, Beaufort County	3,950	1,792	5.17	1.29	3.88	1,017.3	461.5
105	Hollywood town, Charleston	3,946	1,516	21.23	1.18	20.05	196.8	75.6
106	Walhalla city, Oconee County	3,801	1,705	3.76	0.05	3.71	1,023.8	459.2
107	County	3,791	1,762	3.64	.0.05	3.59	1,056.2	490.9
108	County	3,733	1,537	3.54	0.02	3.53	1,058.1	435.6
109t	County	3,707	1,587	2.37	0.00	2.37	1,566.8	670.8
1091	Spartanburg County	. 3,707	1,278	3.55	0.00	3.55	1,043.1	359.6
110	Bishopville city, Lee County	3,670	1,616	2.39	0.03	2.36	1,554.8	684.6
111	County	3,659	1,775	5.34	1.10	4.24	· 862.7	418.5
112	Winnsboro town, Fairfield County	3,599	1,597	3.24	0.00	3.24	1,109.6	492.4
113	Lake Murray of Richland CDP, Richland County	3,526	1,353	8.82	3.07	5.75	. 613.0	235.2
114	Central town, Pickens County	3,522	1,832	2.41	0.00	2.41	1,463.4	761.2
115	Abboyillo County (port)	3,504	1,681	3.49	0.00	3.49	1,004.1	481.
	Anderson County (part)	3.426	1,640	· 3.34	0.00	3.34	1 026 9	207. 491 f
116	Kingstree town, Williamsburg County	3,496	1,618	3.16	. 0.02	3.14	1,114.7	515.9
117	Forestbrook CDP, Horry County	3,391	1,358	3.63	0.00	3.63	933.1	373.7
118	South Sumter CDP, Sumter County	3,365	1,395	2.66	0.00	2.66	1,266.0	524.9
119	East Gaffney CDP, Cherokee County	3,349	1,563	3.17	0.01	3.17	1,058.0	493.8
*1201	Denmark city, Bamberg	3,328	1,537	3.04	0.00	3.04	1,096.0	508.2
121	Williston town, Barnwell	3,307	1,460	. 8.96	0.06	8.90	371.7	164.1
122	Falrax town, Allendate	3,206	948	3.32	.0.00	3.32	965.8	285.6
123	North Hartsville CDP.	3,136	1,406	4.95	0.10	_ 4.86	645.8	- 289.5

# · South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 5 of 11

- 1	·····								
				-	Area	in square	miles	Density p mile of la	er square and area
	Rank	Geographic area Darlington County	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
	124t	Andrews town	3,068	1,347	2.20	0.00	2.20	1,392.6	611.4
		Georgetown County (part)	3,037	1,332	2.07	0.00	2.07	1.464.8	642.5
		Williamsburg County (part)	31	15	0.13	0.00	0.13	238.8	115.6
	1241	Wilkinson Heights CDP	<sup>#3</sup> 3,068	<sup>;</sup> 1,332	3.00	0.00	3.00	1,022.6	444.0
	125	Saluda town, Saluda County	3,066	1,211	3.28	0.04	3.24	947.1	374.1
	126	Lake Wylie CDP, York County	3,061	1,610	4.74	· 1.26	3.48	880.6	463.1
	127	Pickens town, Pickens County	3,012	1,438	2.47	0.02	2.45	1,227.1	585.8
	128	Liberty town, Pickens County	3,009	1,404	4.27	0.00	4.27	705.0	329.0
	129	Blackville town, Barnwell	2,973	1,332	9.27	0,11	9.16	324.7	145.5
	130	Pendleton town, Anderson County	. 2,966	1,533	3.58	0.01	3.57	831.5	429.7
	131	Springdale town, Lexington County	2,877	1,334	4.04	0.03	4.00	718.8	333.3
	132	Duncan town, Spartanburg County	2,870	1,274	3.51	0.00	3.51	818.4	363.3
	133	Springdale CDP, Lancaster County	2,864	1,175	4.24	0.02	4.22	678.6	278.4
	134	Shell Point CDP, Beaufort County	2,856	1,103	7.72	1.61	6.11	467.4	180.5
	135	Hampton town, Hampton County	2,837	1,339	<u>4.55</u>	0.01	4.53	626.1	295.5
-11	136	Gioverville CDP, Alken	<sup></sup>	, 1,324	3.50	0.00	3.50	801.6	378.4
40	137	Westminster city, Oconee County	2,743	1,333	3.44	0.00	3.44	796.6	387.1
	138	Burnettown town, Alken	2,720	1,183	4.88	0.05	4.83	563.5	245.1
	139	Pacolet town, Spartanburg County	2,690	1,178	2.97	<sup>·</sup> 0.01	2.97	906.8	397.1
	140	Lyman town, Spartanburg County	2,659	1,224	4.07	0.01	4.07	654.0	301.1
	<b>841</b>	Edisto CDP Orangeburg	2,632	1,193	5.51	0.05	5.46	482.5	218.7
.	142	Arial CDP, Pickens County	2,607	1,179	4.94	0.00	4.94	527.8	238.7
	143	Lakewood CDP, Sumter County	2,603	1,033	7.78	0.19	7.59	343.0	136.1
	144	Pageland town, Chesterfield County	2,521	1,071	4,42	0.04	4.38	575.4	244.4
	145	Ridgeland town, Jasper County	2,518	597	2.42	0.01	2.41	1,046.6	248.1
	146	McColl town, Mariboro County	2,498	1,090	1.06	0.00	1.06	2,357.8	1,028.8
	147	Landrum city, Spartanburg County	2,472	1,107	2.35	. 0.01	2.35	1,053.7	471.9
	148	Cherryvale CDP, Sumter County	2,461	1,309	1.80	0.03	1.77	1,390.9	739.8
	149	Judson CDP, Greenville County	2,456	1,143	0.81	0.00	0.81	3,044.7	1,417.0
	150	Elgin CDP, Lancaster County	2,426	976	4.92	0.02	4.90	494.7	199.0
.	151	Estill town, Hampton County	2,425	991	3.54	0.00	3.54	685.8	280.2
	152	Ware Shoals town	2,363	1,126	3.99	0.12	3.87	610.1	290.7
		Abbeville County (part)	534	252	0.66	0.01	0.65	824.2	389.0
		Greenwood County (parl)	1,829	. 874	· 3.25	0.09	3.16	578.6	276.5
	152	Laurens County (part) Golden Grove CDP,	0	0 770	0.09	0.02	0.06	0.0	0.0
•	E1548	Greenville County Johnston town, Edgefield	2,040		2 59	0.00	. 9.61	930 6	402.2
4	365 <sup>334</sup> 0 155	County Timmonsville town, Florence	2 915	956	-2 58	0.00	2.01	a apg	370.2
		County Calhoun Falls town, Abbeville	2,010				2.00		

South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 6 of 11

		······					· · · · · ·	
•			•	Area	in square	miles	Density p mile of l	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
156	County	2,303	1,042	3.15	0.01	3.15	731.9	331.2
157	County	2,279	. 991	2.33	. 0.00	2.33	979.3	425.8
158	Lesslie CDP, York County	2,268	961	5.97	0.03	5.94	381.8	161.8
159	South Congaree town, Lexington County	2,266	1,002	· 3.25	0.03	3.22	703.8	311.2
160	Winnsboro Mills CDP, Fairfield County	2,263	1,005	2.76	0.00	2.76	819.9	364.1
161	Dalzell CDP, Sumter County	2,260	. 895	6.90	0.05	6.85	329.7	130.6
162	New Ellenton town, Alken	2,250	<sup>Y</sup> 1,079	5.01	0.00	5.01	449.4	215.5
163	Slater-Marietta CDP, Greenville County	2,228	989	· <b>4.</b> 30	0.00	4.30	518.5	230.2
164	Ravenel town, Charleston County	2,214	863	12.33	0.00	12.33	179.5	70.0
165	Great Falls town, Chester County	2,194	1,041	4.39	0.14	. 4.25	516.8	245.2
166	Privateer CDP, Sumter County	2,118	· 797	. 8.24	0.06	<sup>.</sup> 8.18	- 259.0	97.5
167	Folly Beach city, Charleston County	2,116	1,747	18.64	6.38	12.26	. 172.7	142.5
168	Lancaster Mill CDP, Lancaster County	2,109	963	1.27	0.00	1.27	1,660.0	758.0
169	St. Matthews town, Calhoun	2,107	913	1.94	0.01	1.93	1,091.1	472.8
170	St. George town, Dorchester County	<sup>.</sup> 2,092	928	2.68	0.00	2.68	779.7	345.9
171	Loris city, Horry County	2,079	922	3.12	0.01	3.11	· 668.2	296.3
172	Varnville town, Hampton County	2,074	878	<sup>.</sup> 3.78	.000	3.78	548.4	232.2
173	Wellford city, Spartanburg County	2,030	. 910	2.04	0.00	2.04	. <mark>993.8</mark>	445.5
174	Ninety Six town, Greenwood County	1,936	904	1.46	0.00	1.46	1,325.1	618.7
175	Monarch Mill CDP, Union County	•1,930	. 862	5.62	0.00	5.62	343.1	153.3
176	Sullivan's Island town, Charleston County	1,911	1,045	3.32	0.90	2.43	. 787.2	430.5
177	Inman city, Spartanburg County	1,884	829	0.93	0.00	0.93	2,015.8	. 887.0
178	Blacksburg town, Cherokee County	1,880	911	1.85	0.00	1.85	1,018.8	493.7
179	Mayo CDP, Spartanburg County	1,842	773	3.12	0.00	3.12	590.6	247.9
180	Hardeeville city, Jasper County	1,793	700	4.27	·0.00	4.27	419.8	163.9
181	St. Stephen town, Berkeley County	1,776	708	· 2.46	0.00	2.46	722.9	288.2
182	Eureka Mill CDP, Chester County	1,737	733	1.35	0.00	1.35	1,282.7	541.3
183	Roebuck CDP, Spartanburg County	1,725	783	4,28	0.00	4.28	403.4	183.1
184	Ridgeville town, Dorchester County	1,690	232	1.82	0.00	1.82	930.4	127.7
185	Kershaw town, Lancaster County	1,645	··· 771	1.85	、 0.00	1.85	888.5	416.4
186	Jackson town, Alken County	MAN 1,625	788	3.55	0.00	3.55	457.6	221.9
187	India Hook CDP, York County	1,614	. 702	3.67	0.90	2.77	582.0	253.2
188	Joanna CDP, Laurens County	1,609	758	3.15	0.00	. 3.15	510.5	240.5
189	Pine Ridge town, Lexington County	1,593	626	3.73	0.01	· 3.71	) <sup>·</sup> 429.1	168.6
190	Wedgewood CDP, Sumter	1,544	596	8.54	0.11	8.43	183.2	70.7
ģ	Murphys Estates CDP	and growing out	4		·			

'South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 7 of 11

				Area	in square	miles	Density p mile of l	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
<b>991</b>	Edgefield County	1,518	595	· 2.00	0.00	. 2.00	757.2	296.8
192	Whitmire town, Newberry County	1,512	776	1.26	0.00	1.26	1,203.0	617.4
193	McCormick town, McCormick County	1,489	. 737	3.76	0.00	3.76	396.4	196.2
194	Watts Mills CDP, Laurens County	1,479	629	2.29	0.00	2.29	646.8	· 275.1
195	Cane Savannah CDP, Sumter County	1,452	524	4.26	0.07	4.19	346.4	125.0
196	Buffalo CDP, Union County	1,426	659	4.01	0.00	4.01	355.2	164.2
197	Johnsonville city, Florence County	1,418	602	1.58	0.00	. 1.58	897.6	· 381.
198	Latta town, Dillon County	1,410	665	1.04	0.00	1.04	1,358.9	640.9
199	Irwin CDP, Lancaster County	1,343	554	2.99	0.01	2.98	450.3	185.7
200	Utica CDP, Ocoriee County	1,322	684	1.35	0.00	1.35	9/9.2	506.7
201	Chesterfield County	1,318	. 683	3.44	0.00	3.44	383.2	198.6
202	Gaston town, Lexington County	1,304	532	3.43	0.00	3.43	380.6	155.3
203	Holly Hill town, Orangeburg	\$1,281	575	1.35	0.00	1.35	950.7	426.7
204	Bluffton town, Beaufort County	1,275	501	36.64	2.66	33.98	. 37.5	14.7
205	Oakland CDP, Sumter County	· 1,272	543	0.68	0.00	· 0.68	1,870.9	798.7
206	Stateburg CDP, Sumter County	1,264	477	4.70	0.02	4.68	270.3	102.0
207	City View CDP, Greenville County	1,254	. 575	0.54	0.01	0.53	2,355.0	<sup>.</sup> 1,079.8
208	Seabrook Island town, Charleston County	1,250	1,649	7.09	1.02	6.07	206.0	271.7
. 209	Meggett town, Charleston County	1,230	540	14.84	0.27	14.57	84.4	37.1
210	East Sumter CDP, Sumter County	1,220	505	3.30	0.01	3.30	369.9	153.1
211	Due West town, Abbeville County	1,209	342	· 1.64	0.00	1.64	738.4	208.9
"212	Bowman town, Orangeburg	1,198	्र 532	1.16	0.00	1.16	1,034.5	459.4
213	Awendaw town, Charleston County	1,195	443	· 8.45	0.17	8.28	144.3	53.5
214	Kiawah Island town, Charleston County	: 1,163	3,070	13.54	2.38	11.16	104.2	275.0
215	Iva town, Anderson County	1,156	580	0.90	0.00	0.90	1,286.1	645.3
216	Inman Mills CDP, Spananburg County	1,151	464	1.26	0.00	1.26	911.5	367.
217	Pamplico town, Florence County	1,139	463	. 1.86	0.01	1.85	615.2	250.
218	Bucksport CDP, Horry County	1,117	388	3.86	0.02	3.84	290.8	101.0
219	Gayle Mill CDP, Chester County	1,094	477	0.67	· 0.00	0.67	1,632.2	711.
220	Branchville town, Orangeburg County	1,083	508	3.27	0.00	3.27	331.2	155.3
221	Summerton town, Clarendon	1,061	516	1.15	<sup>.</sup> 0.00	1.15	919.3	447.1
222	Prosperity town, Newberry County	1,047	. 456	2.11	0.00	2.11	495.9	216.0
223	Gray Court town, Laurens County	1,021	398	1.85	0.00	1.85	551.0	214.8
224	Lamar town, Darlington County	1,015	467	1.16	0.00	1.16	874.6	402.4
225	Chesnee city	1,003	460	0.90	0.00	0.90	1,116.4	512.0
	Cherokee County (part)	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.0	0.0
	Spartaphurg County (part)	1.003	460	0.89	0.00	0.89	1,128.3	517.4

South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 8 of 11

,								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	•				Area	In square	miles	Density p mile of l	er square and area
	Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
	226	Mayesville town, Sumter County	1,001	369	1.03	0.00	1.03	968.0	356.8
	227 <sup>`</sup>	Startex CDP, Spartanburg County	988	443	1.91	0.00	1.91	516.1	231.4
	228	Jonesville town, Union County	982	497	1.03	0.01	1.02	965.6	488.7
	229	Scranton town, Florence County	942	347	0.83	0.00	0.83	1,132.0	417.0
•	230	Lake Secession CDP, Abbeville County	928	·739	7.11	. 1.47	· 5.64	164.7	131.1
	231	Lincolnville town, Charleston County	· 904	371	1.14	0.00	1.14	794.1	325.9
	232	Millwood CDP, Sumter County	. 885	. 341	0.83	. 0.03	0.80	1,111.9	428.4
	233	Arcadia Lakes town, Richland	: 882	389	0.65	0.12	. 0.52	1,685.6	743.4
	234	West Pelzer town, Anderson	879	440	0.49	0.00	0.49	1,796.4	899.2
	235t	Fort Lawn town, Chester	. 864	348	1.38	0.00	1.38	626.0	252.1
	235t	Heath Springs town,	864	366	1.30	0.00	1.30	667.1	282.6
	236	Wagener town. Alken County	863	. 424	1.27	0.01	1.26	685.1	336.6
	237	Norris town. Pickens County	847	400	1.89	0.00	1.89	447.9	211.5
l	238	Quinby town, Florence County	842	351	1.11	0.00	. 1.11	755.6	315.0
	239	Mulberry CDP, Sumter County	. 841	. 234	1.98	0.02	1.96	428.4	119.2
	240	Eastover town, Richland County	830	357	1.24	0.00	1.24	. 670.8	288.5
	241	Ridge Spring town, Saluda County	. 823	368	1.86	0.02	1.83	449.3	200.9
	242	North town, Orangeburg County	<sup>.</sup> 813	. 412	0.85	· 0.00	0.85	953.7	483.3
	243	Yemassee town	807	378	4.49	0.00	· 4.49	179.7	84.2
		Beaufort County (part)	116	58	1.62	0.00	1.62	71.6	. 35.8
		Hampton County (part)	691	· 320	2.87	0.00	2.87	240.7	111.5
	244	Elgin town, Kershaw County	806	306	0.97	0.00	. 0.97	· 833.7	316.5
	245	Lake View town, Dillon County	. · 789	374	.1.68	0.00	1.68	468.8	222.2
ļ	246	Clio town, Mariboro County	774	339	0.84	0.00	0.84	926.4	405.8
	247	Elloree town, Orangeburg County	742	. 381	0.96	<b>0.0</b> 0	0.96	772.3	396.5
	248	Santee town, Orangeburg County	740	. 394	. 2.03	0.01	2.01	367.4	195.6
	249	McBee town, Chesterfield County	· 714	329	1.16	0.00	. 1.16	613.3	282.6
	250	Riverview CDP, York County	708	290	2.29	0.00	2.29	309.7	126.8
	251	Cottageville town, Colleton County	707	310	3.18	0.00	. 3.18	222.2	. 97.4
	252	Jefferson town, Chesterfield County	704	345	1.80	0.01	1.78	394.9	193.5
-	253	Society Hill town, Darlington County	700	317	2.18	0.00	2.18	320.4	145.1
	254	Coward town, Florence County	. 650	263	3.43	0.01	3.42	189.9	76.8
	255	Edisto Beach town, Colleton County	641	1,785	2.35	0.23	2.12	301.7	840.2
	256	Chapin town, Lexington County	628	261	1.81	0.01	1.80	349.6	145.3
	257	Ehrhardt town, Bamberg County	614	317	3.18	0.00	3.18	193.1	. 99.7
Ì	258	Olanta town, Florence County	613	223	0.97	0.00	0.97	632.3	230.0
	259	Turbeville town, Clarendon County	602	272	· 1.26	0.00	1.26	478.1	216.0
ſ		•							

# • South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (ge... Page 9 of 11

				Area	in square	miles	Density p mile of la	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
260	Cross Hill town, Laurens	601	245	3.09	0.00	3.09	194.5	79.3
261	Harleyville town, Dorchester	594	282	0.99	0.00	0.99	601.1	285.4
262	Brunson town, Hampton	589	· 287	1.01	0.00	1.01	581.3	283.3
263	Lynchburg town, Lee County	588	262	1.13	0.00	1.13	519.7	231.5
264	Aynor town, Horry County	587	257	1.10	0.00	1.10	533.3	233.5
265	Lane town, Williamsburg County	585	256	3.97	0.00	3.97	147.4	64.5
266	Hemingway town, Williamsburg County	573	278	0.88	.0.00	0.88	<sup>.</sup> 653.2	316.9
267	Promised Land CDP, Greenwood County	559	197	1.58	0.00	1.58	354.7	125.0
268t	Pelion town, Lexington	553	211	3.56	0.10	3.46	159.7	60.9
268t	Six Mile town, Pickens County	553	223	1.82	0.01	1.82	304.4	122.7
269	Swansea town, Lexington County	533	262	- 1.19	0.05	1.13	469.9	231.0
270	Springfield town, Orangeburg County	. 504	. 263	1.56	0.00	· 1.56	322.8	168.4
271	Gilbert town, Lexington County	500	195	2.33	0.06	2.27	220.7	86.1
272	Carlisle town, Union County	496	223	1.42	0.00	1.42	350.0	157.4
273	Reidville town, Spartanburg County	478	209	1,37	0.00	1.37	350.1	153.1
274	Briarcliffe Acres town, Horry County	. 470	. 221	0.65	0.00	. 0.65	719.7	338.4
275t	McClellanville town, Charleston County	459	. 254	2.18	0.10	2.08	220.9	122.2
275t	Pinewood town, Sumter County	459	237	1.07	0.00	1.07	429.7	221.9
276	Greeleyville town, Williamsburg County	· 452	188	1.16	0.00	. 1.16	390.7	162.5
2771	Cameron town, Calhoun County	.449	201	3.14	0.00	3.14	143.2	64.1
277t	Campobello town, Spartanburg County	449	· 176	0.86	0.00	0.86	520.8	204.1
278	Hilda town, Barnwell County	436	204	3.11	0.04	3.07	142.1	66.5
279	Sharon town, York County	421	161	1.28	0.00	. 1.28	329.7	126.1
280	Neeses town, Orangeburg County	413	204	1.68	0.00	1.68	245.9	121.5
281	Salley town, Alken County	410	194	0.79	0.01	0.78	529.0	250.3
282	Nichols town, Marion County	408	199	1.39	0.00	1.39	293.8	143.3
283	Norway town, Orangeburg	. 389	163	<u>4.41</u> 0.84	0.00	<u>4.41</u> 0.84	<u>92.1</u> 465.5	.196.3
285	Rowesville town, Orangeburg	378	159	0.79	. 0.00	0.79	476.2	200.3
286	Clarks Hill CDP, McCormick	376	145	. 3.20	0.00	3.20	117.5	45.3
287	Gifford town, Hampton County	370	146	0.94	0.00	0.94	393.0	155 1
288	Bonneau town, Berkeley	354	176	2.88	0.06	2.82	125.6	62.5
288	Donalds town, Abbeville	354	152	0.84	0.00	0.84	422.9	. 181.6
288	Patrick town, Chesterfield	354	162	0.98	· 0.00	0.98	360.8	165.1
289	Bethune town, Kershaw County	352	193	1.14	0.00	1.14	309.4	<sup>.</sup> 169.6
290	Atlantic Beach town, Horry County	351	244	0.16	0.00	0.16	2,214.5	1,539.4
.291	Ruby town, Chesterfield	348	182	3.13	, 0.02	3.11	112.0	58.6

South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (... Page 10 of 11

		•		•.			·		
				•	· Area	in square	miles	Density p mile of l	er square and area
	Rank	Geographic area County	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
	292	Eutawville town, Orangeburg County	344	161	0.93	0.00	0.93	371.7	174.0
	293	Hickory Grove town, York County	. 337	129	1.29	0.00	<sup>.</sup> 1.29	261.0	99.9
	294	Richburg town, Chester County	. 332	134	. 0.83	0.00	0.83	400.2	161.5
	295	Ridgeway town, Fairfield County	328	157	0.47	0.00	. 0.47	692.7	331.6
	296	West Union town, Oconee County	297	145	0.77	0.00	0.77	386.2	<sub>/</sub> 188.6
	297	McConnells town, York County	287	··· 107	3.44	0.00	3.44	83.4	31.1
	298	Furman town, Hampton County	286	126	3.12	0.00	3.12	91.8	40.4
	299	Cokesbury CDP, Greenwood County	279	111	0.63	0.00	0.63	444.1	176.7
	300	Sellers town, Marion County	277	127	0.69	0.00	0.69	398.9	182.9
	301	Central Pacolet town, Spartanburg County	· 267	147	0.24	0.00	0.24	1,107.6	609.8
	302	Stuckey town, Williamsburg County	263	113	0.91	0.00	0.91	287.7	123.6
	303	Shiloh CDP, Sumter County	259	94	9.74	0.02	9.72	26.6	9.7
	304	Modoc CDP, McCormick County	256	259	7.16	3.08	4.08	62.7	63.5
	305	Little Mountain town, Newberry County	255	· 132	1.06	0.00	1.06	241.3	· 124 <b>.</b> 9
	306	Paxville town, Clarendon County	248	110	1.05	0.00	1.05	236.8	105.0
•	307	Snelling town, Barnwell County	246	. 105	3.11	0.03	3.08	79.8	34.1
	308	Kline town, Barnwell County	238	112	3.13	0.03	3.11	. 76.6	36.1
	309t	Mount Carmel CDP, McCormick County	237	106	9.20	0.00	9.20	25.8	11.5
•	309t	Olar town, Bamberg County	237	152	0.79	· 0.00	0.79	301.1	193.1
.	309t	Perry town, Alken County	237	124	1.19	0.00	1.19	198.7	104.0
	310	Scotia town, Hampton County	227	99	3.18	0.00	3.18	71.3	31,1
	311	Trenton town, Edgefield County	· 226	115	1.31	0.01	1.30	173.9	88.5
	312	Monetta town	220	108	0.74	0.00	0.74	298.7	146.6
		Alken County (part)	141	64	0.25	0.00	0.25	566.4	257.1
	313	Summit town, Lexington		44 103	<u> </u>	0.00	0.49	162.0	90.2
	314	Silverstreet town, Newberry	216	92	3.52	0.00	3.52	61.4	26.2
	315	Elko town, Barnwell County	212	102	• 1.16	0.00	1.16	183.0	· 88.0
	316	Vance town, Orangeburg County	208	71	0.50	0.00	0.50	414.1	141.4
	317t	Lowrys town, Chester County	207	84	3.16	0.00	3.16	65.5	26.6
	317t	Reevesville town, Dorchester County	207	.114	1.62	0.02	. 1.60	· 129.0	71.1
٢	318	Waterloo town, Laurens County	203	<sup>.</sup> 85	1.41	0.00	1.41	144.2	60.4
	319	Woodford town, Orangeburg County	196	103	0.79	0.00	0.79	248.2	130.5
	320	Sycamore town, Allendale County	185	93	3.18	0.01	3.17	58.3	29.3
	321t	Pomaria town, Newberry County	· 177	84	1.05	0.01	1.04	170.1	80.7
	321t	Willington CDP, McCormick County	177	80	6.01	0.04	5.97	<sup>.</sup> 29.6	13.4
	322	Starr town, Anderson County	173	82	1.48	0.00	1.48	116.8	55.4
. 1	• •	1							

South Carolina by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (... Page 11 of 11

		•	·	Area	in square	niles	Density p mile of la	er square ind area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
323	Bradley CDP, Greenwood	171	82	7.84	0.00	7.84	21.8	10.5
324t	Blythewood town	· 170	111	3.22	0.06	3.16	53.9	35.2
	Fairfield County (part)	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.0	· 0.0
	Richland County (part)	· 170	111	3.21	0.06	3.15	54.0	35.3
324t	Coronaca CDP, Greenwood County	· 170	. 91	1.69	0.01	1.68	101.1	54.1
325	Lowndesville town, Abbeville County	166	124	0.78	0.00	0.78	214.1	159.9
326	Hodges town, Greenwood County	158	64	<b>0.78</b>	0.00	0.78	201.8	81.7
327	Cordova town, Orangeburg County	157	. 64	0.45	0.00	0.45	347.0	141.5
328	Mount Croghan town, Chesterfield County	155	· 70	0.76	0.00	0.76	203.5	91.9
329	Livingston town, Orangeburg County	148		0.81	0.00	0.81	183.8	83.2
330	Smoaks town, Colleton County	140	68	1.63	0.00	1.63	85.9	41.7
331	Pawleys Island town, Georgetown County	138	521	0.99	0.29	0.70	196.9	743.3
332t	Blenheim town, Marlboro County	137	78	0.65	. 0.00	0.65	210.1	119.6
332t	Rockville town, Charleston County	137	84	0.53	0.09	0.44	314.7	193.0
333	Mountville CDP, Laurens County	130	59	2.85	0.02	2.83	45.9	. 20.8
334	Windsor town, Alken County	127	63	1.00	0.00	. 1.00	126.7	62.8
335	Salem town, Oconee County	126	72	0.84	0.00	0.84	150.5	86.0
336	County	120	74	0.66	0.00	0.66	182.6	112.6
337	County	118	61	3.94	0.00	3.94	30.0	15.5
338	County	116	. 59	0.79	0.00	0.79	147.5	75.0
339	Luray town, Hampton County	115	52	1.07	0.00	1.07	107.1	48.4
340	Word town, Colleton County	114	59	3.14	0.00	· 3.14	36.3	18.8
342	Cope town, Orangeburg	110	· 62 46	0.78	0.00	0.78	431.7	185.6
343	Troy town, Greenwood	105	· 51	0.80	0.00	0.80	131.4	63.8
344	Ulmer town, Allendale County	102	54	0.98	0.00	0.98	103.9	55.0
345	Plum Branch town, McCormick County	98	52	0.37	0.00	0.37	264.5	. 140.4
346t	Jamestown town, Berkeley County	97	51	0.58	0.00	0.58	168.7	88.7
,346t	Pelzer town, Anderson County	97	·· 37	0.19	0.00	0.19	498.4	190.1
347	Oswego CDP, Sumter County	95	42	1.65	0.00	. 1.65	57.7	25.5
348	Tatum town, Mariboro County	69	38	0.88	0.00	0.88	78.1	43.0
349	Govan town, Bamberg County	· 67	37	0.75	0.00	0.75	88.8	49.0
350	County	-65	36	0.75	0.00	0.75	. 87.1	· · · 48.2
351	Peak town, Newberry County	61	36	0.27	· 0.00	. 0.27	226.9	133.9
352	Smyrna town	59	26	0.71	0.00	0.71	83.6	36.8
	Cherokee County (part)	0	0	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.0	0.0
352	Lockhart town Union County	. 59	26	0.67	0.00	0.67	87.8	38.7
000	Econian town, Union County	33		0.23	0.09	0.14	· 210.4	102.5

(X) Not applicable Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geograph... Page 1 of 17

### U.S. Census Bureau

American FactFinder

Statistics and the second

Signatura

COSCON!

<u>GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geographies ranked by total population): 2000</u> Data Set: <u>Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data</u>

Geographic Area: Georgia – Place

NOTE: For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, and definitions, see <a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exps11u.htm">http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/exps11u.htm</a>.

[	· · · ·							
		•		Area in square miles			Density p mile of la	er square and area
		Bannalation	Housing	Total	Water	Land	D	Housing
Налк	Geographic area	Population	Units	· area	area	area	Population	Units
┝───	Georgia	9 196 452	9 991 797	50 424 77	1 519 62	57 006 14	141.4	EC 7
	Georgia	0,100,400	3,201,737		1,516.05	57,900.14	141.4	
<u>├</u>								
<del>  1</del>	Atlanta city	416.474	186,925	132.42	0.68	131.75	3,161,2	1,418,8
<u> </u>	DeKalb County (part)	29.775	13,285	6.93	0.00	6.93	4,293.5	1.915.7
<u> </u>	Fulton County (part)	386.699	173.640	125.49	0.68	124.81	3.098.3	1.391.2
2	Augusta-Richmond County, Richmond County	199,775	82,312	328.45	4.41	324.04	616.5	254.0
	Augusta-Richmond County (balance)	195,182	80,481	306.48	· <b>4.3</b> 5	302.13	646.0	266.4
	Blythe city (part)	713	261	2.55	0.01	2.54	280.4	102.6
	Hephzibah city	3,880	1,570	19.42	0.06	19.36	200.4	81.1
3	Augusta-Richmond County (balance), Richmond County	195,182	80,481	306.48	4.35	302.13	646.0	266.4
4	Columbus city, Muscogee County	186,291	76,182	221.00	4.74	216.26	861.4	352.3
	Bibb City town	510	242	0.17	0.00	0.17	3,064.9	1,454.3
· · ·	Columbus city (balance)	185,781	75,940	220.83	4.74	216.09	859.7	351.4
5	Columbus city (balance), Muscogee County	185,781	75,940	220.83	4.74	216.09	859.7	351.4
6	Savannah city, Chatham County	131,510	57,437	78.11	3.37	74.74	1,759.5	768.5
. 7	Athens-Clarke County, Clarke County	101,489	42,126	121.28	0.49	120.79	840.2	348.8
е	Athens-Clarke County (balance)	100,266	41,633	118.23	0.48	117.75	<u></u> 851.5	. 353.6
	Bogart town (part)	118	51	0.23	0.01	0.22	540.6	233.7
	Winterville city	1,068	· 432	2.65	0.00	2.65	403.2	163.1
8	Athens-Clarke County (balance), Clarke County	100,266	41,633	118.23	0.48	· 117.75	851.5	353.6
9	Macon city	97,255	44,341	56.27	0.46	55.80	1,742.8	794.6
	Bibb County (part)	96,777	44,155	55.91	0.46	55.45	1,745.4	796.4
	Jones County (part)	478	186	0.36	0.00	0.36	1,341.7	522.1
10	Sandy Springs CDP, Fulton County	85,781	42,794	38.98	1.25	37.72	2,274.1	1,134.5
11	Roswell city, Fulton County	79,334	31,300	38.61	0.59	38.02	2,086.5	823.2
12	Albany city, Dougherty County	76,939	32,062	55.86	0.33	55.53	1,385.5	577.3
13	Marietta city, Cobb County	58,748	25,227	21.95	0.06	21.89	2,684.1	1,152.6
14	Vvarner Hobins city	48,804	21,688	22.86	0.09	22.76	2,143.9	952.7
		48,/87	21,682	22.44	0.09	22.35	2,182.7	970.0
	Voldosta city Lowedca	1/	6	0.41	0.00	0.41	41.2	14.5
15	County	43,724	18,907	30.27	0.33	29.94	1,460.3	631.5
16	Smyrna city, Cobb County	40,999	19,633	13.92	0.02	13.90	2,949.9	1,412.6
17	East Point city, Fulton County	39,595	15,637	13.77	0.01	13.75	2,878.9	1,137.0
[ · · ·	North Atlanta CDP, DeKalb				•			

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geograph... Page 2 of 17

			•	Area	in square i	miles	Density p mile of la	er square and area
Bank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total	Water	. Land	Population	Housing units
18	County	38.579	16.636	7.71	0.06	7.65	5.040.6	2.173.6
19	Rome city, Floyd County	34,980	14.508	29.84	0.46	29.38	1,190.5	493.7
20	Alpharetta city, Fulton County	34,854	14.670	21.38	0.01	21.36	1.631.6	686.7
21	Redan CDP, DeKalb County	33,841	12,106	9.60	0.05	9.55	3,542.0	1,267.1
22	Dunwoody CDP, DeKalb County	32,808	14,599	12.12	0.04	12.08	2,715.7	1,208.4
23	Peachtree City city, Fayette County	31,580	11,313	23,90	0.63	23.27	1,356.9	486.1
24	Hinesville city, Liberty County	30,392	11,742	16.31	0.10	16.22	1,874.0	724.0
25	Mableton CDP, Cobb County	29,733	11,339	20.76	0.17	20.59	1,444.4	550.8
26	Candler-McAfee CDP, DeKalb	28,294	9,415	6.99	0.02	6.98	4,054.2	1,349.0
27	Dalton city, Whitfield County	27,912	10,229	19.84	0.02	19.82	1,407.9	516.0
28	Martinez CDP, Columbia County	27,749	10,320	12.68	0.11	12.57	2,207.1	. 820.8
29	Tucker CDP, DeKalb County	26,532	10,704	12.12	0.10	12.02	2,208.2	890.9
30	LaGrange city, Troup County	. 25,998	11,000	29.55	0.59	28.96	897.8	379.9
31	Gainesville city, Hall County	25,578	. 9,076	29.10	2.02	27.08	944.4	335.1
32	Grittin city, Spalding County	23,451	9,636	14.60	0.08	14.52	1,615.0	663.6
33	County	22,698	9,235	12.62	0.10	12.52	1,812.9	737.6
34	County	22,397	7,684	13.05	0.06	12.99	1,723.9	591.5
35	Duluth city, Gwinnett County	22,122	9,061	8.90	0.10	8.81	2,512.3	1,029.0
36	Kennesaw city, Cobb County	21,675	8,670	8.51	0.07	8.44	2,568.3	1,027.3
37	County	21,447	7,233	9.41	0.04	. 9.38	2,287.5	771.5
38	College Park city	20,382	8,351	9.72	0.01	9.71	2,099.8	860.3
	Clayton County (part)	1,5/2	7 700	2.70	0.00	2.70	581.5	207.5
39	Douglasville city, Douglas	20,065	7,903	21.51	0.01	21.38	938.5	<u>1,112.4</u> 369.6
40	Carrollton city Carroll County	19 843	7 577	20.69	0.52	20 17	0837	375.6
41	Belvedere Park CDP, DeKalb	18,945	7,010	4.98	0.00	4.98	3,801.9	1,406.8
. 42	North Druid Hills CDP, DeKalb County	18,852	10,240	4.98	0.01	4.97	3,790.0	2,058.7
43	Milledgeville city, Baldwin County	18,757	5,356	20.25	0.27	19.98	938.8	268.1
. 44	Thomasville city, Thomas County	18,162	7,788	14.93	0.06	. 14.87	1,221.4	523.7
45	Decatur city, DeKalb County	18,147	8,497	4.18	0.00	4.18	4,343.2	2,033.6
46	Evans CDP, Columbia County	17,727	6,632	10.00	0.07	9.94	1,784.1	667.5
47	Americus city, Sumter County	17,013	7,053	10.68	0.20	10.48	1,623.1	672.9
48	Newnan city, Coweta County Cartersville city, Bartow	<u>16,242</u> 15,925	<u>6,464</u> 6,130	18.10 23.51	0.19	17.92	906.4 680.7	262.0
		15 00-		40.0-			1 1 000 -	
50	Dublin City, Laurens County	15,857	6,977	13.27	0.06	13.21	1,200.7	528.3
51	Snellville city, Givinnett	15,600	6,952 5,391	25.19 9.70	7.98 0.04	17.22	906.0	403.8 558 1
	County				0.04			
53	Waycross city	15,333	7,534	11.71	0.02	11.69	1,311.8	644.5
ļ	Merce County (part)	45 000	7 504	0.68	0.00	0.68	0.0	0.0
54	North Decatur CDP, DeKalb	15,333	8,387	5.00	0.02	5.00	3.054.0	1.677.4
		15.000	6 400		0.10	0.00	+ 000 0	
55	Moultrie city, Till County	10,000	0,102	9.04	0.10	8.93	1,686.2	683.2
57	Wilmington Island CDP,	14,387	5,946	9.46	1.01	8.45	1,682.9	459.4 704.0
. 58	St. Marys city, Camden	13,761	5,351	20.29	1.53	18.75	.733.8	285.3
<u> </u>	County						<u> </u>	

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geograph... Page 3 of 17

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Area	In square i	niles	Density p mile of la	er square and area
			Housing	Total	Water	Land		Housing
Rank	Geographic area	Population	units	area	area	area	Population	units
59	Acworth city, Cobb County	13,422	5,453	7.60	0.53	7.08	1,896.9	770.7
60	St. Simons CDP, Glynn County	13,381	8,437	17.86	<sup>·</sup> 1.25	16.61	805.8	508.1
· 61	Druid Hills CDP, DeKalb County	12,741	4,830	4.21	0.02	4.19	3,040.4	1,152.6
<sup>·</sup> 62	Powder Springs city, Cobb County	12,481	4,101	6.35	0.01	6.34	1,969.2	647.0
63	Riverdale city, Clayton County	12,478	4,590	4.27	0.01	4.26	2,926.3	1,076.4
64	Panthersville CDP, DeKalb County	11,791	4,321	· 3.74	· 0.01	3.73	3,162.0	• 1,158.8
· 65	Mountain Park CDP, Gwinnett County	11,753	4,444	5.81	0.01	5.80	2,025.4	765.9
66	Fort Benning South CDP, Chattahoochee County	11,737	2,028	8.71	0.13	8.58	1,368.0	236.4
67	Bainbridge city, Decatur County	11,722	5,051	18.87	1.16	17.71	. 661.8	285.2
68	Union City city, Fulton County	.11,621	5,332	8.66	0.07	8.59	1,353.2	620.9
69	Cordele city, Crisp County	11,608	4,782	9.58	0.08	9.50	1,222.5	503.6
70	Covington city, Newton	11,547	4,542	13.86	0.10	13.76	839.2	330.1
71	Monroe city, Walton County	11,407	4,637	10.47	0.11	10.36	1,101.3	447.7
72	Sugar Hill city, Gwinnett County	11,399	4,115	9.16	.0.00	9.16	• 1,244.3	449.2
73	Liburn city, Gwinnett County	11,307	4,049	6.20	0.05	6.15	. 1,837.6	658.0
74	Garden City city, Chatham County	11,289	4,413	14.61	0.01	14.61	772.8	302.1
. 75	Fort Stewart CDP, Liberty County	11,205	1,936	6.60	0.00	· 6.60	1,697.1	293.2
76	Fayetteville city, Fayette County	11,148	4,572	9.98	0.08	9.89	1,126.7	462.1
77	Conyers city, Rockdale County	10,689	4,183	11.92	0.14	11.78	907.3	355.1
78	Buford city	10,668	4,044	14.78	0.05	14.73	724.4	274.6
ļ	Gwinnett County (part)	10,566	4,003	13.30	0.05	13.24	797.9	302.3
	Hall County (part)	• 102	41	1.48	0.00	· 1.48	68.7	· 27.6
79	Calhoun city, Gordon County	10,667	4,298	11.67	0.02	11.65	915.4	368.8
80	Douglas city, Coffee County	10,639	4,692	12.94	0.06	12.88	825.7	364.2
81	Georgetown CDP, Chatham County	10,599	4,341	11.93	0.45	11.48	923.3	378.2
82	Kingsland city, Camden County	10,506	4,203	16.87	0.14	16.73	627.9	251.2
83	Vidalia city	10,491	4,676	17.44	0.11	17.33	605.4	269.8
	Montgomery County (part)	160	51	0.85	. 0.00	0.85	188.4	60.0
.04	Minder elby Barrow County	10,331	4,625	16.59	0.11	10.48	041 5	280.7
85	Woodstock city, Cherokee	10,201	4,098	8.83	0.30	8.81	1,140.4	465.5
86	Doraville city, DeKalb County	C38 0	3 102	3 50	0.00	3 50	2747 0	864 1
87	Stockbridge city, Henry	9,853	3,991	11.00	0.05	10.95	900.0	364.6
88	Scottdale CDP, DeKalb	9,803	4,236	3.48	0.00	3.48	2,818.2	1,217.8
00	Vinings CDP Cabb County	0 677	5 670	2 20	0.11	2 10	2 020 0	1 700 0
. 00	Perny city	0,000	1 052	16 40	0.11	16 40	5,039.2	1,700.8
- 30	Houston County (nart)	9,002	4 052	15 17	0.00	15 17	6326	240.0
	Peach County (part)	3,555	-,002 1	1 25	· 0.00	1 25	24	0.102
91	Chamblee city, DeKalb	9,552	2,730	3.14	0.00	3.14	3,043.3	. 869.8
92	Cedartown city, Polk County	9 470	3.642	6 88	. 0.03	6.84	1.384.0	532 2
93	Thomaston city, Upson	9,411	4,152	9.20	0.14	9.05	1,039.4	458.6
94	Toccoa city, Stenhens County	9 323	4 378	8.36	0.05	8.31	1 121 3	526.6
	Cool on, crophene county			0.00	0.00	0.01	1,121.0	020.0

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geograph... Page 4 of 17

		•.		Area	in square i	miles	Density p mile of la	er square and area
Ranl	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
95	Jesup city, Wayne County	9,279	3,469	16.59	0.05	16.54	561.2	209.8
96	Cairo city, Grady County	9,239	3,898	9.37	· 0.05	9.31	992.0	418.5
97	Gresham Park CDP, DeKalb County	9,215	3,104	2.84	0.00	2.83	3,252.1	1,095.4
98	Fitzgerald city	8,758	3,968	7.29	0.04	7.25	1,208.8	547.7
	Ben Hill County (part)	8,723	3,953	7.24	0.04	7.20	1,211.4	548.9
	Irwin County (part)	35	15	0.04	0.00	0.04	794.7	340.6
99	Suwanee city, Gwinnett County	8,725	3,144	9.88	0.07	9.81	889.5	320.5
100	McDonough city, Henry County	8,493	3,234	7.80	0.04	7.76	1,093.8	416.5
101	Fair Oaks CDP, Cobb County	8,443	3,136	1.96	0.01	1.95	4,325.4	1,606.6
102	Norcross city, Gwinnett County	8,410	2,750	4.11	0.01	4.10	2,050.4	670.5
103	Fort Valley city, Peach County	8,005	3,303	5.27	0.00	5.27	1,519.5	627.0
104	Irondale CDP, Clayton County	7,727	2,649	3.20	0.00	3.20	2,414.8	827.8
105	Canton city, Cherokee County	7,709	2,879	14.26	0.00	14.26	540.5	201.8
106	Glynn County	7,594	3,539	4.79	0.04	4.75	1,600.1	745.7
107	Clarkston city, DeKalb County	7,231	2,622	1.06	0.01	1.05	6,856.3	2,486.1
108	Stone Mountain city, DeKalb County	7,145	2,638	1.62	0.01	. 1.62	4,423.4	1,633.2
109	Richmond Hill city, Bryan County	6,959	2,573	10.19	0.05	10.14	686.5	253.8
110	Dock Junction CDP, Glynn County	6,951	3,085	10.69	1.14	9.55	728.2	323.2
111	Swainsboro city, Emanuel County	6,943	3,051	12.69	Ó.30	12.39	560.5	246.3
112	Fort Oglethorpe city	6,940	3,108	13.03	. 0.00	13.03	532.6	238.5
` <b> </b>	Catoosa County (part)	6,755	3,073	10.52	0.00	10.52	. 642.4	292.2
}	Walker County (part)	185	35	2.51	0.00	2.51	73.6	13.9
113	Chatham County	. 6,914	3,491	17.86	1.51	16.36	422.7	213.4
114	Aubum city	6,904	2,322	5.34	0.00	5.34	1,293.3	435.0
	Barrow County (part)	6,610	2,225	5.21	. 0.00	5.21	1,269.5	427.3
115	Thomson city, McDuffie	6,828	2,895	<u> </u>	0.00	3.95	1.726.9	736.4
1 440	County	6.764	0.000	00.00	0.10	00.50	000.4	100.0
117	La Fayette city, Walker	6,702	2,000	20.68	0.13	20.56	828.1	361.6
118	Fairview CDP, Walker County	6.601	2,734	7.50	0.00	7.50	879.7	364.4
119	Pooler city, Chatham County	6.239	2.356	28.84	0.19	28.65	217.8	82.2
120	Conley CDP, Clayton County	6,188	2,053	1.93	0.02	1.91	3,234.2	1,073.0
121	Hapeville city, Fulton County	6,180	2,538	2.37	0.00	2.37	2,608.3	1,071.2
122	Sandersville city, Washington County	6,144	2,589	9.22	0.08	9.14	672.1	283.2
123	Grovetown city, Columbia County	6,089	2,473	2.89	0.01	2.88	2,111.9	857.7
124	Sylvester city, Worth County	5,990	2,378	5.74	. 0.03	5.71	1,049.1	416.5
125	Barnesville city, Lamar County	5,972	2,257	5.67	0.01	5.66	1,055.9	399.1
126	Whitemarsh Island CDP, Chatham County	5,824	2,427	· 6.61	0.71	5.90	. 987.5	411.5
127	Waynesboro city, Burke County	5,813	2,395	5.52	0.06	5.46	1,064.1	438.4
128	Blakely city, Early County	5,696	2,251	17.61	0.13	17.47	326.0	128.8
129	Camilla city, Mitchell County	5,669	2,128	6.11	0.01	6.10	929.4	348.9
130	Fairburn city, Fulton County	5,464	2,005	7.32	0.05	7.28	750.9	275.5
131	Eastman city, Dodge County	5,440	2,418	5.11	0.01	5.10	1,067.3	474.4
132	Loganville city	5,435	2,059	6.04	0.01	6.03	901.0	341.3
	Gwinnett County (part)	1,285	446	1.27	0.00	1.27	1,012.1	351.3

				Area	In square i	miles	Density pe mile of la	er square - Ind area
	•		Housing	Total	Water	Land		Housing
Rank	Geographic area	Population	units	area	area	area	Population	units
	Walton County (part)	4,150	1,613	4.77	0.01	4.76	871.4	338.7
.133	Austell city	5,359	2,144	.5.70	0.01	5.69	942.1	376.9
	Cobb County (part)	5,230	2,078	5.64	0.01	5.63	928.9	369.1
	Douglas County (part)	129	66	0.06	0.00	0.06	2,229.0	1,140.4
134	Adel city, Cook County	5,307	2,164	7.97	0.10	· 7.87	674.1	274.9
135	Commerce city, Jackson County	5,292	2,273	8.31	0.01	8.30	637.3	273.7
136	Midway-Hardwick CDP, Baldwin County	5,135	2,223	4.92	0.02	4.91	1,046.8	453.2
137	Dawson city, Terrell County	· 5,058	1,967	3.68	0.00	3.68	1,373.5	534.1
138	Dallas city, Paulding County	5,056	2,150	4.54	0.03	4.51	1,120.7	476.5
139	Morrow city, Clayton County	4,882	1,823	2.96	0.01	2.95	1,656.9	618.7
140	Lakeview CDP	4,820	2,160	2.29	0.01	2.28	2,112.1	946.5
	Catoosa County (part)	3,910	1,709	1.88	0.01	1.87	2,093.5	915.0
	Walker County (part)	910	451	0.41	0.00	0.41	2,195.7	1,088.2
141	Elberton city, Elbert County	4,743	2,265	4.02	0.02	4.01	1,183.4	565.1
142	Nashville city, Berrien County	4,697	2,098	4.69	0.05	4.64	1,012.2	452.1
143	Quitman city, Brooks County	4,638	2,034	3.85	0.02	3.83	1,211.1	531.1
144	Bremen city	4,579	1,978	8.91	0.03	8.88	515.7	222.8
	Carroll County (part)	27	11	1.98	0.02	1.96	13.8	5.6
	Haralson County (part)	4,552	1,967	6.93	0.01	6.92	657.6	284.1
145	Summerville city, Chattooga County	4,556	2,092	3.98	0.00	3.98	• 1,144.3	525.4
146	Cochran city, Bleckley County	4,455	1,851	4.22	0.14	4.09	1,090.5	453.1
147	Ashburn city, Turner County	4,419	1,846	4.55	0.03	4.52	978.6	. 408.8
148	Rincon city, Effingham County	4,376	1,892	6.72	0.01	6.71	651.9	281.9
149	Washington city, Wilkes County	4,295	1,974	7.86	0.02	7.84	547.5	251.6
150	Centerville city, Houston County	4,278	1,687	2.80	0.00	2.80	1,526.4	601.9
151	Cumming city, Forsyth County	4,220	1,507	5.90	0.02	5.89	717.1	256.1
152	Hartwell city, Hart County	4,188	1,950	4.63	0.00	4.63	904.9	421.3
153	Lyons city, Toombs County	4,169	1,787	7.53	0.04	7.48	557.1	238.8
154 155t	Baxley city, Appling County Montgomery CDP, Chatham	4,150	1,866 1.668	7.15	0.00	7.15	580.7	
	County	1101	1 700	10 70		10.50		1/0.0
1551	Villa Hica City	4,134	1,769	12.72	0.16	12.56	329.2	140.9
. <b></b>	Carroll County (part)	3,871	1,608	8.04	0.05	7.99	484.4	201.2
150	Douglas County (pan)	263	161	4.68	0.12	4.57	57.0	35.3
150	Lipdolo CDP. Floyd Coupty	4,120	1,091	4.00	0.01	5.51	741.6	325.9
157	Chattanooga Valley CDP, Walker County	4,065	1,698	<u> </u>	. 0.00	7.54	539.3	225.3
159	Walthourville city, Liberty County	4,030	1,639	3.79	· 0.00	3.79	1,064.2	432.8
160	Montezuma city, Macon County	3,999	1,673	4.53	0.03	4.50	887.9	371.5
161	Manchester city	3,988	1,853	5.72	0.01	5.71	698.1	324.4
	Meriwether County (part)	3,895	1,811	5.47	0.01	5.46	712.9	331.5
	Talbot County (part)	93	42	0.25	0.00	0.25	. 374.0	168.9
162	Robins AFB CDP, Houston County	3,949	791	2.73	0.02	2.71	1,458.3	292.1
163	Jackson city, Butts County	3,934	1,668	4.73	0.02	4.70	836.3	354.6
.164	Tyrone town, Fayette County	3,916	1,425	12.75	0.11	12.65	309.6	112.7
165	Hephzibah city, Richmond County	3,880	1,570	19.42	0.06	. 19.36	200.4	81.1
166	Metter city, Candler County	3,879	1,522	7.39	0.07	7.32	529.8	207.9
167	Rockmart city, Polk County	3,870	1,681	· 4.37	0.03	4.34	892.0	387.5
. 168	Hampton city, Henry County	3,857	1,525	4.32	0.03	4.29	899.6	· 355.7
169	Dacula city, Gwinnett County	3,848	1,319	2.89	0.00	2.89	1,333.0	456.9
170	Jonesboro city, Clayton	3,829	1,561	2.64	0.05	2.59	1,477.4	602.3

				Area	in square i	miles	Density p mile of la	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area County	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
171	Jefferson city, Jackson County	3,825	1,522	18.98	0.00	18.98	201.6	80.2
172	Hazlehurst city, Jeff Davis County	3,787	1,810	4.71	0.02	4.69	807.1	385.8
173	Forsyth city, Monroe County	3,776	1,560	4.98	0.00	4.98	758.8	313.5
174	Cuthbert city, Randolph County	3,731	1,549	3.05	0.00	3.05	1,223.5	507.9
175	Cornelia city, Habersham County	3,674	1,611	3.43	0.00	3.43	1,071.3	469.7
176	Glennville city, Tattnall County	. 3,641	1,668	6.63	· 0.05	6.58	553.4	253.5
177	Dahlonega city, Lumpkin County	3,638	1,181	6.40	0.00	6.40	568.1	184.4
178	Madison city, Morgan County	3,636	1,494	8.90	0.04	8.86	410.2	168.5
179	Chatsworth city, Murray County	3,531	1,546	4.74	0.02	4.71	749.5	328.1
180	Rossville city, Walker County	3,511	1,693	1.80	0.00	1.80	1,945.7	938.2
181	Millen city, Jenkins County	3,492	1,567	3.61	0.00	3.61	966.9	433.9
102	Coweta County (part)	3,400	93	0.51	0.10	0.51	641.9	· <u>247.0</u> · 182.5
	Fulton County (part)	3,073	1,190	4.77	0.10	4.67	657.7	254.7
183	Tybee Island city, Chatham County	3,392	2,696	2.67	0.12	2.56	1,326.3	1,054.2
184	West Point city	3,382	1,515	4.55	0.13	4.43	764.3	342.4
	Harris County (part)	708	317	0.66	0.01	0.65	1,089.1	487.6
	Troup County (part)	2,674	1,198	3.89	0.12	3.78	.708.3	317.3
185	Newton County (part)	3,379	1,264	0.18	0.03	11.25	300.5	· 112.4
	Walton County (part)	3.379	1.264	11.09	0.03	11.07	305.3	114.2
186	Blackshear city, Pierce County	. 3,283	1,518	4.37	0.09	· 4.28	766.6	354.5
187	Hawkinsville city, Pulaski County	3,280	. 1,579	4.45	0.07	4.38	748.4	360.3
188	Port Wentworth city, Chatham County	3,276	1,377	16.48	. 0.03	16.45	199.2	83.7
189	Ocilla city, Irwin County	3,270	1,283	2.59	0.01	2.59	1,264.3	496.0
190	Hannahs Mill CDP, Upson County	3,267	1,379	4.38	0.01	· 4.37	747.9	315.7
191	Greensboro city, Greene County	3,238	1,264	5.85	0.03	5.82	556.5	217.2
192	Alma city, Bacon County	3,236	1,510	5.82	0.09	5.73	564.6	263.5
193	Experiment CDP, Spalding County	3,233	1,259	. 3.04	0.00	3.04	1,063.4	414.1
194	Euharlee city, Bartow County	3,208	1,057	4.73	0.11	4.62	694.6	228.8
195	County	3,195	1,173	3.17	. 0.00	3.17	1,008.5	370.3
196	Putney CDP, Dougherty County	2,998	1,223	21.67	0.19	21.48	139.6	56.9
197	Vienna city, Dooly County	2,973	1,180	5.26	0.01	5.25	566.2	224.7
198	County	2,904	976	1.21	0.00	1.21	2,391.7	803.8
199	Byron city, Peach County	2,887	1,177	5.83	0.01	5.82	495.7	202.1
200	Soperton city, Treutien	2,824	1,022	3.26	0.00	3.24	870.6	374.6
202	Homerville city, Clinch County	2.803	1.192	2.21	0.00	2.21	1.270.4	540.2
203	Donalsonville city, Seminole County	2,796	1,116	3.99	0.01	3.98	702.8	280.5
204	Tallapoosa city, Haralson County	2,789	1,334	7.46	0.03	7.43	375.6	179.7
205	Hogansville city, Troup County	2,774	1,249	6.67	0.03	6.64	418.1	188.2
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	T	

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geograph... Page 7 of 17

<b></b>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					[	1
				Area	in square i	miles	Density po mile of la	er square ind area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing
206	Unadilla city, Dooly County	2.772	739	5.21	0.01	5.20	532.9	142.1
207	Lakeland city, Lanler County	2,730	1,162	3.13	0.04	3.10	881.0	375.0
208	Louisville city, Jefferson County	2,712	1,123	3.65	0.06	3.59	755.5	312.8
209	Oakwood city, Hall County	2.689	1.098	3.13	0.00	3.13	859.1	350.8
210	McRae city, Telfair County	2.682	1.310	3.39	0.02	3.37	796.7	389.1
211	Sylvania city, Screven County	2,675	1,285	3.79	0.00	3.79	705.5	338.9
212	Bloomingdale city, Chatham County	2,665	1,051	13.31	0.13	13.18	202.3	79.8
213	Lakeview Estates CDP, Rockdale County	2,637	:686	0.57	0.04	0.53	4,992.0	1,298.6
214	Leesburg city, Lee County	2,633	851	4.78	0.06	4.73	557.2	. 180.1
215	Avondale Estates city, DeKalb County	2,609	1,263	. 1.13	0.01	1.12	2,327.7	1,126.8
216	Isle of Hope CDP, Chatham County	2,605	1,038	2.11	<sup>:.</sup> 0.21	1.90	1,373.2	547.2
217	Kings Bay Base CDP, Camden County	2,599	434	2.05	0.00	· 2.05	1,269.4	212.0
218	Adairsville city, Bartow County	2,542	1,103	6.17	. 0.00	6.17	411.9	178.7
219	Lovejoy city, Clayton County	2,495	596	2.34	0.00	2.34	1,064.3	254.2
220	Royston city	2,493	1,135	3.42	0.00	3.42	728.4	331.6
	Franklin County (part)	1,846	860	2.13	0.00	2.13	867.1	403.9
<u> </u>	Han County (pan)	647	275	1.28	0.00	1.28	503.8	214.1
221	East Dublin city, Laurens	2,484	1,105	2.96	0.00	2.92	849.3	377.8
222	Monticello city, Jasper County	2 428	1 006	3.04	0.02	3.01	805.8	333.0
223	Baldwin city	2.425	912	3.59	0.00	3.59	674.9	253.8
	Banks County (part)	432	194	0.97	0.00	0.97	445.1	199.9
	Habersham County (part)	1,993	718	2.62	0.00	2.62	759.9	273.8
224	Ringgold city, Catoosa County	2,422	1,116	3.94	0.01	3.93	617.0	284.3
225	Temple city	2,383	956	6.86	0.10	6.76	352.3	141.3
	Carroll County (part)	2,383	956	6.85	0.10	. 6.75	352.8	141.5
	Haralson County (part)	0	0	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.0	. 0.0
226	Pembroke city, Bryan County	2,379	909	7.63	0.02	7.61	. 312.5	119.4
227	Thunderbolt town, Chatham County	2,340	1,096	1.45	0.18	1.27	. 1,836.9	860.4
228	Locust Grove city, Henry County	2,322	863	2.20	0.07	2.13	1,089.5	404.9
229	Wrens city, Jefferson County	2,314	1,030	3.05	0.01	3.04	760.1	338.3
230	Helena city	2,307	603	2.11	0.00	2.11	1,092.3	285.5
	Teltair County (part)	2,307	603	2.07	0.00	2.07	1,115.8	291.7
	wheeler County (pan)	0	0	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.0	0.0
231	Clayton city, Wilcox County	2,298	467	3.08	• 0.02	3.06	/50.9	152.6
232	Chickamauga city, Walker	2,245	951	1.83	0.00	1.56	1,238.8	524.8
234	Reidsville city, Tattnall County	2 235	1 131	7 71	50.0	7 69	201 1	147 3
235	Wrightsville city, Johnson County	2,223	978	3.49	0.06	3.43	648.1	285.1
236	Lithonia city, DeKalb County	2.187	892	0.79	0.00	0.79	2,770,2	1,129.9
237	Folkston city, Charlton County	2.178	976	3.60	0.00	3.60	605.7	271.4
238	Jasper city, Pickens County	2,167	1,030	3.30	0.00	3.30	657.0	312.3
239	Gordon city, Wilkinson County	2,152	951	5.46	0.06	5.40	398.3	176.0
240	Reed Creek CDP, Hart County	2,148	1,705	34.55	11.21	23.34	92.0	73.1
- 241	Watkinsville town, Oconee County	2,097	862	3.23	0.01	3.22	650.6	267.4
242	Wadley city, Jefferson County	2,088	872	4.60	0.05	4.56	458.3	191.4
243	Mount Vernon city, Montgomery County	2,082	840	. 4.12	0.00	4.12	505.4	203.9
244	Unionville CDP, Tift County	2,074	859	0.75	0.00	0.75	2,766.6	1,145.9

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geograph... Page 8 of 17

			·		·		,	
1				Area	in square i	mlies ·	Density p mile of la	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
245	Lithia Springs city, Douglas	2,072	918	2.21	0.00	2.21	937.6	415.4
246	Statham city, Barrow County	2,040	• 774	3.58	0.05	3.53	577.9	219.3
247	Gumlog CDP, Franklin County	2,025	1,430	16.27	2.68	13.59	149.0	105.2
248	Clayton city, Rabun County	2,019	1,006	3.09	0.00	3.09	653.2	325.5
249	Warrenton city, Warren	2,013	909	1.91	0.01	1.90	· 1,056.9	477.3
250	Trion town, Chattooga County	1,993	906	4.00	<sup>•</sup> 0.02	3.98	500.9	227.7
251	Indian Springs CDP, Catoosa County	1,982	801	2.57	0.00	2.57	771.9	311.9
252	Bowdon city, Carroll County	1,959	. 893	3.40	0.00	3.40	576.5	262.8
253	Alamo city, Wheeler County	1,943	414	1.92	0.01	1.92	1,014.5	216.2
254	Trenton city, Dade County	1,942	843	3.07	0.00	3.07	632.5	274.6
255	Colquitt city, Miller County	1,939	868	8.26	0.01	8.25	235.0	105.2
256t	Butler city, Taylor County	1,907	851	3.18	0.01	3.17	602.2	268.7
256t	Cleveland city, White County	1,907	808	3.16	0.00	3.16	602.7	255.4
257	Deenwood CDP, Ware	1,892	534 856	2.56	0.00	2.56	545.2	208.9
250	County	1,000	000	0.07	0.00	0.07	470.0	207.2
259	Springfield city, Effingham	1,821	704	2.13	0.00	2.13	854.3	330.3
261	Raoul CDP, Habersham	1.816	284	1.95	0.00	1.95	932.6	145.8
- 262	County	1 014	762	0.52	0.01	2.52	710.0	302.8
263	Grav city, Jones County	1,014	713	2.53	0.01	2.52	748.8	294.8
264	Flowery Branch town, Hall	1,806	. 820	2.50	0.01	2.49	725.3	329.3
265	Pearson city, Atkinson County	1.805	742	2.89	0.00	2.89	624.1	256.6
266	Bichland city, Stewart County	1,794	716	4.20	0.02	4.18	429.3	171.3
267	Sparks town, Cook County	1,755	743	3.93	0.27	3.65	480.3	203.3
268	Twin City city, Emanuel County	1,752	, 632	3.58	0.00	3.58	489.3	<sup>.</sup> 176.5
269	Senoia city, Coweta County	1,738	662	4.72	0.09	4.63	. 375.0	142.8
270	Darien city, Mcintosh County	1,719	832	1.98	0.00	1.98	869.6	420.9
271	Berkeley Lake city, Gwinnett County	1,695	610	1.14	0.14	1.01	1,682.8	605.6
272	Shannon CDP, Floyd County	1,682	723	5.02	0.00	5.02	335.2	144.1
273	Union Point city, Greene County	1,669	744	. 2.09	0.03	2.06	811.4	361.7
274	Buena Vista city, Marion County	1,664	756	3.28	0.03	3.24	512.9	233.0
275	Arcade city, Jackson County	1,643	609	6.48	0.02	6.46	254.2	94.2
276	East Griffin CDP, Spalding County	1,635	654	1.56	0.01	1.55	1,056.6	422.7
277	Hahira city, Lowndes County	1,626	715	2.29	0.09	2.20	739.4	325.1
278	Lookout Mountain city, Walker County	1,617	657	2.66	· 0.00	2.66	608.3	247.2
279	Ellaville city, Schley County	1,609	693	3.18	- 0.00	3.18	505.9	217.9
280	Arlington city	1,602	695	4.01	0.01	4.00	400.9	173.9
	. Calhoun County (part)	1,161	525	2.39	. 0.00	2.39	486.2	219.9
<u> </u>	Early County (part)	441	170	1.61	0.01	1.61	274.3	· 105.7
281	Lincolnton city, Lincoln County	1,595	657	3.20	0.00	3.20	498.6	205.4
282	Ellijay city, Gilmer County	1,584	662	2.68	0.00	2.68	591.7	247.3
283	Davisboro city, Washington County	1,544	158	3.06	0.00	3.06	505.0	51.7
284	Sparta city, Hancock County	1,522	725	1.83	0.00	1.82	· 835.4	397.9
285	Tennille city, Washington County	1,505	683	1.73	0.01	1.72	876.1	397.6
286	Varnell city, Whitfield County	1,491	526	2.46	0.00	. 2.46	606.9	214.1
1	Demorest city, Habersham							

Demorest city, Habersham
Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geograph... Page 9 of 17

·					Area	In square i	Density per square mile of land area		
/    A	lank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
	287	County	· 1,465	564	2.30	0.02	2.27	644.4	248.1
	288	Morgan city, Calhoun County	1,464	. 128	1.32	0.00	1.32	· 1,113.3	97.3
Ľ	289	Ludowici city, Long County	1,440	636	2.23	0.01	2.22	649.0	286.6
Ľ	290	Lula city	1,438	585	2.77	0.00	. 2.76	520.1	211.6
F		Banks County (part)	84	44	0.57	0.00	0.56	149.1	
$\left  \right $	291	Hall County (part) Willacoochee city, Atkinson	1,354	541 655	2.20	0.00	2.20	615.0 378.0	245.7
H		County	1 400		0.00	0.00	0.10	440.0	
H	292	Broxton City, Conee County	1,428	612	3.28	0.04	3.24	440.8	188.9
· [-	293	Boston City, Milcox County	1,417	642	1 00	0.00	2.23	030.0	283.6
H	294	Suppyside CDP, Ware County	1,415	. 042 600	1.00	0.00	1.00	076.0	342.3
H	295	Lumpkin city Stewart County	1,365	621	1.47	0.00	1.42	\$ 862.2	423.2
H	207	Hiram city, Baulding County	1 361	506	3.03	0.02	3.01	452.5	168.2
H	2981	Edison city, Calboun County	1,001	584	2 33	0.02	2 33	575.9	251.0
H	298t	Omena city	1,340	522	1.78	0.00	1.78	754.7	294.0
- H		Colquitt County (part)	1	1	0.07	0.01	0.07	15.0	15.0
F		Tift County (part)	1.339	521	1.71	0.01	1.71	783.6	304.9
	299	Marshallville city, Macon	1,335	582	3.16	0.00	3.16	422.8	184.3
1	300	Grantville city. Coweta County	1,309	569	5.21	0.02	5.19	252.0	109.6
	301	East Newnan CDP, Coweta County	1,305	508	2.96	0.07	2.89	451.0	175.6
	302	Porterdale town, Newton	1,281	487	1.03	0.00	1.03	1,241.3	471.9
	303	Mount Zion city, Carroll County	1,275	467	9.92	0.17	9.75	130.7	47.9
	304	Clarkesville city, Habersham County	1,248	639	. 1.86	0.00	1.86	670.6	343.3
(   -	305t	Lumber City city, Telfair County	1,247	578	1.94	0.00	1.94	642.7	297.9
	305t	Maysville town	1,247	529	3.60	0.00	3.60	346.1	146.8
		Banks County (part)	672	279	1.85	0.00	1.85	363.8	151.0
. [		Jackson County (part)	575	250	1.76	0.00	1.76	327.6	142.4
	305t	Nicholson city, Jackson County	1,247	484	2.95	0.00	2.95	423.3	164.3
$\left[ \right]$	306	Walnut Grove town, Walton County	1,241	473	1.52	0.00	1.52	813.9	310.2
:	307	Woodbine city, Camden County	1,218	520	2.24	0.00	2.24	543.1	231.9
:	308	Blue Ridge city, Fannin County	1,210	631	2.17	0.00	2.17	557.2	290.6
	309t	Jeffersonville city, Twiggs County	1,209	. 496	3.68	0.00	3.68	328.8	134.9
:	309t	Tunnel Hill city, Whitfield County	. 1,209	474	1.52	0.00	1.52	794.7	311.6
13	310	Braselton town	1,206	491	7.20	0.00	7.20	167.4	68.1
		Barrow County (part)	-242	105	1.85	0.00	1.85	131.1	56.9
L		Gwinnett County (part)	240	100	2.75	• 0.00	2.75	87.3	36.4
·		Hall County (part)	23	8	0.27	0.00	0.27	83.9	29.2
F		Jackson County (part)	. 701	278	2.33	0.00	2.33	300.3	119.1
	311.	Oglethorpe city, Macon County	1,200	566	. 2.06	0.03	2.03	590.3	278.4
	312	Cusseta city, Chattahoochee County	1,196	543	1.52	0.01	1.52	787.8	357.7
:	313	Woodbury city, Meriwether County	1,184	499	2.02	0.01	2.01	588.7	248.1
1	314	Zebulon city, Pike County	1,181	499	3.54	0.04	3.49	338.0	142.8
L	315	Sardis town, Burke County	1,171	519	1.51	0.00	1.51	776.3	344.1
	316	Shellman city, Randolph County	1,166	465	3.15	· 0.00	3.15	369.8	147.5
13	<u>317  </u>	Pine Mountain town	1,141	. 882	2.80	0.10	2.69	423.9	327.7

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geogra... Page 10 of 17

·									
			•		Area in square miles			Density po mile of la	er square and area
		:					·		
			-	Housing	Total	Water	Land		Housing
R	lank	Geographic area	Population	. units	area	area	area	Population	units
L		Harris County (part)	1,118	871	2.66	0.10	2.55	437.7	341.0
		Meriwether County (part)	23	11	0.14	0.00	0.14	167.6	80.2
	318	Lincoln Park CDP, Upson County	. 1,122	520	1.03	0.00	1.03	1,094.2	507.1
Ŀ	319	Brooklet town, Bulloch County	1,113	467	3.10	· 0.04	3.06	364.0	152.7
Ľ	320	Fort Gaines city, Clay County	1,110	519	7.72	2.93	4.79	231.6	108.3
	3211	Ivey town, Wilkinson County	1,100	529	2.98	0.42	2.56	430.2	206.9
Ŀ	3211	Midway city, Liberty County	1,100	395	5.60	0.04	5.56	197.8	71.0
Ľ	322	Emerson city, Bartow County	1,092	408	5.92	0.02	5.90	185.0	69.1
Ŀ	323	Meigs city	1,090	460	1.61	0.02	1.59	686.4	289.7
		Mitchell County (part)	29	·13	0.29	0.00	0.29	101.6	45.5
		Thomas County (part)	1,061	447	1.32	0.02	1.30	814.7	343.2
F	324	McCaysville city, Fannin County	1,07,1	· 604	1.63	0.05	1.57	680.8	383.9
·	325	Hoschton city, Jackson County	1,070	404	2.45	0.00	2.45	437.2	165.1
	326	Winterville city, Clarke County	1,068	432	2.65	0.00	· 2.65	. 403.2	163.1
	327	Comer city, Madison County	1,052	. 424	3.18	0.00	3.18	330.6	133.2
	328	Bogart town	1,049	· 457	2.39	0.01	2.38	441.6	192.4
Γ		Clarke County (part)	118	· 51	. 0.23	0.01	0.22	540.6	233.7
		Oconee County (part)	931	406	2.16	0.00	2.16	431.6	188.2
	329	Aragon city, Polk County	1,039	424	1.08	0.00	1.08	965.1	393.9
	330	Reynolds town, Taylor County	1,036	495	1.33	. 0.01	1.32	784.9	375.0
	331	Talbotton city, Talbot County	1,019	420	3.13	0.01	3.12	326.8	134.7
	332	Milan town	1,012	383	3.15	0.01	3.14	322.6	122.1
F		Dodge County (part)	434	206	1.40	0.00	1.40	309.4	146.9
F		Telfair County (part)	578	177	1.75	0.01	1.73	333.2	102.0
	333	Nicholls city, Coffee County	1.008	500	1.56	0.00	1.56	646.4	320.6
	334	Moody AFB CDP, Lowndes County	993	330	0.40	0.00	. 0.40	2,452.6	815.1
	335	Cave Spring city, Floyd County	975	431	4.03	0.02	. 4.02	242.7	107.3
	336	Georgetown city, Quitman County	973	554	3.94	. 1.20	2.74	355.0	202.1
	337	Homer town, Banks County	950	406	9.59	0.00	9.59	99.1	42.4
	3381	Greenville city, Meriwether County	. 946	432	<sup>.</sup> 1.83	0.01	1.82	520.8	237.8
	3381	Poulan city, Worth County	946	399	1.66	0.00	1.66	571.2	240.9
	339	Buchanan city, Haralson County	941	380	· 1.68	0.20	1.47	638.6	257.9
	340	Nahunta city, Brantley County	930	470	2.99	0.00	2.99	311.2	157.3
	341	Guyton city, Effingham County	917	340	1.20	0.01	1.19	770.3	285.6
	342	Franklin city, Heard County	902	398	3.39	0.14	3.25	277.8	122.6
H	3431	Bowman city. Elbert County	898	411	2.57	0.00	2.57	350.0	160.2
H	3431	Hagan city, Evans County	898	421	2.18	0.10	2.09	430.5	201.8
H	344	Lenox town, Cook County	889	405	1.26	0.02	1.24	717.0	326.6
H	345	Phillipsburg CDP. Tift County	887	370	0.31	0.00	0.31	2.846.8	1,187 5
	346	Glenwood city, Wheeler	884	409	3.16	0.00	3.16	279.9	129.5
H	347	Alto town	876	325	0.83	0.00	0.83	1.061.2	393 7
F		Banks County (part)	357	125	0.36	0.00	0.36	990.5	346.8
F	<u> </u>	Habersham County (part)	519	200	0.47	0.00	0.47	1.116.0	430 1
	348	Sunset Village CDP, Upson	871	358	4.97	0.05	4.93	176.8	72.7
F	349	Enigma town, Berrien County	869	348	3.28	. 0.03	3.25	267.2	107.0
	350 1	Newton city. Baker County	851	346	3.02	0.11	2 91	2927	119.0
	351	Norman Park city, Colquitt	849	374	3.13	0.02	3.11	272.6	120.1
	352	Remerton city, Lowndes County	847	492	0.21	<u></u> 0.00	0.21	4,117.8	2,391.9
F									

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geogra... Page 11 of 17

	الكريبي والمتحد المتحد المتحد الألبية المتحد والمتحد والمتحد المتحد والمتحد والمتحد والمتحد والمتحد والمتحد						and the second	and the second
	· · ·		• .	Area in square miles			Density p mile of i	er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
353	Dasher town, Lowndes County	834	322	4.95	0.09	4.86	171.7	66.3
354	Mountain City town, Rabun County	829	462	1.79	0.01	1.79	464.1	258.6
355	Doerun city, Colquitt County .	828	385	1.27	0.01	1.26	658.3	306.1
356	Resaca city, Gordon County	815	280	2.83	0.07	2.76	295.4	101.5
357t	Hiawassee town, Towns County	808	527	2.15	0.47	1.69	479.5	312.7
3571	Roberta city, Crawford County	808	330	1.50	0.02	1.48	544.3	222.3
358	Crawford city, Oglethorpe County	807	369	1.17	0.00	1.17	687.5	314.4
359	Baconton city, Mitchell County	804	310	1.28	0.00	1.28	626.5	· 241.5
360	Allenhurst town, Liberty County	788	· 326	1.14	0.01	1.13	694.3	287.2
361	Luthersville city, Meriwether County	.783	299	3.08	0.01	3.07	254.9	97.4
362	Smithville city, Lee County	774	305	2.55	0.00	2.55	303.6	119.6
363t	Grayson city, Gwinnett County	765	288	1.76	0.00	1.76	435.8	164.1
363t	Homeland city, Charlton County	765	318	2.58	0.00	2.58	296.9	123.4
364	Franklin Springs city, Franklin County	762	227	2.10	0.00	2.10	363.6	108.3
365	Canon city	755	361	3.18	0.00	3.18	· 237.5	113.5
	Franklin County (part)	688	, `331	2.63	0.00	2.63	261.7	125.9
· ·	Hart County (part)	67	30	0.55	0.00	0.55	121.7	54.5
366	Ray City city, Berrien County	746	341	0.80	0.00	0.80	936.3	428.0
367	Fairmount city, Gordon	745	334	. 1.20	0.00	• 1.20	619.9	277.9
368	Riceboro city, Liberty County	736	292	11.40	0.31	11.09	66.4	26.3
369t	Ball Ground city, Cherokee County	730	298	1.24	0.00	1.24	589.1	240.5
369t	Stillmore town, Emanuel County	730	253	3.20	.0.02	3.18	. 229.8	79.6
370t	Blythe city	• 718	262	2.84	0.01	2.83	253.6	92.5
	Burke County (part)	5	1	0.29	0.01	0.29	17.4	3.5
	Richmond County (part)	. 713	261	2.55	0.01	2.54	280.4	102.6
370t	County	718	298	5.36	0.16	5.19	138.3	57.4
3711	Bethlehem town, Barrow County	716	265	2.16	0.00	. 2.16	331.8	122.8
371t	Ty Ty city, Tift County	<sup>·</sup> 716	289	0.80	0.00	0.80	897.1	362.1
372	Pavo city	711	345	1.76	0.00	1.76	403.1	195.6
<u>├</u>	Thomas County (part)	293	200	0.89	0.00	0.89	330.7 A76 1	163.7
373	Waverly Hall town, Harris	709	267	3.41	0.05	3.36	211.2	79.5
374t	East Ellijay city, Gilmer	707	265	1.98	0.00	1.98	357.6	134.0
3741	Rutledge city. Morgan County	707	280	3.28	0.01	3.27	215.9	85.5
375	Screven city, Wayne County	702	346	2.17	0.00	2.17	324.0	159.7
376	Gibson city, Glascock County	694	325	1.04	0.01	1.04	669.1	313.3
377	White city, Bartow County	. 693	274	0.91	0.00	0.91	764.8	302.4
378	Alapaha town, Berrien County	682	318	1.00	0.00	1.00	684.5	319.2
379	Leary city, Calhoun County	666	288	3.20	0.01	3.19	208.8	90.3
3801	Biairsville city, Union County	659	261	1.06	0.00	1.06	619.7	245.4
381	Tighall town, Wilkes County	653	207	2.01	0.00	0.01	927 1	100 5
382	Flovilla city. Butts County	652	· 222	1.95	0.00	1.95	334.7	114.0
383	Plains city, Sumter County	637	244	0.82	0.00	0.82	780.0	298.8
384	Morven city, Brooks County	634	250	1.74	0.01	1.73	366.0	144.3
385	Whigham city, Grady County	631	212	1.18	0.00	1.18	533.8	179.4

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geogra... Page 12 of 17

			•	Area in square miles			Density p mile of la	Density per square mile of land area		
Denk		Deputation	Housing	Total	Water	Land	Benuistien	Housing		
Rank	Betterson city Pierce County	Population 627	UNITS 218	area 272	area	area 2 72	Population			
387	Nelson city	626	275	0.90	0.00	0.90	695.0	305.3		
<u> </u>	Cherokee County (part)	287	123	0.38	0.00	0.38	758.3	325.0		
<b> </b>	Pickens County (part)	339	152	0.52	0.00	0.52	649.1	291.0		
388	Toomsboro town, Wilkinson County	622	252	1.86	0.00	1.86	333.9	135.3		
389	Pine Lake city, DeKalb County	621	349	0.20	0.01	0.19	3,293.0	1,850.7		
390	Dawsonville city, Dawson County	619	257	1.93	<u>0.00</u>	1.93	320.9	133.2		
391	Waleska city, Cherokee County	616	114	1.46	<sup>-</sup> 0.01	1.46	422.7	78.2		
392	Ochlocknee town, Thomas County	605	270	0.95	0.01	0.94	641.7	286.4		
393t	Mount Airy town, Habersham County	604	256	1.87	. 0.01	1.87	323.3	137.0		
393t	Young Harris city, Towns County	604	134	· 1.02	0.00	1.02	591.2	131.2		
394	Portal town, Bulloch County	597	254	.1.77	0.03	1.74	343.1	146.0		
395	Whitesburg town, Carroll County	596	247	2.80	0.03	2.77	215.1	89.1		
396	Berlin town, Colquitt County	595	249	.0.75	0.00	0.75	794.7	-332.6		
397	County	587	271	3.15	0.00	3.15	186.5	86.1		
398	Conutta town, whittield	582	235	2.52	0.04	2.49	233.8	94.4		
399	Adrian city	579	276	. 1.43	0.05	1.38	419.3	199.9		
<u> </u>	Lebasan County (part)	267	129	0.51	0.00	0.51	528.2	255.2		
400	Crawfordville city, Taliaferro	. 572	312	3.14	0.05	3.14	182.4	99.5		
401	Brooks town, Favette County	553	208	4 07	0.01	4 07	136.0	512		
402	Coolidge city. Thomas County	552	270	0.81	0.00	0.81	682.8	334.0		
403	Lake Park city, Lowndes County	549	262	1.47	0.04	1.42	385.5	184.0		
404	Carnesville city, Franklin County	541	222	2.45	0.01	2.44	. 221.7	91.0		
405	Pineview town, Wilcox County	532	218	1.96	0.00	1.96	271.6	111.3		
406	Uvalda city, Montgomery County	530	252	. 1.91	0.00	. 1.91	277.0	131.7		
407	Collins city, Tattnall County	528	304	1.03	0.00	1.03	513.5	295.7		
408 409	Milner city, Lamar County Newborn town, Newton	522 520	201 187	<u> </u>	0.00	1.40	372.0	143.2		
410	Ideal city Macon County		217	4 47	0.00	4 47		196 7		
411	Bronwood town, Terrell	513	203	0.79	0.00	0.79	648.7	256.7		
412	Bibb City town, Muscogee County	510	242	0.17	0.00	0.17	3,064.9	1,454.3		
413t	Dexter town, Laurens County	509	231	0.77	0.02	0.76	670.4	304.2		
413t	Harrison town, Washington County	509	210	. 1.77	0.04	1.73	295.0	121.7		
414	Mountain Park city	506	248	0.54	0.07	0.47	1,082.2	530.4		
	Cherokee County (part) 10 4 0.04 0.02 0.03		388.9	155.6						
	Fulton County (part)	County (part)       496       244       0.49       0.05       0.44         a city       Turger County       496       209       1.00       0.00       1.00		1,122.6	552.2					
415	Attapulgus city, Decatur	496 492	. 209	1.00 0.80	0.00 . 0.00	<u>1.00</u> 0.80	<u>497.4</u> 617.6	209.6 246.0		
44.71	Collect aity Medices County	400	000	0.07			E04 F			
4171	Lyerly town, Chattooga	488 488	223	0.87 0.75	0.00	0.87 0.75	<u>561.5</u> 651.3	256.6 295.0		
110+	Menlo city Chattoora Couchy	ΛQE	251	0.70	0.00	0.70	600 E	200.0		
+10(	Menio city, Ghallouga County	400	201	0.78	0.00	0.78	022.5	322.2		

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geogra... Page 13 of 17

				Area in square miles			Density pe mile of la	er square nd area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water . area	Land area	Population	Housing units
418t	Warm Springs city, Meriwether County	485	208	1.20	0.01	` 1.18	409.7	175.7
419	Talmo town, Jackson County	477	150	1.73	·0.00	1.73	275.5	86.6
420	Molena city, Pike County	475	141	1.74	0.00	1.74	272.7	81.0
.421	Waco city, Haralson County	469	203	1.61	· <b>0.0</b> 0	· 1.61	291.4	126.1
422	Hoboken city, Brantley County	463	202	3.49	0.00	3.49	132.7	57.9
423t	Danielsville city, Madison County	. 457	216	1.12	0.01	1.11	412.4	194.9
423t	Midville city, Burke County	457	225	2.00	0.00	2.00	228.3	112.4
424	Arabi town, Crisp County	456	· 204	4.61	0.09	4.52	100.9	45.1
425	Leslie city, Sumter County	455	192	1.77	0.00	1.77	256.6	108.3
426	County	453	205	4.53	0.00	4.53	100.1	45.3
427	Dudley city, Laurens County	447	207	3.12	· 0.01	3.12	143.5	66.4
428	Barwick town	. 444	205	0.78	0.03	0.75	591.1	272.9
	Brooks County (part)	116	/3	0.41	0.03	0.38	304.7	191.8
429	Dearing town, McDuffie	328 441	132	0.37	0.00	0.37	528.9	247.0
430	North High Shoals town,	439	162	2.50	0.00	2.50	175.8	64.9
421	Woodland city Talbot County	. 432	201	0.79	0.00	0.79	548.1	255.0
431	Pendergrass city, Jackson	432	171	2.03	0.00	2.02	212.8	84.4
4331	Helen city. White County	• 430	319	2.11	0.00	2.11	203.8	151.2
4331	Warwick city, Worth County	430	181	0.81	0.00	0.81	531.9	223.9
434	Funston town, Colguitt County	426	173	1.17	0.00	1.17	365.0	148.2
435	Shiloh city, Harris County	423	· 174	2.27	0.02	, 2.25	187.7	77.2
436	Rhine town, Dodge County	. 422	243	3.14	0.00	.3.14	134.4	77.4
437	Hiltonia city, Screven County	421	154	1.74	0.01	1.73	243.6	89.1
438	Clermont town, Hall County	419	170	0.96	0.00	· 0.96	434.5	176.3
439	Byromville town, Dooly County	415	150	0.36	0.00	0.36	1,153.7	417.0
440	Odum town, Wayne County	. 414	192	1.94	0.00	1.94	213.5	99.0
441	Yatesville town, Upson County	408	175	0.88	0.01	0.88	465.0	199.5
442	Offerman city, Pierce County	403	172	3.14	0.00	3.14	128.2	54.7
443	Hilltop CDP, Pike County	401	129	0.98	0.02	0.96	416.9	134.1
444	Woodville city, Greene County	400	147	4.93	0.01	4.92	81.3	29.9
445	County	394	182	2.03	0.00	2.03	194.1	89.7
446t	Moreland town, Coweta County	393	155	0.87	0.00	0.87	451.7	• 178.1
446t	Sasser town, Terrell County	. 393	169	0.78	0.00	0.78	500.9	215.4
447	Manstield city, Newton County	392	142	.1.07	0.01	1.07	367.8	133.2
448	Epnesus town, Heard County Centralhatchee town, Heard	388	<u>170</u> 151	3.03	0.00	3.03	127.9	56.0 46.0
	County	. 000	474	4 70		4 70	000.0	100.0
450	Papyilla town	380	1/4	1./3	0.00	1./3	22U.3	200.9
451	Twings County (part)	3/3	10/	0.80	0.00	0.00	400.4 542 A	200.0
	Wilkinson County (part)	- 24	13	0.04	0.00	0.04	153.6	832
452	Fiemington city, Liberty	· 369	.177	4.72	0.00	4.71	78.3	37.5
453	Oak Park town, Emanuel	366	. 199	7.16	0.02	7.14	51.3	27.9
454	Salem CDP, Upson County	. 339	135	8.32	0.00	8.32	40.7	16.2
455t	Concord town, Pike County	336	128	0.83	0.00	0.83	403.5	153.7
455t	Ellenton town, Colquitt County	336	119	0.79	0.00	0.79	423.4	150.0
456	Bowersville town, Hart County	334	156	3.10	0.01	3.09	108.1	50.5
4571	Andersonville city, Sumter County	331	. 142	1.30	0.00	1.30	254.1	109.0

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?\_bm=y&-geo\_id=04000US13&-\_box\_head... 6/15/2005

7

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geogra... Page 14 of 17

				Area in square miles			Density p mile of la	er square Ind area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units
457t	Siloam town, Greene County	. 331	144	1.24	0.01	1.23	269.8	117.4
458	Cadwell town, Laurens County	329	178	1.29	0.00	1:29	254.3	137.6
459	Ila city, Madison County	328	143	0.81	0.00	0.81	403.2	175.8
460t	Bostwick town, Morgan County	322	135	3.09	0.01	3.08	104.6	43.8
460t	Newington town, Screven County	322	154	· 0.82	0.00	0.82	394.1	188.5
461	Iron City town, Seminole County	321	149	0.80	0.00	0.80	401.4	186.3
462	Ambrose city, Coffee County	320	145	3.13	0.06	3.07	104.3	. 47.3
463t	Eton city, Murray County	319	· 131	0.42	0.00	0.42	762.1	313.0
463t	Sale City town, Mitchell County	319	144	1.84	0.01	1.83	174.8	78.9
464	Stapleton city, Jefferson County	<sup>.</sup> 318	117	1.75	0.00	1.75	182.1	67.0
465t	Higgston town, Montgomery County	316	152	-3.15	0.00	3.15	. 100.3	48.2
465t	Sharpsburg town, Coweta County	316	127	0.55	0.00	0.55	579.0	232.7
465t	Tiger town, Rabun County	316	.161	0.82	• 0.00	0.82	384.2	195.7
466t	Arnoldsville city, Oglethorpe County	312	136	1.68	0.00	1.68	185.7	80.9
466t	Graham city, Appling County	. 312	132	1.75	0.00	1.75	178.5	75.5
467t	Cobbtown city, Tattnall County	311	178	0.68	. 0.00	0.68	459.7	263.1
467t	Martin town	311	153	1.50	0.00	<u>1.50</u>	207.8	102.2
	Franklin County (part)	0	. 0	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.0	0.0
- 400	Stephens County (part)	311	153	1.41	0.00	1.41	220.3	108.4
408	Bitte city Wilcox County	309	145	1.07	0.00	1.07	288.4	110.7
405	Hamilton city, Harris County	307	145	2.09	0.00	2.09	147.2	100.7
4701	Pinehurst city, Dooly County	. 307	156	1.02	0.00	1.02	301.2	· 153.0
471	Chester town, Dodge County	305	167	0.87	0.00	0.87	349.0	191.1
472	Rentz town, Laurens County	304	164	1.05	0.00	1.05	288.5	155.7
473	Scotland city	300	138	1.41	0.01	<sup>.</sup> 1.40	213.8	98.4
	Telfair County (part)	257	119	1.22	0.01	1.21	· 212.7	98.5
	Wheeler County (part)	. 43	· 19	0.19	0.00	0.19	221.2	97.7
474t	Morganton town, Fannin County	299	152	0.86	. 0.01	0.85	350.8	178.4
4741	Norwood city, Warren County_	299	140	0.82	0.00	0.82	362.6	169.8
475t	Climax city, Decatur County	297	134	0.79	0.00	0.79	375.7	169.5
475t	Chauncey town, Dodge	<u>. 297</u> 295	122	0.60	0.00	0.60	495.6	203.6
477	Gounty Allentown town	297	120	3.08	0.00	3.09	1021	41 2
	Bleckley County (nart)	207	12.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	35.1	+1.0
	Laurens County (part)	· 3	3	0.49	0.00	0.12	61	6.1
<u> </u>	Twiggs County (part)	79	27	0.77	0.00	0.77	102.3	35.0
	Wilkinson County (part)	205	99	1.69	0.00	1.69	121.0	58.4
.478	White Plains city, Greene County	283	126	4.60	0.00	4.60	61.5	. 27.4
479	Oconee city, Washington County	280	102	1.14	0.00	1.14	245.1	89.3
480	Avalon town, Stephens County	. 278	116	1.76	0.00	1.76	157.9	65.9
481	Damascus town, Early County	277	115	1.77	0.01	1.76	157.6	65.4
482	Gumbranch city, Liberty County	- 273	129	0.81	0.01	0.80	341.7	161.4
483	Denton city, Jeff Davis County	269	112	1.55	0.00	1.55	174.0	72.5
484	Cecil town, Cook County	265	138	0.85	0.01	0.85	313.1	163.1
485	Pulaski town, Candler County	261	83	0.80	0.00	0.80	326.8	103.9

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geogra... Page 15 of 17

				Area in square miles			Density p	Density per square mile of land area		
				Area	in square	nnies	mile of it	ino area		
Bank	Geographic area	Population	Housing	Total area	Water	Land	Population	Housing units		
486	Plainville city, Gordon County	257	102	0.59	0.00	. 0.59	435.5	172.8		
487	Oliver city, Screven County	253	• 118	0.94	0.00	0.94	269.6	125.8		
488	Rebecca city, Turner County	246	104	0.78	0.00	0.78	314.8	133.1		
489	Shady Dale town, Jasper	242		0.83	0.00	0.83	290.2	• 106.7		
100	Kite town Johnson County	241	. 140	0.80	0.00	0.80	200.4	172.0		
491	Lexington city, Oglethorpe	239	115	· 0.54	0.00	0.54	439.6	211.5		
492t	Santa Claus city, Toombs	237	89	· 0.18	0.00	0.18	1,297.2	487.1		
-492t	Surrency town, Appling	237	115	0.78	0.00	0.78	305.5	148.2		
100	County	000	110	1.00	0.00	1.00		117.0		
493	Canton city, Madison County	233	118	1.00	0.00	1.00	232.3	117.6		
494	County	230	94	0.36	0.00	0.36	646.9	264.4		
495	Taylorsville town	229	103	1.49	0.00	1.49	153.3	68.9		
	Bartow County (part)	185	87	<u> </u>	0.00	1.04	177.9	83.7		
ŀ	Polk County (part)	44	. 16	0.45	0.00	0.45	96.8	35.2		
496	Girard town, Burke County	227	111	3.20	0.01	3.19	<u>. 71.1</u>	34.8		
497	Brinson town, Decatur County	225	106	1.87	0.00	1.87	120.3	56.7		
498t	Bartow town, Jefferson County	223	106	1.14	0.00	1.14	196.1	93.2		
498t	Culloden city, Monroe County	223	95	0.79	0.01	0.77	288.2	122.8		
499t	Lilly city, Dooly County	221	93	0.60	0.00	0.60	367.0	154.5		
499t	Sky Valley city, Rabun County	221	675	3.03	0.00	· 3.03	72.9	222.6		
500	Avera city, Jefferson County	217	127	0.65	0.00	0.65	333.7	195.3		
501	De Soto city, Sumter County	214	88	0.82	0.00	0.82	262.4	107.9		
502	Corinth town	213	88	0.91	0.00	0.91	235.2	97.2		
·	Coweta County (part)	13	7	0.29	0.00	0.29	44.6	24.0		
•	Heard County (part)	· 200	. 81	0.61	0.00	0.61	325.7	131.9		
503t	Good Hope town, Walton County	210	89	1.77	0.01	1.76	119.2	. 50.5		
503t	Maxeys town, Oglethorpe County	210	86	2.40	0.01	· 2.39	87.8	36.0		
504t	Buckhead town, Morgan County	205	81	0.80	0.00	0.80	257.5	101.8		
504t	Carl town, Barrow County	205	99	0.80	0.00	0.80	257.6	· 124.4		
505	Jenkinsburg town, Butts	. 203	84	0.79	. 0.00	0.79	258.4	106.9		
506	Dillard city, Rabun County	198	115	1.55	0.00	1.55	127.9	74.3		
507	Gillsville city	195	90	1.14	0.00	1.14	171.3	79.1		
	Banks County (part)	28	12	0.31	0.00	0.31	88.9	38.1		
	Hall County (part)	167	78	0.82	0.00	0.82	202.9	94.8		
508	Meansville city, Pike County	· 192	78	0.52	0.00	0.52	365.9	148.7		
509	Rocky Ford town, Screven	186	88	1.24	0.03	1.21	153.6	72.7		
510	Kevsville town	180	52	1 49	0.00	. 1.49	121 0	35.0		
	Burke County (part)	170	48	1 43	0.00	1.43	119.2	33.7		
. <u>  </u>	Jefferson County (part)	10	A	0.06	0.00	an n	162 7	65.1		
511	Junction City town, Talbot	179		2.55	0.06	2.49	71.9	36.6		
510	Pourse eity Ribb County	170	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		0.00	0.04	AEEDE	0.004.0		
512	Roopville town Carroll County	1/8	90	0.04	0.00	0.04	4,002.0	2,301.8		
514	Woolsey town, Fayette	175	62	0.79	0.00	0.82	213.6	75.7		
515	Mitchell town, Glascock	173	77	1.45	0.00	1.45	119.2	53.0		
	County	105						100 -		
5161	Camak town, warren County	165	84	0.79	0.00	0.79	209.2	106.5		
5161	Turin town, Coweta County	165	68	1.25	0.00	1.25	131.5	54.2		
5171	register town, Bulloch County	164	/3	0.78	0.00	.0.78	210.1	93.5		
5171	I allulan Falls IOWN	164	106	8.55	. 0,40	8.15	20.1	13.0		
	Habersham County (part)	61	· 32	4.79	0.14	4.65	13.1	6.9		

Georgia by Place - GCT-PH1-R. Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density (geogra... Page 16 of 17

		· ·		Area in square miles			Density per square mile of land area		
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing units	
	Rabun County (part)	103	74	3.77	0.27	3.50	29.4	21.1	
518t	Dooling town, Dooly County	163	64	0.46	0.00	0.46	352.4	138.4	
518t	Jersey town, Walton County	163	65	0.78	0.00	0.78	208.9	83.3	
519	Hull city, Madison County	. 160	78	0.33	0.00	0.33	483.7	235.8	
520	Alston town, Montgomery County	159	72	2.86	· 0.00	2.86	55.5	25.2	
521	Jakin city, Early County	157	86	1.24	0.00	1.24	126.3	69.2	
522	Parrott town, Terrell County	156	88	0.78	0.00	0.78	200.1	112.9	
523	County	154	65	· 1.61	0.00	1.61	95.5	40.3	
.524	Garfield town, Emanuel County	152	84	. 0.80	0.00	0.80	190.3	105.2	
525t	Argyle town, Clinch County	151	64	1.72	0.00	1.72	87.8	37.2	
<u>525t</u>	Hest Haven town	151	67	0.40	0.00	0.40	373.5	165.7	
<u> </u>	Holl County (part)	113	48	0.33	0.00	. 0.33	347.4	147.6	
		38	19	0.08	0.00	• 0.08	481.3	240.7	
526t	Coleman city, Handolph County	149	84	0.77	. 0.01	• 0.77	194.4	109.6	
526t	Gay town, Menwether County	149	69	0.86	0.00	0.86	173.1	80.2	
527	Between town, waiton County	148	63	0.87	0.00	0.87	170.4	72.5	
520	Haralson town, Oconee County	146	6/	0.78	0.00	0.78	188.2	. 86.4	
529	Coweta County (nart)	144	00	0.72	0.01	0.71	203.1		
	Meriwether County (part)	144		0.07	0.01	0.00	210.0	97.9	
530	Sunny Side city, Spalding County	. 142	56	0.04	0.00	0.20	701.3	276.6	
531	Summertown town, Emanuel County	wn town, Emanuel 140 58 0.80 0.00 0.80 17		176.1	73.0				
532t	Du Pont town, Clinch County	139	62	0.79	0.00	0.79	176.8	78.8	
532t	Rayle town, Wilkes County	139	61	0.92	0.00	0.92	151.3	66.4	
533	Vernonburg town, Chatham County	138	69	. 0.37	0.01	0.36	380.4	190.2	
534	Deepstep town, Washington County	132	· 59	0.79	0.02	0.78	170.0	76.0	
535	Nunez town, Emanuel County	131	53	1.34	0.00	1.34	97.7	39.5	
536	Bellville city, Evans County	130	64	0.99	0.01	0.98	132.5	65.2	
537	Dalsy city, Evans County	126	60	1.02	0.03	0.99	127.8	60.9	
538	Riddleville town, Washington County	124	. 46	0.78	0.01	0.77	160.4	59.5	
539t	Blutton town, Clay County	118	60	1.61	0.00	1.61	73.2	37.2	
539t	County	118	62	1.12	0.00	1.12	105.7	55.5	
540	Geneva town, Talbot County	114	59	0.79	0.00	0.79	144.9	75.0	
541	VICERE CITY, BURKE County	112	• 44	0.97	0.00	0.97	115.2	45.3	
542 543	Lone Oak town, Meriwether	105 104	<u>53</u> 47	0.78	0.00	0.78	134.2 166.2	67.7 75.1	
544t	Manassas city, Tattnall	100	50	0.78	0.00	0.78	128.7	64.4	
544t	Tarrytown village,	100	51	0.87	0.00	0.87	115.6	59.0	
545	Aldora town Lamar County		AE	0.00	. 0.00		000 4	100.0	
545	Banger town, Cardon County	90	40	0.03	0.00	0.33	290.1	130.9	
547	Braswell city 80 27 3.07 0.01 3		3.04	04.2	00				
	Paulding County (part)	38	. 14	2.18	0.00	2.18	17.4	6.0	
<u>⊢</u> i	Polk County (part)	42	13	0.89	· 0.01	0.88	47.7	14.8	
.548	Weston town, Webster County	75	42	0.94	0.00	0.94	79.5	. 44.5	
549	Riverside town, Colquitt	57	26	0.22	0.00	· 0.22	263.7	120.3	
550	Talking Rock town, Pickens	49	23	0.19	0.00	0.19	255.5	119.9	
<u> </u>									

				Area	Area in square miles			er square and area
Rank	Geographic area	Population	Housing units	Total area	Water area	Land area	Population	Housing ⁄units
551	Edge Hill city, Glascock County	30	16	0.19	· 0.00	D.19	161.7	86.2
552	Blacksville CDP, Henry	4	· 1	0.08	0.00	0.08	50.7	12.7

U.

(X) Not applicable Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1

Census 2000 PHC-T-29. Ranking Tables for Population of Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Micropolitan Statistical Areas, Combined Statistical Areas, New England City and Town Areas, and Combined New England City and Town Areas: 1990 and 2000 (Areas defined by the Office of Management and Budget as of June 6. 2003.)

hon 2.5.1

( USCB 2003)

23

Table 3b. Population in Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas Ranked Separately by 2000 Population for the United States and Puerto Rico: 1990 and 2000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and 1990 Census. Internet Release date: December 30, 2003

1994 (M. 1994)

/-237

[For infor	mation on	confident	iality and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf1.	pdf. For information on definitions, see	Э.			
(x) Not a	w.census.g policable.	iow/popul	alion/www/estimates/aboutmetro.ntmlj				•	
Metro		s' :	n		· · ·		·	
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical	· · · · ·		<u>enange re</u>	00.02000
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
<del></del>	· .							
			Inited States		•			
	· ·	·						•
•	· • .	• .	Metropolitan Statistical Areas					•
35620		1	New York-Northern New Jersev-Long Island NY-N I-PA <sup>2</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Area	18 323 002	16 846 046	1 476 956	8.8
35620	20764	(x)	Edison, NJ	Metropolitan Division	2,173,869	1,898,386	275 483	14.5
35620	35004		Nassau-Suffolk NY <sup>3</sup>	Metropolitan Division	2 753 913	2 609 212	144 701	55
35620	35084	(x)	Newark-Union NJ-PA	Metropolitan Division	2,008,843	1 960 063	138 780	7 1
35620	35644		New York-Wayne-White Plains, NY-NJ	Metropolitan Division	11,296,377	10.378.385	917,992	88
31100		2	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana. CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	12.365.627	11.273.720	1.091.907	9.7
31100	31084	(x)	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA	Metropolitan Division	9,519,338	8,863,164	656,174	7.4
31100	42044	(x)	Santa Ana-Anaheim-Irvine, CA	Metropolitan Division	2,846,289	2,410,556	435,733	18.1
16980		3	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	9,098,316	8,182,076	916,240	11.2
16980	16974	(x)	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL	Metropolitan Division	7,628,412	6,894,440	733,972	·10.6
16980	23844	(x)	Gary, IN	Metropolitan Division	675,971	643,037	32,934	. 5.1
16980	29404	(X)	Lake County-Kenosha County, IL-WI	Metropolitan Division	793,933	644,599	149,334	23.2
37980		_ 4	Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE	Metropolitan Statistical Area	5,687,147	5,435,468	251,679	4.6
37980	15804	(x)	Camden, NJ	Metropolitan Division	1,186,999	1,127,972	59,027	. 5.2
37980	37964	(x)	Philadelphia, PA	Metropolitan Division	3,849,647	3,728,909	120,738	3.2
37980	48864	(x)	Wilmington, DE-MD-NJ	Metropolitan Division	650,501	5/8,58/	/1,914	12.4
19100	10104	5	Dallas-Fort worth-Arlington, IX	Interropolitan Statistical Area	5,161,544	3,989,294	1,1/2,250	29.4
19100	19124	(X)	Dailas-Plano-Irving, IA	Interropolitan Division	3,451,226	2,022,562	828,004	31.0

			•					
	F		$\epsilon$	-				e
·	<u> </u>	·	t					
Metro/				1			<b>.</b> .	-
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
19100	23104	(X)	Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	Metropolitan Division	1,710,318	1,366,732	343,586	25.1
33100	007.44	6	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	5,007,564	4,056,100	951,464	23.5
33100	22/44	(X)	Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach-Deerfield Beach, FL	Metropolitan Division	1,623,018	1,255,488	367,530	29.3
33100	33124	(X)	Miami-Miami Beach-Kendall, FL	Metropolitan Division	2,253,362	1,937,094	316,268	16.3
33100	48424	(X)	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach, FL	Metropolitan Division	1,131,184	. 863,518	267,666	31.0
47900	•	7	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,796,183	4,122,914	673,269	<b>16.3</b>
47900	13644	(x)	Bethesda-Frederick-Gaithersburg, MD	Metropolitan Division	1,068,618	907,235	161,383	17.8
47900	47894	(x)	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	Metropolitan Division	3,727,565	3,215,679	511,886	15.9
26420		. 8	Houston-Baytown-Sugar Land, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,715,407	3,767,335	948,072	25.2
19820		9	Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,452,557	. 4,248,699	203,858	· <b>4.8</b>
19820	19804	(x)	Detroit-Livonia-Dearborn, MI	Metropolitan Division	2,061,162	2,111,687	-50,525	-2.4
19820	47644	(x)	Warren-Farmington Hills-Troy, MI	Metropolitan Division	2,391,395	2,137,012	254,383	11.9
14460	·	.10	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,391,344	4,133,895	257,449	6.2
14460	14484	(x)	Boston-Quincy, MA	Metropolitan Division	1,812,937	1,715,269	97,668	5.7
14460	15764	(x)	Cambridge-Newton-Framingham, MA	Metropolitan Division	1,465,396	1,398,468	66,928	4.8
14460	21604	(x)	Essex County, MA	Metropolitan Division	723,419	670,080	53,339	8.0
14460	40484	(x)	Rockingham County-Strafford County, NH	Metropolitan Division	389,592	350,078	39,514	11.3
12060		11	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,247,981	3,069,425	1,178,556	38.4
41860		12	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,123,740	3,686,592	437,148	11.9
41860	36084	(x)	Oakland-Fremont-Hayward, CA	Metropolitan Division	2,392,557	2,082,914	309,643	14.9
41860	41884	(x)	San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City, CA	Metropolitan Division	1,731,183	1,603,678	127,505	8.0
40140		13	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	3,254,821	2,588,793	666,028	25.7
38060		<sup>.</sup> 14	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	3,251,876	2,238,480	1,013,396	45.3
42660	{	15	Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	3,043,878	2,559,164	484,714	18.9
42660	42644	(x)	Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	Metropolitan Division	2,343,058	1,972,961	370,097	18.8
42660	45104	(x)	Tacoma, WA	Metropolitan Division	700,820	· 586,203	114,617	19.6
33460		16	Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,968,806	2,538,834	429,972	16.9
41740		17	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,813,833	2,498,016	315,817	. 12.6
41180		18	St. Louis, MO-IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,698,687	2,580,897	117,790	4.6.
12580		19	Baltimore-Towson, MD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,552,994	2,382,172	170,822	7.2
38300		20	Pittsburgh, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,431,087	2,468,289	-37,202	-1.5
45300	, v	21	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,395,997	2,067,959	328,038	15.9
19740	· .	22	Denver-Aurora, CO <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,179.240	1,666.883	512.357	30.7
17460	I. ·	23	Cleveland-Elvria-Mentor. OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,148.143	2,102.248	45.895	2.2
17140		24	Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2.009.632	1.844.917	164,715	8.9
38900		25	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton. OR-WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,927,881	1.523.741	404,140	26.5
	• •	1					· · · · • [	

Page 2 of 29

· · ·	É,	•	, (	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	e	(	- n.
Metro/	]			ī				
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
28140		26	Kansas City, MO-KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,836,038	1,636,528	199,510	12.2
40900		27	Sacramento-Arden-ArcadeRoseville, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,796,857	1,481,102	315,755	21 <b>.</b> 3
41940		28	San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,735,819	1,534,274	201,545	13.1
41700		29	San Antonio, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,711,703	1,407,745	303,958	21.6
36740		30	Orlando, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,644,561	1,224,852	419,709	34.3
18140		31	Columbus, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,612,694	1,405,168	207,526	14.8
39300		32	Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,582,997	1,509,789	73,208	. 4.8
47260	· ·	33	Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,576,370	1,449,389	126,981	8.8
26900		. 34	Indianapolis, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,525,104	1,294,217	· 230,887	17.8
33340		35	Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,500,741	1,432,149	68,592	· 4.8
29820		36	Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,375,765	741,459	634,306	85.5
16740		37	Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,330,448	1,024,643	305,805	29.8
35380		38	New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,316,510	1,264,391	52,119	4.1
34980		39	Nashville-DavidsonMurfreesboro, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,311,789	1,048,216	263,573	25.1
12420		40	Austin-Round Rock, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,249,763	846,227	403,536	47.7
32820		41	Memphis, TN-MS-AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,205,204	1,067,263	137,941	12.9
15380		42	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY <sup>2</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,170,111	1,189,288	-19,177	-1.6
31140	1	43	Louisville, KY-IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,161,975	1,055,973	106,002	10.0
25540		44	Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,148,618	1,123,678	24,940	2.2
27260		45	Jacksonville, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,122,750	. 925,213	197,537	21.4
40060		. 46	Richmond, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,096,957	949,244	147,713	15.6
36420		47	Oklahoma City, OK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,095,421	971,042	124,379	12.8
13820		48	Birmingham-Hoover, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,052,238	956,844	95,394	. 10.0
40380		49	Rochester, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,037,831	1,002,410	35,421	3.5
41620		50	Salt Lake City, UT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	968,858	768,075	200,783	26.1
14860		51	Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	882,567	827,645	54,922	6.6
26180	i	52	Honolulu, HI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	876,156	836,231	× 39 <b>,</b> 925	4.8
46140		53	Tulsa, OK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	859,532	761,019	98,513	12.9
19380		54	Dayton, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	848,153	843,835	4,318	0.5
46060		55	Tucson, AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	843,746	666,880	176,866	26.5
10580		56	Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	825,875	809,443	16,432	2.0
35300		57	New Haven-Milford, CT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	824,008	804,219	· 19,789	2.5
23420		58	Fresno, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	799,407	667,490	131,917	19.8
39580	1	59	Raleigh-Cary, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	797,071	541,100	255,971	47.3
36540		60	Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	767,041	685,797	81,244	11.8
37100	ļ.	61	Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	753,197	669,016	84,181	12.6

•

ز~

Page 3 of 29

ter en	ſ	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<b>-</b>		(	·
· · · ·		·	<u>N</u>	·	······································	(	
Metro/	· .						-
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Population :	Change 199	0 to 2000
Area ·	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical			
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000 April 1, 199	0 Number	Percent
49340	· ·	62	Worcester, MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	750,963 709,70	5 41,258	5.8
24340	ļ	63	Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	740,482 645,91	4 94,568	14.6
10900		64	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	740,395 686,68	8 53,707	7.8
10740		65	Albuquerque, NM	Metropolitan Statistical Area	729,649 599,41	6 130,233	. 21.7
12940		66	Baton Rouge, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	705,973 623,85	3 82,120	13.2
10420	1 • •	67	Akron, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	694,960 657,57	5 37,385	5.7
44140		68	Springfield, MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	680,014 672,97	0 7,044	1.0
21340		69	El Paso, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	679,622 591,61	0 88,012	14.9
12540		70	Bakersfield, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	661,645 543,47	7 118,168	21.7
45780	ľ	71	Toledo, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	659,188 654,15	7 5,031	0.8
45060		.72	Syracuse, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	650,154 659,86	4 -9,710	-1.5
17900	•	73	Columbia, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	647,158 548,33	5 98,823	18.0
24660		74	Greensboro-High Point, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	643,430 540,03	0 103,400	19.1
39100		75	Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	621,517 567,10	9 54,408	9.6
28940		76	Knoxville, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	616,079 534,91	7 81,162	15.2
30780	2.5	77	Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	610,518 535,03	4 75,484	14.1
49660	1	78	Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	602,964 613,62	2 -10,658	-1.7
42260		79	Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	589,959 489,48	3 100,476	20.5
48620		80	Wichita, KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	571,166 511,11	1 60,055	11.7
32580	Į	81	McAllen-Edinburg-Pharr, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	569,463 383,54	5 185,918	<b>48.5</b>
44700		82	Stockton, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	563,598 480,62	8 82,970	17.3
42540		83	ScrantonWilkes-Barre, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	560,625 575,26	4 -14,639	-2.5
24860	· ·	84	Greenville, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	559,940 472,15	3 87,787	18.6
16700		· 85	Charleston-North Charleston, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	549,033 506,87	5 42,158	8.3
17820		86	Colorado Springs, CO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	537,484 409,48	2 128,002	31.3
25420		87	Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	509,074 474,24	2 34,832	7.3
31540	· ·	88	Madison, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	501,774 432,32	3 69,451	16.1
₹12260		89	Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	499,684 435,76	3 63,921	14.7
27140		90	Jackson, MS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	497,197 446,94	1 50,256	11.2
38860	1	91	Portland-South Portland, ME	Metropolitan Statistical Area	487,568 441,25	7 46,311	10.5
29460		92	Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	483,924 405,38	2 78,542	19.4
19780		. 93	Des Moines, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	481,394 416,34	6 65,048	15.6
16860	l. •	94	Chattanooga, TN-GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	476,531 433,21	0 43,321	10.0
37340		95	Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	476,230 398,97	8 77,252	19.4
29540		96	Lancaster, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	470,658 422,82	2 47,836	11.3
14260		97	Boise City-Nampa, ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	464,840 319,59	6 145,244	45.4
	•	•			•	•	

.

Page 4 of 29

. '	ſ			· · ·	•		· /	(
Metro/	ť`			Ī			i	€
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
42220		98	Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	458,614	388,222	70,392	18.1
29620	1.	99	Lansing-East Lansing, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	447,728	432,674	15,054	, 3.5
33700		100	Modesto, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	446,997	370,522	76,475	20.6
19660		101	Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	443,343	370,712	72,631	19.6
36260		102	Ogden-Clearfield, UT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	442,656	351,799	90,857	25.8
15980		103	Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	440,888	335,113	105,775	31.6
22420	·	104	Flint, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	. 436,141	430,459	5,682	1.3
20500	ľ	105	Durham, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	426,493	344,625	81,868	23.8
49180		106	Winston-Salem, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	421,961	361,448	60,513	16.7
44060	· ·	107	Spokane, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	417,939	361,364	56,575	15.7
37860		108	Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	412,153	344,406	67,747	19.7
30460	1	109	Lexington-Fayette, KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	408,326	348,428	59,898	17.2
15940		110	Canton-Massillon, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	406,934	394,106	12,828	· 3.3
18580		111	Corpus Christi, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	403,280	367,786	35,494	9.7
41500	1	112	Salinas, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	401,762	· 355,660	46,102	13.0
33660	[	113	Mobile, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	399,843	378,643	21,200	5.6
42060		114	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	399,347	369,608	29,739	8.0
46700		115	Vallejo-Fairfield, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	394,542	340,421	54,121	15.9
23060	· ·	116	Fort Wayne, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	.390,156	354,435	35,721	10.1
13140		117	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	385,090	.361,226	23,864	6.6
49620		118	York-Hanover, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	381,751	339,574	42,177	. 12.4
31700	· .	119	Manchester-Nashua, NH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	380,841	336,073	44,768	13.3
39340.		120	Provo-Orem, UT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	376,774	. 269,407	107,367	· 39.9
19340		121	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	376,019	· 368,151	7,868	2.1
43340	· ·	122	Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· 375,965	359,687	16,278	4.5
39740		123	Reading, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	373,638	336,523	37,115	11.0
11700	1 · · ·	124	Asheville, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	369,171	308,001	61,170	19.9
44180		125	Springfield, MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	368,374	298,818	69,556	23.3
47300	· ·	126	Visalia-Porterville, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	368,021	311,921	56,100	18.0
37900		127	Peoria, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· 366,899	358,552	8,347	2.3
45940	1	128	Trenton-Ewing, NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	350,761	325,824	24,937	7.7
41420		129	Salem, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	347,214	278,024	69,190	24.9
22220	· · ·	130	Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	347,045	239,464	107,581	44.9
33860		131	Montgomery, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	346,528	305,175	41,353	13.6
39900	. ·	132	Reno-Sparks, NV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	342,885	257,193	85,692	33.3
21780		133	Evansville, IN-KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	342,815	324,858	17,957	5.5

Page 5 of 29

	E	•				E · ·
Metro/	┤┺╤╷──				······	<u>E</u>
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Population	Change 1990 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical		
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990	Number Percent
26620		134	Huntsville, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	342,376 293,047	49,329 16.8
25860		135	Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	341,851 292,409	49,442 16.9
22180		136	Fayetteville, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	336,609 297,422	39,187 13.2
15180		137	Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	335,227 260,120	75,107 28.9
28660		138	Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	330,714 268,822	61,892 23.0
21660		139	Eugene-Springfield, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	322,959 282,912	40,047 14.2
11460	· ·	140	Ann Arbor, Mi	Metropolitan Statistical Area	322,895 282,937	39,958 14.1
45220		141	Tallahassee, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	320,304 259,096	61,208 23.6
40420		142	Rockford, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	320,204 283,719	36,485 12.9
11260		143	Anchorage, AK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	319,605 266,021	53,584 20.1
38940		144	Port St. Lucie-Fort Pierce, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	319,426 251,071	68,355 27.2
43780		145	South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	316,663 296,529	20,134 6.8
28020	1	146	Kalamazoo-Portage, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	314,866 293,471	21,395 7.3
16620		147	Charleston, WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	309,635 307,689	1,946 0.6
46540		148	Utica-Rome, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	299,896 316,633	-16,737 -5.3
42340	1	149	Savannah, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	293,000 258,060	34,940 13.5
26580		1.50	Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	288,649 288,189	460 0.2
40220	· ·	151	Roanoke, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	288,309 268,398	19,911 7.4
24580		152	Green Bay, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	282,599 243,698	38,901 16.0
17980		153	Columbus, GA-AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	281,768 266,450	15,318 5.7
21500	•	154	Erie, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	280,843 275,572	5,271 1.9
20260		155	Duluth, MN-WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	275,486 269,230	6,256 2.3
48900		156	Wilmington, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	274,532 200,124	74,408 37.2
22900		157	Fort Smith, AR-OK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	273,170 234,078	39,092 16.7
14500	1	158	Boulder, CO <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Area	269,814 208,949	60,865 29.1
30700		159	Lincoln, NE	Metropolitan Statistical Area	266,787 229,091	37,696 16.5
. 35980		160	Norwich-New London, CT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	259,088 254,957	4,131 1.6
36100		161	Ocala, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	258,916 194,833	64,083 32.9
42100		162	Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	255,602 229,734	25,868 11.3
43900		163	Spartanburg, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	253,791 226,800	26,991 11.9
12100	<b>,</b>	164	Atlantic City, NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	252,552 224,327	28,225 12.6
13780		165	Binghamton, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	252,320 264,497	-12,177 -4.6
22660		166	Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	251,494 186,136	65,358 35.1
34940		167	Naples-Marco Island, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	251,377 152,099	99,278 65.3
31180		168	Lubbock, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	249,700 229,940	19,760 8.6
42020	1	169	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	246,681 217,162	29,519 13.6

Page 6 of 29

Metro       Metro       Change 1990 to 2000         Micro       Div.       Pop.       Metropolitan Division       Legal/Statistical       April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990       Number       Percent         Code       Code       Rank       Micropolitan Statistical Area       April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990       Number       Percent         25060       1770       Guiport-Biloxi, MS       Metropolitan Statistical Area       238,315       18.4         29180       1712       Lafayote, LA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       238,314       18.7,768       50,346       26.5         1743       GalaresWile, FL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       232,329       191,263       11,229       21.5       14.2238       22.3       21.5       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.5       19.6       32.3       22.5       12.6       22.5       12.6       22.5       12.6       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.3       22.2       22.5       12.6       22.3       23.9       12.5       33.3       33.4       14.5			·				<u> </u>		<u> </u>
Micro       Metro       2000       Metropolitan Statistical Area       Legal/Statistical         Code       Rank       Micropolitan Statistical Area       Area Description       Areil 1, 2000 April 1, 1990       Number       Percent         25060       170       Guiport-Bliox, Mission       Areil 1, 2000 April 1, 1990       Number       Percent         25060       172       Gedar Rapids, RA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       236, 306       208, 740       30, 345       18.4         25100       173       Cedar Rapids, RA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       237, 230       210, 440       55, 546       42.5         23440       174       Gainesville, FL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       237, 230       19, 42, 233       41, 129       21, 555       12.6         23440       176       Garkswille, TN-VAY       Metropolitan Statistical Area       230, 014       211, 365       186, 439       8.8         31340       177       Kingsport-Bristo, TN-VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       228, 012       206, 141       211, 365       18, 649       8.8         31400       178       Kingsport-Bristo, TN-VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       228, 522 <td>Metro/</td> <td>1</td> <td>·</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Metro/	1	·						
Area       Div.       Pop.       Metropollan Division       Legal/Statistical       Area       Description       April 1, 2000, April 1, 1990       Percent         25060       0       8nk       Meropolitan Statistical Area       2246,190       207,875       38,316       18,4         29180       171       Lafgavette, LA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       238,036       208,740       30,346       14,5         23540       172       Holland-Grand Haven, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       237,230       210,640       26,500       12,6         174       Galmesville, FL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       232,001       189,279       42,721       22,6         176       Diremetron-Silverdale, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       230,014       211,365       16,649       8,8         31340       177       Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       228,014       203,378       16,55         180       Topeka, KS       Metropolitan Statistical Area       228,612       190,277       29,977       15,6         49420       122       Yakima, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,231       186,823	Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· · · ·	Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Code       Code       Rank       Micropolitan Statistical Area       Area Description       April 1, 2000 (April 1, 1990       Number/       Percent         25060       1770       Guiport-Bilox, MS       Metropolitan Statistical Area       239, 066       208,740       38,316       18.4         25100       172       Holland-Grand Haven, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       238,314       197,768       50,546       26.590       12.6         1730       173       Cedar Rapids, IA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       232,322       191,263       41,129       21.5         1740       Gañesville, FL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       232,302       191,263       41,129       22.5         1747       Ingsport-Bristol, TN-VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       231,969       189,731       42,228       22.3         28700       177 <kingsport-bristol, td="" tn-va<="">       Metropolitan Statistical Area       228,616       206,226       22.900       10.3         1100       179       Amarilo, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       224,551       210,257       14,294       6.8         25800       181       Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV       Metropolitan</kingsport-bristol,>	Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical			•	. •
2500       170 Guffport-Bloxi, MS       Metropollan Statistical Area       246,190       207,875       38,315       18.4         29180       171 Ladyetle, LA       Metropollan Statistical Area       230,806       208,774       03,646       14.5         26100       172 Holland-Grand Hayen, MI       Metropollan Statistical Area       233,214       187,768       50,646       26.59         173 Cadar Rapids, IA       Metropollan Statistical Area       233,209       191,263       41,129       21.5         174 Gemerton-Silverdale, WA       Metropollan Statistical Area       232,000       189,279       42,721       22.6         17410       Tris Instructure, WA       Metropollan Statistical Area       230,014       211,365       18,649       8.8         31340       178 Lynchburg, VA       Metropollan Statistical Area       226,515       200,1277       42,997       15.6         55800       180       Topeka, KS       Metropollan Statistical Area       222,521       186,143       33,758       17.9         31420       181 Hagerstown-Marthsburg, MD-WV       Metropollan Statistical Area       222,521       186,463       33,756       17.9         31420       183 Macon, GA <td>Code</td> <td>Code</td> <td>Rank</td> <td>Micropolitan Statistical Area</td> <td>Area Description</td> <td>April 1, 2000</td> <td>April 1, 1990</td> <td>Number</td> <td>Percent</td>	Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
29180     1771     Lafayette, LA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     239,086     206,740     30,346     14.5       26100     172     Cledar Rapidis, IA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     237,230     210,640     26,560     12.6       25400     174     Glanesville, FL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     237,230     210,640     26,560     12.6       1730     Clarksville, TN-KY     Metropolitan Statistical Area     231,969     189,771     42,721     22.6       1747     Kingsont-Brisch, TN-KY     Metropolitan Statistical Area     231,969     189,771     42,238     22.3       28700     178     Kingsont-Brisch, TN-KY     Metropolitan Statistical Area     236,616     206,226     22,390     10.9       11100     178     Amarillo, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,616     206,226     22,390     10.9       112700     181     Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,361     86,823     3,758     17.6       212700     182     Macron, GA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,368     266,616     15,752     7.6       212700     18	25060		. 170	Gulfport-Biloxi, MS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	246,190	207,875	38,315	18.4
26100       172 Holland-Grand Haven, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       238,314       167,768       50,546       26,590         1730       173 (Cadra Rapids, IA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       237,230       210,640       26,690       12,6         23540       174 (Gainesville, FL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       232,200       189,279       42,721       22,5         17300       175 (Catrksville, TN-KY       Metropolitan Statistical Area       232,000       189,273       42,233       22,3         28700       177 [Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       230,014       211,365       18,649       8.8         31340       178 [Lynchburg, VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       228,616       206,226       22,390       10.9         1100       179 [Amarillo, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,771       192,774       29,997       15.6         25180       180 [Topeka, KS       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,381       180,823       33,758       17.9         31420       183 [Macon, GA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,386       206,616       15,752       7.6         17300	29180	} .	171	Lafayette, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	239,086	208,740	30,346	- 14.5
16300     173 (Cedar Rapids, IA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     237,230     210,640     26,590     12.6       17300     173 (Ciantswille, TL-     Metropolitan Statistical Area     232,392     191,263     41,129     21.5       17300     175 (Ciantswille, TN-KY     Metropolitan Statistical Area     231,996     189,731     42,721     22.6       174 (Kingsport-Bristo), TN-VA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     231,996     189,731     42,738     22.3       28700     173 (Kingsport-Bristo), TN-VA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     228,616     206,222     23,900     10.9       11100     179 (Amarillo, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     228,616     206,222     196,144     30,376     17.5       25100     180 (Topeka, KS     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,711     192,774     29,997     15.6       24420     182 Yakima, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,711     198,773     23,958     17.9       31420     183 Macon, GA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,720     186,605     35,625     19,1       17300     186 Merced, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,557     161,172 <td>26100</td> <td></td> <td>172</td> <td>Holland-Grand Haven, MI</td> <td>Metropolitan Statistical Area</td> <td>238,314</td> <td>187,768</td> <td>50,546</td> <td>26.9</td>	26100		172	Holland-Grand Haven, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	238,314	187,768	50,546	26.9
23540       174 (Gainesville, FL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       232,392       191,263       41,129       21.5         17300       176 Direksville, TN-KY       Metropolitan Statistical Area       231,969       189,279       42,721       22.6         14740       176 Bremeton-Silverdale, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       231,969       189,279       42,723       22.3         28700       177 Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       230,014       211,305       180,649       8.8         31340       178 Lynchburg, VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,517       192,774       29,997       15.6         45820       181 Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,771       192,774       29,997       15.6         4420       162 Yakima, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,81       188,823       33,756       17.9         17300       184 Barnstable Town, MA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       221,324       24,334       12.9         180 Waco, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,554       178,403       32,151       18.0         180 Statistical Area       210,554	16300		173	Cedar Rapids, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	. 237,230	210,640	26,590	12.6
17300     175 Clarksville, TN-KY     Metropolitan Statistical Area     232,000     189,279     42,721     22.6       176 Diementon-Silverdale, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     230,001     211,365     186,49     8.8       31340     177 Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     230,014     211,365     186,649     8.8       31340     1778 Lynchburg, VA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     226,512     2196,144     30,376     15.5       45820     180 Topeka, KS     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,771     192,774     29,997     15.6       49420     181 Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,368     206,616     15,752     7.6       182 Yakima, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,368     206,616     15,752     7.6       17300     186 Marced, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,575     178,122     43,394     12.9       1800     186 Kagajnaw-Saginaw Township North, MI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,575     202,844     41,907     -0.9       36500     188 Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     203,171     182,12	23540	· ·	174	Gainesville, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	232,392	191,263	41,129	21.5
14740     176 Bremerton-Silverdale, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     231,969     189,731     42,238     22.3       28700     177 Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     230,014     211,365     18,649     8.8       31340     179 Lynchburg, VA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     228,522     196,144     30,378     15.5       45820     180 Topeka, KS     Metropolitan Statistical Area     224,551     210,257     14,294     6.8       25180     181 Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,561     188,223     33,755     17.9       31420     182 Yakima, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,561     188,223     33,755     17.9       31420     183 Macon, GA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,326     206,605     35,625     19.1       47300     186 Macon, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,554     178,403     32,151     18.0       32900     186 Merced, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,255     161,238     46,117     26.6       40980     188 Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,053 <td< td=""><td>17300</td><td>· ·</td><td>175</td><td>Clarksville, TN-KY</td><td>Metropolitan Statistical Area</td><td>. 232,000</td><td>189,279</td><td>42,721</td><td>22.6</td></td<>	17300	· ·	175	Clarksville, TN-KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	. 232,000	189,279	42,721	22.6
28700       177 [Kingsport-Bristel, TN-VA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       230,014       211,365       18,649       8.8         31340       178 [Amarillo, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       226,522       199,144       30,378       15.5         45820       180 [Topeka, KS       Metropolitan Statistical Area       224,551       .210,257       14,294       6.8         52180       182 [Yakima, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,581       186,823       33,758       17.9         31420       183 [Macon, GA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,230       186,605       35,625       19.1         47300       184 [Marced, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       223,018       206,616       15,752       7,66         32900       186 [Merced, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,848       7,427       3,77         49930       188 [Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,848       7,427       3,77         19202       190 [Chico, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,075       202,848       7,427       3,77         19404       Dymp	14740		176	Bremerton-Silverdale, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	231,969	189,731	42,238	22.3
31340     178 [Lynchburg, VA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     228,616     206,226     22,390     10.9       11100     179 Amarillo, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     226,521     196,144     30,378     15,5       45820     180 Topeka, KS     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,451     182,774     29,997     15,6       49420     182 Yakima, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,361     188,823     33,758     17,9       31420     183 Macon, GA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,361     188,623     33,758     17,9       31420     183 Macon, GA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,361     188,623     33,758     17,9       31420     184 Barnstable Town, MA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,554     178,403     32,151     18.0       32900     186 Merced, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,554     178,403     32,151     18.0       1650     187 Champaign-Urbrana, IL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,054     178,403     32,151     18.0       17020     190 Chrico, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,051     182,680     174,284	28700		177	Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	230,014	211,365	18,649	8.8
11100     179 Amarillo, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     226,522     196,144     30,378     15.5       45820     180 Topeka, KS     Metropolitan Statistical Area     224,551     210,257     14,294     6.8       45820     182 Yakima, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,771     192,774     29,997     15.6       49420     182 Yakima, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,361     188,823     33,758     17.9       31420     183 Macon, GA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,361     186,605     55,625     19.1       47380     165 Waco, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,554     178,403     32,151     18.0       16580     186 Merced, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,275     202,848     7,427     3.7       40980     188 Seginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,039     211,946     -1,907     -0.9       36500     189 Olympia, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,021     116     142,120     21,051     11.6       17540     191 Appleton, WI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,602     174,801     26,8	31340		. 178	Lynchburg, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	228,616	206,226	22,390	10.9
45820     180     Topeka, KS     Metropolitan Statistical Area     224,551     210,257     14,294     6.8       25180     181     Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,771     192,774     29,997     15.6       31420     183     Macon, GA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,368     206,616     15,752     7.6       12700     184     Barnstable Town, MA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,230     186,605     35,625     19.1       32900     186     Mecod, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,554     178,403     32,151     18.0       16580     187     Champaign-Urbana, IL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,275     202,848     7,427     3.7       17020     190     Chico, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,275     161,238     46,117     22.6       17020     190     Chico, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,602     174,801     26,001     15.3       1540     191     Appleton, WI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,602     174,801     26,801     15.3       15540     1	11100	ł.	179	Amarillo, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	226,522	196,144	30,378	15.5
25180       181       Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,771       192,774       29,997       15.6         49420       182       Yakima, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,581       188,823       33,758       17.9         182       Yakima, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,581       188,823       33,758       17.9         183       Macon, GA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,230       186,605       35,625       19.1         47380       186       Macon, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,517       189,123       24,394       32,151       18.0         32900       186       Mercod, GA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,848       7,427       3.7         49980       188       Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,848       7,427       3.7         17020       190       Chico, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,317       182,120       21,051       11.6         11540       191       Appleton, WI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,437	45820	1.	180	Topeka, KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	224,551	210,257	14,294	6.8
49420     182 Yakima, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,581     188,623     33,758     17.9       31420     183 Macon, GA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     222,368     206,616     15,752     7.6       12700     184 Barnstable Town, MA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     212,351     189,605     35,625     19.1       32900     186 Merced, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,554     176,403     32,151     18.0       40980     188 Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,275     202,848     7,427     3.7       17020     190 Chico, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,039     211,946     -1,907     -0.9       36500     189 Olympia, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,039     211,946     -1,907     -0.9       36500     190 Chico, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,602     174,801     26,611     15.3       41100     192 Springfield, IL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,437     189,550     11,887     6.3       34820     194 Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC     Metropolitan Statistical Area     196,629     144,0	25180		181	Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	222,771	192,774	29,997	15.6
31420       183 Macon, GA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,368       206,616       15,752       7.6         12700       184 Barnstable Town, MA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,230       186,605       35,625       19,1         32900       186 Merced, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       213,517       189,123       24,394       12.9         32900       186 Merced, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,554       178,403       32,151       18.0         16580       187 Champaign-Urbana, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,844       7,427       3.7         36500       189 Olympia, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,375       161,238       46,117       28.6         17020       190 Chico, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,437       189,550       11,867       6.3         144100       192 Springfield, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,437       189,550       11,867       6.3         193 Burlington-South Burlington, VT       Metropolitan Statistical Area       198,889       177,059       21,830       12.3         34820       194 Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux	49420		182	Yakima, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	222,581	188,823	33,758	17.9
12700       184       Barnstable Town, MA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       222,230       186,605       35,625       19,1         47380       185       Waco, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       213,517       189,123       24,334       12.9         32900       186       Merced, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,554       178,403       32,151       18.0         16580       187       Champaign-Urbana, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,848       7,427       3.7         40980       188       Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,848       7,427       3.7         40980       189       Olympia, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       207,355       161,238       46,117       28.6         17020       190       Chico, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,602       174,801       26,801       15.3         44100       192       Springfield, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,602       174,801       26,801       15.3         34520       194       Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC       Metro	31420	1	. 183	Macon, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	222,368	206,616	15,752	7.6
47380     185     Waco, TX.     Metropolitan Statistical Area     213,517     189,123     24,394     12.9       32900     186     Merced, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,554     178,403     32,151     18.0       16580     187     Champaign-Urbana, IL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,275     202,848     7,427     3.7       40980     188     Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     210,039     211,946     -1,907     -0.9       36500     189     Olympia, WA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     207,355     161,238     46,117     28.6       17020     190     Chico, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,602     174,801     26,801     15.3       14100     192     Springfield, IL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,437     189,550     11,887     6.3       15540     193     Burlington-South Burlington, VT     Metropolitan Statistical Area     196,629     144,053     52,576     36.5       26380     195     Houra-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     194,042     180,053     13,989     7.8 <td>12700</td> <td>1</td> <td>184</td> <td>Barnstable Town, MA</td> <td>Metropolitan Statistical Area</td> <td>222,230</td> <td>186,605</td> <td>35,625</td> <td>19.1</td>	12700	1	184	Barnstable Town, MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	222,230	186,605	35,625	19.1
32900       186       Merced, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,554       178,403       32,151       18.0         16580       187       Champaign-Urbana, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,848       7,427       3.7         40980       188       Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,039       211,946       -1,907       -0.9         36500       189       Olympia, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       207,355       161,238       46,117       28.6         17020       190       Chico, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,602       174,801       26,801       15.3         11540       191       Appleton, WI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,437       189,550       11,887       6.3         15540       193       Burlington-South Burlington, VT       Metropolitan Statistical Area       196,629       144,053       52,576       36.5         26380       195       Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       194,477       182,842       11,635       6.4         29340       197       Lake Charles, LA	47380	<u> </u> .	· 185	Waco, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	213,517	189,123	24,394	12.9
16580       187       Champaign-Urbana, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,275       202,848       7,427       3.7         40980       188       Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,039       211,946       -1,907       -0.9         36500       189       Olympia, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       207,355       161,238       46,117       28.6         17020       190       Chico, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       203,171       182,120       21,051       11.6         11540       191       Appleton, WI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,602       174,801       26,801       15.3         44100       192       Springfield, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,437       189,550       11,887       6.3         34820       194       Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC       Metropolitan Statistical Area       196,629       144,053       52,576       36.5         26380       195       Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       194,477       182,642       11,635       6.4         29340       197       Lake Charles, LA </td <td>32900</td> <td></td> <td>186</td> <td>Merced, CA</td> <td>Metropolitan Statistical Area</td> <td>210,554</td> <td>178,403</td> <td>32,151</td> <td>18.0</td>	32900		186	Merced, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	210,554	178,403	32,151	18.0
40980       188       Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       210,039       211,946       -1,907       -0.9         36500       189       Olympia, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       207,355       161,238       46,117       28.6         17020       190       Chico, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       203,171       182,120       21,051       11.6         11540       191       Appleton, WI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,602       174,801       26.801       15.3         44100       192       Springfield, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,602       174,801       26.801       15.3         34820       194       Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC       Metropolitan Statistical Area       196,629       144,053       52,576       36.5         26380       195       Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       194,477       182,842       11,635       6.4         30980       196       Longview, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       194,477       182,842       16,174       9.1         22500       198       Florence, SC	16580		187	Champaign-Urbana, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	210,275	202,848	7,427	3.7
36500       189       Olympia, WA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       207,355       161,238       46,117       28.6         17020       190       Chico, CA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       203,171       182,120       21,051       11.6         11540       191       Appleton, WI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,602       174,801       26,801       15.3         44100       192       Springfield, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,602       174,801       26,801       15.3         44100       192       Springfield, IL       Metropolitan Statistical Area       201,437       189,550       11,887       6.3         34820       194       Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC       Metropolitan Statistical Area       196,629       144,053       52,576       36.5         26380       195       Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA       Metropolitan Statistical Area       194,477       182,842       11,635       6.4         30980       196       Longview, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       193,568       177,394       16,174       9.1         22500       198       Florence, SC       Metropolitan S	40980		188	Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	210,039	211,946	-1.907	-0.9
17020     190     Chico, CA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     203,171     182,120     21,051     11.6       11540     191     Appleton, WI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,602     174,801     26,801     15.3       44100     192     Springfield, IL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     201,437     189,550     11,887     6.3       15540     193     Burlington-South Burlington, VT     Metropolitan Statistical Area     198,889     177,059     21,830     12.3       34820     194     Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC     Metropolitan Statistical Area     196,629     144,053     52,576     36.5       26380     195     Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     194,477     182,842     11,635     6.4       30980     196     Longview, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     193,568     177,394     16,174     9.1       22500     198     Florence, SC     Metropolitan Statistical Area     193,117     133,239     59,878     44.9       24022     200     Tuscaloosa, AL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     192,034     176,173     15,861     9.0	36500		189	Olympia, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	207,355	161,238	46,117	28.6
11540191Appleton, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area201,602174,80126,80115.344100192Springfield, ILMetropolitan Statistical Area201,437189,55011,8876.315540193Burlington-South Burlington, VTMetropolitan Statistical Area198,889177,05921,83012.334820194Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area196,629144,05352,57636.526380195Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area194,477182,84211,6356.430980196Longview, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area194,042180,05313,9897.829340197Lake Charles, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area193,155176,19516,9609.629700198Florence, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area193,117133,23959,87844.946220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area192,034176,17315,8619.028420201Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WAMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area187,09313,7977.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area187,09313,50933,59321.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area187,09313,50033,	17020	1	190	Chico, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· 203,171	182,120	21,051	11.6
44100192Springfield, ILMetropolitan Statistical Area201,437189,55011,8876.315540193Burlington-South Burlington, VTMetropolitan Statistical Area198,889177,05921,83012.334820194Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area196,629144,05352,57636.526380195Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area194,477182,84211,6356.430980196Longview, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area194,042180,05313,9897.829340197Lake Charles, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area193,568177,39416,1749.122500198Florence, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area193,155176,19516,9609.629700199Laredo, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area193,117133,23959,87844.946220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.42140205Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885 <td>11540</td> <td></td> <td>191</td> <td>Appleton, WI</td> <td>Metropolitan Statistical Area</td> <td>201,602</td> <td>174,801</td> <td>26,801</td> <td>15.3</td>	11540		191	Appleton, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	201,602	174,801	26,801	15.3
15540193Burlington-South Burlington, VTMetropolitan Statistical Area198,889177,05921,83012.334820194Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area196,629144,05352,57636.526380195Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area194,477182,84211,6356.430980196Longview, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area194,042180,05313,9897.829340197Lake Charles, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area193,568177,39416,1749.122500198Florence, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area193,155176,19516,9609.629700199Laredo, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area193,117133,23959,87844.946220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.943620203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205Elkhart-Goshen, JNMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791<	44100		192	Springfield, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	201,437	189,550	11,887	6.3
34820     194     Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC     Metropolitan Statistical Area     196,629     144,053     52,576     36.5       26380     195     Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     194,477     182,842     11,635     6.4       30980     196     Longview, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     194,042     180,053     13,989     7.8       29340     197     Lake Charles, LA     Metropolitan Statistical Area     193,568     177,394     16,174     9.1       22500     198     Florence, SC     Metropolitan Statistical Area     193,155     176,195     16,960     9.6       29700     199     Laredo, TX     Metropolitan Statistical Area     193,117     133,239     59,878     44.9       46220     200     Tuscaloosa, AL     Metropolitan Statistical Area     191,822     150,033     41,789     27.9       39540     202     Racine, WI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     191,822     150,033     41,789     27.9       39540     202     Racine, WI     Metropolitan Statistical Area     188,831     175,034     13,797     7.9	15540	[	193	Burlington-South Burlington, VT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	198,889	177,059	21,830	12.3
26380195Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area194,477182,84211,6356.430980196Longview, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area194,042180,05313,9897.829340197Lake Charles, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area193,568177,39416,1749.122500198Florence, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area193,155176,19516,9609.629700199Laredo, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area193,117133,23959,87844.946220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area192,034176,17315,8619.028420201Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WAMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.943620203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	34820		194	Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	196,629	144,053	52,576	36.5
30980196Longview, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area194,042180,05313,9897.829340197Lake Charles, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area193,568177,39416,1749.122500198Florence, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area193,155176,19516,9609.629700199Laredo, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area193,117133,23959,87844.946220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area192,034176,17315,8619.028420201Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WAMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.943620203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	26380	1	195	Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· 194,477	182,842	11,635	6.4
29340197Lake Charles, LAMetropolitan Statistical Area193,568177,39416,1749.122500198Florence, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area193,155176,19516,9609.629700199Laredo, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area193,117133,23959,87844.946220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area192,034176,17315,8619.028420201Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WAMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.943620203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	30980		196	Longview, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	194,042	180,053	13,989	7.8
22500198Florence, SCMetropolitan Statistical Area193,155176,19516,9609.629700199Laredo, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area193,117133,23959,87844.946220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area192,034176,17315,8619.028420201Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WAMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.943620203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	29340	1 · .	197	Lake Charles, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	193,568	177,394	16,174	9.1
29700199Laredo, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area193,117133,23959,87844.946220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area192,034176,17315,8619.028420201Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WAMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.943620203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	22500	1	198	Florence, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	193,155	176,195	16,960	9.6
46220200Tuscaloosa, ALMetropolitan Statistical Area192,034176,17315,8619.028420201Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WAMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.943620203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	29700	·	199	Laredo, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	193,117	133,239	59,878	44.9
28420201Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WAMetropolitan Statistical Area191,822150,03341,78927.939540202Racine, WIMetropolitan Statistical Area188,831175,03413,7977.943620203Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	46220	1 ·	200	Tuscaloosa, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	192,034	176,173	15,861	9.0
39540       202 Racine, WI       Metropolitan Statistical Area       188,831       175,034       13,797       7.9         43620       203 Sioux Falls, SD       Metropolitan Statistical Area       187,093       153,500       33,593       21.9         17780       204 College Station-Bryan, TX       Metropolitan Statistical Area       184,885       150,998       33,887       22.4         21140       205 Elkhart-Goshen, IN       Metropolitan Statistical Area       182,791       156,198       26,593       17.0	28420	}	201	Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	191,822	150,033	41,789	27.9
43620203 Sioux Falls, SDMetropolitan Statistical Area187,093153,50033,59321.917780204 College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205 Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	39540		202	Racine, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	188,831	175,034	13,797	7.9
17780204 College Station-Bryan, TXMetropolitan Statistical Area184,885150,99833,88722.421140205 Elkhart-Goshen, INMetropolitan Statistical Area182,791156,19826,59317.0	43620		203	Sioux Falls, SD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	187,093	153,500	33,593	21.9
21140 205 Elkhart-Goshen, IN Metropolitan Statistical Area 182,791 156,198 26,593 17.0	17780	1	204	College Station-Bryan, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	184,885	150,998	33,887	22.4
	21140		205	Elkhart-Goshen, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	182,791	156,198	26,593	· 17.0

. . . . ,

Page 7 of 29

	$\int$		E Contraction of the second		· .	•	i	E ··
Malast	<u> </u>		(¥(	·			· · · · · ·	
Wetro/		0000	Matropolitan Statistical Area		Bonu	lation	Change 10	00 to 2000
Aron		2000   Don	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Logol/Statistical	Гори		Change 19	90 10 2000
Alea -	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division		Annil 1: 2000	April 1, 1000	Number	Dereent
07740	Loae	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990		Percent
21140		200	Johnson City, TN Medferd, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	101,007	146 290	21,230	13.2
32100		207	Creater CO <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitari Statistical Area	101,209	140,309	34,000	23.0
24540		208	Greeley, CO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	180,926	131,817	49,109	37.3
29140	· .	209	Lalayelle, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	178,541	158,848	19,693	12.4
20740		210	Ningslon, NY Diagminatan IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	177,749	105,304	12,445	7.5
14020		211	Bloomington, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	175,500	100,009	18,837	12.0
40340		212		Metropolitan Statistical Area	174,700	101,309	20,097	10.0
29740	i i	213		Metropolitan Statistical Area	174,002	135,510	39,172	28.9
46020		214	Charlottaguille VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	174,307	100,290	21,071	13.7
10020		210	Terro Hauta IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	174,021	143,003	30,130	20.9
40400		210	Terre Haule, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	170,943	100,070	4,300	2.0
23020		217	Muskagan Norton Shoron MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	170,490	143,170	20,722	7 1
34740		210	Maproe 1 A	Metropolitan Statistical Area	170,200	100,900	7 172	7.1
20140	}	219	Prospett AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	167 517	102,001	50 803	4.4 55.5
39140 41060		220	St Cloud MM	Metropolitan Statistical Area	167 302	1/19 076	19,003	12.4
41000		221	St. Cloud, Min	Metropolitan Statistical Area	166 814	127 780	30 034	30.5
12020		222	Athons Clarke County, CA	Motropolitan Statistical Area	166 070	136 025	30,054	22.1
12020		220	Anderson SC	Motropolitan Statistical Area	165 740	1/15 106	20 544	1/1
37620	· ·	224	Parkershurg-Marietta MN/-OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	164 624	161 907	20,044	17
17010	[ ·	: 226	Materioo-Codar Falls, 14	Metropolitan Statistical Area	163 706	158 640	5,066	32
40340		220	Rochester MN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	163 618	141 945	21.673	15.3
39820		228	Redding CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	163 256	147,036	16,220	11.0
35660		220	Niles-Benton Harbor, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	162,453	161.378	1.075	0.7
10180	. • •	230	Ahilene TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	160.245	148.004	12.241	8.3
49740		231	Yuma AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	160.026	106.895	53,131	49.7
27100		232	Jackson, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	158,422	149,756	8,666	5.8
10500		233	Albany, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	157.833	146.574	11,259	7.7
27900		234	Joplin, MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	157.322	134.910	22,412	16.6
36780		235	Oshkosh-Neenah. Wi	Metropolitan Statistical Area	156,763	140,320	16,443	11.7
48540		236	Wheeling, WV-OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	153,172	159,301	-6,129	-3.8
24780		237	Greenville, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	152,772	123,308	29,464	23.9
27780	ļ .	238	Johnstown, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	152,598	163,029	-10,431	-6.4
27500		239	Janesville, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	152,307	139,510	12,797	9.2
48660	·	240	Wichita Falls, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	151,524	140,375	11,149	7.9
13980		241	Blacksburg-Christiansburg-Radford, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	151,272	140,715	10,557	7.5

-

Page 8 of 29

· ·	Æ			•				
Motrol	ار کے ا		Y	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•	`	ر
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· .	Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
37700	·····	242	Pascagoula, MS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	150,564	131,916	18,648	14.1
14060	ł	243	Bloomington-Normal, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	150,433	129,180	21,253	16.5
27340		244	Jacksonville, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	150,355	149,838	517	0.3
20740		245	Eau Claire, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	148,337	137,543	10,794	7.8
37460		246	Panama City-Lynn Haven, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· 148,217	126,994	21,223	16.7
47220		247	Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	146,438	. 138,053	8,385	6.1
33780	1	248	Monroe, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	145,945	133,600	12,345	9.2
19460		249	Decatur, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	145,867	131,556	14,311	10.9
17860	1 .	250	Columbia, MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	145,666	122,010	23,656	19.4
10780		251	Alexandria, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	145,035	149,082	-4,047	-2.7
12620	· .	252	Bangor, ME	Metropolitan Statistical Area	144,919	146,601	-1,682	-1.1
44220		253	Springfield, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	144,742	147,548	-2,806	. <b>-1.9</b>
43580		254	Sioux City, IA-NE-SD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	143,053	131,350	11,703	8.9
40580		255	Rocky Mount, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	143,026	133,235	9,791	· 7.3
22460		256	Florence, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	142,950	131,327	11,623	8.9
20940		257	El Centro, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	142,361	109,303	33,058	30.2
39460		258	Punta Gorda, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	141,627	110,975	30,652	27.6
39380		259	Pueblo, CO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	141,472	123,051	18,421	15.0
27620	l .	260	Jefferson City, MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	140,052	120,704	19,348	<sup>-</sup> 16.0
23580		261	Gainesville, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	139,277	95,428	43,849	45.9
49700		262	Yuba City-Marysville, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	139,149	122,643	16,506	13.5
13740	· ·	263	Billings, MT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	138,904	121,499	17,405	14.3
12980		264	Battle Creek, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	137,985	135,982	2,003	• 1.5
44300		· 265	State College, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	135,758	123,786	11,972	9.7
38340		266	Pittsfield, MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	134,953	139,352	-4,399	-3.2
11300		267	Anderson, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	133,358	130,669	2,689	2.1
48260		268	Weirton-Steubenville, WV-OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	132,008	142,523	-10,515	7.4
26980		269	Iowa City, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	131,676	115,731	15,945	13.8
20020		270	Dothan, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	130,861	120,352	10,509	8.7
15500		271	Burlington, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	130,800	108,213	22,587	20.9
45500	1	272	Texarkana, TX-Texarkana, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	129,749	120,132	9,617	8.0
25260	1	273	Hanford-Corcoran, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	129,461	101,469	27,992	27.6
42140	1	274	Santa Fe, NM	Metropolitan Statistical Area	129,292	98,928	30,364	30.7
11020	1	275	Altoona, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	129,144	130,542	-1,398	-1.1
31900		276	Mansfield, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	128,852	126,137	2,/15	2.2
29100	1	277	La Crosse, WI-MN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	126,838	· 116,401	10,437	9.0

Page 9 of 29

		-		-				· .		
	•	£	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	- ·		•		
•	)·	<u> </u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			·	·		<u> </u>
	. Metro/	Matra	2000	Matropoliton Statistical Area	•	· · ·	Bonu	lation	Change 10	00 to 2000
•	Area		2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area			Fopu			90 10 2000
	Codo	Div.	Pople	Micropolitan Statistical Area	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Legal/Statistical	April 1, 2000	April 1 1000	Number	Dereent
	20100	Coue	270	Dever DE	· · ·	Metropoliton Statistical Area	126 607	April 1, 1990		Percent
	20100 19110		270			Metropolitan Statistical Area	120,097	- 110,993	10,704	14.1
	2/020		219	Gione Falle NV		Metropolitan Statistical Area	120,004	115,400	10,434	9.0
-	3/000		200	Nana CA	•	Metropolitan Statistical Area	124,343	. 110,009	5,000	4.9
	25620		201	Hattiochura MS		Motropolitan Statistical Area	124,279	100,700	13,514	12.2
	20020		202	Madam : CA		Metropolitan Statistical Area	123,012	109,003	14,209	13.0
	3/100		200	Morristown TN		Metropolitan Statistical Area	123,109	100 501	35,019	· 39.0
•	A11A0	· ·	285	St Joseph MO-KS	· .	Metropolitan Statistical Area	123,001	115 016	22,490	22.4
•	36220		286	Odessa TX	•	Motropolitan Statistical Area	122,000	110,010	0,520	0.0 1 0
	30140	· ·	287	Lehanon PA	· ·	Metropolitan Statistical Area	121,123	112 744	2,109	1.0
	48700		288	Williamsport PA		Metropolitan Statistical Area	120,527	118 710	1 334	J.0 1 1
	19140	1	289	Dalton GA		Metropolitan Statistical Area	120,044	08 600	21 422	1.1 21.7
•	46660		290	Valdosta GA		Metropolitan Statistical Area	110 560	00 244	20,316	21.7
	34620		200	Muncie IN		Metropolitan Statistical Area	118,500	110 650		-0.7
•	22380		292	Flagstaff AZ		Metropolitan Statistical Area	116,700	96 591	19 729	20.4
•	24300		293	Grand Junction CO		Metropolitan Statistical Area	116,020	93 145	23 110	24.8
	33260		294	Midland TX	•	Metropolitan Statistical Area	116,200	106 611	9 398	24.0
	13460		295	Bend OR		Metropolitan Statistical Area	115 367	74 958	40,409	53.9
	12220		296	Auburn-Opelika: Al		Metropolitan Statistical Area	115,092	87,146	27,946	32.1
	30020		297	Lawton, OK		Metropolitan Statistical Area	114,996	111,486	3,510	3.1
	19500		298	Decatur, II.		Metropolitan Statistical Area	114,706	117,206	-2,500	-2.1
	22140		299	Farmington NM		Metropolitan Statistical Area	113,801	91,605	22,196	24.2
•	24140		300	Goldsboro, NC		Metropolitan Statistical Area	113.329	104,666	8.663	8.3
	46940		301	Vero Beach, FL		Metropolitan Statistical Area	112.947	90,208	22,739	25.2
•	39660		302	Rapid City, SD		Metropolitan Statistical Area	112.818	103,221	9,597	9.3
	43100		303	Sheboygan, WI		Metropolitan Statistical Area	112.646	103,877	8,769	8.4
•	11500		304	Anniston-Oxford, AL		Metropolitan Statistical Area	112.249	116.034	-3,785	-3.3
	47020		305	Victoria. TX		Metropolitan Statistical Area	111.663	99,394	12,269	12.3
	34060		306	Morgantown, WV		Metropolitan Statistical Area	111,200	104,546	6,654	6.4
	47580		307	Warner Robins, GA		Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,765	89,208	21,557	. 24.2
	43300	· ·	308	Sherman-Denison. TX	· · ·	Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,595	95.021	15,574	16.4
	13020	1	309	Bay City, MI		Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,157	111,723	-1,566	-1.4
2000 - 1 	19260		310	Danville. VA		Metropolitan Statistical Area	110.156	108.711	1,445	1.3
	33140		311	Michigan City-La Porte. IN	•••	Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,106	107,066	3,040	2.8
	36980	· ·	312	Owensboro, KY		Metropolitan Statistical Area	109,875	104,681	5,194	5.0
•	41540	-	313	Salisbury, MD		Metropolitan Statistical Area	109,391	97,779	11,612	11.9

Page 10 of 29

	F							· · · ·
	<u>(</u>		(	E				( <u> </u>
Metro/	-						•	• . ·
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Popul	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				•
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
17660	1	314	Coeur d'Alene, ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	108,685	69,795	38,890	55.7
30620		315	Lima, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	108,473	109,755	-1,282	-1.2
25500		316	Harrisonburg, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	108,193	88,189	20,004	22.7
27860		317	Jonesboro, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	107,762	93,620	14,142	15.1
21060	.	318	Elizabethtown, KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	107,547	100,919	6,628	6.6
27180		319	Jackson, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	107,377	90,801	16,576	18.3
38220		320	Pine Bluff, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	107,341	106,958	383	0.4
41660		321	San Angelo, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	105,781	100,087	5,694	5.7
44940		322	Sumter, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	104,646	102,637	2,009	2.0
14540		323	Bowling Green, KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	104,166	87,030	17,136	19.7
17420		324	Cleveland, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	104,015	87,355	16,660	19.1
28100		325	Kankakee-Bradley, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	103,833	96,255	7,578	7.9
30340		326	Lewiston-Auburn, ME	Metropolitan Statistical Area	103,793	105,259	-1,466	-1.4
23460	•	327	Gadsden, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	103,459	. 99,840	3,619	3.6
49020		328	Winchester, VA-WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,997	84,168	18,829	22.4
34580		329	Mount Vernon-Anacortes, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,979	79,555	23,424	29.4
30860		330	Logan, UT-ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	. 102,720	79,415	23,305	29.3
36140		331	Ocean City, NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,326	95,089	7,237	7.6
19060		332	Cumberland, MD-WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,008	101,643	365	0.4
26820		333	Idaho Falls, ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	101,677	88,750	12,927	14.6
29020		334	Kokomo, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	101,541	96,946	4,595	4.7
29940	ŀ.	335	Lawrence, KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	99,962	81,798	18,164	22.2
48300		· 336	Wenatchee, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	99,219	78,455	20,764	26.5
24220		. 337	Grand Forks, ND-MN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	97,478	103,181	-5,703	· <b>-5.5</b>
22540		338	Fond du Lac, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	97,296	90,083	· 7,213	8.0
27060		339	Ithaca, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	96,501	94,097	2,404	2.6
33540		340	Missoula, MT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	95,802	78,687	17,115	21.8
13900		341	Bismarck, ND	Metropolitan Statistical Area	94,719	83,831	10,888	13.0
15260		342	Brunswick, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	93,044	82,207	10,837	13.2
31020		343	Longview-Kelso, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	92,948	82,119	10,829	13.2
21300		344	Elmira, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	91,070	95,195	-4,125	-4.3
40660		345	Rome, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	90,565	.81,251	9,314	11.5
41100		346	St. George, UT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	90,354	48,560	41,794	86.1
20220		347	Dubuque, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	89,143	86,403	2,740	3.2
26300		348	Hot Springs, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	88,068	73,397	14,671	20.0
19180		349	Danville, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	83,919	88,257	-4,338	-4.9

Page 11 of 29

	<u>(E</u>			•		· ·	(	
Metro/			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,			· · ·	×.
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Рори	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical	· ·			
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
38540		350	Pocatello, ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	83,103	73,112	9,991	13.7
21820		351	Fairbanks, AK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	82,840	77,720	5,120	6.6
16940	· ·	352	Cheyenne, WY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	81,607	73,142	8,465	11.6
24500		353	Great Falls, MT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· 80,357	77,691	2,666	.3.4
11180		354	Ames, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	79,981	74,252	5,729	7.7
41780		355	Sandusky, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	79,551	76,779	2,772	3.6
18700	1	356	Corvallis, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	78,153	70,811	7,342	10.4
25980		357	Hinesville-Fort Stewart, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	71,914	58,947	12,967	22.0
18020		358	Columbus, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	71,435	63,657	7,778	12.2
14980		359	Bristol, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	68,470	64,313	4,157	6.5
16220		360	Casper, WY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	. 66,533	61,226	5,307	8.7
30300		361	Lewiston, ID-WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	57,961	51,359	6,602	12.9
16180		· 362	Carson City, NV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	52,457	40,443	12,014	29.7

•••

Page 12 of 29

<u> </u>	<u> </u>		T		· ·		•	
Metro/								
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				• •
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
			Micropolitan Statistical Areas			· ·		
45860		1	Torrington, CT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	182,193	174,092	8,101	4.7
30100	ł .	2	Lebanon, NH-VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	167,387	155,133	12,254	· 7.9
42580		3	Seaford, DE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	156,638	113,229	43,409	38.3
29420	ŀ	4	Lake Havasu City-Kingman, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	155,032	93,497	61,535	65.8
36860		5	Ottawa-Streator, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	153,098	148,331	4,767	3.2
39060	1	6	Pottsville, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	150,336	152,585	-2,249	-1.5
25900	1	7	Hilo, HI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	148,677	120,317	28,360	23.6
30540		8	Lexington-Thomasville, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	147,246	126,677	. 20,569	16.2
25940		9	Hilton Head Island-Beaufort, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	141,615	101,912	39,703	39.0
19300	1	10	Daphne-Fairhope, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,415	98,280	42,135	42.9
27460		11	Jamestown-Dunkirk-Fredonia, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	139,750	141,895	-2,145	-1.5
20700		12	East Stroudsburg, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	138,687	95,709	- 42,978	- 44.9
18180	[· "	13	Concord, NH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	136,225	120,005	16,220	13.5
45900		14	Traverse City, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	131,342	106,497	24,845	23.3
41580	· .	15	Salisbury, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	130,340	110,605	19,735	17.8
16540		16	Chambersburg, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	129,313	121,082	8,231	6.8
27980		17	Kahului-Wailuku, HI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	128,094	100,374	27,720	27.6
21700		<sup>·</sup> 18	Eureka-Arcata-Fortuna, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	126,518	119,118	7,400	6.2
46180	1	19	Tupelo, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	125,251	107,835	17,416	· 16.2
31300		20	Lumberton, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	123,339	105,179	18,160	17.3
44380		21	Statesville-Mooresville, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	122,660	92,931	29,729	32.0
26140		22	Homosassa Springs, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	118,085	93,515	24,570	. 26.3
43420	}	23	Sierra Vista-Douglas, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	117,755	97,624	20,131	<sup>-</sup> 20.6
12300		24	Augusta-Waterville, ME	Micropolitan Statistical Area	117,114	115,904	1,210	1.0
35100		25	New Bern, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	114,751	102,399	12,352	12.1
20620		26	East Liverpool-Salem. OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	112,075	108,276	3,799	3.5
36300		27	Ogdensburg-Massena, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	·111,931	111,974	-43	0.0
48060	•	28	Watertown-Fort Drum, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	111,738	110,943	795	0.7
49300		29	Wooster, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	111,564	101,461	10,103	10.0
48740		30	Willimantic, CT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	109,091	102,525	6,566	6.4
31740		31	Manhattan, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	108,999	113,720	-4,721	-4.2
44420		32	Staunton-Waynesboro, VA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	108,988	97,687	11,301	11.6
14140		33	Bluefield, WV-VA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	107.578	110,940	-3,362	-3.0
32940	1 .	34	Meridian. MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	106,569	103,224	3,345	3.2
	•	I '	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • • •	•	•		

6

Page 13 of 29

. (	$\left( - \right)$			-	· . ·	· · ·		(
Metro/		0000			Bopul	ation	Change 10	
MICIO	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1	Fopul	alion	Change 19	90 10 2000
Area		Pop.	Metropolitan Division			A		Deveent
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
10880		35	Allegan, Mi	Micropolitan Statistical Area	105,005	90,509	15,156	16.7
11700	ľ	30	Albany-Lebanon, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	103,009	91,227	11,842	13.0
11700		20	Ashtabula, On	Micropolitan Statistical Area	102,720	99,821	2,907	2.9
20220		30	Ranninonu, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	100,566	· 85,709	14,079	17.4
40700		39	Adrian MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	100,399	94,049	5,750	0.1
27140	· ·	40	Paduoah KV II	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90,090	91,470	1,414	0.1
10500		41	Corning NV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90,700	. 94,090	4,170	4.4
10000	1	42	Shelby NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90,720	99,000	-302	-0.4
25260	· .	43	New Castle PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	04 642	04,714	1,573	13.7
33200		44	Sunhung DA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	94,043	90,240	-1,003	-1.7
44500	· ·	45	Whitewater Wi	Micropolitan Statistical Area	03 750	75,000	18 750	-2,3 25.0 <sup>-</sup>
18260		40	Cockeyille TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	03/17	78 306	15 111	10.3
10200	•	19	Tullahoma TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	93,417	70,000	13 230	16.6
21/60		10	Enterprise Ozerk Al	Micropolitan Statistical Area	02 744	80 873	2 871	3.2
17220		50	Clarkshurg WV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	92 144	91 509	635	0.2
46020		51	Truckee-Grass Valley CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	92 033	78 510	13 523	17.2
36700		52	Orangehurg SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	91 582	84 803	6 779	80
23900	· ·	53	Gettyshurg PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	91 292	78,274	13.018	16.6
20380		54	Dunn NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	91,025	67,822	23,203	34.2
35420		55	New Philadelphia-Dover OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90.914	84,090	6.824	8.1
32740		56	Meadville, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90,366	86,169	4.197	. 4.9
16020		57	Cape Girardeau-Jackson, MO-IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90.312	82,878	7,434	9.0
26860		58	Indiana. PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	89,605	89,994	-389	-0.4
36660		59	Opelousas-Eunice, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	87,700	80,331	7,369	9.2
40020		60	Richmond, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	87,454	72,311	15,143	20.9
42700		61	Sebring, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	87,366	68,432	18,934	27.7
46380		62	Ukiah, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	86,265	80,345	5,920	7.4
30500		63	Lexington Park, MD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	86,211	75,974	10,237	13.5
13180	ł	64	Beaver Dam, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	85,897	76,559	9,338	12.2
31860	1	65	Mankato-North Mankato, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	85,712	82,120	3,592	· 4.4
49780		66	Zanesville, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	84,585	82,068	2,517	3.1
36460	· ·	67	Olean, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	83,955	. 84,234	-279	-0.3
20180		68	DuBois, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	83,382	78,097	5,285	6.8
29860		69	Laurel, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	83,107	79,145	3,962	· 5.0
31820	·	70	Manitowoc, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82,887	80,421	2,466	3.1

Page 14 of 29

	ſ					•	·	<u> </u>
(	<u> </u>	·	())()()()())()()())()())()_()		· · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Metro/			Mature allow Otabletical Area		Bonu	lation	Change 10	00 to 2000
	Inetro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		- Fobu	lauon	Change 19	90 10 2000
Area		Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Area Description	April 1 2000	April 1, 1000	Numbor	Porcont
<u>-000e</u>			Midland Mi	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82 874	75 651	7 223	
33220 46300		72	Twin Falle ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82 626	68 718	13 008	9.J 20.2
1/100	1	. 73	Bloomshurg-Benwick PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82 387	80 037	1 450	- 1.8
14660		74	Brainerd MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82 249	66 040	16 209	24.5
. 10700		75	Albertville Al	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82,231	70 832	11,399	16.1
12180		76	Auburn NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	81 963	82 313	-350	-0.4
37820	1	77	Pendleton-Hermiston, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	81,543	66.874	14,669	21.9
45180		. 78	Talladega-Sviacauga, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	80.321	74,107	6.214	8.4
31260		79	Lufkin. TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	80.130	69.884	10.246	14.7
43740	• •	80	Somerset, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	80.023	78.218	1.805	2.3
38460		81	Plattsburgh, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,894	85,969	-6,075	-7.1
28580	•	82	Key West-Marathon, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,589	78,024	1,565	2.0
40260	•	83	Roanoke Rapids, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,456	76,314	3,142	4.1
13220		84	Beckley, WV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,220	76,819	2,401	3.1
39020		85	Portsmouth, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,195	80,327	-1,132	-1.4
39500	ł	· 86	Quincy, IL-MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	78,771	76,323	2,448	3.2
18980	· · ·	87	Culiman, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	77,483	67,613	9,870	14.6
24420	· ·	88	Grants Pass, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	75,726	62,649	13,077	20.9
40780		89	Russellville, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	75,608	63,642	11,966	18.8
49220	1.	90	Wisconsin Rapids-Marshfield, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	75,555	73,605	1,950	2.6
23700		91	Gallup, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,798	60,686	14,112	23.3
43860		92	Southern Pines, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,769	59,013	15,756	26.7
34180		93	Moses Lake, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,698	54,758	19,940	36.4
23660	· ·	94	Galesburg, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,571	75,574	-1,003	-1.3
28060	1	95	Kalispell, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,471	59,218	15,253	25.8
47700		96	Warsaw, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,057	65,294	8,763	13.4
48020		<sup>•</sup> 97	Watertown-Fort Alkinson, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,021	67,783	6,238	9.2
28300	·	98	Keene, NH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,825	70,121	3,704	5.3
48980		99	Wilson, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,814	66,061	7,753	11.7
31980		100	Marion, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,403	74,169	~766	-1.0
32300	1 .	101	Martinsville, VA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	/3,346	/3,104	242	0.3
17060		102	Chillicothe, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,345	69,330	4,015	5.8
11980		103	Athens, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,277	58,543	14,/34	25.2
35340	· ·	104	New Iberia, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	/3,266	68,297	4,969	7.3
37020		105	Owosso, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,687	69,770	1,91/	2.1
36020		106	Oak Harbor, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	. 71,558	60,195	11,363	18.9

. .

Page 15 of 29

	<b>(</b> 1	• •		- · ·	· ·	• •	.(	$\left( \right)$
Metrol	<u>ار ک</u>	<u> </u>	``	`	· · ·			
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· · · · ·	Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
22300		107	Findlay, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,295	65,536	5,759	8.8
34340		108	Mount Airy, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,219	61,704	9,515	15.4
42940	1	109	Sevierville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,170	51,043	20,127	39.4
39980	Ì	110	Richmond, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,097	71,951	-854	-1.2
37260		111	Palatka, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	70,423	65,070	5,353	8.2
17940		112	Columbia, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	69,498	54,812	14,686	26.8
34780		113	Muskogee, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	69,451	68,078	1,373	2.0
31940		114	Marinette, WI-MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,710	65,468	3,242	5.0
16500		115	Centralia, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,600	59,358	9,242	15.6
14700		116	Branson, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,361	44,639	23,722	53.1
24260		117	Grand Island, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,305	63,022	5,283	8.4
44660		118	Stillwater, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,190	61,507	6,683	10.9
14580	ŀ	119	Bozeman, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,831	50,463	17,368	34.4
33500	· ·	120	Minot, ND	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,392	67,609	-217	-0.3
10140		121	Aberdeen, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,194	64,175	3,019	4.7
44620		122	Stevens Point, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,182	61,405	5,777	<b>`9.4</b>
42620		123	Searcy, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,165	54,676	12,489	22.8
23180		124	Frankfort, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	66,798	58,352	8,446	14.5
24940		125	Greenwood, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	66,271	59,567	6,704	11.3
32020		126	Marion, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	66,217	64,274	1,943	3.0
42860		127	Seneca, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	66,215	57,494	8,721	15.2
25740		128	Helena, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	65,765	55,434	10,331	18.6
35900		129	North Wilkesboro, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	65,632	59,393	6,239	10.5
43060		130	Shawnee, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	65,521	58,760	6,761	11.5
26740		131	Hutchinson, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	64,790	62,389	2,401	3.8
32100		132	Marquette, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	64,634	70,887	-6,253	8.8
38820		133	Port Angeles, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	64,525	56,464	8,061	14.3
16660		134	Charleston-Mattoon, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	64,449	62,314	2,135	3.4
30740	1	· 135	Lincolnton, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,780	50,319	13,461	26.8
28900		136	Klamath Falls, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,775	57,702	6,073	10.5
40860	· .	· 137	Rutland, VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,400	62,142	1,258	2.0
34380		138	Mount Pleasant, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,351	54,624	8,727	16.0
26460		139	Hudson, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,094	62,982	112	0.2
24740		140	Greenville, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,977	67,935	-4,958	-7.3
24620		141	Greeneville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,909	55,853	7,056	12.6
22580		142	Forest City, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	[ 62,899	56,918	5,981	10.5

Page 16 of 29

	£			-				<i>c</i> .
	<u> </u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					€
Metro/	T .			1				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area	. ·	Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical	·	÷		· · · · · · ·
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
18300		143	Coos Bay, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,779	60,273	2,506	4.2
42380		144	Sayre, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,761	60,967	1,794	2.9
44780		145	Sturgis, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,422	58,913	3,509	6.0
10460		146	Alamogordo, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,298	51,928	10,370	20.0
11900		147	Athens, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,223	59,549	2,674	4.5
<sup>.</sup> 32220		·148	Marshall, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,110	57,483	4,627	8.0
23380		· 149	Fremont, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,792	61,963	-171	-0.3
26660		150	Huntsville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,758	50,917	10,841	21.3
36580		151	Oneonta, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,676	60,517	1,159	1.9
18060		152	Columbus, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,586	59,308	2,278	3.8
40740	1	153	Roswell, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,382	57,849	3,533	6.1
29580		154	Lancaster, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,351	54,516	6,835	12.5
32060		155	Marion-Herrin, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,296	57,733	3,563	6.2
44580		156	Sterling, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	60,653	60,186	467	0.8
12860	·	157	Batavia, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	60,370	60,060	310	0.5
41460		158	Salina, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,760	54,935	4,825	8.8
28820		· 159	Kinston, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,648	57,274	2,374	4.1
16060	·	160	Carbondale, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,612	61,067	-1,455	-2.4
35940	·	161	Norwalk, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,487	56,240	3,247	5.8
33980		162	Morehead City, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,383	· 52,556	6,827	13.0
34860		163	Nacogdoches, <del>T</del> X	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,203	54,753	4,450	8.1
18940	· .	164	Crowley, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,861	55,882	2,979	5.3
29300		165	LaGrange, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,779	55,536	3,243	5.8
45660		166	Tiffin-Fostoria, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,683	59,733	1,050	-1.8
28180		167	Kapaa, HI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,463	51,177	7,286	14.2
17340		168	Clearlake, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,309	50,631	7,678	15.2
10620	ŀ	169	Albemarle, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,100	51,765	6,335	12.2
· 12740		170	Barre, VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,039	54,928	3,111	5.7
40820		171	Ruston, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,906	57,450	456	0.8
21420		172	Enid, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,813	56,735	1,078	1.9
36340		173	Oil City, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,565	. 59,381	-1,816	-3.1
22260		174	Fergus Falls, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,159	50,714	6,445	12.7
38580	1	175	Point Pleasant, WV-OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,026	56,132	894	1.6
22060		176	Faribault-Northfield, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,665	49,183	7,482	15.2
21900		177	Fairmont, WV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,598	57,249	-651	-1.1
29380	· ·	178	Lake City, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,513	42,613	13,900	32.6

1.8 J -

Page 17 of 29

•								
. (	E	. ·	(	-		· · · ·		C :
<u> </u>		·	<u> </u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			F
Metro/								
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
29060		179	Laconia, NH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	· 56,325	49,216	7,109	14.4
43700	ļ	180	Somerset, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,217	49,489	6,728	13.6
39780		181	Red Bluff, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	· 56,039	49,625	6,414	12.9
44340		182	Statesboro, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,983	43,125	12,858	29.8
23860	•	183	Georgetown, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,797	46,302	9,495	_ 20.5
22100		184	Farmington, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,641	48,904	6,737	13.8
26020	1	185	Hobbs, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,511	55,765	-254	-0.5
12660		186	Baraboo, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,225	· 46,975	8,250	17.6
47460		187	Walla Walla, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,180	48,439	6,741	13.9
37300		188	Palestine, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,109	48,024	7,085	14.8
24100		189	Gloversville, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	· 55,073	54,191	882	1.6
33300		190	Milledgeville, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,776	48,438	6,338	13.1
35020		191	Natchez, MS-LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,587	56,184	-1,597	-2.8
38020		192	Phoenix Lake-Cedar Ridge, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,501	48,456	6,045	<sup>•</sup> 12.5
34540		193	Mount Vernon, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,500	47,473	7,027	14.8
11620		194	Ardmore, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,452	51,076	3,376	<b>6.6</b>
32380		195	Mason City, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,356	54,724	-368	-0.7
42460		196	Scottsboro, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,926	47,796	6,130	· 12.8
34700		197	Muscatine, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,905	51,499	2,406	4.7
10020	1	198	Abbeville, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,807	50,055	3,752	7.5
40100		199	Rio Grande City, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,597	40,518	13,079	32.3
34020		200	Morgan City, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,500	58,086	-4,586	-7.9
20140		201	Dublin, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,434	48,317	5,117	10.6
45540		202	The Villages, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,345	31,577	21,768	68.9
24820		203	Greenville, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,309	53,619	-310	-0.6
21020		204	Elizabeth City, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,150	47,649	5,501	11.5
30940		205	London, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,715	43,438	9,277	21.4
32620	ļ	206	McComb, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,539	50,210	2,329	4.6
23500		207	Gaffnev. SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,537	· 44,506	8,031	18.0
22860		208	Fort Polk South, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,531	61,961	<sup>-</sup> -9,430	-15.2
11740	·	209	Ashland, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,523	47,507	5,016	10.6
27540	1	210	Jasper, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,511	49,125	3,386	6.9
36620	ľ	211	Ontario, OR-ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,193	42,472	9,721	22.9
14180		212	Blytheville, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,979	57,525	-5,546	-9.6
25340		213	Harriman, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,910	47,227	4,683	9.9
16100		214	Carlsbad-Artesia, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,658	48,605	3,053	6.3
• • •	1	· ···	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• <u>•</u> •	• •	•	• • •	

Page 18 of 29

					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			<u> </u>
Metro/								
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Popula	ation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical	· .		.	
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000 /	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
37740	· ·	215	Payson, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,335	40,216	11,119	27.6
31660	1	216	Malone, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,134	46,540	4,594	9.9
48180		217	Waycross, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,119	48,799	2,320	4.8
19220		218	Danville, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,058	45,686	5,372	11.8
40300	1	219	Rochelle, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,032	45,957	5,075	11.0
15460		220	Burlington, IA-IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	50,564	. 50,710	-146	-0.3
17540		221	Clinton, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	50,149	51,040	-891	· -1.7
49100		222	Winona, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,985	47,828	2,157	4.5
37380		223	Palm Coast, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,832	28,701	21,131	73.6
11220		224	Amsterdam, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,708	51,981	-2,273	-4.4
46980		. 225	Vicksburg, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,644	47,880	• 1,764	3.7
38420	1	226	Platteville, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,597	49,264	333	0.7
35740		227	Norfolk, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,538	46,726	2,812	6.0
20780		228	Edwards, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,471	27,935	21,536	77.1
43220	· .	229	Shelton, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,405	38,341	11,064	28.9
28260		230	Kearney, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,141	44,076	5,065	11.5
41820		231	Sanford, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,040	41,374	7,666	18.5
11940		232	Athens, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,015	42,383	6,632	. 15.6
12780		233	Bartlesville, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,996	48,066	930	1.9
23300		234	Freeport, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,979	48,052	927	1.9
24900	•	235	Greenwood, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,716	46,578	2,138	4.6
34500		236	Mount Vernon, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,666	45,519	3,147	6.9
38100		237	Picayune, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,621	38,714	9,907	25.6
18660		238	Cortland, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,599	48,963	-364	-0.7
35220	1.	239	New Castle, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,508	48,139	. 369	0.8
37580	·	240	Paris, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,499	43,949	4,550	. 10.4
47660		241	Warrensburg, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,258	42,514	5,744	13.5
38620		242	Ponca City, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,080	48,056	24	0.0
23980		243	Glasgow, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,070	42,964	5,106	11.9
43380		244	Sidney, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	47,910	44,915	2,995	6.7
24180		245	Granbury, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	47,909	34,341	13,568	39.5
36060		246	Oak Hill, WV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	47,579	47,952	-373	-0.8
20580		247	Eagle Pass, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	47.297	36,378	10,919	30.0
15340		248	Bucyrus, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46.966	47.870	-904	-1.9
21220	1 ·	249	Flko, NV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46.942	35.077	11.865	33.8
18900		250	Crossville TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,802	34.736	12.066	34.7
	1	1 200	crocornich tru			,		

Page 19 of 29

Metro       Zoon       Metropolitan Statistical Area       Population       Change 1990 to 2000         Area       Div       Pop.       Metropolitan Division       Legal/Statistical       Area Description       April 1, 1990       Number       Percent         27380       281 Jacksonville, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,851       41,059       5.610       13.7         47540       255 Wagkoneta, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,651       44,555       2.025       4.5         30160       255 Mockingham, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,564       44,551       2.046       4.5         30360       255 Levistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,564       46,197       289       0.6         23340       256 Levistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,365       41,155       3.989       2.22         13860       250 Centonlaivelle, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,197       2.399       0.6       7.76       7.837       8.398       2.22       1.765       3.977       7.839       3.998       2.22       1.866       4.519       4.2310       1.765       2.75		F		Į.	-	• •	
Metrov       Metropolitan Statistical Area       Pop.       Change 1990 to 2000         Area       Div.       Pop.       Metropolitan Statistical Area       Area Description       April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990       Number       Percent         Code       Code       Code       Code       April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990       Number       Percent         27300       2251       Jacksonville, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,659       41,049       5,610       13.7         47540       2252       Wapskontala, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,559       44,555       2,026       4.5         31580       2556       Metropolitan Statistical Area       46,543       35,028       11,515       32,9         30380       2565       Lewistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,346       46,137       22,93       3,039       256       43,03       3,972       43,00       3,865       3,77       8,398       22,273       3,872       43,00       3,865       8,72       3,865       8,72       3,865       8,71       1,195       2,273       3,872       43,00       3,865       8,72       1,420	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	£		<u>(t</u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u>_</u>
Micro       Metro       2000       Metropolitan Statistical Area       Population       Charge 1990 02:000         Code       Code       Rank       Micropolitan Statistical Area       April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990       Number       Percent         27380       251 Ljackonville, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,615       41,049       5,610       13.7         47540       253 Rockonville, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,611       44,585       2,026       4.5         36180       254 Qoean Plines, MD       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,643       45,028       11,115       32.9         30380       256 Medisorwi, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,645       46,114       42,825       46,23       35,028       11,115       32.9         30380       256 Lewistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,465       46,114       32.273       30.87       23.38       22.28       11,115       32.9       22.9       22.73       31,872       43.0         2540       2581 Gendaliville, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,145       32.273       13,872       43.0        2521 Beradford, PA       M	Metro/					Denstation	Ohanna 1000 to 2000
Area       Div.       Pop.       Metropolitan Division       Legar/Statistical         Code       Code       Code       Area       Description       April 1, 199       Number       Percent         27380       251 (Jacksonville, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,655       41,049       5,610       13.7         40460       253 Rockingham, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,654       44,518       2,026       4.5         30150       255 Madisonville, KY       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,643       45,126       393       0.9         30380       256 Lewistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,645       46,197       288       6.6         2820       257 Selma, AL       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,645       32,277       8,398       22.2         1340       269 Canon City, CO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,045       32,277       8,398       22.2         1340       260 Bellefontaino, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,036       47,11       1,195       2.5         13200       261 Bradróct, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,027       3,989	Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Population	Change 1990 to 2000
Code       Rank       Micropolitan       Statistical Area       Area Description       April 1, 2000 (April 1, 1990)       Nummer       Predent         27300       251 Jacksonville, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,659       41,049       5,610       13.7         47540       252 Wapakoneta, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,651       44,515       2,026       4.5         40460       253 Rockingham, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,541       2,049       4.6         30380       256 Lewistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,519       46,17       299       0.6         42820       257 Selma, AL       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,465       48,130       -1,765       -3.7         8340       256 Lewishdiville, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,145       32,273       13,872       43.0         13400       260 Bellefontaine, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,145       32,273       13,872       43.0         261 Bradiord, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,936       47,131       -1,195       -2.5         13260       226 Bedfort, IN       Micropolitan Sta	Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical		
27380       251       Jacksonville, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,659       41,049       5,610       13.7         47540       252       Wapakoneta, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,654       45,052       2,025       4.5         6460       253       Rockingham, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,654       35,021       11,515       32.9         31580       255       Madisonville, KY       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,619       46,122       333       0.9         30380       256       Lewistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,465       46,170       280       0.6         257       Selma, AL       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,365       44,130       -1,765       -3.7         13340       256       Kondalville, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,035       47,11       -1,155       -2.5         13260       262       Bedford, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,592       46,719       -1,000       -2.3         13740       263       Coldwater, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,529       46,719       -1,00	Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990	Number Percent
47540       252       Warpolitan Statistical Area       46,611       44,585       2,0226       4.5.         04600       253       Rockingham, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,654       44,151       2,046       4.6.         31580       255       Madisonville, KY       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,543       35,028       11,515       32.9         30380       256       Lewistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,464       46,197       289       0.6         28240       257       Slema, AL       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,145       32,273       13,872       43.0         31340       260       Belefontaine, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,145       32,273       13,872       43.0         31340       260       Belefontaine, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,936       47,131       -1,195       -2.5         31260       261       Bradford, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,767       41,502       4,263       10.3         326500       264       El Dorado, AR       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,767       41,612       2.946<	27380	<b>.</b>	251	Jacksonville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,659 41,049	5,610 13.7
40460       253       Rockingham, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,643       44,518       2,048       4,35         31580       256       Madisonville, KY       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,513       350,028       11,515       32.9         30380       256       Lewistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,619       46,177       283       0.6         42820       257       Selma, AL       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,486       46,197       289       0.6         43840       256       Kendaliville, IV       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,145       32,273       13,872       43.0         13840       260       Bellefontaine, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,005       42,310       3,695       8.7         13260       261       Bradford, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,593       67,713       1,105       -2.5         20980       266       Huntingdon, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,523       67,714       1,502       4,265       1,03         20980       266       Huntingdon, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45	47540		252	Wapakoneta, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,611 44,585	2,026 4.5
36180     254 (Ocean Pines, MD     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,543     35,028     11,515     323     0.9       30380     256 Lewistown, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,619     46,197     289     0.6       2020     257 Selma, AL     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,265     37,307     8,398     22.2       15800     259 Canon City, CO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,275     37,377     8,388     22.2       13400     260 Belfeontaine, OH     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,025     42,310     3,665     8.7       13200     261 Bradford, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,936     47,131     -1,195     -2.5       13200     262 Bedford, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,936     47,131     -1,195     -2.5       13200     263 Clodwater, MI     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,586     44,164     1,422     3.2       20800     264 El Dorado, AR     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,586     44,164     1,422     3.2       28460     265 Vantingdon, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,128     42,182     2,466     7.0	40460		253	Rockingham, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,564 44,518	
31580     255 Madisonville, KY     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,191     40,126     393     0.93       30300     256 Lewistown, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,486     46,191     229     257     Sema, AL     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,486     48,100     -1,765     -3.7       28340     258 Kendallville, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,145     32,273     13,472     43.00       13340     260 Bellefontaine, OH     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,005     42,310     3,695     8.7       13420     261 Bradford, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,936     47,131     -1,195     -2.5       13260     262 Bedford, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,937     41,502     4,285     10.3       2080     264 El Dorado, AR     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,586     46,114     1,422     3.2       28460     266 Keuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,124     49,926     5,198     13.0       17560     267 Plymoth, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,124     39,926     5,198     13.0       17650 <td< td=""><td>36180</td><td>ł</td><td>254</td><td>Ocean Pines, MD</td><td>Micropolitan Statistical Area</td><td>46,543 35,028</td><td>3 11,515 32.9</td></td<>	36180	ł	254	Ocean Pines, MD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,543 35,028	3 11,515 32.9
30380       256 [Lewistown, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       49,485       49,197       239       0.5         2871       2571 Selma, AL       Micropolitan Statistical Area       49,285       49,130       -1,765       -3,7         28340       258 Kendallville, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,275       37,877       6,398       22.2         15860       259 Canon City, CO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,005       42,310       3,695       8,7         14620       261 Bradford, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,936       47,131       -1,195       -2.5         13260       262 Bedford, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,629       46,719       -1,090       -2.3         26500       2264 Ei Dorado, AR       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,529       46,719       -1,090       -2.3         26500       2265 Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,629       46,719       -1,090       -2.3         2660       268 Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,624       2,966       7,0         30800       267 Piymouth, IN       Micropolitan	31580		255	Madisonville, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,519 46,126	393 0.9
42820       257 [Selma, AL       Micropolitan Statistical Area       49,365       49,130       -1,765       -3,7         28340       258 [Canon City, CO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       40,365       49,130       -1,765       -3,7         13340       250 [Bellefontaine, OH       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,005       42,310       3,695       8.7         14620       261 [Bacford, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,936       47,131       -1,195       2.5         13260       262 [Bedford, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,922       42,836       3,086       7.2         17740       263 [Coldwater, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,526       44,164       1,422       3.2         20800       264 [E Dorado, AR       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,586       44,164       1,422       3.2         20800       266 [Kextuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,128       42,182       2,946       7.0         38500       267 [Pymouth, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,128       42,182       2,946       7.0         16520       2671 [Douglas, GA	. 30380		256	Lewistown, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,486 46,197	
28340       256 Kendaliville, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,275       37,877       8,398       22.2         15860       259 Canon City, CO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       46,005       42,310       3,695       8.7         14520       261 Bradford, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,936       47,131       -1,195       -2.5         17740       263 Coldwater, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,522       42,866       30,686       7.2         17740       263 Coldwater, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,529       46,719       -1,090       -2.3         26500       265 Huntingdon, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,566       44,164       1,422       3.2         26600       266 Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,586       44,164       1,422       3.2         26400       266 Koskuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,586       44,164       1,422       3.2         2650       267 Plymouth, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,686       44,127       39,926       5,198       13.0         17560       <	42820	· .	257	Selma, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,365 48,130	) -1,765 -3.7
15860     259 Canon City, CO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,145     32,273     13,872     43.0       13340     260 Bellefontaine, OH     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,005     42,310     3,695     8.7       14620     261 Beraford, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,936     47,131     -1,195     -2.5       13260     262 Bedford, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,936     47,131     -1,195     -2.5       13260     262 Bedford, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,787     41,502     42,285     10.3       20980     264 El Dorado, AR     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,629     46,719     -1,090     -2.3       28600     266 Kockuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,468     46,234     -766     -1.7       38500     267 Plymouth, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,128     42,182     2,946     7.0       16520     268 Corsicana, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,044     42,207     2.837     6.7       20600     270 Douglas, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,044     42,207     2.655     16.8	28340		258	Kendallville, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,275 37,877	8,398 22.2
13340     260 Bellefontaine, OH     Micropolitan Statistical Area     46,005     42,310     3,695     8.7       14620     261 Bradford, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,936     47,131     -1,195     -2.5       13260     262 Bedford, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,922     42,836     3,086     7.2       17740     263 Coldwater, MI     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,629     46,719     -1,090     -2.3       26500     266 Huntingdon, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,629     46,719     -1,090     -2.3       28600     266 Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,128     42,2182     2,946     7.0       18620     268 Corsicana, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,128     42,2182     2,946     7.0       17580     269 Clovis, NM     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,124     39,926     5,198     13.0       17580     270 Douglas, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,042     38,507     6,455     16.8       47820     271 Cadillac, MI     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     38,507     6,455     16.8	15860		259	Canon City, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,145 32,273	3 13,872 43.0
14620     261 [Bradford, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,936     47,131     -1,195     -2.5       13260     262 Bedford, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,922     42,836     3,086     7.2       2090     264 EI Dorado, AR     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,629     46,719     -1,090     -2.3       26500     265 Huntingdon, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,668     46,234     -7.66     -1.7       28460     266 (Keckuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,128     42,182     2.946     7.0       18620     268 Corsicana, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,124     42,027     2.837     6.7       20600     270 Douglas, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,022     38,505     9,217     25.7       15620     271 Cadillac, MI     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     36,507     6.455     16.8       19620     273 Del Rio, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     36,507     6.455     16.8       39860     274 Red Wing, MN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     36,507     9.33     8.4	13340		260	Bellefontaine, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,005 42,310	3,695 8.7
13260     262 Bedford, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,922     42,836     3,086     7.2       17740     263 Coldwater, MI     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,767     41,602     4,285     10.3       20980     264 EI Dorado, AR     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,586     44,164     1,422     3.2       26500     265 Huntingdon, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,686     46,719     -1,090     -2.3       2640     266 Keckuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,468     46,234     -766     -1.7       18620     267 Keckuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,124     39,926     5,198     13.0       17580     269 Clovis, NM     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,044     42,207     2,837     6,7       2060     270 Douglas, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     38,507     6,455     16.8       47820     272 Washington, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     38,707     6,15     5.8       39600     273 Del Rio, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,964     36,727     6,135     15.8	14620		261	Bradford, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,936 47,131	-1,195 -2.5
17740     263 Coldwater, MI     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,787     41,502     4,285     10.3       20980     264 El Dorado, AR     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,629     46,719     -1,090     -2.3       26500     266 Huntingdon, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,686     44,164     1,422     3.2       28460     266 Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,468     46,234     -766     -1.7       38500     267 Plymouth, IN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,124     42,182     2,946     7.0       17580     268 Corsicana, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,044     42,207     2,837     6.7       20060     270 Douglas, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     38,507     6,455     16.8       47820     272     Washington, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,958     42,283     2,675     6.3       19620     273 Del Rio, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,856     38,721     6,135     15.8       39860     274     Red Wing, MN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,953     40,551     3,372	13260	· .	262	Bedford, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,922 42,836	5 <b>3,086</b> 7.2
20980       264 EI Dorado, AR       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,629       46,719       -1,090       -2.3         26500       265 Huntingdon, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,586       44,164       1,422       3.2         26460       266 Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,468       46,234       -766       -1.7         38500       267 Plymouth, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,128       42,182       2.946       7.0         18620       268 Corsicana, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,024       42,207       2.837       6.7         20060       270 Douglas, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,962       38,507       6,455       16.8         47620       271 Cadillac, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,958       42,283       2,675       6.3         9960       273 Red Wing, MN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,958       42,283       2,675       6.3         9960       274 Red Wing, MN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,957       9,032       25.8         32540       276 Gahoun, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area	17740		263	Coldwater, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,787 41,502	2 4,285 10.3
26500       265       Huntingdon, PA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,586       44,164       1,422       3.2         28460       266       Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,468       46,234       -766       -1.7         38500       267       Plymouth, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,128       42,182       2946       7.0         18620       268       Corsicana, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,024       42,182       2946       7.0         20060       270       Douglas, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,022       35,605       9,217       25.7         15620       271       Cadillac, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,962       38,507       6,455       16.8         19620       273       Del Rio, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,958       42,283       2,675       6.3         19620       273       Del Rio, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,127       40,690       3,437       8.4         15660       275       Calihoun, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,953       40,581 </td <td>20980</td> <td></td> <td>264</td> <td>El Dorado, AR</td> <td>Micropolitan Statistical Area</td> <td>45,629 46,719</td> <td>-1,090 -2.3</td>	20980		264	El Dorado, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,629 46,719	-1,090 -2.3
28460       266       Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,468       46,234       -766       -1.7         38500       267       Plymouth, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,128       42,182       2,946       7.0         18620       268       Corsicana, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,124       39,926       5,198       13.0         17580       269       Clovis, NM       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,022       35,805       9,217       25.7         20060       270       Douglas, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,962       38,507       6,455       16.8         47820       272       Washington, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,952       38,507       6,35       15.8         9960       274       Red Wing, MN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,127       40,690       3,437       8.4         15660       275       Calhoun, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,953       40,581       3,372       8.3         20420       277       Durango, CO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,941       32,284 </td <td>26500</td> <td></td> <td>265</td> <td>Huntingdon, PA</td> <td>Micropolitan Statistical Area</td> <td>45,586 44,164</td> <td>1,422 3.2</td>	26500		265	Huntingdon, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,586 44,164	1,422 3.2
38500       267       Plymouth, IN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,128       42,182       2,946       7.0         18620       268       Corsicana, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,124       39,926       5,198       13.0         17580       269       Clovis, NM       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,022       35,805       9,217       2,837       6,7         15620       271       Cadillac, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,962       38,507       6,455       16.8         47820       272       Washington, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,958       42,223       2,675       6.3         19620       273       Del Rio, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,127       40,690       3,437       8.4         15660       275       Calloun, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,127       40,690       3,437       8.4         12204       276       McAlester, OK       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,953       40,581       3,372       8.3         20420       277       Durango, CO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,863 <t< td=""><td>28460</td><td></td><td>266</td><td>Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO</td><td>Micropolitan Statistical Area</td><td>45,468 46,234</td><td>-766 -1.7</td></t<>	28460		266	Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,468 46,234	-766 -1.7
18620       268       Corsicana, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,124       39,926       5,198       13.0         17580       269       Clovis, NM       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,044       42,207       2,837       6.7         20060       270       Douglas, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,022       35,805       9,217       25.7         15620       271       Cadillac, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,962       38,507       6.455       16.8         47820       272       Washington, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,962       38,507       6.435       15.8         39860       274       Red Wing, MN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,127       40,690       3,437       8.4         15660       275       Calhoun, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,953       40,551       3.372       8.3         20420       277       Durango, CO       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,953       40,551       3.6.1         14220       278       Bogalusa, LA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,963       45,050       -1,187	38500		267	Plymouth, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,128 42,182	2 2,946 7.0
17580     269     Clovis, NM     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,044     42,207     2,837     6.7       20060     270     Douglas, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     45,022     35,805     9,217     25.7       15620     271     Cadillac, MI     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     38,507     6,455     16.8       47820     272     Washington, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,958     42,283     2,675     6.3       19620     273     Del Rio, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,866     38,721     6,135     15.8       39860     274     Red Wing, MN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,127     40,690     3,437     8.4       15660     275     Calhoun, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,953     40,581     3,372     8.3       20420     277     Durango, CO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,926     43,185     741     1.7       14220     278     Bogalusa, LA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,926     43,185     741     1.7       20340     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropo	18620		268	Corsicana, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,124 39,920	5,198 13.0
20060       270       Dougtas, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       45,022       35,805       9,217       25.7         15620       271       Cadillac, MI       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,962       38,507       6,455       16.8         47820       272       Washington, NC       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,958       42,283       2,675       6.3         19620       273       Del Rio, TX       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,856       38,721       6,135       15.8         39860       274       Red Wing, MN       Micropolitan Statistical Area       44,104       35,072       9,032       25.8         32540       276       McAlester, OK       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,941       32,284       11,657       36.1         14220       278       Bogalusa, LA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,863       45,050       -1,187       -2.6         41220       280       St. Marys, GA       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,664       30,167       13,497       44.7         20340       2270       Uncan, OK       Micropolitan Statistical Area       43,663       36,304	17580		269	Clovis, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,044 42,207	2,837 6.7
15620     271     Cadillac, MI     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,962     38,507     6,455     16.8       47820     272     Washington, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,958     42,283     2,675     6.3       19620     273     Del Rio, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,856     38,721     6,135     15.8       39860     274     Red Wing, MN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,127     40,690     3,437     8.4       15660     275     Calhoun, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,104     35,072     9,032     25.8       32540     276     McAlester, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,953     40,581     3,372     8.3       20420     277     Durango, CO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,951     741     1.7       14220     278     Bogalusa, LA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,863     45,050     -1,187     -2.6       41220     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282     Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistic	20060		270	Douglas, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,022 35,805	5 9,217 25.7
47820272Washington, NCMicropolitan Statistical Area44,95842,2832,6756.319620273Del Rio, TXMicropolitan Statistical Area44,85638,7216,13515.839860274Red Wing, MNMicropolitan Statistical Area44,12740,6903,4378.415660275Calhoun, GAMicropolitan Statistical Area44,10435,0729,03225.832540276McAlester, OKMicropolitan Statistical Area43,95340,5813,3728.320420277Durango, COMicropolitan Statistical Area43,94132,28411,65736.114220278Bogalusa, LAMicropolitan Statistical Area43,94345,050-1,187-2.641220280St. Marys, GAMicropolitan Statistical Area43,66430,16713,49744.728500281Kerrville, TXMicropolitan Statistical Area43,65336,3047,34920.220340282Duncan, OKMicropolitan Statistical Area43,18242,2998832.125780283Henderson, NCMicropolitan Statistical Area43,18242,99438,8924,06210.444260284Starkville, MSMicropolitan Statistical Area42,90238,3754,52711.814940285Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.24700290Kerrville, CAM	15620		271	Cadillac, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,962 38,507	6,455 16.8
19620     273     Del Rio, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,856     38,721     6,135     15.8       39860     274     Red Wing, MN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,127     40,690     3,437     8.4       15660     275     Calhoun, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,127     40,690     3,437     8.4       32540     276     McAlester, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,953     40,581     3,372     8.3       20420     277     Durango, CO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,941     32,284     11,657     36.1       14220     278     Bogalusa, LA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,863     45,050     -1,187     -2.6       4120     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,664     30,167     13,497     44.7       28500     281     Kerrville, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282     Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,182     42,299     883     2.1       25780     283     Henderson, NC <td< td=""><td>47820</td><td></td><td>272</td><td>Washington, NC</td><td>Micropolitan Statistical Area</td><td>44,958 42,283</td><td>3 2,675 6.3</td></td<>	47820		272	Washington, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,958 42,283	3 2,675 6.3
39860     274     Red Wing, MN     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,127     40,690     3,437     8.4       15660     275     Calhoun, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     44,104     35,072     9,032     25.8       32540     276     McAlester, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,953     40,581     3,372     8.3       20420     277     Durango, CO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,941     32,284     11,657     36.1       14220     278     Bogalusa, LA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,863     45,050     -1,187     -2.6       4120     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,664     30,167     13,497     44.7       28500     281     Kerrville, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282     Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,182     42,299     883     2.1       25780     283     Henderson, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,954     38,892     4,062     10.4       44260     284     Starkville, MS	19620		273	Del Rio, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,856 38,72	6,135 15.8
15660275Calhoun, GAMicropolitan Statistical Area44,10435,0729,03225.832540276McAlester, OKMicropolitan Statistical Area43,95340,5813,3728.320420277Durango, COMicropolitan Statistical Area43,94132,28411,65736.114220278Bogalusa, LAMicropolitan Statistical Area43,92643,1857411.747620279Warren, PAMicropolitan Statistical Area43,66430,16713,49744.741220280St. Marys, GAMicropolitan Statistical Area43,65336,3047,34920.220340282Duncan, OKMicropolitan Statistical Area43,18242,2998832.125780283Henderson, NCMicropolitan Statistical Area42,95438,8924,06210.444260284Starkville, MSMicropolitan Statistical Area42,90238,3754,52711.814940285Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.214940285Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.214940285Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.214940285Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.2	39860		274	Red Wing, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,127 40,690	3,437 8.4
32540     276     McAlester, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,953     40,581     3,372     8.3       20420     277     Durango, CO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,941     32,284     11,657     36.1       14220     278     Bogalusa, LA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,926     43,185     741     1.7       47620     279     Warren, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,663     45,050     -1,187     -2.6       41220     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,664     30,167     13,497     44.7       28500     281     Kerrville, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282     Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,182     42,299     883     2.1       25780     283     Henderson, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,954     38,892     4,062     10.4       44260     284     Starkville, MS     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,902     38,375     4,527     11.8       14940     285     Brigham City, UT	15660		275	Calhoun, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,104 35,072	2 9,032 25.8
20420     277     Durango, CO     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,941     32,284     11,657     36.1       14220     278     Bogalusa, LA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,926     43,185     741     1.7       47620     279     Warren, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,863     45,050     -1,187     -2.6       41220     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,664     30,167     13,497     44.7       28500     281     Kerrville, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282     Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,182     42,299     883     2.1       25780     283     Henderson, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,954     38,892     4,062     10.4       44260     284     Starkville, MS     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,902     38,375     4,527     11.8       14940     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2       14500     285     Brigham City, UT	32540	·] ·	276	McAlester, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,953 40,58	1 3,372 8.3
14220     278     Bogalusa, LA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,926     43,185     741     1.7       47620     279     Warren, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,863     45,050     -1,187     -2.6       41220     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,664     30,167     13,497     44.7       28500     281     Kerrville, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282     Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,182     42,299     883     2.1       25780     283     Henderson, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,954     38,892     4,062     10.4       44260     284     Starkville, MS     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,902     38,375     4,527     11.8       14940     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2       47500     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2       47500     285     Brigham City, UT<	20420		277	Durango, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,941 32,284	1 11,657 36.1
47620     279     Warren, PA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,863     45,050     -1,187     -2.6       41220     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,664     30,167     13,497     44.7       28500     281     Kerrville, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282     Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,182     42,299     883     2.1       25780     283     Henderson, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,954     38,892     4,062     10.4       44260     284     Starkville, MS     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,902     38,375     4,527     11.8       14940     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2       4500     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2       4500     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,737     38,086     3,751     9,6	14220		278	Bogalusa, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,926 43,18	5 741 1.7
41220     280     St. Marys, GA     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,664     30,167     13,497     44.7       28500     281     Kerrville, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282     Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,182     42,299     883     2.1       25780     283     Henderson, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,954     38,892     4,062     10.4       44260     284     Starkville, MS     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,902     38,375     4,527     11.8       14940     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2       45200     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2       45200     285     Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,737     38,986     3,751     9,6	47620		279	Warren, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,863 45,050	) -1,187 -2.6
28500     281 Kerrville, TX     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,653     36,304     7,349     20.2       20340     282 Duncan, OK     Micropolitan Statistical Area     43,182     42,299     883     2.1       25780     283 Henderson, NC     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,954     38,892     4,062     10.4       44260     284 Starkville, MS     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,902     38,375     4,527     11.8       14940     285 Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2       45200     285 Brigham City, UT     Micropolitan Statistical Area     42,745     36,485     6,260     17.2	41220		280	St. Marvs. GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,664 30,16	7 13,497 44.7
20340282 Duncan, OKMicropolitan Statistical Area43,18242,2998832.125780283 Henderson, NCMicropolitan Statistical Area42,95438,8924,06210.444260284 Starkville, MSMicropolitan Statistical Area42,90238,3754,52711.814940285 Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.214520285 Brigham City, OTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.2	28500		281	Kerrville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,653 36,30	4 7,349 20.2
25780283 Henderson, NCMicropolitan Statistical Area42,95438,8924,06210.444260284 Starkville, MSMicropolitan Statistical Area42,90238,3754,52711.814940285 Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.214940285 Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.214940285 Brigham City, UTMicropolitan Statistical Area42,74536,4856,26017.2	20340		282	Duncan, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,182 42,29	9 883 2.1
44260       284 Starkville, MS       Micropolitan Statistical Area       42,902       38,375       4,527       11.8         14940       285 Brigham City, UT       Micropolitan Statistical Area       42,745       36,485       6,260       17.2         14520       285 Brigham City, UT       Micropolitan Statistical Area       42,745       36,485       6,260       17.2         14520       285 Brigham City, UT       Micropolitan Statistical Area       42,737       38,986       3,751       9,6	25780		283	Henderson, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,954 38,892	2 4,062 10.4
14940       285 Brigham City, UT       Micropolitan Statistical Area       42,745       36,485       6,260       17.2         Micropolitan Statistical Area       42,745       36,485       6,260       17.2	44260	ľ	284	Starkville, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,902 38,37	5 4,527 11.8
Micropalitan Statistical Area 42 737 38 086 3 751 96	14940	.	285	Brigham City, UT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,745 36,48	5 6,260 17.2
	45620		286	Thomasville, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,737 38,98	6 3,751 9.6

•

· .	Á –		$\sim$	-	•		1	e 1,2
Motrol	· ۲. –	<u> </u>	<u>````````````````````````````````</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u>·</u>	(	<b></b>
Micro	Motro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area	· · · ·	Population		Change 199	in to 2000
	Div	Pon	Metropolitan Division	Logal/Statistical		<u>'</u>		0 10 2000
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000 April	1.1000	Number	Percent
14380		287	Boone, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,695	36 952	5 743	15.5
25460	ŀ	288	Harrison, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,556	35,963	6,593	18.3
45140		289	Tahleguah, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42.521	34.049	8,472	24.9
10940	1.1.	290	Alma, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42.285	38,982	3,303	8.5
27300		291	Jacksonville, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42.153	42.041	112	0.3
34220		292	Moultrie, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42.053	36.645	5,408	14.8
40940		293	Safford, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42.036	34.562	7,474	21.6
33380		294	Minden, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41.831	41.989	-158	-0.4
13940		295	Blackfoot, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,735	37,583	4,152	11.0
16460		296	Centralia, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,691	41,561	130	0.3
30260		297	Lewisburg, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,624	36,176	5,448	. 15.1
15420		298	Burley, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,590	38,893	2,697	6.9
42980		299	Seymour, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,335	37,730	3,605	9.6
23820		300	Gardnerville Ranchos, NV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,259	27,637	13,622	49.3
48820		301	Willmar, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,203	38,761	2,442	6.3
21580		302	Espanola, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,190	34,365	6,825	19.9
20900		303	El Campo, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,188	39,955	1,233	3.1
22780		304	Fort Leonard Wood, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,165	41,307	-142	-0.3
30900		305	Logansport, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,930	38,413	2,517	6.6
16380		306	Celina, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,924	39,443	1,481	3.8
<sup>·</sup> 38740		307	Poplar Bluff, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,867	38,765	2,102	5.4
15740		308	Cambridge, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,792	. 39,024 .	1,768	4.5
39420		309	Pullman, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,740	38,775	1,965	5.1
17380		310	Cleveland, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,633	41,875	-1,242	-3.0
13660		311	Big Rapids, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,553	37,308	3,245	8.7
48940		312	Wilmington, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,543	35,415	5,128	14.5
23780		313	Garden City, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,523	33,070	7,453	22.5
43460		314	Sikeston, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,422	39,376	1,046	2.7
12140		315	Aubum, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,285	35,324	4,961	14.0
22700		316	Fort Dodge, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,235	40,342	-107	-0.3
46460		317	Union City, TN-KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,202	39,988	214	0.5
34460	[ ·	318	Mount Sterling, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,195	34,345	5,850	17.0
29980 .		319	Lawrenceburg, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,926	35,303	4,623	13.1
32860		320	Menomonie, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,858	35,909	3,949	11.0
29220	· ·	321	La Follette, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,854	35,079	4,775	13.6
10100	I	322	Aberdeen, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,827	39,936	-109	-0.3

· · ·	E		(	-	· .	• .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(
Metro/	Γ. —			1				
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Рори	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
40620	1,	323	Rolla, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,825	35,248	4,577	13.0
38700	ľ	324	Pontiac, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,678	39,301	377	1.0
13420		325	Bemidji, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,650	34,384	5,266	15.3
40500		326	Rockland, ME	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,618	. 36,310	3,308	9.1
13620	ľ	327	Berlin, NH-VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,570	41,233	-1,663	-4.0
19580	<u>}</u> .	328	Defiance, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,500	39,350	150	0.4
42740		329	Sedalia, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,403	_ 35,437	3,966	11.2
10860		330	Alice, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,326	37,679	1,647	4.4
32260		331	Marshalltown, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,311	38,276	1,035	2.7
39940		332	Rexburg, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,286	34,611	4,675	. 13.5
47180		333	Vincennes, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,256	- 39,884	-628	-1.6
35060	·	334	Natchitoches, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,080	36,689	. 2,391	6.5
21380		. 335	Emporia, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,965	37,753	1,212	3.2
46500		336	Urbana, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,890	36,019	2,871	8.0
37060	· ·	337	Oxford, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,744	31,826	6,918	21.7
12380		338	Austin, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,603	37,385	1,218	3.3
42300		339	Sault Ste. Marie, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,543	34,604	3,939	11.4
21540		340	Escanaba, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,520	37,780	740	2.0
45700	· ·	341	Tifton, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,407	34,998	3,409	9.7
34260	1	342	Mountain Home, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,386	31,186	7,200	23.1
35700	•	. 343	Nogales, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,381	29,676	8,705	29.3
26340		344	Houghton, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,317	37,147	1,170	3.1
32660		. 345	McMinnville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,276	32,992	5,284	• 16.0
47500		346	Walterboro, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,264	34,377	3,887	11.3
15900	· ·	347	Canton, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,250	38,080	170	0.4
38260		348	Pittsburg, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,242	35,568	2,674	. 7.5
25580	· ,	349	Hastings, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,190	36,748	1,442	. 3.9
16340		350	Cedartown, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,127	33,815	4,312	12.8
26540		351	Huntington, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,075	35,427	2,648	7.5
13060		352	Bay City, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,957	36,928	1,029	2.8
25300		353	Hannibal, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,915	36,158	1,757	4.9
30820		354	Lock Haven, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,914	37,182	732	2.0
42420		355	Scottsbluff, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,770	36,877	893	2.4
15220		356	Brownwood, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,674	34,371	3,303	9.6
18820		357	Crawfordsville, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,629	34,436	3,193	9.3
40540	l .	358	Rock Springs, WY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,613	<b> </b> 38,823	-1,210	-3.1

. . .

Page 22 of 29

	<u>(</u>				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Metro/						
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Population	Change 1990 to 2000
Агеа	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical		· .
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990	Number Percent
43180		<sup></sup> 359	Shelbyville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,586 30,411	7,175 23.6
42780		360	Selinsgrove, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,546 36,680	866 2.4
37500	· ·	361	Paragould, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,331 31,804	5,527 17.4
20540		362	Dyersburg, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,279 34,854	2,425 7.0
48460		363	West Plains, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,238 31,447	5,791 18.4
35500		364	Newton, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,213 34,795	2,418 6.9
32460	ļ	365	Mayfield, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,028 33,550	3,478 10.4
13540	ļ	366	Bennington, VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,994 35,845	1,149 3.2
11140		367	Americus, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,966 33,816	3,150 9.3
18740	1	368	Coshocton, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,655 35,427	1,228 3.5
38380		369	Plainview, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,602 34,671	1,931 5.6
46740		370	Valley, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,583 36,876	-293 -0.8
<sup>.</sup> 20460		371	Durant, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,534 32,089	4,445 13.9
23620		372	Gainesville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,363 30,777	5,586 - 18.1
49060		373	Winfield, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,291 36,915	-624 -1.7
17700		374	Coffeyville, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,252 38,816	-2,564 -6.6
17500		375	Clewiston, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,210 25,773	10,437 40.5
23340		376	Fremont, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,160 34,500	1,660 4.8
35140		377	Newberry, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,108 33,172	2,936 8.9
37940		378	Peru, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,082 36,897	-815 -2.2
19940		379	Dixon, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,062 34,392	1,670 4.9
36900		380	Ottumwa, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,051 35,687	364 1.0
29900		381	Laurinburg, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,998 33,754	2,244 6.6
35820		382	North Platte, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,939 33,932	2,007 5.9
36380		383	Okeechobee, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,910 29,627	6,283 21.2
18460		384	Cornelia, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,902 27,621	8,281 30.0
18340		-385	Corbin, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,865 33,326	2,539 7.6
40180	1	386	Riverton, WY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,804 33,662	2,142 6.4
11820		· 387	Astoria, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,630 33,301	2,329 7.0
45380		388	Taylorville, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,372 34,418	954 2.8
10220		389	Ada, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,143 34,119	1,024 3.0
41260		390	St. Marys, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,112 34,878	234 0.7
47340	1	391	Wabash, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,960 35,069	-109 -0.3
34140		392	Moscow, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,935 30,617	4,318 14.1
26780		393	Hutchinson, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,898 32,030	2,868 9.0
15580	<b>.</b>	394	Butte-Silver Bow, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,606 33,941	665 2.0

				í (	-		•	· · ·	(
Metro/	Ţ		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	` ·	· · · · · ·	l · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area			Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division		Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	· .	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
18420	1	395	Corinth, MS	·····	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,558	31.722	2.836	8.9
15780		396	Camden, AR		Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,534	36,400	-1.866	-5.1
26940		397	Indianola, MS		Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,369	32,867	1,502	4.6
20820		398	Effingham, IL		Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,264	31,704	2,560	8.1
12900	Ì	399	Batesville, AR		Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,233	31,192	3,041	9.7
34660	· ·	400	Murray, KY		Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,177	30,735	3,442	11.2
16900	1	401	Chester, SC		Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,068	32,170	1,898	5.9
23140		402	Frankfort, IN		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,866	30,974	2,892	9.3
20660		403	Easton, MD		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,812	30,549	3,263	10.7
16260		404	Cedar City, UT	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,779	20,789	12,990	62.5
23940		405	Gillette, WY		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,698	29,370	4,328	14.7
36940		406	Owatonna, MN		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,680	30,729	2,951	9.6
33820	1	407	Monroe, WI		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,647	30,339	3,308	10.9
13700		408	Big Spring, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,627	32,343	1,284	4.0
19540		409	Decatur, IN	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,625	31,095	2,530	8.1
35460		410	Newport, TN		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,565	29,141	4,424	15.2
26260		411	Hope, AR	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,542	31,722	1,820	5.7
33940		412	Montrose, CO		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,432	24,423	9,009	36.9
21260		413	Ellensburg, WA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,362	26,725	6,637	24.8
42900	ľ	414	Seneca Falls, NY		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,342	33,683	-341	-1.0
11420		415	Angola, IN		Micropolitan Statistical Area	.33,214	27,446	5,768	21.0
33060		416	Miami, OK	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,194	30,561	_ 2,633	8.6
15020		417	Brookhaven, MS		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,166	30,278	2,888	9.5
28380		418	Kennett, MO		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,155	33,112	43	0.1
44500		419	Stephenville, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,001	27,991	5,010	17.9
19760		420	De Ridder, LA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,986	30,083	2,903	9.6
31380	ł	421	Macomb, IL		Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,913	35,244	-2,331	-6.6
10820		422	Alexandria, MN		Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,821	28,674	4,147	14.5
10660		423	Albert Lea, MN	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,584	33,060	-476	-1.4
27020		424	Iron Mountain, MI-WI		Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,560	31,421	1,139	3.6
30060	•	<sup>′</sup> 425	Lebanon, MO		Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,513	27,158	5,355	19.7
37220	1	426	Pahrump, NV	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,485	17,781	14,704	82.7
19980		427	Dodge City, KS		Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,458	27,463	4,995	18.2
13300		428	Beeville, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,359	25,135	7,224	28.7
11580		429	Arcadia, FL		Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,209	23,865	8,344	. 35.0
29660		430	Laramie, WY	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,014	30,797	1,217	4.0

Page 24 of 29

	$\left( \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \right)$	. •		-		$\int dx dx$
Metro/						
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		Population	Change 1990 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical		
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000 April 1, 1990	Number Percent
28780		431	Kingsville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,963 30,734	1,229 4.0
44860	<b>.</b>	432	Sulphur Springs, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,960 28,833	3,127 10.8
16420	· ·	.433	Central City, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,839 31,318	<b>521 1.7</b>
31500		434	Madison, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,705 29,797	7 1,908 6.4
.18100		435	Columbus, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,662 29,820	0 1,842 6.2
47980	· .	436	Watertown, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,437 27,672	2 3,765 13.6
27660		437	Jennings, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,435 30,722	2 713 2.3
10980		438	Alpena, Mi	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,314 30,605	5 709 2.3
30660		· 439	Lincoln, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,183 30,798	3 385 1.3
37540		440	Paris, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,115 27,888	3 3,227 11.6
12820		441	Bastrop, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,021 31,938	3 -917 -2.9
43500	• •	442	Silver City, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,002 27,676	6 3,326 12.0
32500		443	Maysville, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,892 29,69	5 1,197 4.0
19900		444	Dillon, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,722 29,114	1,608 5.5
27940	1 ·	445	Juneau, AK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,711 26,75	3,960 14.8
15700		446	Cambridge, MD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,674 30,236	6 438 · 1.4
17260		447	Clarksdale, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,622 31,665	5 -1,043 -3.3
14780	· ·	448	Brenham, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,373 26,154	4,219 16.1
29780		449	Las Vegas, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,126 25,743	4,383 17.0
33180		450	Middlesborough, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area		
45340	1	451	laos, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area		3 6,861 29.7
28620		452	Kill Devil Hills, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,967 22,740	
46420		453	Union, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,881 30,33	
47780		454	Washington, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area		
46780		455	Van Wert, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,659 30,464	
32980		456	Merrill, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area		
45980		457	Iroy, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area		
32700	· ·	458	McPherson, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area		
14820	. ·	459	Brevard, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area		7 3,014 14.9
22020	.	460	Forrest City, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,329 20,49	
20000	1	401	Mauntain Hama ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,147 20,010	7 925 37 A
34300		402	Poppottovillo SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,100 21,20	-543 -1.8
10000	1	403		Micropolitan Statistical Area	28/30 28.76	
17860		404	Machington OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,403 20,70	967 35
47000		400	Painbridge CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,400 27,400	2,729 10.7
12400	1	1 400	loanninge, GA	Inneroponian Statistical Alea	20,240 20,01	

Page 25 of 29

•	(	:	• • •						F ···
Metro/	<u></u>	<u> </u>		······································	Γ				
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area	•		; Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division		Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area		Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
15100	1	467	Brookings, SD		Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,220	25,207	3,013	12.0
24460	· ·	. 468	Great Bend, KS		Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,205	29,382	-1,177	-4.0
49540	<b>`</b> .	469	Yazoo City, MS		Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,149	25,506	2,643	10.4
34420		470	Mount Pleasant, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,118	24,009	4,109	17.1
45580	· ·	471	Thomaston, GA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,597	26,300	1,297	4.9
35860		472	North Vernon, IN	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,554	23,661	3,893	16.5
18860		473	Crescent City North, CA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,507	23,460	4,047	17.3
25700		474	Hays, KS	· ·	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,507	26,004	1,503	5.8
22340		475	Fitzgerald, GA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,415	24,894	2,521	10.1
22820		476	Fort Morgan, CO	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,171	21,939	5,232	23.8
33420	1.	477	Mineral Wells, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,026	25,055	1,971	7.9
48100		478	Wauchula, FL	• •	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,938	- 19,499	7,439	38.2
35580		479	New Ulm, MN	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,911	26,984	-73	-0.3
25380	· ·	480	Harrisburg, IL	· ·	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,733	26,551	- 182	0.7
27700		481	Jesup, GA	•.	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,565	22,356	4,209	18.8
43260		482	Sheridan, WY		Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,560	23,562	2,998	12.7
30420	· ·	483	Lexington, NE		Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,508	21,868	. 4,640	21.2
48340	· ·	484	West Helena, AR		Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,445	28,838	-2,393	-8.3
14340	<b>.</b> .	485	Boone, IA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,224	25,186	1,038	4.1
46620		486	Uvalde, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,926	23,340	2,586	11.1
33020		487	Mexico, MO	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,853	23,599	2,254	9.6
31620		488	Magnolia, AR		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,603	25,691	-88	-0.3
24380		· 489	Grants, NM		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,595	23,794	1,801	7.6
18220		490	Connersville, IN	·	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,588	26,015	-427	-1.6
44900	1	491	Summerville, GA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,470	22,242	3,228	14.5
45740		492	Toccoa, GA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,435	23,257	2,178	9.4
32140		493	Marshall, MN		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,425	24,789	636	2.6
46860		494	Vernal, UT		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,224	22,211	3,013	13.6
47420		495	Wahpeton, ND-MN		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,136	25,664	-528	-2.1
19700.	ł	496	Deming, NM		Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,016	18,110	6,906	38.1
33620		497	Moberly, MO		Micropolitan Statistical Area	24,063	24,370	293	1.2
24700		498	Greensburg, IN	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	24,555	23,645	910	3.8
29260	1	499	La Grande, OR		Micropolitan Statistical Area	24,530	23,598	932	3.9
27220		500	Jackson, WY-ID	·	Inicropolitan Statistical Area	24,250	14,611	9,039	0.00
46260	·	501	Luskegee, AL		Interopolitan Statistical Area	24,105	24,928	-823	-3.3
21980	ļ	502	Fallon, NV	• •	Imicropolitan Statistical Area	23,982	17,938	0,044	33.7

Page 26 of 29

	~				_	•	•			
•	E.			•					. (	
Metro/	]		· · ·	· · ·					•	
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area		•		Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	•		Legal/Statistical				· <u>··</u> ···
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	• .	· .	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
14420	1	503	Borger, TX			Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,857	25,689	-1,832	-7.1
17180		504	City of The Dalles, OR		•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,791	21,683	2,108	9.7
32180	· ·	505	Marshall, MO			Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,756	23,523		1.0
22980		506	Fort Valley, GA	•	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,668	21,189	2,479	11.7
37420	ſ	507	Pampa, TX			Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,631	24,992	-1,361	-5.4
43540		508	Silverthorne, CO	· · · ·		Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,548	12,881	10,667	82.8
11660	1	509	Arkadelphia, AR			Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,546	· 21,437	2,109	· 9.8
19860	1	· 510	Dickinson, ND		, ,	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,524	23,940	-416	-1.7
38200		511	Pierre Part, LA	• • •		Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,388	22,753	. 635	2.8
24980	· ·	512	Grenada, MS		•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,263	21,555	1,708	7.9
13100		· 513	Beatrice, NE	•		Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,993	22,794	199	0.9
42500		514	Scottsburg, IN		•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,960	20,991	1,969	<b>9.4</b> .
15820	}	515	Campbellsville, KY			Micropolitan Statistical Area	· 22,927	21,146	1,781	8.4
37660		516	Parsons, KS			Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,835	23,693	-858	-3.6
30220		517	Levelland, TX			Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,716	24,199	-1,483	-6.1
30580		· 518	Liberal, KS			Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,510	18,743	3,767	20.1
36820		519	Oskaloosa, IA			Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,335	21,522	813	3.8
18380		520	Cordele, GA	·		Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,996	20;011	1,985	9.9
32340		521	Maryville, MO			Micropolitan Statistical Area	. 21,912	21,709	203	0.9
27420		522	Jamestown, ND	•		Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,908	22,241	-333	-1.5
33580		523	Mitchell, SD			Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,880	20,497	.1,383	6.7
21860		524	Fairmont, MN	•		Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,802	22,914	-1,112	-4.9
43940	ŀ	525	Spearfish, SD			Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,802	20,655	1,147	5.6
49460		526	Yankton, SD	•		Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,652	19,252	2,400	12.5
15060		527	Brookings, OR	•		Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,137	19,327	1,810	9.4
49380		528	Worthington, MN			Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,832	20,098	734	3.7
44540		529	Sterling, CO	• •	*	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,504	17,567	2,937	16.7
39220		530	Price, UT			Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,422	20,228	_ 194	1.0
26220		531	Hood River, OR		•••	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,411	16,903	3,508	. 20.8
44740		532	Storm Lake, IA			Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,411	19,965	446	2.2
20300		533	Dumas, TX			Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,121	17,865	2,256	12.6
25100	ł	534	Guymon, OK			Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,107	16,419	3,688	22.5
39700		535	Raymondville, TX			Micropolitan Statistical Area	·20,082	17,705	2,377	13.4
15140	1	536	Brownsville, TN		• •	Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,797	19,437	360	1.9
48780		537	Williston, ND			Micropolitan Statistical Area	· 19,761	21,129	-1,368	-6.5
21740		538	Evanston, WY			Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,742	18,705	1,037	5.5

Page 27 of 29
•	E		······································	6	<b>~</b>		÷.	•	( · · ·
Metro/	Ť		······		ے		• • •	· · ·	£
Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area			Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division		Legal/Statistical				
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area		Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
38180		539	Pierre, SD		Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,253	17,270	1,983	11.5
· 39260	· ·	540	Prineville, OR		Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,182	14,111	5,071	35.9
25820	1	541	Hereford, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	18,561	19,153	-592	-3.1
49260		542	Woodward, OK	• .	Micropolitan Statistical Area	18,486	18,976	-490	-2.6
31060		543	Los Alamos, NM		Micropolitan Statistical Area	18,343	18,115	· 228	1.3
38780	•	544	Portales, NM		Micropolitan Statistical Area	18,018	16,702	1,316	:7.9
13860	1	545	Bishop, CA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	17,945	18,281	-336	-1.8
43980	· ·	546	Spencer, IA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	17,372	17,585	-213	-1.2
26700		547	Huron, SD		Micropolitan Statistical Area	17,023	18,253	-1,230	-6.7
11860	, i	548	Atchison, KS		Micropolitan Statistical Area	16,774	16,932	158	-0.9
25660		549	Havre, MT		Micropolitan Statistical Area	16,673	17,654	-981	-5.6
44020		550	Spirit Lake, IA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	16,424	14,909	1,515	10.2
43660		551	Snyder, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	16,361	18,634	-2,27,3	-12.2
45020	•	552	Sweetwater, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	15,802	16,594	-792	-4.8
29500		553	Lamesa, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	14,985	14,349	636	· 4.4
46900	1	554	Vernon, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	14,676	15,121	-445	-2.9
28540		555	Ketchikan, AK		Micropolitan Statistical Area	14,070	13,828	242	1.8
28980		-556	Kodiak, AK	· .	Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,913	13,309	604	4.5
45260		557	Tallulah, LA		Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,728	12,463	1,265	10.2
46820	i .	558	Vermillion, SD	•	Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,537	13,186	351	2.7
37780	1 .	559	Pecos, TX	-	Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,137	15,852	-2,715	-17.1
11380		560	Andrews, TX		Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,004	14,338	-1,334	-9.3

Page 28 of 29

<u>.</u>	L	•.•	• •	=	•		· · ·	t i
Metro/ Micro	Metro	2000	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1	Popu	lation	Change 19	90 to 2000
Area	Div.	Pop.	Metropolitan Division	Legal/Statistical			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·
Code	Code	Rank	Micropolitan Statistical Area	Area Description	April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
			Puerto Rico		· · ·			
		]	Metropolitan Statistical Areas	•		1		
41980	1	1 1	San Juan-Caguas-Guavnabo, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2.509.007	2.322.271	186 736	8.0
10380		2	Aguadilla-Isabela-San Sebastián, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	312.602	272.580	40.022	14.7
38660		3	Ponce, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	264.919	256,506	8,413	3.3
41900	1	4	San Germán-Cabo Rojo, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	136.212	119,597	16.615	13.9
49500		5	Yauco, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	118.063	106.138	11,925	11.2
32420		6	Mayagüez, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	115,048	115,583	-535	-0.5
25020		7	Guayama, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	83,570	80,131	3,439	4.3
21940		8	Fajardo, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	78,533	72,127	6,406	8.9
	1 . ·		Micropolitan Statistical Areas			•		•
17620	1	1 1	Coamo, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37.597	33.837	3.760	11.1
46580	{	2	Utuado, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,336	34,980	356	1.0
42180	· .	3	Santa Isabel, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,665	19,318	2,347	12.1
10260	1	.4	Adjuntas, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,143	19,451	-308	-1.6
27580	1	5	Jayuya, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	17,318	15,527	1,791	· 11.5
	ľ	1						•

<sup>1</sup> Broomfield County, CO was formed from parts of Adams, Boulder, Jefferson, and Weld Counties, CO on November 15, 2001 and is coextensive with Broomfield city. For purposes of defining and presenting data for metropolitan statistical areas, Broomfield city is treated as if it were a county at the time of the 1990 and 2000 censuses.

<sup>2</sup> Title changed subsequent to the June 6, 2003 Office of Management and Budget Definition.

<sup>3</sup> Title and code changed subsequent to the June 6, 2003 Office of Management and Budget Definition.

Page 29 of 29



# 2002 Census of Agriculture County Profile

# Burke, Georgia

3 1

Number of farms 494 farms in 2002, 406 farms in 1997, up 22 percent.

Land in farms 218,954 acres in 2002, 214,566 acres in 1997, up 2 percent.

Average size of farm 443 acres in 2002, 528 acres in 1997, down 16 percent.

**Market Value of Production** 

\$26,246,000 in 2002, \$43,937,000 in 1997, down 40 percent. Crop sales accounted for \$15,506,000 of the total value in 2002. Livestock sales accounted for \$10,741,000 of the total value in 2002.

Market Value of Production, average per farm \$53,131 in 2002, \$108,219 in 1997, down 51 percent.

#### **Government Payments**

\$2,232,000 in 2002, \$1,850,000 in 1997, up 21 percent.

Government Payments, average per farm receiving payments \$9,419 in 2002, \$8,527 in 1997, up 10 percent.





NASS-nodale USDA 2002



835 m² = 534400 acros.

218,954/534,400

-printed 5/19/05

#### 2002 Census of Agriculture **County Profile** United States Department of Agriculture, Georgia Agricultural Statistics Service

#### Burke, Georgia

**C**2

#### Ranked items among the 159 state counties and 3,078 U.S. counties, 2002

Item	Quantity	State Rank	Universe <sup>1</sup>	U.S. Rank	Universe <sup>1</sup>
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD (\$1,000)				· ·	•
Total value of agricultural products sold Value of crops including nursery and greenhouse Value of livestock, poultry, and their products	26,246 15,506 10,741	61 39 63	159 159 159	1,841 1,355 1,822	3,075 3,070 3,070
VALUE OF SALES BY COMMODITY GROUP (\$1,000)					
Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas Tobacco Cotton and cottonseed Vegetables, melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes Fruits, erree nuts, and berries Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod Cut Christmas trees and short rotation woody crops Other crops and hay Poultry and eggs Cattle and calves Milk and other dairy products from cows Hogs and pigs Sheep, goats, and their products Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys Aquaculture	3,306 6,746 162 591 19 4,131 (D) 3,830 6,562 58 (D) 146	5 18 71 41 80 27 22 (D) 11 7 64 (D) 29	150 50 93 149 151 148 84 158 142 159 111 135 152 151 152 151 64	1,380 141 1,462 475 1,376 979 294 (D) 1,721 513 1,647 (D) 1,412	2,871 560 656 2,747 2,638 2,708 1,774 3,046 2,918 3,053 2,493 2,919 2,997 3,014 1,520
Other a nimals and other animal products	(D)	(D)	108	(D)	2,727
TOP LIVESTOCK INVENTORY ITEMS (number)				1	
Quail Cattle and calves Horses and ponies All Goats Hogs and pigs	(D) 19,106 737 657 576	5 11 26 32 . 69	52 159 158 155 141	(D) 1,512 1,670 785 1,567	1,412 3,059 3,065 2,971 2,926
TOP CROP ITEMS (acres)					
All Conton Forage - land used for all hay and haylage, grass silage, and greenchop Peanuts Soybeans Corn for grain	27,047 8,998 8,813 7,507 5,776	16 15 25 4 15	93 159 79 111 145	133 1,884 51 1,108 1,222	663 3,059 398 2,076 2,592

#### **Other County Highlights**

Economic Characteristics	Quantity	Operator Characteristics	Quantity
Farms by value of sales		Principal operators by primary occupation:	
Less than \$1,000	232	Farming	241
\$1,000 to \$2,499	40	Other	253
\$2,500 to \$4,999	31		
\$5,000 to \$9,999	20	Principal operators by sex:	
\$10.000 to \$19.999	47	Male	410
\$20.000 to \$24.999	16	Female	84
\$25,000 to \$39,999	19		i
\$40.000 to \$49.999	12	Average age of principal operator (years)	54.5
\$50,000 to \$99,999	18		1
\$100,000 to \$249,999	. 30	All operators <sup>2</sup> by race:	
\$250,000 to \$499,999	19	White	577
\$500,000 or more	10	Black or African American	60
		American Indian or Alaska Native	3
Total farm production expenses (\$1,000)	32,346	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	
Average per farm (\$)	65,611	Asian	
· · · ·		More than one race	
Net cash farm income of operation (\$1,000)	-1,216		
Average per farm (\$)	-2,466	All operators <sup>2</sup> of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino Origin	1

1

(D) Cannot be disclosed. (Z) Less than half of the unit shown. See "Census of Agriculture, Volume 1, Geographic Area Series" for complete footnotes. <sup>1</sup> Universe is number of counties in state or U.S. with item. <sup>2</sup> Data were collected for a maximum of three operators per farm.

category represents the gross market value before taxes and production expenses of all agricultural products sold or removed from the place in 2002 regardless of who received the payment. It is equivalent to total sales. It includes sales by the operators as well as the value of any shares received by partners, landlords, contractors, or others associated with the operation. The value of commodities placed in the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) loan program is included in this figure. Market value of agricultural products sold does not include payments received for participation in other federal farm programs. Also, it does not include income from farm-related sources such as customwork and other agricultural services, or income from nonfarm sources.

The value of crops sold in 2002 does not necessarily represent the sales from crops harvested in 2002. Data may include sales from crops produced in earlier years and may exclude some crops produced in 2002 but held in storage and not sold. For commodities such as sugarbeets and wool sold through a co-op that made payments in several installments, respondents were requested to report the total value received in 2002.

The value of agricultural products sold was requested of all operators. If the operators failed to report this information, estimates were made based on the amount of crops harvested, livestock or poultry inventory, or number sold. Caution should be used when comparing sales in the 2002 census with sales reported in earlier censuses. Sales figures are expressed in current dollars and have not been adjusted for inflation or deflation. The value of sales of some crops and of some livestock and animal specialties were asked separately in the 1997 census and were combined into categories in the 2002 census as follows:

individual grain crops were combined.

hay, silage, field seeds, and grass seeds (excluding grain silage and forage) were combined with other crops.

individual nursery and greenhouse items were combined.

sales of cut Christmas trees was combined with value of short-rotation woody crops.

2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

horses and ponies were combined with horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys.

colonies of bees and honey were combined with other animals and other animal products.

- milk goats and goat milk were combined with sheep, goats, and their products.
- angora goats and mohair were combined with sheep, goats, and their products.
- Other goats were combined with sheep, goats, and their products.
  - mink and their pelts were combined with other animals and other animal products.
- rabbits and their pelts were combined with other animals and other animal products.

Meat and other goats. This is a name change only. The 1997 census name was Other goats.

Migrant farm labor on farms. Information on migrant workers was collected for the first time in the 2002 census. Operators were asked whether any hired or contract workers were migrant workers, defined as a farm worker whose employment required travel that prevented the migrant worker from returning to his/her permanent place of residence the same day.

Misreported or miscoded crops. In a few cases, data may have been reported on the wrong line, in the wrong section, or the wrong crop code may have been assigned to a write-in crop code. A few of these errors may not have been identified and corrected during processing which resulted in rare cases of inaccurately tabulated data. Reports with significant acres of unusual crops for the area were examined to minimize the possibility that they were in error.

Mollusks. This is a new category for 2002. These are invertebrate animals with a soft body covering and shells of 1-18 parts or sections. Examples include abalones, clams, mussels, oysters, snails, and quahogs.

More than one race reported. This category represents those operators who chose to report more than one race on the census form. Tabulating more



[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Bulloch	Burke	Butts	Calhoun	Camden	Candler	Carroli	Catoosa
arms number and in farms acres Average size of farm control acres Median size of farm control acres	641 206,206 322 117	494 218,954 443 203	173 36,685 212 101	119 118.032 992 430	47 12,389 264 100	272 62,933 231 118	975 94,124 97 71	290 27,135 92 57
stimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> : Average per farm	481,079 1,629	626,372 1,344	465,477 2,036	1,265,558 1,298	463,421 1,615	· 310,984 1,354	381,616 3,897	377,949 3,877
stimated market value of all machinery and squipment : Average per farm dollars	71,515	92,931	30,068	228,408	16,788	52,952	35,935	40,83
arms by size: 1 to 9 acres 50 to 19 acres 50 to 179 acres 180 to 499 acres 500 to 999 acres 500 to 999 acres 1,000 acres or more	43 171 217 97 57 56	25 96 155 100 59 59	4 59 64 30 10 6	3 21 24 18 25 28	4 13 15 7 2 6	17 - 54 110 56 25 10	64 379 408 105 12 7	1 13 10 3
tal cropland	505 113,855 406 92,843	345 104,645 248 64,164	136 9,240 88 3,160	100 64,645 70 55,438	32 963 14 207	207 26,213 164 19,430	616 34,782 430 14,005	12,91 12,91 12 6,87
igated land farms : acres	103 10,536	68 15,868	11 124	35 22,294	9 227	49 4,368	31 1,005	
arket value of agricultural products sold (see text) \$1,000 Average per larm	42,709 66,629	26,246 53,131	2,476 14,311	25,846 217,192	995 21,161	11,811 43,424	106,358 109,085	24,21 81,80
Crops	33,255 9,454	15,506 10,741	803 1,672	19,562 6,284	828 167	7,729 4,083	4,887 101,471	73 23,48
arms by value of sales: Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$5,000 to \$9,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$99,999 \$100,000 or more	302 47 59 90 31 40 72	272 31 20 63 31 18 59	97 16 17 32 6 1 4	44 8 5 11 4 5 42	26 9 6 1 1 3 1	151 21 12 40 15 24	450 140 120 92 38 12 123	17 3 2 1 1
overnment payments	307 3,362	237 2,232	57 124	69 1,571	4	138 840	169 335	
otal Income from fam-related sources, pross before taxes and expenses (see text)	214 4,174	147 • 2,593	30 212	59 2,673	. 4 (D)	84 1,107	136 524	4
otal farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>	42,125 66,130	32,346 65,611	· 2,960 18,913	23,825 198,538	926 18,901	11,897 44,062	80,362 81,918	16.5 55.6
let cash farm income of operation (see text) <sup>1</sup>	637 7,394	493 -1,216	175 -30	120 6,586	49 199	270 1,286	981 34,608	8.3
Average per farm dollars	11,608	-2,466	<b>-171</b>	54,882	4,069	4,762	35,278	28,1
Farming number Other	332 309	241 253	82 91	67 52	18 29	125 147	553 422	1! 14
rincipal operator by days worked off farm: Any	340 252	279 187	103 84	56 40	30 20	153 105	521 373	1
Jvestock and poultry: Cattle and calves inventory	193 11,206 163 4,905	176 19,106 146 7,619	91 4,519 76 (D)	. 24 5,413 23 2,063	27 551 22 351	96 6,065 82 (D)	674 26,926 598 15,743	- 21 7,78 18 3,8
Milk cows farms number Cattle and calves sold farms	13 46 149	14 2,464 131	(D) 70	22	20	6 (D) 80	20 473 517	. · 1
number Hogs and pigs inventory	3,713 29 9,449	6,960 18 576	3,775	3,318	333 8 320	1,628 7 (D)	12,173 6 46	2,9
Hogs and pigs sold farms	27 (D)	- 13 687		73	. 6 68	(D)	(D)	. 61
Sneep and tamos inventory	. 34	392 6	5	(D)	6	8	* 85 17	
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold furmber	208 · 7 2.164.815	137	. 36	3 2.615.000	635	(D) 5 1,272,020	192,381 109 52,228,733	60,11 11,725,3
elected crops harvested: Com for grain	87 8,408	54 5.776	. 4 24	21 4,050	5 86	25 1.082	11 144 7 499	(
Com for silage or greenchop farms acres	· 1	10 2.622	-	555,197	4,120	2 (D)	3	
None Wheat for grain, All	. (D) 20	58,000	·				399	1
acres bushels	6,506 253,750	4,954 228,928	· 253 4,574	5,303 191,659	· (8)	884 26,276	ß	. {
Winter wheat for grain farms acres bushels	29 6,506 . 253,750	41 4,954 228,928	5 253 4,574	19 5,308 191,659	(B)	14 884 26,276	5 (D) (D)	· · {
Oats for grain farms acres	16 335	15 813	6 73	329	· :	B 132	3 (D)	

See footnote(s) at end of table.

206 GEORGIA

-continued

## 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

	ltern	Clinch	Cobb	Coffee	Colquitt	Columbia	Cook	Coweta	Crawford
	Farms	. 118 30,666 260 85	191 10,950 57 20	692 188,740 273 120	583 228,205 383 172	196 23,296 119 60	254 67.554 266 105	480 60,820 127 55	179 38,145 213 100
لمس	Stimated market value of land and buildings 1: Average per farm	446,447 1,693	353,420 9,113	440,006 1,584	592,033 1,583	390,151 4,048	471,291 1,864	698,424 5,540	409,059 1,992
	Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ': Average per farm dollars	30,696	21,451	84,014	94,805	26,749	71,372	27,055	53,335
	Farms by size: 1 to 9 acres 10 to 49 acres 50 to 179 acres 180 to 499 acres 500 to 999 acres 1,000 acres or more	18 37 23 17 19 4	52 91 36 8 4	28 171 260 142 48 43	33 151 172 112 65 55	30 77 49 32 7	15 79 76 50 18 18	44 201 149 61 14	19 38 73 37 4 8
	Total cropland	80 2,990 62 1,392	118 3,489 59 1,000	502 87,145 381 71,155	437 134,060 363 117,539	117 4,987 77 1,860	217 40,431 170 34,519	314 19,852 179 7,777	140 15,143 103 10,602
	Imigated land farms acres	21 332	22 172	120 16,195	137 34,360		61 9,421	37 792	26 3,971
	Market value of agricultural products sold (see text) \$1,000 Average per lam	5,842 49,507	5,377 28,150	123,986 179,170	129,465 220,179	4,862 24,808	38,854 152,970	7,099 - 14,789	19,308 107,864
	Crops\$1,000 Livestock, poultry, and their products\$1,000	3,613 2,229	- 5,073 303	39,011 84,975	104,266 25,199	1,335 3,528	37,522 1,333	4,080 3,019	12,248 7,060
	Farms by value of sales: Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$24,999 \$50,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$39,999	48 8 14 10 11 13	138 14 23 8 5 3	279 55 66 78 58 28 130	219 55 51 52 58 30 126	123 26 19 13 6 9	105 18 21 33 28 39	276 53 68 53 21 5 8	86 26 17 21 4 6 19
	Government payments	- 6 5	30 31	341 2,589	272 4,638	43 188	86 1,092	65 250	- 38 88
	gross before taxes and expenses (see text)	9 · 241	· 48 · 828	219 3,323	191 4,258	· 37 · 589	 86 860	- 72 1,455	34 1,278
	Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> \$1,000 Average per farm dollars	3,986 34,362	5,327 27,743	90,696 131,064	· 99,887 168,727	3.026 15,361	28,150 109,532	12,187 25,711	· 16,639 92,439
	Net cash farm income of operation (see text) <sup>1</sup>	118 2,001 17,253	192 1,283 6,684	692 47,644 68,850	592 38,702 65,376	197 2,462 12,498	257 12,674 49,316	474 -4,454 -9,396	180 4,157 23,092
_	Principal operator by primary occupation: Farming	54 64	101 90	378 316	350 238	75 . 121	148 106	205 275	78 101
	Principal operator by days worked off farm: Any	64 54	79 51	· · 377 275	279 220	132 105	134 108	268 166	106 67
	Livestock and poultry: farms Cattle and caives inventory	47 1,454 39 786 5 15 28 710	46 868 37 484 - 29 323	293 15,864 265 (D) 5 (D) 215 6,085	291 22,937 244 (D) 214 (D) 214 7,967	76 2,097 66 (D) 1 (D) 73 884	109 5,400 (D) 2 (D) 83 2,293	207 6.446 181 (D) 4 (D) 147 . 3.012	85 2,608 76 (D) 89 1.075
	Hogs and pigs inventory	:	(D) 2	18 8,887 17	12 (D) 10	(D)	(D)		
	number Sheep and lambs inventory			30,257 5 124	(D) 7 306	(O) 7 81	(D) 30	1 (D)	
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory farms number Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold farms number	(D) (D) (D)	145	10 (D) 66 37,401,458	16 322 14 11,902,510	5 15	3 43	324	(D) 3.012.000
	Selected crops harvested: Com for grain acres bushes	18 464 27,730	(D) (D)	71 5,204 640,150	55 2,517 253,156	(D)	42 1,485 104,056	5 136 (D)	4 133 (D)
	Com for silage or greenchop farms acres tons		:		5 . 282 5,031	. (D)		B	
	Wheat for grain, Alliams acres bushels	:	:	10 512 17,839	10 1,058 49,434		6 592 23,181	6 329 (D)	6 720 27,701
	Winter wheat for grain	:	:	10 512 17,839	10 - 1,058 49,434	100	6 592 23,181	6 329 (D)	6 720 27,701
	Oats for grain farms acres bushels		:	. 9 312 15,559	14 510 21,900		· 1 80	4 44 1.800	100

See footnote(s) at end of table.

208 GEORGIA

#### 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

--continued

For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text)

tem	Douglas	Early	Echols	Effingham	Elbert	Emanuel	Evans	Fannin
Farms	153 7,989 52 40	347 160,286 462 201	78 29,336 376 150	206 53,196 258 128	438 63,429 145 101	554 159,723 288 150	242 48,087 199 100	208 15,485 74 55
Estimated market value of land and buildings 1: Average per farm	304,102 5,803	568,192 1,319	601,249 1,602	493,738 1,740	290,239 2,142	411,634 1,225	315,045 1,655	324,480 3,549
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment : Average per farm	22,902	91,210	72,948	33,430	20,707	71,058	48,031	30,350
Farms by size: 1 to 9 acres	15 83 46 8 1	14 75 103 74 37 44	9 9 32 14 9 5	13. 59 55 52 16 11	17 114 200 87 13 7	20 94 215 144 44 37	8 65 94 47 18 . 10	34 80 74 18 1
Fotal cropland farms acres Harvested cropland farms acres	87 3,341 54 1,635	249 89,023 194 71,544	46 10,706 35 8,151	167 17,575 119 11,976	311 26,103 203 12,794	385 56,180 237 36,881	176 18,765 145 12,007	156 6,401 94 2,338
rrigated land farms acres	16 . 414	72 24,689	16 4,404	24 461	14 30	37 5,372	38 2,719	10 160
Aarket value of agricultural products sold (see text) \$1,000 Average per larm	1,975 12,908	26,250 75,647	23,821 305,392	3,735 18,131	23,136 52,821	11,877 21,440	22,502 92,983	10,632 51,117
Crops	821 1,153	23,835 2,415	23,383 438	2,694 1,041	2,989 20,146	8,018 3,860	9,001 13,501	970 9,663
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$5,000 to \$4,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$24,999 \$50,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to rmore	93 21 12 17 4 2 4	130 31 44 45 20 15 62	35 9 5 8 8 8 8	109 31 18 27 10 4 7	226 86 42 31 17 5 31	317 74 40 50 22 28 23	129 17 25 21 11 7 32	125 20 18 22 3 4 4
Sovemment payments farms \$1,000	21 17	212 2,874	36 55	· 63 190	171 397	277 1,478	106 381	30 23
ctal income from farm-related sources, gross before taxes and expenses (see text)	19 146	122 2,608	20 323	58 1,002	75 276	149 1,841	59 647	· 11
Fotal farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>	2,583 16,885	27,260 78,558	17,647 226,245	5,C11 24,562	21,787 49,628	15,209 27,753	17,050 70,749	8,726 41,752
Net cash farm income of operation (see text) 1 farms \$1,000	153 -429	347 3,868	78 6,619	204 -790	439 1,266	548 1,783	241 6,423	209 1,957
Average per tarm coulars Principal operator by primary occupation: Farming	-2,805 66	11,146	29	-3,871	2,885	3,254 208	26,652 98	9,363
Principal operator by days worked off farm: Any	98 74	192 151	41 39	· 96	280 200	281 222	145	120
Livestock and poultry: Cattle and calves inventory	82 1 272	151	26	91 4 207	288	204	78	118
Beef cows	· 60 (D) 2	135 6,214	25 -534	- 71 1.658	6,692 10	5,582 7	5,313 68 2,091	3,350 114 (D
number Cattle and calves soldfarms	(D) 69 739	128 5 191	26	61 2 004	1,562 219 5 213	67 159 5 275	62 2 074	(D 8 1 17
Hogs and pigs inventory farms number	3 15	22 1,395	. 1 (D)	4 345	10	5 (D)	9 (D)	(D
Hogs and pigs sold		28 1,729	(D)	(0)	5 34	(D)	(D)	(P
Sheep and lambs inventory	.4	250		· (D)	33	231	(D)	3
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	184 2 (D)	469	(D)	50	77,281 17 8 463 083	96	(D) 17 6 141 256	126,15
Selected crops harvested:		_			0,100,000		0,141,200	4,030,00
Com for grain farms acres bushels	6 78 6,310	66 5,871 667,617	6 660 · (D)	38 4,056 281,694	5 (D) (D)	45 2,490 197,578	24 1,086 73,806	00
Com for silage or greenchop farms acres tons	8	•	:	100	1	l B	2 B	
Wheat for grain, All	1 (D)	51 7,474	•	8 447	4 130	10 833	8 333	
Dusheis Winter wheat for grain	(ט) 1 (ס)			12,330 8 447	4,500 4 130	34,703 10 833	11,531 8 333	
bushels Onto for orbit	(ŏ)	335,521	Ē	12,300	4,500	34,703	11,531	
Uais for grain lams &cres buebale		1,617		(c)	l' g	407	50	

See footnote(s) at end of table.

210 GEORGIA

-continued

## 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

lem				···	· · ·			
me number	Jeff Davis	Jefferson	Jenkins	Johnson	Jones	Lamar	Lanier	Laurens
nd in farms	254 56,198	388 137,217	240 94,632	286 76.128	194 35.054	243 41,908	134 51.762	103 6
Average size of lam	221	354	394	266	181	172	386	2
time text we have all land and buildings to		200		160	139	<b>6</b> 5	134	· 1
Average per farm dollars	308,298	429.035	573,924	433.677	335 153	483 271	432 474	2014
Average per acre dollars	1,509	1,323	1,337	1,587	2,110	2,450	1,181	1,3
timated market value of all machinery and		· · ·			•		1	
quipment ': Average per farm	40 436	58 431	53 679					
	. 45,400	50,751	33,676	51,513	34,900	61,191	//,544	36,34
rms by size: 1 to 9 acres	20	14	16		16			
10 to 49 acres	· 67	46	33	53	. 45	82	34	. 1
180 to 499 acres	48	144	64 68	106	71	97 ( 39	40	20
500 to 999 acres	15	44	37	21	15	10	7	
		21	~ ~ ~	14	2	1	13	
tai cropiand fams	186 27.011	322 73 477	173	217	121	157	10.97	
Harvested cropland farms	142	225	120	126	92	121	19,555	. 67,9
acres	22,836	51,660	27,057	16,014	4,507	11,621	17,418	37,4
pated land farms	32	86	27	. 17	8	15	13	
aurs	3,057	10,002	7,219	1,433	174	2,212	7,529	6,4
Average per lam.	10,557	38,326	14.056	4,440	8,030	23.019	10,053	12,9
the second s	+00,04	80,119	96,366	15,524	41,392	94,728	75,025	18,2
Ivestock, poulity, and their products	6,508 4 049	29.270	7,373	2,551	523	3,999	9,536	9,1
		0,001	0,002	1,018	. 1,507	19,020	518	•3,7
ess than \$2,500	131	203	141	179	<u>م</u>	11.1	·	
2,500 to \$4,999	14	27	_9	20	25	26	15	4
10,000 to \$24,999	31	26	21	32 30	19 24	39 27	11	
25,000 to \$49,999	10	26	14	10	12	. 13	9)	
100,000 or more	19	55	27	8		23	12	
emment payments farms	80	213	. 130	443				
\$1,000	654	1,735	1,372	410	203	411	827	1.
al income from farm-related sources,	. 83	110		E4	41	50		
\$1,000	592	1,378	BŠŎ	. 737	192	292	702	1.1
al farm production expenses 1 \$1,000	11.119	24,353	14.904	· 6.012	6 885	20 784	10.000	
Average per farm dollars	43,948	62,765	62,358	20,947	36,047	85,531	75,226	19,7
cash farm income of operation (see text)4 farms	253	368	239	287	191	243	134	· · · · ·
Averace per farm	545   2 155	16,224	1,702	-248	1,441	. 5,979	1,479	1,0
sheet as a start by admant and unations			,,,er	-005	1,545	24,000	11,034	1,4
arming number	. 122	208	101	137	103	115		
Wher number	132	180	139	149	91	128	75	
cipal operator by days worked off farm;					· .	.	1	
200 days of more	166	212	145	166	98	108	80	3
dealy and payment			100	140	. 63		62	. 1
attle and calves inventory	. 93	162	. 97	152	118	147	. 28	
Beef cows	3,763	12,089	6.873	8,058	5,591	7,651	2,172	13,
number	·	5,259	2,424	131 4,584	108 2.368	129	29	
Milk cows farms	2	11	10	10	14	4		· · · · · ·
attle and calves sold fams	73	132	56	110	1,069	124	27	
ogs and pigs inventory farms	1,581	9,142	1,923	3,341	2,191	3,639	841	5,
number	970	412	(D)	1,394	46	(0)	217	2.7
uys anu piys aolu tarms i number i	1.126	(C)	5	13 3.091	3		7	
neep and lambs inventory farms		, 2			5		-	4,1
syers 20 weeks old and older inventory farms	9	- 14	12	7		7	i si	
rollers and other meat-type chickens sold	. (0)	. (D)	(D)	143	182	72	340	
number	, (o)	-1	(c)		2,141,623	8,735,000		•
cted crops harvested:	. 4						ļ	
om for grain farms (	· 21	62	20	18	<u>اب</u>	1	28	
busheis	78,464	1,104,507	131,611	61,275		8	1,165	4.2
orn for silage or greenchop			-		(-)		,000	
acres	• •	570	1.130	( <u>a</u> )	:	io)	. :	2
tons	-	10,832	13,233	(a)		(D)	•	8,1
heat for grain, All farms	3	54	12	25	1	5	2	
Scres j bushels i	20.149	10,366	1,618	4,055		2,246		7.4
Winter wheat for grain				100,044		000,121		. 310,5
TANTIOL MINER IN BIGHT	624	10.366	1.618	25 4.055	1	2 246	2	<b>-</b> .
acres i						5,67Q		- (A
acres bushels	20,149	472,345	63,953	168,344	. (D)	121,386	(0)	310.5
acres bushels ats for grain	20,149	472,345	63,953	168,344	(D)	121,386	(0)	310,5

See footnote(s) at end of table.

214 GEORGIA

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

.

•

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

-continued

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

	[For meaning of appreviations and sympols, see introductory text]						·		
	ttern	Randolph	Richmond	Rockdale	Schley	Screven	Seminole	Spalding	Stephens
	Farmsnumber Land in farmsacres Average size of farmacres	136 79,296 583	140 12,439 89	140 8,789 63	115 35,425 308	347 184,170 531	206 92,933 451	249 25,587 103	238 19,527 82
y	Estimated market value of land and buildings 1: Average per farm	700,471 1,204	255,709 · 2,917	387,949 5.718	484,£89 1,£86	653,203 1,355	· 688,023 1,547	458,587 4,594	365,486 4,447
	Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment :	131 128	26 417	28 268	64 822	82 840	103.321	25 558	
	Fams by size:	10,1120		20,200		-2,010	100,011		-0,010
•	1 to 9 acres	5 12 30 47 16 26	20 62 42 14 2	24 75 30 9 2	2 13 48 28 12 12	8 46 109 101 45 38	11 36 81 33 21 24	28 89 93 31 8	21 103 89 22 3
	Total cropland farms acres	93 47,998	- 109 5,009	85 3,128	88 12,911	263 87,467	146 . 56,253	156 9.060	150 8.035
	Harvested cropland farms acres	67 38,267	77 2,541	42 1,382	69 6,500	195 54,320	108 46,094	98 3,953	92 3,820
•	Irrigated land farms acres	40 14,831	16 87	13 101	8 370	53 12,040	54 20,650	12 26	14 452
	Market value of agricultural products sold (see text) \$1,000 Average per larm dollars	13,363 98,258	3,124 22,312	852 6,083	9,658 83,934	18,794 54,162	24,037 116,683	4,427 17,781	44,422 186,546
	Crops \$1,000 Livestock, poultry, and their products \$1,000	11,582 1,781	1,687 1,437	. 385 · 467	1,479 8,179	16,100 2,694	19,721 4,315	666 3,761	239 44,183
	Farms by value of sales:	67		10	50	179	73	157	107
	Less than \$<,500 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$5,000 to \$4,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$24,999	8 8 12 3	19 19 17 12	18 14 11 3	13 12 5 9	22 35 42 23	73 7 11 27 26 28	21 35 17 11	29 38 18 2
	\$100,000 or more	30	ē	ī	10	35	. 36	4	· 35
	Government payments	91 1,220	13 15	15 67	56 304	· 194 2,245	101 1,461	36 108	42 <sup>.</sup> 72
	gross before taxes and expenses (see text)	72 1,414	17 68	33 683	43 5-15	106 2,547	58 1,898	38 218	22 185
	Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>	14,603 107,377	2,897 20,692	2,181 15,579	7,868 67,823	19,863 57,408	22,706 . 110,221	4,837 19,348	26,209 111,056
•	Net cash farm income of operation (see text) *	136	140	140	116	346	206	250	236
	Average per farm dollars	9,632	-792	-3,577	24,438	9,767	22,733	258	84,045
~	Principal operator by primary occupation: Farming	75 61	• 69 71	54 86	40 75	149 198	130 76	101 148	145 93
	Principal operator by days worked off farm: Any number 200 days or more number	- 168 40	85 68	91 63	65 61	210 165	99 75	135 106	107 89
	Livestock and poultry: Cattle and calves inventory farms	52	50	· 46	46	111	107	149	. 173
	number Beel cows farms	4,304	2,082	923 27	2,561	8,147	12,175	4,837 135	6,590 151.
	Milk cows		3	48/	859		4,858	. (0)	
Ċ	Cattle and calves sold farms	. 42	41	25 735	36	83	92 6 312	107	146
	Hogs and pigs inventory farms	- 5 467	2	2 (D)	1.050	16	24		
	Hogs and pigs sold farms	9 636			4 (D)	17 (D)	22 12,574	· :	
	Sheep and lambs inventory farms number	. (0)		213		12	· (D)		(D)
•	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory		(D)	170	(D)	105	A A	90	8 105,162 31
	number	•••			4,655,000	•	•	. ( <u>p</u> )	15,896,951
	Selected crops harvested: Com for grain farms acres bushels	21 2,671 348,924	. s		8 295 16,550	79 7,144 694,198	38 7,834 1,070,136	:	
	Com for silage or greenchop	4			4	3	4	. 1	2
	acres tons	3,778			(D)	1,961	2,900	8	(8)
	Wheat for grain, Alt farms acres bushels	27 7,745 300,162	:	30 2,310	17 2,038 · 62,411	17 2,179 100,950	20 3,419 176,013	1	
	Winter wheat for grain farms acres acres bushels	27 7,745 300,162		30 2,310	17 2,039 62,411	17 2,179 100,950	20 3,419 176,013		100
	Oats for grainfarms acres bushels	108 4,850	5 86 3,372			14 447 29,101	17 955 49,807		

See lootnote(s) at end of table.

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

**GEORGIA 219** 

-continued

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text] ,

. .

Item	Lee	Liberty	Lincoln	Long	Lowndes	Lumpkin	McDuffie	McIntosh
Farms number Land in farms acres Average size of farm acres Median size of farm acres	. 171 146,736 858 319	68 15,935 234 110	207 30,835 149 103	76 23,624 311 158	462 73,917 160 73	250 21,303 85 49	296 46,774 158 91	39 11,306 290 88
Average per farm	1,364,904 1,544	474,243 2,325	362,394 2,657	455,515 • 1,454	350,002 2,046	556,950 6,096	360,513 1,991	469,457 1,618
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment 1: Average per farm	130,785	26,287	40,701	34,897	37,541	. 50,763	37,225	31,998
Farms by size: 1 to 9 acres: 10 to 49 acres: 50 to 179 acres: 180 to 499 acres: 500 to 999 acres: 1,000 acres: or more:	4 48 34 24 23 38	5 18 21 15 5 4	6 90 31 7 4	16 34 10 12 4	41 181 - 147 60 20 13	27 121 69 29 3 1	27 116 80 45 17 11	10 17 7 1
Total cropiand	135 52,823 109 46,273	36 3,784 22 483	138 8,998 84 3,189	65 5,647 50 3,527	352 30,795 276 23,127	149 6,181 91 2,367	201 15,869 123 6,888	24 1,315 10 96
Inigated land	50 21,615	4 11	· 11 87	- 564	. 75 6,968	. 12	· 23 646	4
Market value of agricultural products sold (see text) \$1,000 Average per larm	23.521 137,550	313 4,598	2,512 12,137	7,950 104,605	23,929 51,794	44,124 176,494	30,477 102,961	· (8) ·
Crops \$1,000 Livestock, pouttry, and their products \$1,000	16,074 7,447	199 114	216 2,296	1,524 6,426	22,369 1,560	3,370 40,754	B	(D) 502
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$249,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$49,999 \$100,000 or more	68 10 14 24 13 8 36	42 16 4 4 2	105 29 25 31 9 9 3 5	32 10 5 8 4 5 12	220 59 42 61 30 17 33	106 33 23 16 11 2 59	174 35 37 30 9 1 10	21 9 5 2
Government payments	83 1,512	· 10	70 227	18 67	144	42 130	60 134	
Total income from farm-related sources, gross before taxes and expenses (see lext)	64 4,170	13 58	25 241	15 304	98 1,250	18 326	48 318	2 (D)
Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>	23,643 136,665	535 7,864	2,775 13,405	5,167 67,981	19,935 42,872	26,636 106,974	22,575 76,525	8
Net cash farm income of operation (see text) 1	173 6,201 35,841	68 -67 -992	207 -593 -2 863	· 76 2,119 27 888	465 7,476 16,077	249 18,080 72,509	295 8,148 27,619	40
Principal operator by primary occupation: Farming	81 90	20	93 114	37	203 259	142	139 157	15 24
rincipal operator by days worked off farm: Any	108 73	54 29	144 116	42 37	252 204	144 . 86	178 141	30 23
Uvestock and poulity:farms Cattle and calves inventorynumber Beef cows farms number	42 10,817 39 (D)	40 1,405 38 892	145 6,206 133 3,284	· 31 975 28 (D)	186 6.114 157 3.354	133 5,695 126 (D)	156 9,013 138 (D)	19 349 19 244
Milk cows Iams number Cattle and calves sold fams	(D) 28	23	4 387 119	(D)	3 11 121	(D)	(D)	12
number Hogs and pigs inventoryfams number	4,492 3 57	311 2 (D)	2,887	642 1 (D)	2,830 27 867	2,240 1 (D)	- 3,614 3 (D)	(D) 20
Hogs and pigs sold farms number Sheep and lambs inventory farms		.(D)		(D)	1,125	(D)	3 140 2	(D)
number Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory	4 50	(D)	(D) 8 346	(D) 2 (D)	68 11 195	48 7 158,901 45	(D) 120	(D) (D)
number Selected crops harvested: Com for grain farms acres bushela	22 4,177 509,542	3	(D) 3 50 (D)	16 3,477,400 16 442 30,473	57 2.776 247,198	14,915,836 113 113 113	le le	
Com for silage or greenchopfarms acres tons	100		00		g	( <u>0</u>		3
Wheat for grain, All farma acres bushels	15 4,241 195,773				, DD		30: 6,61	5 - 5 -
Winter wheat for grainfarms acres bushels	15 4,241 195,773					}		5 -
Oats for grain farms acres bushale	3 55 2,550			, je	27			:

.

See footnote(s) at end of table.

002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

**GEORGIA 215** 

--continued

# Table 7. Hired Farm Labor - Workers and Payroll: 2002

. Item	Georgia	Appling	Atkinson	Bacon	Baker ·	Baldwin	Banks	Barrow
lired farm labor farm worke \$1.000 parv	s 11,636 5 60,713	. 144 745 2 379	65 286 1,138	144 7C1 1.910	59 237 2 664	55 130 151	83 644 1 120	61 326 736
Farms with-	4,883	54	33	44	15	26	48	32
worke 2 workers	3     4,883       5     2,302       5     4,604	54 25 50	- <sup>33</sup> 11 22	44 32 64	15 15 30	26 8 16	48 9 18	(D) 19 38
3 or 4 workers fam worker	s 2,026	- 24	5	· 29	11	16 49	- 12	1
5 to 9 workers farm worke	s 1.302 8 8.443	21 136	10	14	11	5	9	
10 workers or more fam worke	s 1,123 s 35,799	20 425	6 147	25	7 85		5 478	8 247
Vorkers by days worked: 150 days or more	s 4,343	49	35 70	43	38	14	34 197	8 90
Farms with-	2.111	- 20	25	17	18	2	18	
2 workers	s 2,111 s 872	20 20	25 3	17 6	18 7	, D)	(D) 12	(0)
3 or 4 workers fam	s 1,744	40	(0)	1 (1)	14    6	18	24	
worke 5 to 9 workers	8 2,281 386	· (P)	· (D)	64	20	(ດ)	,	
worke 10 workers or morefam worke	3 2,426 s 299 s 9,844	(D) 4 120	33		29 3 46		(D) 2 (D)	- 1 (D)
Less than 150 days	s 9,333	128	49	133	39	. 49	67	56
Farms with- 1 worker farm	s 4,255	48	22	57	16	27	46	32
worke 2 workers	s 4,255 s 1,880 s 3,760	48 28 56	22 12 24	57 22 41	. 16 5 10	27 3 6	46 8 15	· 32 14 (D)
3 or 4 workers fam	s 1,475	25	. 3	21	. 14	16	6	2
5 to 9 workers	s 914 5 5026	11	7	8	-	3	4	
10 workers or more fam worke	809 8 23,309	) 18	5 114	25 362	4	-	· 335	8 169
Reported only workers working	- 2 202	1 10	16					
works \$1,000 payra	8,891 128,859	116 421	21	27	92 1,756	. 11	165 635	9 9
Réported only workers working	7 000					· .	· .	
tess man 150 days	s 24,809 5 27,119	318 570	66 106	424	70 187	70	49 409 228	153 405
Reported both - workers working 150	<b>.</b>		•	· ·				
working less than 150 days	s 2,040	33	19	32	18	1	18	3
less than 150 days, worke less than 150 days, worke \$1,000 payre	17,498 170,643	227 1,388	49 150 805	177 982	40 721	18 31 70	32 38 257	250
vligrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text)	is 858	25	7	18	2	.		
vigrant farm labor on farms reporting only			· · .					

continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

ttem	Bartow	Ben Hill	Berrien	Bibb	Bieckley	Brantley	Brooks	Bryan
Hirad farm labor farms workers \$1,000 payroll	91 352 2,611	50 166 · 702	108 564 2,806	36 60 150	56 133 231	45 205 219	179 1,031 5,353	. 17 118 82
Farms with- , 1 worker	36 36 7	11 (D) 12	36 (D)	23 23 6	26 (D) 20	22 22 8	80 80 47	772
workers	(D)	. 24	(D)	(D)	40	16	94	(D)
3 or 4 workers farms	38 135	21 71	- 23	15	9 35	14	- 74	. 2 (D)
10 workers of more	(D) 8 154	(D) 5 54	158 19 287	, (D)	1 (D)	37 6 116	35 22 748	- 6 100
Workers by days worked: 150 days or more	58 169	25 49	- 61 118	10 15	8 12	13	96 323	. 3
Farms withfarms 1 worker	35 35	10 10	48 48	5	5	8 (D)	59 59	, 1 (D)
2 workers farms workers	36	. 22	(D)	5 10	· (D)	(D)	4 8	(D)
3 or 4 workers farms workers	12 36	2 (D)	4 13		(D)	1 (D)	18 56	1 (D)
5 to 9 workers	3 19 5 73	(D)	5 33 2 (D)			•	9 55 6 145	
Less than 150 days farms workers	48	38 117	82 446	33 45	49	44 186	136	15
Farms with- 1 worker	14 14	12 (D)	15	27	21 (D)	31 (D)	74 74	7
2 workers fams workers	- 6 12	14	12 24	4 (D)	19 38	(D)	40 80	(D) (D)
3 or 4 workers	· 21 83	· 14 45	/ 14		8 32	(D)	2 (D)	
10 workers or more	28 3 46	(D) 3 33	126 16 235	(D)	1 (D)	32 6 116	(D) 17 529	6 100
Reported only workers working 150 days or more	43	12 24	26 57	3	7	· 1	· 43	. 2
\$1,000 payrolt	761	327	539	24	102	(5)	1,508	65
Reported only workers working less than 150 days	33 112 72	25 79 33	47 259 155	26 38 24	48 91 (D)	32 170 (D)	83 194 246	14 110 8
Reported both - workers working 150 - days or more and workers working less than 150 days 150 days or more, workers	15	13	35 81	7		12	53 229	1
L' less than 150 days, workers \$1,000 payroli	71 1,778	38 343	187 2,112	102		115	514 3,599	
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text)	2	3	19			10	23	•
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor (see text) farms	.	· ·	.	· .		· 7		.

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

-continued

2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

326 GEORGIA

Data are based on a sample of larms. For meaning of appreviations an	d symbols, see	introductory text]		<u> </u>				
tem	Bulloch	Burke	Butts	Calhoun	Camden	Candler	Carroll	Catoosa
fired farm labor	175 503 3,277	150 455 3,355	29 90 237	57 332 2,455	14 27 57	88 688 1,714	209 480 3,073	54 139 445
Farms with- 1 worker	114 114	65 65	13 13	9.9	9 (D)	43 43	120 120	15 15
2 workers farms workers	13 26	19 38	16 16	- 18 36	:	, (D)	- 43 - 86	. 26 . 52
3 or 4 workers fams workers	27 91 11	41 150 22	3 (D)	15 53	4 12	1 (D) 25	38 118 4	5 15 5
10 workers of more	- 75 10 197	128 3 74	(D) 3 33	37 9 197	(D) -	180 11 446	24 4 132	25 3 32
Workers by days worked: 150 days or morefarms workers	- 85 155	57 197	9 13	35 129	5 10	21 51	19 115	14 33
Farms with- 1 worker	56 56 13	9 (D) 18	7 (D)	10 (D)	4 (D)	10 (D)	13 13 3	(D)
3 or 4 workers farms	26	36	-	12 10	-	18	(D)	. 8
5 to 9 workers	41 3 (D)	76 . 7 . 44	(D)	36 7 47	1	- 1 (D)	1	12 1
10 workers or more	(D)	(D)		2 (D)		(D)	(D) (D)	
Less than 150 days farms workers	' 125 348	110 258	23 77	39 203	9 17	80 637	199 365	46 106
1 worker	82 82 8	62 62 15	11 11 6	14 14 8	5	40 40 5	112 112 46	15 15 22
3 or 4 workers farms	16 21	. (D) . <u>19</u>	12	. 16	- 4	10 6	92 34	44
workers	65 8 52	/1 12 61		27 5 34	12	24 21 155	102 5 (D]	(D) 4 24
10 workers of more	133	(D)	33	112 112	•	8 408	(D)	(D)
Reported only workers working 150 days or morefarms workers \$1,000 payroli	. 50 72 939	40 131 1,949	6 10 175	· 18 67 1,074	5 10 54	8 28 382	10 39 929	8 17 157
Reported only workers working less than 150 days	90 - 172 151	93 184 184	20 72 10	22 84 104	. 9 17 2	67 579 158	190 324 473	40 •86 48
Reported both - workers working 150 - days or more and workers porking less than 150 days , 150 days or more, workers less than 150 days, workers S1,000 payroli S1,000 payroli	35 83 176 2,187	17 66 74 1,222	3 3 52	17 62 119 1,278	- -	13 23 58 1,174	9 76 41 1,672	6 16 20 241
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farms	. 15	9		2	· -	- 4	1	
Migrant fam labor on fams reporting only		· ·						

- 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

GEORGIA 327

-continued

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

328 GEORGIA

Item	Charlton	Chatham	Chattahoochee	Chattooga	Cherokee	Clarke	Clay	Clayton
ired farm labor farms workers \$1,000 payroll	21 103 270	17 114 617	5 15 4	72 197 264	138 488 3,073	30 188 2,417	17 59 657	9 17 82
Farms with- 1 worker	(D) . 4	5 (D) 5 10	1 (D)	37 37 18 36	84 84 21 42	7 (D) 36	8 (0) (1)	(D)
3 or 4 workers	3 12 (D) 4 65	1 (D) 1 (D) 5 88	ο 0 -0 -0	4 12 9 72 4 40	25 98 3 18 5 246	14 48 1 (D) 5 121	3 10 4 29 1 (D)	1 (D
orkers by days worked: 150 days or more	8 27	12		22	17 146	19	11	
Farms with- 1 worker	1 - (D) (D)	, 3 3 2 (D)	-	18 18	10 10 10 10	4 (D) (D)	4 4 2 (D)	0 0 0
3 or 4 workers	4 14 1	. (D)		-	3 (D)	9 27	2 (D) 3	:
workers 10 workers or more farms workers	(D)	29 1 (D)	:	20	(D) (D) (D)	5 106	20	
Less than 150 days farms workers	16 75	· 10 60	5 15	67 159	131 342	16 49	- 10 24	1
arms win- 1 worker farms 2 workers farms workers workers	8 8 2 (D)	2 (D) 3 (D)	(D)	45 45 5 10	82 82 21 (D)	7 7 3 (D)	5 5 2 (D)	. 1
3 or 4 workers	1 6 0 0 9	2 (D)	3 (D) 1 (D)	4 12 13 92	24 94 1 (D)	4 15 1 (D)	2 (D) (D)	
workers working	50 5 (D)	40 7 18	-	5	117 7 35	(D) 14 117	7	. (
aported only workers working ess than 150 days	13 41 (D)		5 15 4	50 126 35	(D) 121 258 (D)	11	210 6 11 6	
eported both - workers working 150 tays or more and workers vorking less than 150 days	(D) 3 14 (D) (D)			17 33 33 201	10 111 84 2,026	5 22 20 316	4 18 13 441	
tigrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farms	·   1				1			

-continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Cilnch	Cobb	Coffee	Colquitt	Columbia	. Cook	Coweta	Crawford
Hired farm labor	53 257 495	31 159 (D)	220 1,568 7,555	197 2,540 20,608	37 102 338	77 1,583 7,210	88 247 1,614	40 468 4 391
Farms with- 1 worker	15	13 (D)	76	55	19 19	31 31	58 (D)	21
2 workers farms workers	13 26		. 57 114	30 60	_ (D)	. 11	(D)	. (D)
3 or 4 workers farms s to 8 workers	17 59	9 27	· 16 50	43 141 23	(D)	4	22 87	7 26
10 workers or more	18 5 139	50 1 (D)	257 31 1 071	157 46 2 127	59 1 (D)	37 25 1 477	7	(D) 309
Workers by days worked:	. 7	. 5		Ny RA		- 35	17	237
Farms with-	26	51	Ĩ.	1,181	, j	283	, 56	200
2 workers	(D) 2 (D)	(D)		31 11 22	(ດີ)	20 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	13 13 (D)	(D) (D)
3 or 4 workers farms workers	2 (D)	· . :		12		13 51	1 (D)	· 5 17
5 to 9 workers farms workers	2 (D)	(D)	1	16 97		3 19	(0)	. (D)
Workers		(0)	).	992		198	(0)	164
Less than 150 days farms workers.	231	108	1 37	1,359	93 93	1,300	78 191	29 268
, 1 worker farms workers 2 workers farms workers workers	16 16 11 22	(D)	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	49 49 33 66	14 14 4 (D)	23 23 · 9 18	· 51 · 51 (D)	15 15 6 12
3 or 4 workers farms workers	17	9 27	3	33	2 (D)	5	· 20	3
5 to 9 workers	3 18 4	6 32 1	3	11 78 37	12 65	3 19 23	(D)	2 (D) 3
Workers Working	. 116	(0)	21	. 1,055	•	1,220	(D)	(D)
150 days or more farms workers \$1,000 payroli	(D)	4 (D) 106	6 5 5	34 207 3 2,604	. (D) 206	14 116 1,377	10 43 1,191	. 11 18 223
Reported only workers working less than 150 days	46 122	26 70	• 1	113	31 87	42 192	71 131	18 23
\$1,000 payroli . Reported both - workers working 150	(D)	74	7	1,368	(D)	415	121	64
days or more and workers working less than 150 days	5 (D) 109 212	1	4	50 3 974 691 3 16,637	1 (D) (D) (D) (D) (D)	21 167 1,108 5,418	7 13 60 301	11 182 245 4,104
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farms	8		4	60		23		5
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor (see text) farms	2	· .		3 1	.	· .	1	· .

--continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

JSDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

GEORGIA 329

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

330 GEORGIA

		in a case of y lexit	·					
ltern	Crisp	Dade	Dawson	Decatur	DeKalb	Dodge	Dooly	Dougherty
Hired farm tabor	67 484 3.876	· · 46 161 63	. 55 194 687	101 920 6,478	7 20 138	118 741 1.338	130 696 4,914	50 427 2.918
Farms with- 1 worker	19 19	. 14 (D)	20 20	. 12 . 12		42 42	48 46	15
2 workers farms workers	10 20	12 24	6 (D)	26 . 52	5 (D)	32 64	23 46	7 14
3 or 4 workers farms workers 5 to 9 workers farms	15 53 10	14 42 2	5 16 23	25 96 16	(D)	15 47 12	27 91 19	5 16
workers 10 workers or more	58 13 334	· (D) 4 · 69	134 1 (D)	· 105 22 655	(D)	108 17 480	103 15 410	55 14 327
Workers by days worked: 150 days or more	38	6	29 99	61 374	7	45	82 310	25
Farms with-	13	5	_33 7	14		35	34	100
workers	13 6 (D)	(D)	7 7 14	14 5 10	6 12	35	34 22 44	(D)
3 or 4 workers farms	.7	. 1	.4	12	. 1	2	. 9	
5 to 9 workers	10	. (0)	11	11		S <sup>N</sup>	6	. 3
10 workers or more	(D)			19 237		(D) (D)	11 159	8
Less than 150 days farms workars	47 341	41 153	· 36	73 546	2 (D)	91 639	84 386	4' 27
Farms with- 1 worker	12	10 (D)	18 18	13 (D)		22 22	· 33 33	1
2 workers tarms workers	· 10	12 24	. 6	20 40	(D)	41 82	22 44	1
3 or 4 workers	11 39	13 39	23	22 82		-	17 58	. 3
10 workers or more	28 9 242	. (D) 68	48	(D) 17 405		108 16 427	33 6 218	. 2
Reported only workers working 150 days or more	20	5	. 19	28	. 5	27	46	
workers \$1,000 payroll	54 1,116	(D) 37	· 422	167 3,327	10 (D)	55 633	196 3,055	44 532
Reported only workers working less than 150 days	29	40	26	40		73	. 48	2!
\$1,000 payroll	298	. (D)	63	726		70	307	27
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers working lase than 150 days	19		1 . 10	22		10		
150 days or more, workers less than 150 days, workers \$1,000 payroli	89 180 2,462		24 30 202	207 430 2,425		47 221 636	114 294 1,552	10 177 2,35
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farms	13		1	J	1	5	13	
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor (see text)	.	1	1 1	.			} .	<b>)</b>

-continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

Table 7.	Hired Farm	Labor - Workers	and Payroll:	: 2002 - Con.

	•	• *	-	
Mate are	hased n	on a sample of farms. For me	aning of abbreviations and symbols, see introdu	ictory text]

Item	. Douglas	Early	Echois	Effingham	Elbert	Emanuel	Evans	Fannin
Hired farm labor	33 124	113 260	27 541	60 188	87 379	94 279	60 298	· 30 137
Farms with- 1 worker farms	351 8	2,026 82	(D) 9	822 17	1,560	834 20	1,391	628 19
2 workers	8 10 20	· 82 8 16	(D) (D) (D)	17 25 50	51 13 26	20 47 94	14 24 48	. (D) 4 B
3 or 4 workers	11 36	9 30		7 21	15 45	· 14 45	6 20	2 (D)
5 to 9 workers	N N N N	8 50 6 82	, 50 50 9 478	3 15 8 85	8	10 67 3 53	12 68 4 148	4 24 1
Workers by days worked: 150 days or more farms	3	40	5	29	12	31	25	· · 12
Farms with-	(0)	- 94	142	44	45	60 19	89	93
workers	(D)	19 9 (D)	, (D)	22 6 (D)	. 8	19 7 (D)	8 10 20	· (Ď)
3 or 4 workers		7	•	•	2	2	3	1
5 to 9 workers farms workers		- 4				3 20	2 (D)	
10 workers or more farms workers	(D)	,(D)	3 (D)	· 1 (D)	1 (D)		(D)	1 (D)
Less than 150 days farms workers	32 (D)	92 165	24 399	55 144	77 334	81 219	48 209	· 23
rams win- 1 worker	77	73 73	ဨ	34 34	46 46	20 (D)	14 14	17 17
2 WORKERS	20	(ດ)	(ດັ່ງ	20	18	. 76	32	•
3 or 4 workers	11 36	5			· 14 · 42	13 39	8 24	3
10 workers or more	(D) 2000	37 1 (D)	49 7 338	20 7 7 70	B 228	,46 2 (D)	30 4 109	18
Reported only workers working		21			10	13	12	7
workers \$1,000 payroli	(8)	47 891	·.8	424	16 235	20 275	29 178	(D) 506
Reported only workers working less than 150 days	30 79 (D)	. 73 75 118	22 291 139	31 111 56	75 310 (D)	63 141 33	35 96 47	18 37 73
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers 								•
150 days or more, workers less than 150 days, workers \$1,000 payroll		47 91 1,017	000	24 35 33 341	000	18 40 78 525	13 50 113 1,166	· (D)
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farms	-	1	12	3	•	5	. 7	
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor (see text) farms	.		. 2		.		B	

-continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

332 GEORGIA

Item	Fayette	Floyd	Forsyth	Franklin	Fulton	Gilmer	Glascock	Glynn
red farm labor farms workers	79 201	171 515	90 438	163 558	· 43 193	83 270	9 56	4 (D)
Farms with- 1 worker farms	703	1,149	1,720	959 83	2,729	1,214 28	181 3	· (D)
2 workers farms workers	33 26 52	75 26 (D)	33 10 20	83 30 60	. 15 4 (D)	28 21 42	3 1 (D)	(D (D
3 or 4 workers farms workers	15 49	· 35 135	35 135	14 (D)	:	17 59	· 1	(D
5 to 9 workers	3 (D)	33   182	. 36	35 291	23 156	12 73	(D)	
10 workers of more	(ັ້ດ)	(D)	214	(D)	(D)	· 68	(D)	
rkers by days worked: 150 days or more	11 45	52 69	45 113	43 107	20 90	46 91	. 2 (D)	(C
Farms with- 1 worker	-	46	7	27	-	21	•	
2 workers	9 (D)	46 4 (D)	31 62	27 8 16	:	21 15 30		(1
3 or 4 workers farms workers	. :	•	4	5 17	17 68	6 20		
5 to 9 workers	(D)	2 (D)	(D)	2 (D)	(D)	4 20	2 (D)	
10 workers or more larms workers	(D)	-	2 (D)	(0)	(D)	•		
ess than 150 days farms workers	69 156	155 446	84 325	131 451	42 103	61 179	. 7 (D)	
Farms with- 1 worker farms	33	72	34	62	16	28	3	
2 workers	33 17 34	72 19 (D)	34 37 74	- 30 60	16 4 8	28 . 10 . (D)	· 1 (D)	(
3 or 4 workers farms workers	15 49	39 156	14	· 7 · (D)	18 55	14 49	(D)	
5 to 9 workers	2 (D)	24 125	· 26	31 268	· 4 _ 24	7 46		
10 workers or more tarms : workers	. (0)	(D)	177	(0)		(D)	(D)	
ported only workers working 50 days or more farms	10	16	. 6	32	1	• 22	2	
workers \$1,000 payroll	(D) 132	19 271	22 (D)	53 530	8	46 298	8	
sponed only workers working ss than 150 days	68	119	45	120	23	37	. 7	
workers \$1,000 payroli	144 (D)	277 172	206 (D)	387 - 192 -	(D) 12	107 220	. 8	[ · ·
ported both - workers working 150								ļ
orking less than 150 days farms 150 days or more, workers	·· (D)	36 50	39 91	11 54	19 84	24 45		(
less than 150 days, workers \$1,000 payroll	B	169 706	119 1,384	64 237	56 (D)	72 695		{
grant farm labor on farms with hired bor (see text) farms	•	•	1	•		· 7	-	. 
prant farm labor on farms reporting only			я I		· _		_	1.

-continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

Item	Gordon	Grady	Greene	Gwinnett	Habersham	Hall	Hancock	Haralson
lired farm labor farms	162	91	. 66	61	71	246	37	41
workers \$1,000 payroli	584 2,614	1,015   11,650	476 2.807	288 4,585	384 2,029	805 5.431	. 61 . 318	104 279
Farms with-		36				110	10	
workers	88	36	Š	18	44	116	(Ď)	14
2 workers tarms workers	32 64	20 40	8 16	9 18	11 22	48 96	15 30	20 40
3 or 4 workers	23	18	. 33	25 94	7	47 166	2	4
5 to 9 workers farms	. 7	6	15			6		2
10 workers or more farms workers	12 320	11 835	(D)	9 158	9 295	29 389	(0)	
Workers by days worked:	1	}						
150 days or more farms workers	34 170	58 813	. 20 194	34 226	25 102	78 268	8 17	12
Farms with- 1 worker	17	22	7	4	11	41	5	10
Workers fame	17	ୁ ଦୁ	7	4	11	41	(D)	(D)
workers	(D)	32	6	-	(D)	14	-	(D)
3 or 4 workers	2	8	. 8	21	10	22	2	. •
5 to 9 workers farms	3	7			2	3		
10 workers or more	- 19	49 5		9	막	19	(0)	-
workers	. 111	(D)	(D)	140	(D)	126	. •	-
Less than 150 days farms workers	143 414	56 202	62 282	31 62	.56 282	186 537	· 29 44	· 36 90
Farms with-	. 79	27	-13	16	35	· 91	14	. 17
workers	78	27	(D)	16	35	91	14	17
Workers	64	34	22	16	(0)	84	30	26
3 or 4 workers tarms	18		27	4	2	25	-	3
5 to 9 workers farms	.54	14	9	. 12		95	:	9
10 workers or more	- 49	. 33	64	18	24	31	:	( <sup>0</sup> )
workars	168	94	(a)	-	195	· 236	-	(D)
Reported only workers working	. 10	95		20	15		1	
workers	68	746	14	189	68	188	17	· 6
\$1,000 раутон	1,416	10,485	272	3,393	1,553	3,962	292	49
Reported only workers working farms	128		`	27	46	160	20	
workers	306	49	. 174	43	60	465	44	83
\$1,000 payroll	220	53	230	. 49	135	416	26	. 168
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers				{			· ·	1
working less than 150 days	15	23	16	4	10	18	-	1 3
less than 150 days, workers	108	153	108	19	222	. 72	:	
\$1,000 payroli	977	1,112	2,305	1,144	341	1,053	1	6
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text)	2	16	6	2	· .	1		
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only					1	· · ·		
nagran ann abor on taine toponing only .		· ·	1			1.	1	1

--continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

SDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

GEORGIA 333

Table 7.	<b>Hired Farm</b>	Labor -	Workers an	d Payroll:	2002 - Con.
----------	-------------------	---------	------------	------------	-------------

•			
[Data are based on a sam	ple of farms. For meaning of abb	reviations and symbols, s	ee introductory text]

334 GEORGIA

item	Harris	Hart	Heard	Henry	Houston	Irwin	Jackson	Jasper
lired farm labor farms workers \$1.000 payroll	48 212 1.078	80 682 1.734	45 141 347	87 372 1.740	107 306 1,330	114 442 2,078	180 881 3,805	5: 27: 2.59
Farms with- 1 worker	19 19	40 40	23 (D)	9	51 51	50 50	96 96	2
2 workers tarns workers	· 13 · 26	18 36		37 74	26 52	32 64	32	1
3 or 4 workers farms workers	4 16	11 36	13 51	11 44	17 59	12 39	26 83	. 1
5 to 9 workers	34	. 27	57	123	60	46	69	•
10 workers or more	117	543	(0)	122	84	243	. 601	1
orkers by days worked: 150 days or more	13 36	44 132	13 22	29 97	. 24 49	57 115	78 366	1
Farms with- 1 worker farms	· B	25	. 8	7	12	35	. 30	
workers farms workers workers	2 (D)	25 12 (D)	3 (D)	(D) 20 40	(D) 6 12	35 11 22	30 12 (D)	. (
3 or 4 workers farms workers		1 (D)	1	-	4	7 24	···· 22 67	
5 to 9 workers farms workers	2 (D)	4	(D)	1 (D)	2 (D)	3 (D)	2 (D)	
10 workers or more farms workers	(D)	2 (D)		(D)	•	(D)	12 232	•
Less than 150 days farms	43	43 550	36 · 119	86 275	. 89 . 257	74 327	122 515	:
Farms with- 1 worker farms	21	25	15	. 15	41	32	79	
workers farms workers workers	21 8 16	25 . 5 . 1D	. 15 3 6	15 41 82	41 24 - 48	32 18 36	79 11 22	
3 or 4 workers ianns workers	5 15	· . 8	10 39	8 31	15 53	8 25	. 11	
5 to 9 workers larms workers	4 24		59	16 81	5	7	3	
10 workers or more farms workers	100	5 490	:	· 66	· . 84	192	18 348	
eported only workers working 50 days or more	5	37	9	-1	18	40	58	
workers \$1,000 payroli	15	124 1,497	13	. (B)	34 537	67 897	323 2,946	
eported only workers working	. 35	36	. 33	58	83	. 57	. 102	
workers \$1,000 payroll	158	539 182	106	197 (D)	229	168 249	436	
eported both - workers working 150				· · · ·			·	
days of more and workers working less than 150 days	8	7	. 4	28	6	17	20	• •
less than 150 days, workers \$1,000 payroll	18 762	11 55	13 108	78 1,209	28	159 932	79 579	
igrant farm labor on farms with hired abor (see text)tarms	4	1	-	· 18	··· -	. 11	1	
tigrant farm labor on farms reporting only	.	_	· .	l · _	·	1 .	<b>,</b>	

-continued

•

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

Data are based on a sample of family. For meaning of abbreviations an	iu synibols, see	Introductory lext	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				·
ltem	Jeff Davis	Jefferson	Jenkins	Johnson	Jones	Lamar	Lanier	Laurens
Hired farm labor	43 275 513	82 300 2,425	56 216 1,517	23 64 351	31 90 435	55 182 1,193	38 212 2,177	111 248 1,370
Farms with- 1 worker	17 17 6	28 28 33	15 . 15 . 6	10 (D)	13 13 3	26 26 5	12 (D) 14	82 82 5
3 or 4 workers	9 35 7 41 4 170	11 36 3 22 7 148	(5) 15 56 18 103 2 (D)	12 36 1 (D)	8 32 7 39	15 48 5 32 4 \$6	6 (D) 4 28 2 (D)	6 18 15 103 3 (35
Workers by days worked: 150 days or more	16	30 115	25	7 26	10 27	14	14	27
Farms withfarms 1 worker	9 9 3 6	11 (D) 8 16	9 9 .7 14	5 (D)	5 (D) 1	3 3 3 6	2 (D) 8 16	15 15 2 (D)
3 or 4 workers	4	4	6 20 2	(D)	1 (0)	5 18	2 (D)	12
workers 10 workers or more		33 2 (D)		1 (D)	16	(D) 2 (D)	(D) 1 (D)	· 3
Less than 150 days farms workers	37 248	69 185	45 146	17 38	22 63	49 119	- 30 80	9 17
Farms with- 1 worker	14 14 7 14	29 29 33 66	17 17 3 6	6 (D) 1 (D)	9 (D) 22 (D)	27 27 2 (D)	12 12 12 24	7 7 1
3 or 4 workers	8 33 4	3 (D)	11 41 14 82	10 30	7 28 4 22	15 45 3 16	2 (D) 32	. (Ľ
10 workers or more farms workers	164	3		:	:	2 (D)	· (D)	(0
Reported only workers working 150 days or more	22	13 33 627	11 30 473	6 (D) 334	9 (D)	6 31 589	8 115 (D)	1 5 97
Reported only workers working less than 150 daysfarms workers \$1,000 payrol		, . 5 5 5 1 1 3 1 3	2 31 2 109 1 159	, 16 36 (D)	21 62 12	41 80 96	24 56 (D)	8 9 7
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers wiking less than 150 days	1 1 5 1 24	0 11 8 82 7 53 2 1,66	7 14 2 40 3 37 7 886	1000	1000	8 32 39 508	6 17 24 128	3
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text)	<b>3</b>	4	1	2		2	7	
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only				· ·			3	· ·

- 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

SDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

GEORGIA 335

-continued

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

336 GEORGIA

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Item	Lee	Liberty	Lincoln	Long	Lowndes	Lumpkin	McDuffie	Mcintosh
ed farm labor farms workers \$1,000 payrolt	60 327 2,544	. 15 16 26	. 62 235 : 183	22 63 92	. 144 707 2,158	64 175 1,868	48 505 9,779	2 (D) (D)
arms with- 1 worker	28 28	14 (D)	34 34	9	. 60 60	22 22	19 19	
2 Workers lams workers	18	(D)	13	(ດ)	68 68	29 58	15 30	(D)
3 or 4 workers farms 5 to 9 workers farms	- 20 5		8 29	(D)	20	8 27 3	4	
10 workers or more	32 12 229		7 146	40	66 22 446	(D) 2 (D)	18 7 426	1 (D)
kers by days worked: 50 days or more	37	. 2	24	5	49	26	19	. 1
Farms with-	21	2	- 17	2		· 12	- 314	. (0)
workers farms workers	21 3 (D)	(O)	· 17 7 14	(D) (D)	29 7 14	12 10 20	(D) 5 10	. (D
3 or 4 workers	1	:			. 3	· 2	4	
5 to 9 workers farms workers	5				7			
10 workers or more fams workers	111	•	· :	:	· 3 48	(D)	3 (D)	
ess than 150 days farms workers	39 149	14 (D)	48 204	18 55	· 108	51 90	37 191	່ 1 ເວ
Farms with- 1 worker	20	14	31	7	. 38	26	12	
2 workers	9 . (D)		31 - 3 - 6	(D) (D)	27 54	20 18 36	12 14 28	
3 or 4 workers farms workers	·2 (D)		7	3	17	12	4	
5 to 9 workers farms workers	21	:		6 34	6 54	3		
10 workers or more fams workers	· 4 83	:	7 146		20 369	:	133	1 (D)
ported only workers working 0 days or more	21	. 1	14	4	36	13	11	
workers \$1,000 payroli	117 1,230	B)	21	8	89 764	51 929	15 117	
ported only workers working ss than 150 days	23	13	. 38	17	95	. 38	29	ļ,
workers \$1,000 payroli	54 149	. 13 (D)	183	51 47	425 585	66 58	90 51	
ported both - workers working 150 ays or more and workers		l	l	ł				
rking less than 150 days farms 150 days or more, workers less than 150 days, workers \$1,000 payroll	16 61 95 1,165	1000	10 10 21 72	1000	13 52 141 . 809	13 34 24 882	8 299 101 9,611	
rant farm labor on farms with hired oor (see text)	5		· · ·	1	27	1	2	
trant farm labor on farms reporting only		_						

-continued

2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

Table 7.	Hired Farm	Labor -	Workers	and Payroll:	2002 - Con.
				-	

ltem	Macon	Madison	Marion	Meriwether	Miller	Mitchell	Monroe	Montgomery
Hired farm labor	119 777 9 331	154 458 1 073	63 165	78 194	80 285 1 870	215 2,314	71 417 2057	50 161
Farms with- 1 worker	38	41	20	48	26	77	2,057	22
2 workers	34 68	32 64	16 32	19 38	20 24 48	39 78		22
3 or 4 workers	12 41	57 177	23 73	-4 14	. 13 48	45 171	6 20	(D)
10 workers workers	132 15	18 116 6	(D) N	23	11 66 6	22 160 32	4 30 11	(D)
Workers by days worked:	498	60	(D)	71	87	1,828	303	85
Farms with-	369	44 91	- 18 35	16 41	44 96	101 875	101	93 93
1 worker	27 27 9	27 27 6	(D)	99	23 23 10	35 35 14	15 15 7	(D)
workers 3 or 4 workers	. 18	(D)	14	. 8	20 8	28	14	-
workers 5 to 9 workers farms workers	24 9 56	(D) 9 46	(D) (D)	(D) T (D)	· 29 2 (D)	72 15 89	(D)	(D) 1
10 workers or more farms workers	. 244			(D)	(D)	15 651	(D)	81
Less than 150 days farms workers Farms with-	90 408	124 367	49 130	73 153	60 189	170 1,439	56 316	· 44 · 68
1 worker	27 27 36	23 23 24	16 16 8	57 57 6	32 32 12	64 , 64 34	33 33 . 7	22 (D) 21
3 or 4 workers farms		48 59		5	4	· 35	14	42
5 to 9 workers	23 11 - 69	183 18 113	, (D)	18 3 22	14 6 33	134 13 94	10 3 19	
Workers of more workers	215		ູ (ຊັ	(D)	. 86	1,079	240	
150 days or more	29 178 3,903	30 48 373	14 31 313	. 23 936	20 49 834	45 542 5,194	15 23 356	6 . 72 800
Reported only workers working less than 150 days	61 229 476	110 321 494	45 120 80	· 62 134 235	36 117 209	. 114 264 741	44 258 115	42 00
Reported both - workers working 150								
working less than 150 days	29 191 179 4,953	14 43 46 206	4 4 10 103	11 18 19 255	24 47 72 827	56 333 1,175 4,965	12 78 58 1,585	N 000
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text)	11	-	5	· •	6	28	1	
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only			· .			l. • .		1 ·

-continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

GEORGIA 337

(

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

338 GEORGIA

ttem	Morgan	Murray	Muscogee	Newton	Oconee	Oglethorpe	Paulding	Peach
Hired farm labor farms workers \$1,000 payroll	105 671 2,903	81 182 752	14 42 149	58 133 748	120 497 3,738	66 460 3,431	39 102 327	48 439 6,344
Farms with	54 54 14 28	45 45 9 18	1 (D) (D)	28 28 7 14	45 45 38 76	· 22 22 8 16	15 (D) 21 42	29 29 7 (D)
3 or 4 workers	5 18 56 24 515	16 53 11 66	9 28 1 (D)	15 45 8 46 -	12 45 10 59 15 272	12 47 16 88 8 287	2 (D) 1 (D)	1 (D) 28 6 364
Workers by days worked: 150 days or more	51	. 30	3	7	32	31	8	20
Farms with- 1 worker	124 23 (D) 14 28	43 26 26 1 (D)	(0) - 2 (D)	15 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	5 (D) 12 24	154 12 12 3 (D)	43 (D) (D)	273 (D) (D)
3 or 4 workers	9 33 4 28 1	2 (D) (D)	. (D)	1 (D) -	10 39 (D) 30	2 (D) 10 62 4 7	••••	( (D) 4 24 3
Less than 150 days	65 547	51	13	51	. 98 309	50 306	36 57	39 166
Farms with- 1 worker	32 32 3 6	19 19 19 19	3 (D) 3 6	28 (D) (D)	46 (D) 30 60	23 (D) (D)	19 (D) 15 30	27 27 4 (D)
3 or 4 workers	3 10 9 64 18	14 45 10 59	6 19 1 (D)	14 42 8 46	2 (D) 56 11	12 45 9 46 4	.2 (D)	3 12 1 (D)
Reported only workers working 150 days or more	40 40 79 1,376	3( 4; 68:		7	.22 149 2,822	168 16 56 1,203	3 (D) 113	) 114 9   (D)   (D)
Reported only workers working less than 150 daystarms workers \$1,000 payroli	54 477 340	5 13 6	1 11 9 33 7 (D	51 118 49	88 253 154	35 259 82	31 52 93	28 (D) 37
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers vorking less than 150 days	1 4 7 1,18		000		10 39 56 761	15 98 47 2,146	5 (D) 5 121	11 51 134 (D
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text)	; 1 <sup>1</sup>	B	-	2 .				1
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only								}

-continued

2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

Data are based on a sample of family of meaning of abbreviations at	10 Symbols, 828	Introductory text						
item	Pickens	Pierce ·	Pike	Polk	Pulaski	Putnam	Quitman	Rabun
Hired farm labor farms workers \$1,000 payroll	37 117 248	93 877 2,473	78 299 1,091	47 123 222	38 220 1,008	62 209 2,373	6 52 305	23 183 611
Farms with- 1 worker	21 21 5	23 (D) 2	33 33 3	3 3 14	12 12 11	28 28 7	2 (D)	7 7 6
workers	. 10		6	28	22	· 14	· (D)	12
3 or 4 workers farms S to 9 workers farms	4 15	10	23 86	30 92	5 20	13 44		:
workers or more	23 3 48	194 30 .625	63 7 111		41 4 125	61 4 62	(D) (D)	31 5 133
Workers by days worked: 150 days or more	10	44	17	18 29	16	31	2 (D)	58
Farms with-			12	. 10		. 13	(-)	
workers	(D) 2 (D)	22 7 (D)	12 2 (D)	10 5 10	7 6 12	13 4 8	(D)	4 . 1 (D)
3 or 4 workers		9	1	. 3	1	7	1	. 2
workers		28		9	· (D)	24 4 25	(D)	(D)
10 workers or more tarms workers		5	(D)			20 3 46		(0) (D)
Less than 150 days farms workers	31 105	85	73	41 94	32 187	44 92	. 6. (D)	. 20 125
Farms with- 1 worker farms	19	20	34	6	12	· 27	2	5
2 workers farms workers	(D	6	5	17 34	6 12	3	(D) (D)	5 7 14
3 or 4 workers farms workers	2	3 9 3 28	17	18 54	5 20	8 24	:	2 (D)
5 to 9 workers	0	2 27	11		. 29	6 35	(D)	. (D)
workers	4	474	90	•	114		(D)	86
Reported only workers working 150 days or morefarms workers \$1,000 payroli		6 6 8 · 49 5 (D	3	6 12 86	6 12 214	18 66 1.059		3
Reported only workers working less than 150 days	,	7 4		. 20	27	31		
workers	12	5 38 1 (D	7 22	1 74 3 47	106	. 58 35	12 (D)	76
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers The original state of the second		4 3	8 1	2 13		1 .		
150 days or more, worken less than 150 days, worken \$1,000 payrol		4 11 0 33 2 1,31	1 1 0 2 3 13	2 17 9 20 5 89		51 34 0 . 1,279	. 00	55
Nigrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farms	s	- 2	4	1	• _ ·	5 1	. 1	10
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor (see text) farm	s	-	•					1

--continued

# - 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

JSDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

**GEORGIA 339** 

Dote are based on a sample of larr	e. For meaning of shirevia	tions and symbols see introduct	nny levil
Data ale Daseu un a sample un am	a. I of mounting of approvia		ory long

340 GEORGIA

item	Randolph	Richmond	Rockdale	Schley	Screven	Seminole	Spalding	Stephens
Hired farm labor farms workers \$1 000 navroi	47 179 1325	23 86 287	31 79 150	19 38 443	117 393 2 429	89 252 2 877	29 174 199	52 204 1 794
Farms with- 1 worker	16 16	10 10	12 (D)	10	76 76	36 (D)	12 12	25
2 workers 1arms workers	· 14	4 8	· 10 20	4 (D)	24 48	. 24 . 48	5 (D)	. 14
3 or 4 workers	10 36 10	2 (D) 5	8 32	4 15 1	7 25 6	18 67 9	(0)	13 40 4
workers 10 workers or more	60 . 4 . 53	. 32 . 2 (D)	. (D)	(D)	42 4 202	54 2 (D)	. 48 . 4 100	26 3 99
Workers by days worked: 150 days or morefarms	24	.9		 12	56	. 36	.7	24
workers Farms with- 1 worker farms	. 69	27	· 11 3	25 5	175	100	11	13
workers	8 5 10	(D) 2 (D)	. 4 8	- 5 4 8	39 4 (D)	10 20		(D) 3 6
3 or 4 workers	27	4 13		3 12	9 31	8	2 (D)	7 21
10 workers or more	24	(O)						1
Less than 150 days farms	33	20 59	30 68	7	83 218	75	25	33
Farms with- 1 worker farms workers	15	8 (D)	13 (D)	5 (D)	63 63	37	B (D)	12
2 workers farms workers	5 10	5 10	12 24		13 26	23	6	6 12
3 or 4 workers	26 3	5 17	4 16	(D)		11 38 3	(D)	12 36 1
workers 10 workers or more	17 3 42	· 2 (D)	1 (D)	(D)	(D) 2 (D)		37 4 100	(D) 2 (D)
Reported only workers working 150 days or more	14	3		12	34	14	· · •	19
S1,000 payroli	402	(D)		426	463	1,906	8	1,548
less than 150 days farms workers \$1,000 payroll	23 88 124	14 24 6	24 58 (D)	7 13 17	· 61 73 71	53 88 • 57	22 155 24	28 99 (D)
Reported both - workers working 150 - days or more and workers orking less than 150 days 150 days or more, workers less than 150 days. workers \$1,000 payroli	10 39 22 799	6 17 35 (D)	6 (D) 10 105		22 67 145 1,895	22 39 64 914	3 7 8 167	5 14 16
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farms			. 1	1	4	· . 3	-	
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor (see text) farms	.			.				<u> </u>

-continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

Table 7, Thiod Fallin Labor ; Trontero and Fallon Looz Con	Table 7.	Hired Farm	Labor - Workers	and Payroll:	2002 - Con
--	----------	------------	-----------------	--------------	------------

item .	Stewart	Sumter	Talbot	Taliaferro	Tattnall	Taylor	Telfair	Terrell
lired larm labor	21 45	168	35	17	158	72	53	82
\$1,000 payroll	223	5,037	277	238	8,660	1,339	342	1,630
1 worker	11	76	14	. 7	. 72	27	37	31
workers	11	76	14	7	72	27	37	3
2 workers workers	. 14	66	(ຕ)	(O)	. 80	32	(D)	5
3 or 4 workers farms	1	13	8	· .5	· 19	. 5	1	1
5 to 9 workers tarms		21	4	2	6 6	12	3	4
10 workers or more		148	32	(0)	37	83	23	. 2
workers	(D)	451	(O)	· ·	1,725	376	82	4
forkers by days worked:				•				· . •
150 days or more farms	3	61 187	6 10	5	73	14	. 14	
Farms with-	-		. 10	10	-10			
1 worker farms	· · 2	29	2		38	7	10	. 1
2 workers farms		15	4		· 17	· 2	1	
workers	(D)	30	(D)	-	34	(0)	(D)	(1
3 or 4 workers farms	-	9	-	•	. 6	1	2	
5 to 9 workers	-	32	-		. 19	(D)	(D)	
workers	• •	(D)	•		39	17	-	
10 workers of more		85			286	(a)	(0)	(
Less than 150 days farms	21	· 140	· 31	14	. 122	67	50 1	
Earne with	• 41	600	152	24	1,558	· 492	121	1
1 worker farms	- 11	73	. 12	7	61	28	41	
2 workers farms	11	73	12		61	(P)	41	
workers	14	. 38	, (D)	i š	66	. 32		
3 or 4 workers farms	1	11	8	3	· 8	1	1	
Workers Workers	· (D)	40	30	9	. (0)	ା ୁ ପ୍ରା	(D)	
Sto 9 workers	. (D)	110	32	} :	ໄ ທີ່	69	ທີ່	
10 workers or more farms		20	2	{ -	18	12	` <u>`</u> 6	
workers				· ·	1,664	360	60	
Reported only workers working		28	· · ·	1 9	36			
workers	:	86	6	9	87	14	21	
\$1,000 payroll	•	1,988	93	(D)	1,834	(D)	.177	8
Reported only workers working			· · ·	·				
less than 100 days fams	18	107	29	12	85	58	39	
\$1,000 payroll	(ସି)	1,027	i Ö	13	1,292	. (D)	23	
Reported both - workers working 150					ł	· · ·		
days or more and workers	· •							
150 days or more, workers	4	101	່ ຫ້	ໄ ເວັ້	329	28	13	
less than 150 days, workers	16	154			1,061	82	. 67	Į .
, \$1,000 payrol	(0)	2,021	1 (0)	(0)	- 2,533	908	142	6
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text)		10	2	.	32	A 1		
Harris da una labora da forma demodian ante		1	-	· · ·	1	ľ	l · •	
Migram tarm labor on tarms reporting only	1	1	1. •	1	1 1	1	1.	1

-continued

# - 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

SDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service، لم

GEORGIA 341

#### Table /, HIRED Harm Labor - Workers and Payroll: 2002 - Con.

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

ltem	Thomas	Tift	Toombs	Towns	Tre	utien	Troup	Tumer	Twiggs
Hired farm labor farms workers \$1,000 payroll	161 689 3,715	114 2,174 9,103	153 1,763 7,712	18 30 15		32 181 243	70 156 402	88 456 2,451	· 29 79 288
Farms with- 1 worker	34 34 43 86	23 23 27 54	38 38 32 64	1		2 (D) (D) (D)	34 34 6 (D)	34 34 23 46	
3 or 4 workers	49 177 24 142 11 250	27 102 15 105 22 1,890	36 125 26 19 11	(C	2))2)	4 12 23 152 1 (D)	29 101 1 (D)	14 43 11 67 260	6 21 5 33
Workers by days worked: 150 days or more	74 200	72	2 4	2 5 (		4	15	3	2 7
Farms withfarms 1 workerworkers 2 workersfarms workersworkers	33 33 22 44	4		6 )) 2 4	1	1 (D) (D)	.11 11		5 6 5 (D) 7 -
3 or 4 workers	28		6 20 · · (( 8	1	•	2		1	5
10 workers or more farms workers Less than 150 days	4	3 7 80 6 1	8 08 1 01 1	9 97 37	18	31			3 3 61 - 75 - 25
Farms with- workers	48 31 2 3 2 3 2 3 4	9 1,2 2 12	30 1,4 45 4	98 36 38 29	(D) 14 14	167 (D) 2	1	5 3 24 5	40 68 32 9 32 9 20 7
worker 3 or 4 workersfarm vorker 5 to 9 workers	5 5 5 5 1 6 5 7 1	30 30 19 20 28	8 19 75 16 105	58 27 101 27 185	3 9 1 (D)	(D) 4 (D) 23 149		10 28 97	40 14 10 5 32 17 8 4 42 28
10 workers or more	ns 1	40	17 997 1,	18	:				5 194 -
150 days of moretam worke \$1,000 payr	ns 1 oli 1,6	45 33 164	13 41 897	16 45 589	-	8		13 15 108	13 57 430 119
Reported only workers working less than 150 days	ns ans rolt	87 376 519	42 173 371	111 405 153	17 [2]	28 151 (D)		55 128 (D)	56 22 105 62 140 (D)
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers working less than 150 days 150 days or more, work less than 150 days, work \$1,000 pay	ms ers ers roli 1	29 67 113 532	59 903 1,057 7,836	26 220 1,093 6,969	- 600	3 (D) 16 167		2 000 000	19 3 59 3 235 6 1,881 (D)
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) fa	ms	4	26	55	••••	. 4		•	5
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor (see text) fa	ms )		-	-				· 3 ·	

342 GEORGIA

#### 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

-continued

#### Table /. They raini Labor - Workers and Payron: 2002 - Con.

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

ltem	Union	Upson	Walker	Walton	Ware	Warren	Washington	Wayne
Hired farm labor	31 243 1,124	27 70 560	111 295 1,130	143 471 3,051	52 486 1,331	33 70 486	50 188 1,483	88 934 1,081
Farms with- 1 worker	13 (D)	12 12 9 18	71 71 7	53 53 21 42	20 20 11 22	16 16 11 22	32 32 4 8	35 35 17 34
3 or 4 workers	7 25 4 20 6	391 DN	15 46 16 144 2	40 130 23 140 6	4 12 6 35	4 (D) 2 (D)	8 25 3 18	· 12 46 8 52 16
workers Workers by days worked: 150 days or more farms	183	(D) 7	(D) 28	106	18	17	105.	767
Farms with- 1 worker	48	22 4 4	- 36 20 20		99 99 (D)	36	98 98 99 52 71 22	109 8 (D) 8
3 or 4 workers	(0)	(D)					- (0) - 22 2 1	10 12 39 5 29
10 workers or more	2 (D) 30	(D)	8	(D	2 61 9 41 6 38		6 4	(D) 81 825
Farms with- 1 worker		12 (D) 1( 3 20	55	2 5 2 5 1 2 5	3 1 3 (L 1 1 2 2	6 )) . 1 . 2	8 3 8 3 4 3	31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 3
3 or 4 workers	2	3 4 6 7		4 2 )) 7 7 1 3 11	3 77 · 2 19 · 18 (1 3 56 31	7 2 2 0) 9 17	4 16 1 - (C	6 7 9 21 1 5 ) 31 2 13
Reported only workers working 150 days or more		1 2) 1 5) 44	4 9 2 5	16 13 57 2,3	24 98 25 ()	7 49 D) 4	17 38 1 62 2	8 7 6 12 6 79
Reported only workers working less than 150 days		24 22 22 4 2) 5	0 3 3 5 (	33 1 48 3 D) 3	12 03 54	34 92 D)	16 32 23 2	54 54 13 532 50 185
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers working less than 150 days	5 6 : () 5 11 (	6 D) 75 D)	3 3 5 84	2 D) D)	7 27 43 372	11 50 95 113		8 2 82 9 47 29 97 81
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farm	s .	1	-		1	15	3	2
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only contract labor (see text) farm	s				<b>.</b>			-

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

GEORGIA 343

-continued

#### WUINCIS and Faylun. 2002 - Con. I aure 1. UI. -1 111 1 at

ole sea introductory taxt]

344 GEORGIA

ltem	Wabster	Wheeler	White	Whitfield	Wilcox	Wilkes	Wilkinson	Worth
Hired farm labor.	38	37	112	73	6	4	0 28	160
workers \$1,000 payroll	101	143	425	177	35	6 32	58	896
Farms with-	. 1,1-5	. 755	2,010	004	1,00	· · · · ·	4 103	4,042
1 worker farms workers	22	(D)	49 49	4			12 19	51
vorkers tarms workers	3 (D)	16 32	1B 32	(D		24 (1	10 D) (D	32 64
s or 4 workers farms	.8	5	27	1 . 1		9	8	
5 to 9 workers farms	29	1/2	13	5	3	7	17	- 101
workers 10 workers or more	28 1 (D)	(D) 4 71	106	) (t	8 2	39 1 7 36 (	04 3 (D) (D	214 2 19 3) 466
Workers by days worked: 150 days or more	. 23	14	3	5 2	3	21	55	6 77
Farms with-	. 44	21	13	( <u></u>	<sup>18</sup>	.10 1	137	9 178
1 worker	13 13	10		8	12		40 40	3 43 3 43
2 workers farms workers	(0)	S . (0	5 1	6 (	D)	9 18	(O)	3 15 6 30
3 or 4 workers farms		<u></u>		4	· ·	3	5	- 7
5 to 9 workers tarms workers	(0			4	3	3	3	
10 workers or more farms workers			-] a	1	2 (D)	(D)	(D)	- (D)
Less than 150 days farms workers	. 2	3 3	2 .	35	62 109	58	46	24 127 49 718
Farms with- 1 worker		1	4	35	48	31	12	20 41
2 workers		5	9 . 18	9 18	-	31 12 24	14 28	20 41 2 25 (D) 50
3 or 4 workers		3	4 .	23	12 .	6	12	- 29
5 to 9 workers farm worker	S	4 27	2 D)	13		4	6 35	- 17
10 workers or more farm worker	8	-	3 60	5 63	(0)	148	(D)	2 15 (D) 405
Reported only workers working			_1	- I		_\		
150 days or more	is is iki	15 23 170	11 51 2,	105 206	27 248	37 382	45 736	7 74 29 876
Reported only workers working	1.		· [·	_1				
less than 150 days	ns rs oll	15 26 324	23 86 116	229 227	81 34	43 74 297	25 66 55	22 8 47 51 (D) 64
Reported both - workers working 150 days or more and workers								
working less than 150 days		8 21 31	9 10 36	8 26 65	12 41 28	15 73 172	21 92 123	
\$1,000 pay	roll	352	586	185	582	1,127	1,023	(D) 2,52
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text)	ms	-	4	1	•	19	•	
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only				Į				

۰.

#### 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

*.*.

# Table 1. County Summary Highlights: 2002

Section 2.5.1 (USDA 20046)

(For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text)						-	•
	South Carolina	Abbeville	Aiken	Allendale	Anderson	Bamberg	Bamwell
Farms number Land in farms acres Average size of farm acres Median size of farm acres	24,541 4,845,923 197 79	538 95,170 177 97	929 143,942 155 68	156 107,703 690 215	1,644 176,947 108 56	340 105,277 310 175	370 85,114 230 105
/ Estimated market value of land and buildings ': Average per farm	410,897 2,067	353.021 2,029	355,660 2,219	871,703 1,252	349,436 3,314	438,855 1,314	346,228 1,306
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ': . Average per farm	53,108	40,932	49,446	82,469	33,010	49,441	63,207
Farms by siza: 1 to 9 acres	1,706 8,536 8,504 3,749 1,107 939	.14 175 207 95 35 12	91 313 351 131 22 21	6 26 44 42 18 20	91 730 579 . 186 40 .18	7 54 132 90 35 22	16 107 132 75 20 20
Total cropland	19,450 2,270,084 13,321 1,374,617	404 35,086 280 13,474	745 56,872 485 29,267	108 50,933 66 36,979	1,297 87,393 837 38,806	261 47,622 153 29,829	298 35,458 193 18,995
Irrigated land farms acres	1,918 95,642	23 625	90. 1,799	17 7,889	- 89 - 996	44 4,754	56 1,313
Market value of agricultural products sold (see text) \$1,000 Average per larm dollars	1,489,750 60,705	11,155 20,735	50,450 54,306	10,379 66,534	37,046 22,534	15,061 44,297	7,068 19,102
Crops \$1,000 Livestock, poutry, and their products \$1,000	593,245 896,505	2.849 8,306	7,949 42,501	8,326 2,053	14,916 22,130	10,206 4,855	4,694 2,374
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$10,000 to \$2,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$49,999 \$100,000 or more	14,496 2,543 2,204 2,117 921 600 1,660	291 79 63 52 25 12 16	523 125 84 86 24 13 74	107 7 11 7 6 2 16	1,007 193 152 168 49 33 42	217 20 32 18 13 13 27	225 29 30 28 18 20 20
Government payments	6,112 38,384	.115 251	155 640	105 1,174	267 789	193 1,281	145 981
Total income from farm-related sources, gross before taxes and expenses (see text)	4,912 71,770	79 409	197 5,247	46 754	211 2,320	72 1,028	69 500
Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>	1,313,233 53,525	13,050 24,212	48,829 52,845	15,461 100,399	35,776 21,748	14,762 43,289	11,493 31,230
Net cash farm income of operation (see text) <sup>1</sup>	24,535 311,880	539 169	924 14,188	-3,398	1,645	341 3.693	368
Average per farm dollars : Principal operator by primary occupation;	12,712	314	15,355	-22,062	1,751	10,831	-9,003
Farming	11,377 13,164	251 287	467 462	· 72 · 84	755 889	181 179	164 206
Principal operator by days worked off farm: Any	13,624 10,075	314 241	518 366	77 53	936 705	175 113	219 161
Livestock and poulty: Cattle and caives inventory	10,000 432,265 8,730 218,650 326 20,182 7,139 179,594 900 291,743 736 1,065,420 2,733 1,065,420 1,107 5,583,892 1,107	375 19,123 339 10,509 13 472 286 9,445 10 148 6 152 75 21 (D) 4	322 10.634 283 6,181 9 21 215 4,166 2,112 4,166 2,112 4,166 5,112 4,166 5,112 4,166 5,112 4,166 5,112 4,166 5,112 4,166 5,112 4,166 5,112 4,166 4,167 4,1777 4,17777777777	28 6,604 22 2,363 19 3,204 3 (D) 3 (D) - 4 4	924 40,505 807 32 1,767 697 17,822 29 3,154 422 80 (D) 15	7,487 65 2,784 13 1,325 68 2,163 2,103 2,103 2,103 2,103 2,103 2,103 2,103 2,103 2,103 2,103 2,78 4 7 95 3	76 4,188 61 1,960 4 4 4 72,143 24 727 7,210 10 10 22 21 56,927 1
rumber Selected cross harvested: Com for grain	181,792,956 2,243 240,085 11,147,604	112 - 5 58 770	21,088,811 68 2,332 115,354	21 10,244 584 201	5,556,593 25 448 6 994	30 54 5,207	(D) 57 4,312
Com for slage or greenchop farms acres	140 13,890 147,218	l B	3 43 348	ا ۲۵۹٬۳۵۵ • •	8 975 5 207	400,430 11 1,113	233,600 2 (D)
Wheat for grain, All	967 155,778 5,710,029	15 595	28 1,178	14 9,191	41 2,784	14 2,233	(U) 18 1,144
Winterwheat for grain	967 155,776 5,710,029	15,505 15 595	40,913 28 1,178	304,895 14 9,191 364,005	41 2,784	93,142 14 2,233	37,722 18 1,144
Oats for grain farms acres bushels	579 21,202 975,883	7 140 7,623	21 446 16,723	5 793 33,915	31 1,079 57,310	¥3,142 16 643 32,449	37,722 9 500 27,091

See footnote(s) at end of table.

202 SOUTH CAROLINA

245

-continued

# 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

# Table 1. County Summary Highlights: 2002 - Con. [For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Colleton	Dartington	Dillon	Dorchester	Edgefield	Fairfield	Florence	Georgetown
Farms	495	361	197	365	325	237	612	226
	137,460	161,443	112,262	57,773	74,494	56,375	• 171,388	54,691
	278	447	570	158	229	238	280	242
	98	124	200	61	98	150	104	78
Estimated market value of land and buildings 1:	467,374	472,581	768,990	352,639	491,871	464,227	437,720	485,959
Average per farm	1,750	996	1,391	1,985	2,032	1,493	1,570	2,122
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ': Average per farm	43,754	124,187	179,402	53,131	76,731	38,120	93,787	57,955
Farms by size: 1 to 9 acres 10 to 49 acres 50 to 179 acres 180 to 499 acres 500 to 999 acres 1,000 acres or more	46 136 164 98 26 25	29 90 110 64 25 43	3 28 67 44 25 30	33 153 118 42 8 13	19 95 123 51 23 14	19 60 69 57 19 13	41 187 205 95 33 51	17 84 62 33 17 13
Total cropland	425	306	171	298	235	176	532	189
	35,930	96,968	90,048	31,334	25,960	16,750	103,576	15,152
	278	223	138	188	178	127	426	148
	15,634	68,171	78,239	18,084	15,075	8,172	79,544	B,695
Irrigated land farms acres	49	· 37	13	16	45	23	42	23
	1,287	948	1,928	175	5,304	250	2,505	1,325
Market value of agricultural products sold (see text) \$1,000	13,197	39,579	69,247	12,660	48,554	16,307	35,055	23,942
Average per farm dollars	26,661	109,636	351,508	34,684	149,396	68,804	57,280	105,939
Crops\$1,000	10,323	18,866	22,793	2,634	44,560	752	29,761	21,967
Livestock, poultry, and their products\$1,000	2,875	20,712	46,454	10,025	3,994	15,555	5,294	1,975
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$5,000 to \$49,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$100,000 to \$499,999 \$100,000 or more	305 62 43 43 13 12 13	164 24 31 34 24 26 58	64 55 12 19 18 10 69	234 30 36 27 9 6 23	177 28 45 34 11 22	142 27 23 15 8 9 13	298 59 43 52 52 24 84	135 17 21 17 11 6 19
Government payments	126	144	110	79	99	23	207	73
	386	1,841	1,816	533	397	74	1,611	211
Total income from farm-related sources, gross before taxes and expenses (see text) farms \$1,000	105 3,272	136 4,465	106 2,023	86 1,135	- 68 - 867	45 542	203 3,393	. 52 478
Total form emotivation evenement 1	12 477	42 917	59.088	13 946	34 958	12 205	37 608	99,367

For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

(For meaning of approved and a final terre and a								
ltem	Greenville	Greenwood	Hampton	Horry	Jasper	Kershaw	Lancaster	Laurens
Farms number Land in farms acres Average size of farm acres Median size of farm acres	909 86,852 96 45	501 80,671 161 66	248 127,913 516 157	988 188,311 191 78	163 79;023 485 98	479 69,703 146 60	637 81,468 128 70	931 .142,732 153 79
mated market value of land and buildings ': Average per farm dollars Average per acre	394,871 3,402	293,815 1,858	810,055 1,498	439,723 2,171	709,122 1,454	319,777 2,116	219,240 2,204	427.315 2,236
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ': Average per farm	32,817	20,228	73,127	75,665	. 81,353	43,702	26,090	45,709
Farms by size: 1 to 9 acres. 10 to 49 acres. 50 to 179 acres. 180 to 499 acres. 500 to 999 acres. 1,000 acres or more.	82 435 287 76 20 9	32 185 183 75 16 10	10 38 94 49 30 27	· · 75 329 347 149 54 34	7 54 61 20 6 15	42 183 166 61 14 13	31 248 245 86 21 8	51 310 343 166 39 22
Total cropland farms acres Harvested cropland	698 38,394 447 17 337	350 25,075 229	203 44,295 136 25 549	872 101,336 659	135 15,120 83	357 23,510 223	493 31,049 · 318	749 58,899 505
Inigated land farms acres	71 1,760	21 179	20,545	62 741	1,132 13 2,737	37 903	14,516	24,326 45 525
Market value of agricultural products sold (see text) \$1,000 Average per farm dollars	18,154 19,972	5,719 11,415	6,177 24,906	54,451 55,112	8,545 52,421	84,475 176,356	45,710 71,759	15,648 16,808
Crops	14,873 3,261	1,211 4,508	5,515 661	38,571 15,880	8,241 303	2,081 82,394	1,660 44,050	2,069 13,579
Less than \$2,500           \$2,500 to \$4,999           \$5,000 to \$9,999           \$10,000 to \$24,999           \$25,000 to \$49,999           \$25,000 to \$99,999           \$50,000 to \$99,999	589 114 91 58 22 10 25	311 61 48 56 11 8 8	145 26 16 21 15 6	505 793 93 93 93 97 5 63 63 33 97 118	119	292 49 36 38 31 10 10 12 47	395 68 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 69	547 114 95 98 42 12 23
Government payments	· 77 130	87 133	120 937	275	3 15	1 82 2 32	2 · 87 5 220	164 562
Total income from farm-related sources, gross before taxes and expenses (see text)	117 904	63 354	2,48	t 344 9 6,432	1,12	9 3 1,43	7 97 2 591	139 808
Total farm production expenses \$1,000 Average per farm	22,648 25,025	8,100 16,135	10,58 43,21	7 55,853 2 56,474	7,50 45,19	60,690 8 125,92	8 28,386 4 44,353	17,900 19,144
Net cash farm income of operation (see text) <sup>1</sup>	905 -4,378 -4,838	502 191 381	24 -1,33 -5,46	5 989 9 8,383 5 8,47	9 16 3 2,26 7 13,63	5 48 4 26,44 6 54,85	2 640 0 17,622 4 27,535	935 -120 -128
Principal operator by primary occupation: Farming	388	233	2 9 14	9 53 9 45	4 6 4 9	8 22 5 25	2 307 7 330	437
Any	r 530 r 383	2 28	3 15 3 9	5 51	0 8 4 7	7 25	7 344 16 241	538 430
Livestock and poutry: Cattle and calves inventory	43: r 11,07	2 31 7 13,66	7 7	2 27 6 8,42	2 5	2 14 1 4,85	10 34 36 12,52	7 529 0 24,540
Beef cows	s 3/4 r 5,84 s 1	29 0 8,02	7 1,15	2 22 2 4,45	3 1 59 3	19 10 12 2,89 4	19 31: 19 7,24 - 10	6454 9 12,367 0 16
numbe Canle and calves sold	r 41 s 29 r 4.59	3 7 3 25 7 5.28		19 16 30 3.12	7 5 7 3		4 25 64 5.16	9   1,196 7   389 5   10,464
Hogs and pigs inventory	s 2 r 78	8 1	1 6	16 39 43,90	0 20	5	12 D) 10	7 19 6 316
Hogs and pigs sold	68 - 68		3	13 125,72	21 (1		b) 6	7 16 0 143
Lavers 20 weeks old and older inventory	n 14 s 3	9 10	2]. () 9]. ()			D) (	D) 5	4 87
numbé Brollers and other meat-type chickens sold	er 58 5 er 31	9 (1 4 0 23	0) 11 6 . 14	80 97 3,372,0	72 7 7 20	26 (	D) 35 3 00 2,150,02	7 663 5 7 2,879,505
Selected crops harvested: Com for grainfam acre busha	13 13 15 13 15 296	3	3 29 8,4	70 2: 66 13.8 03 752 1	24 13 1.6 99 29 2	33 29 1,1 43 531	22 1 10 20	
Com for sliage or greenchop fam acre				36	3 D)	•	2 (2)	
Wheat for grain, All fam acri	15 50 16 50		7	14 62 6,7	68 77		15 406 6	17 1 76 33
Dusne Winter wheat for grainfam acri burba		13,8 11 33 2 13 12 12	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	14 14 62 6.7	68 77	1 . (D)	15 406 895	10,59 17 ·1 76 33
Oats for grainfam acr bushe	ns as 2: as 12:1	13 42 75 9.9	7 02 30 11.6	11 313 2,8 301 132.6	63 142	6 286 (D) 3.1	3 60 2 350 5.2	13 05 14 71 7.75

See footnote(s) at end of table.

2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

JSDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

SOUTH CARÓLINA 205

-continued

## Table 7. Hired Farm Labor - Workers and Payroll: 2002

[Data are based on a sample of farms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	South Caroline	. Abboville	Aikan	Allendale	Anderson	Bambern	Bamwali
lired farm labor farms	4,821	· 82	162		196	57	101
workers \$1,000 payroli	27,544 158,993	227 1,880	448 2,516	342 (D)	756 4,904	370 1,504	285 743
Farms with- 1 worker	1,927	41	67	9	91	13	42
workers farms	1,927	41 10	67 63	9	91 53	13	42
workers	1,876	(D)	126	8	106	· 24	40
3 or 4 workers farms		2	12	9	22	7	29
5 to 9 workers fams	605	· 29	· 13	5	16	18	.4
10 workers or more farms workers	581 17,231		139	6 267	14 403	7 216	- 2- 6 71
/orkers by days worked: 150 days or more	1,916		80	23	. 73	41	25
Farms with-	. 8,894	66	219	152	284	. 89	40
1 worker farms workers	836	14	45	9	· 49	23	18
2 workers tarms workers	430 860	2 (D)	14 28	9	· 19 (D)	· 8	(D
3 or 4 workers farms	325	14	3	-	1	. 8	
5 to 9 workers farms	198	43	14	2		25	(0
Workers or more	1,209 127 4,832		4		(D) 3 188	33	
Less than 150 days	4,008	· · 66	120 229	25 190	160 472	42 281	9 24
Farms with- 1 worker farms	1.870	. 28	73	6	88	10	4
workers farms	1,870		73		88 30	10	. 4
workers	1,482	46	76	14	60	22	2
3 or 4 workers farms workers	571	1	3	722	- 16	11	2
5 to 9 workers farms	419	14		1	14	3	
10 workers or more farms workers	407 10,554		64	142	12 205	192	5
Reported only workers working							
150 days or more farms workers	3,143	16	130	23	36	38	
\$1,000 payroli	39,388	. 686	1,082	208	1,869	496	23
Reported only workers working less than 150 days farms	2,905	51	. 82	10	123	16	· 7
workers \$1,000 payroม	9,335	132	107	7 (D)		34	20
Reported both - workers working 150	·.				· ·		
working less than 150 days	1,103	. 15	38	.15	37	- 26	. 1
less than 150 days workers \$1,000 payrofi	9,315	29	99	153 (D)	123	247 961	3
vigrant farm labor on farms with hired labor (see text) farms	469	1	2	5	1	13	
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only			· · ·				

-continued

# SOUTH CAROLINA 239

JSDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

Table 7.	<b>Hired Farm</b>	Labor -	Workers	and Pa	yroll:	2002 -	Con.
----------	-------------------	---------	---------	--------	--------	--------	------

Item	Colleton	Darlington	Dillon	Dorchester	Edgefield	Fairfield	Florence	Georgetown
tired farm labor farms	32	103	100	89	π	28	243	7
workers \$1,000 payroll	2,208	5,192	961 5.230	492 · 735	1,374	86 205	1,592	484
Farms with-		22			4			. 4,004
workers	- ij	33	27	50	45	(0)	94 94	38
2 workers farms workers	· 18	4	10 20	. · 20	:	(D)	9 18	(D
3 or 4 workers farms		19	21	6	17	9	30	10
5 to 9 workers farms		. 24	14	11	5		92 53	(D ) 1
10 workers or more	(0)	172	87	· 79 22	26 10	(D)	383	8
workers	· (D)	356	756	323	1,244	(0)	. 1,005	320
Norkers by days worked:				•			•	
150 days or more farms workers	- 32	290	66	37 104	. 21 425	13	71	1
Farms with-			40					
workers	(D)	32	18	(D)	3	10		
2 workers farms workers	7	· 15 - 30	- 13	15	· 9	1	23	
0 ai fundan			20					
3 of 4 workers	•	23 74	· 50	61	· (0)	തി	32 112	·
5 to 9 workers	(D)	14	13		2		3	
10 workers or more farms		3	6		6		2	2
workers	-	.53	78	•	387		(D)	16
Less than 150 days farms	· 28	69 350	81	90	76	23	224	6
Farms with-				300	849	. 65	8064 ·	28
1 worker	. 10	12	26	49	51	12	97	
2 workers farms	8	12	10	8	4		· 4	
	10	.24	20		°			«
3 of 4 workers tarms workers	(D)	19	· 14		10	(C)	29	1
5 to 9 workers farms	3	12		10	7		50	1 1
10 workers or more farms	• 1	14	22	22	- 4	2	44	ľ
workers	(D)	165	555	.269	. 804	(0)	792	11
Reported only workers working	· · ·	34	10			· -		
workers	9	· _83	57	25	6	9	55	
\$1,000 payroli	223	752	510	266	(D)	44	685	. <sup>2</sup>
Reported only workers working	17	16						
workers	35	62	. 99	161	(O)	38	990	18
\$1,000 payroll	18	65	255	49	(0)	24	1,195	20
Reported both - workers working 150				1 ·	·			
working less than 150 days	. 11	53	47	· 28	20	. 8	52	1.
150 days or more, workers less than 150 days, workers	23	207	196 607	79	420	12	169	1
\$1,000 payroll	1,967	4,374	4,465	421	11,038	138	2,653	4,46
Migrant farm labor on farms with hired	_	· ·	1	1 .				
labor (see lext) farma	2	17	20	-	) 9	1. •	40	1 ·
Migrant farm labor on farms reporting only	· ·	1	1 .	1 .	· ·	1	1.	1 .

-continued

2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA
## Table 7. Hired Farm Labor - Workers and Payroll: 2002 - Con.

Data are based on a sample of larms. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

242 SOUTH CAROLINA

Item	Greenville .	Greenwood	Hampton	Нолу	Jasper	Kershaw	Lancaster	Laurens
ired farm labor farms workers \$1.000 payroli	113 578 2,540	72 139 343	60 305 1.341	270 - 1,704 4,829	32 133 2,549	96 404 4,404	90 224 (D)	14 36 1.01
Farms with- 1 worker	49	36	8	59	15	30	· 46	3
workers farms workers	23 (D)	36 18 (D)	21	69 138	· 15 7 (D)	30 24 48	46 31 62	33
3 or 4 workers farms workers	(D)	16 56	12 44	48 143	5 18	21 74	11 (D)	· 7. 23
5 to 9 workers farms workers	32 219	2 (D)	8 56	33 233	2 (D)	17 102		(
10 workers or more farms workers	8 260		11 155	63 1,131	3 72	4 150	· · 2 (D)	(E
orkers by days worked: 150 days or morefarms workers	.30 141	22 37	32 90	. 120 298	13 87	56 185	19 63	4
Farms with-	20	11	. 4	32	3	34	12	
2 workers	20	· (c)	4	32 47	(O)	34 13	12	
workers	(0)	18	34	94	6	26	8	
3 or 4 workers farms	2	1	7	35	2	· 3	2	,
5 to 9 workers	200		4	5	. 4	2		
10 workers or more	92 92			(D) (D)	(D)	104	(D) (D)	
Less than 150 days farms workers	110 437	67 102	41 215	227 1,406	23 46	72 219	- 81 161	1
Farms with- 1 worker	61	40		50	. 12	29	45	
workers	61 12	· 40	8	50 47	12	(D)	45 27	1
workers	(D)	<u>,</u> 38	22	94	12	. 28	54	1
3 or 4 workers farms workers	36	· 24	10 34	42 132	3 (D)	19 70	8 (D)	
5 to 9 workers farms workers	25		26	458	(D)	9		
10 workers or more farms workers	3	:	125	27 672		(D)		
aconted only workers working						· · · ·	/	
150 days or more	3	5	. 19	43	9	24	9	
\$1,000 payroll	873	. 74	. 687	608	2,011	1,217	116	• 1
eported only workers working	83	. 50	28	150	. 10	40	71	•
workers • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	241	74	177	786	31	121	115	
					. "			
ays or more and workers		17				. 22		
150 days or more, workers	. 86	27	45	221	21	116	51	· ·
1000 payroll	1,478	236	596	3,401	513	3,070	488	· ·
igrant farm labor on farms with hired	12	. 8	.	67	2	2	3	
igrant farm labor on farms reporting only	1.	l .	1		.	1		• •

--continued

## 2002 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE - COUNTY DATA

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service