Appendix G

Economic Impact Forecast System (EIFS) Analysis and Population Estimations

G.1 – EIFS Model Analysis for Fort Belvoir, Virginia

G.2 – Population Estimate Calculations

This page is intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX G.1

ECONOMIC IMPACT FORECAST SYSTEM (EIFS) MODEL ANALYSIS FOR FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA

Socioeconomic Impact Assessment

Socioeconomic impacts are linked through cause-and-effect relationships. Military payrolls and local procurement contribute to the economic base for the ROI. In this regard, base realignment at Fort Belvoir would have a multiplier effect on the local and regional economy. With the proposed action, local expenditures would increase, generating new business sales, employment, and income. This spending generally creates secondary jobs, increases business volume, and increases revenues for schools and other social services.

The EIFS Model

The U.S. Army, with the assistance of academic and professional economists and regional scientists, developed EIFS to address the economic impacts of NEPA-requiring actions and to measure their significance. As a result of its designed applicability, and in the interest of uniformity, EIFS should be used in NEPA assessments for BRAC. The entire system is designed for the scrutiny of a populace affected by the actions being studied. The algorithms in EIFS are simple and easy to understand but still have firm, defensible bases in regional economic theory.

EIFS was developed under a joint project of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Army Environmental Policy Institute, and the Computer and Information Science Department of Clark Atlanta University. EIFS is implemented as an online system supported by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District. The system is available to anyone with an approved user-ID and password. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers staff are available to assist with the use of EIFS.

The databases in EIFS are national in scope and cover the approximately 3,700 counties, parishes, and independent cities that are recognized as reporting units by federal agencies. EIFS allows the user to define an economic ROI by identifying the counties, parishes, or cities to be analyzed. Once the ROI is defined, the system aggregates the data, calculates multipliers and other variables used in the various models in EIFS, and prompts the user for forecast input data.

The basis of the EIFS analytical capabilities is the calculation of multipliers that are used to estimate the impacts resulting from Army-related changes in local expenditures or employment. In calculating the multipliers, EIFS uses the economic base model approach, which relies on the ratio of total economic activity to basic economic activity. Basic, in this context, is defined as the production or employment engaged to supply goods and services outside the ROI or by federal activities (such as military installations and their employees). According to economic base theory, the ratio of total income to basic income is measurable (as the multiplier) and sufficiently stable so that future changes in economic activity can be forecast. This technique is especially appropriate for estimating aggregate impacts and makes the economic base model ideal for the EA and EIS process.

The multiplier is interpreted as the total impact on the economy of the region resulting from a unit change in its base sector; for example, a dollar increase in local expenditures due to an expansion of its military installation. EIFS estimates its multipliers using a location quotient approach on the

basis of the concentration of industries within the region relative to the industrial concentrations for the nation.

The user inputs into the EIFS model the data elements that describe the Army action: definition of the ROI; the change in local expenditures; number of affected (moving) civilian personnel and their salaries; number of affected (moving) military employees and their salaries; and the percent of affected military living on-post.

Although there would be a net gain of about 22,000 jobs (military and civilian) to Fort Belvoir, the installation would also lose some jobs due the proposed realignment. Per the *2005 Defense BRAC Commission Report to the President, Volumes I and 2*, almost 1,800 jobs would be realigned from Fort Belvoir to several other DoD installations in the continental U.S. (Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission 2005). It is assumed these jobs would be transferred in 2011, the year when BRAC actions must be completed. Because the jobs would be transferred outside the ROI, they were entered in to the EIFS model as the change in military and civilian employment. Average annual income for the military personnel was estimated at $30,000, and average annual income for civilian personnel was about $45,000 (Webster 2005). It was assumed that 100 percent of the military personnel would relocate to their new assignment, and it was estimated that 50 percent of the civilian personnel would relocate.

Implementation of the proposed realignment action also would require renovation of existing facilities and construction of new facilities to accommodate the increase in personnel and functions assigned to Fort Belvoir. The installation would construct about 6.2 million square feet of new built space and renovate about 320,000 square feet of existing space (see Table 2-3). These facilities would be new work space for the incoming personnel and general support facilities to meet the needs of the larger working population. Construction would begin about 2007 and be completed by 2011 (5 years). The EIFS model output assumes that changes occur at one time, when in fact the effects of the preferred alternative's changes in construction expenditures and employment would be spread out over the 5-year development period. Therefore, the multiyear activity was modeled using EIFS by determining the changes in amount of construction spending and employment in each year of the project cycle (2007 through 2011), and a separate EIFS model run was completed for each year. Fort Belvoir's expected construction expenditures for the BRAC action and associated other facility projects were input into the model as the change in local expenditures. The realignment of almost 1,800 jobs from Fort Belvoir to other DoD installations in 2011 was entered as the change in employment. Table G.1-1 lists the EIFS model input parameters for each year.

Once the input variables are entered into the EIFS model, the model is run and it projects changes to the local economy's business sales volume, income, employment, and population. These four indicator variables are used to measure and evaluate socioeconomic impacts. Sales volume is the direct and indirect change in local business activity and sales (total retail and wholesale trade sales, total selected service receipts, and value-added by manufacturing). Employment is the total change in local employment due to the proposed action, including the direct and secondary changes in local employment. Income is the total change in local wages and salaries due to the proposed action, which includes the sum of the direct and indirect wages and salaries, plus the income of the civilian and military personnel affected by the proposed action. Population is the increase or decrease in the local population as a result of the proposed action.

Table G.1-1
EIFS Model Input Parameters for the Proposed BRAC Action at Fort Belvoir

Input Parameter	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Construction Expenditures[a]	$161,337,500	$2,134,221,000	$655,818,800	$578,870,800	$254,050,000
Change in Civilian Employment[b]	0	0	0	0	-1,560
Average Income of Affected Civilian[c]	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000
Percent Civilian Expected to Relocate	0	0	0	0	50%
Change in Military Employment[b]	0	0	0	0	-210
Average Income of Affected Military[c]	$30,000	$30,000	$30,000	$30,000	$30,000
Percent of Military Living On-Post	0	0	0	0	0

Sources:
[a]Fort Belvoir Detailed Facilities Project List, November 6, 2006 (updated February 15, 2007)
[b]Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission 2005
[c]Webster 2005

The Significance of Socioeconomic Impacts

Once model projections are obtained, the RTV profile allows the user to evaluate the significance of the impacts. This analytical tool reviews the historical trends for the defined region and develops measures of local historical fluctuations in sales volume, income, employment, and population. These evaluations identify the positive and negative changes within which a project can affect the local economy without creating a significant impact. The greatest historical changes define the boundaries that provide a basis for comparing an action's impact on the historical fluctuation in an area. Specifically, EIFS sets the boundaries by multiplying the maximum historical deviation of the following variables:

		Increase	Decrease
Sales volume	X	100%	75%
Income	X	100%	67%
Employment	X	100%	67%
Population	X	100%	50%

These boundaries determine the amount of change that will affect an area. The percentage allowances are arbitrary, but sensible. The maximum positive historical fluctuation is allowed with expansion because economic growth is beneficial. While cases of damaging economic growth have been cited, and although the zero-growth concept is being accepted by many local planning groups, military base reductions and closures generally are more injurious to local economics than are expansion.

The major strengths of the RTV are its specificity to the region under analysis and its basis on actual historical data for the region. The EIFS impact model, in combination with the RTV, has proven successful in addressing perceived socioeconomic impacts. The EIFS model and the RTV

technique for measuring the intensity of impacts have been reviewed by economic experts and have been deemed theoretically sound.

The following are the EIFS inputs and output data and the RTV values for the ROI. These data form the basis for the socioeconomic impact analysis presented in Section 4.10.2.1.2.

EIFS REPORT

PROJECT NAME: Fort Belvoir BRAC EIS

STUDY AREA

11001	District of Columbia
24009	Calvert County, MD
24017	Charles County, MD
24021	Frederick County, MD
24031	Montgomery County, MD
24033	Prince George's County, MD
51013	Arlington County, VA
51059	Fairfax County, VA
51107	Loudoun County, VA
51153	Prince William County, VA
51179	Stafford County, VA
51510	Alexandria City, VA
51600	Fairfax City, VA
51610	Falls Church City, VA
51683	Manassas City, VA
51685	Manassas Park City, VA

2007 FORECAST INPUT

Change In Local Expenditures	$161,337,500	
Change In Civilian Employment	0	
Average Income of Affected Civilian	$0	
Percent Expected to Relocate	0	
Change In Military Employment	0	
Average Income of Affected Military	$0	
Percent of Military Living On-post	0	

2007 FORECAST OUTPUT

Employment Multiplier	2.76	
Income Multiplier	2.76	
Sales Volume – Direct	$161,337,500	
Sales Volume – Induced	$283,954,000	
Sales Volume – Total	$445,291,500	0.21%
Income – Direct	$34,259,020	
Income - Induced	$60,295,860	
Income – Total (place of work)	$94,554,870	0.06%
Employment – Direct	702	
Employment – Induced	1,235	
Employment – Total	1,937	0.06%
Local Population	0	
Local Off-base Population	0	0.00%

2008 FORECAST INPUT		
Change In Local Expenditures	$2,134,221,000	
Change In Civilian Employment	0	
Average Income of Affected Civilian	$0	
Percent Expected to Relocate	0	
Change In Military Employment	0	
Average Income of Affected Military	$0	
Percent of Military Living On-post	0	
2008 FORECAST OUTPUT		
Employment Multiplier	2.76	
Income Multiplier	2.76	
Sales Volume – Direct	$2,134,221,000	
Sales Volume – Induced	$3,756,228,000	
Sales Volume – Total	$5,890,449,000	2.82%
Income – Direct	$453,188,500	
Income - Induced	$797,611,700	
Income – Total (place of work)	$1,250,800,000	0.84%
Employment – Direct	9,286	
Employment – Induced	16,343	
Employment – Total	25,628	0.85%
Local Population	0	
Local Off-base Population	0	0.00%

2009 FORECAST INPUT		
Change In Local Expenditures	$655,818,800	
Change In Civilian Employment	0	
Average Income of Affected Civilian	$0	
Percent Expected to Relocate	0	
Change In Military Employment	0	
Average Income of Affected Military	$0	
Percent of Military Living On-post	0	
2009 FORECAST OUTPUT		
Employment Multiplier	2.76	
Income Multiplier	2.76	
Sales Volume – Direct	$655,818,800	
Sales Volume – Induced	$1,154,241,000	
Sales Volume – Total	$1,810,060,000	0.87%
Income – Direct	$139,259,000	
Income - Induced	$245,095,900	
Income – Total (place of work)	$384,354,900	0.26%
Employment – Direct	2,853	
Employment – Induced	5,022	
Employment – Total	7,875	0.26%
Local Population	0	
Local Off-base Population	0	0.00%

2010 FORECAST INPUT		
Change In Local Expenditures	$578,870,800	
Change In Civilian Employment	0	
Average Income of Affected Civilian	$0	
Percent Expected to Relocate	0	
Change In Military Employment	0	
Average Income of Affected Military	$0	
Percent of Military Living On-post	0	
2010 FORECAST OUTPUT		
Employment Multiplier	2.76	
Income Multiplier	2.76	
Sales Volume – Direct	$578,870,800	
Sales Volume – Induced	$1,018,813,000	
Sales Volume – Total	$1,597,683,000	0.77%
Income – Direct	$122,919,600	
Income - Induced	$216,338,500	
Income – Total (place of work)	$339,258,100	0.23%
Employment – Direct	2,519	
Employment – Induced	4,433	
Employment – Total	6,951	0.23%
Local Population	0	
Local Off-base Population	0	0.00%

2011 FORECAST INPUT		
Change In Local Expenditures	$254,050,000	
Change In Civilian Employment	-1,560	
Average Income of Affected Civilian	$45,000	
Percent Expected to Relocate	50	
Change In Military Employment	-210	
Average Income of Affected Military	$30,000	
Percent of Military Living On-post	0	
2011 FORECAST OUTPUT		
Employment Multiplier	2.76	
Income Multiplier	2.76	
Sales Volume – Direct	$194,528,500	
Sales Volume – Induced	$342,370,200	
Sales Volume – Total	$536,898,700	0.26%
Income – Direct	$-22,554,060	
Income - Induced	$72,700,180	
Income – Total (place of work)	$50,146,120	0.03%
Employment – Direct	-924	
Employment – Induced	1,490	
Employment – Total	566	0.02%
Local Population	-2,465	
Local Off-base Population	-2,465	-0.06%

RTV SUMMARY

	Sales Volume	Income	Employment	Population
Positive RTV	12.03%	11.56%	3.44%	1.15%
Negative RTV	-4.46%	-3.85%	-2.92%	-0.75%

RTV DETAILED

SALES VOLUME

Year	Value	Adj_Value	Change	Deviation	%Deviation
1969	12487987	54572502	0	0	0
1970	13822532	57087059	2514557	-464206	-0.81
1971	15319874	60666702	3579643	600880	0.99
1972	16879944	64650184	3983483	1004720	1.55
1973	18540008	66929427	2279243	-699520	-1.05
1974	20302148	65981981	-947446	-3926209	-5.95
1975	22302194	66460539	478558	-2500205	-3.76
1976	24627620	69449887	2989348	10585	0.02
1977	27185027	71768474	2318587	-660176	-0.92
1978	30016402	73840350	2071876	-906887	-1.23
1979	33336113	73672811	-167539	-3146302	-4.27
1980	37300698	72363356	-1309455	-4288218	-5.93
1981	41309891	72705408	342052	-2636711	-3.63
1982	44564161	73976506	1271098	-1707665	-2.31
1983	48491783	78071771	4095266	1116503	1.43
1984	54481740	83901878	5830106	2851343	3.4
1985	60194608	89689966	5788089	2809326	3.13
1986	65885847	96193339	6503373	3524610	3.66
1987	72734574	112738586	16545247	13566484	12.03
1988	80522543	109510660	-3227927	-6206690	-5.67
1989	86932341	112142717	2632057	-346706	-0.31
1990	91886260	113020102	877385	-2101378	-1.86
1991	94796472	111859832	-1160270	-4139033	-3.7
1992	100451351	114514539	2654707	-324056	-0.28
1993	105432219	117029765	2515226	-463537	-0.4
1994	109805076	118589487	1559722	-1419041	-1.2
1995	113723153	119409305	819818	-2158945	-1.81
1996	118472471	120841918	1432613	-1546150	-1.28
1997	125654346	125654346	4812428	1833665	1.46
1998	135111444	132409218	6754872	3776109	2.85
1999	146647589	140781682	8372465	5393702	3.83
2000	161175166	149892906	9111223	6132460	4.09

INCOME

Year	Value	Adj_Value	Change	Deviation	%Deviation
1969	14319990	62578355	0	0	0
1970	16042780	66256683	3678329	195972	0.3
1971	17719588	70169569	3912886	430529	0.61
1972	19433040	74428542	4258973	776616	1.04
1973	21318070	76958230	2529689	-952668	-1.24
1974	23463564	76256583	-701647	-4184004	-5.49
1975	25725858	76663057	406474	-3075883	-4.01
1976	28261512	79697462	3034405	-447952	-0.56
1977	31032678	81926273	2228811	-1253546	-1.53
1978	34216866	84173492	2247218	-1235139	-1.47
1979	38043291	84075675	-97817	-3580174	-4.26
1980	42908340	83242182	-833493	-4315850	-5.18
1981	48269158	84953718	1711536	-1770821	-2.08
1982	52670305	87432705	2478987	-1003370	-1.15
1983	57174793	92051418	4618713	1136356	1.23
1984	64363606	99119951	7068533	3586176	3.62
1985	70729098	105386357	6266406	2784049	2.64
1986	76800017	112128028	6741671	3259314	2.91
1987	84333410	130716781	18588754	15106397	11.56
1988	93310155	126901812	-3814969	-7297326	-5.75
1989	101616400	131085152	4183340	700983	0.53
1990	107884900	132698429	1613277	-1869080	-1.41
1991	112366744	132592752	-105677	-3588034	-2.71
1992	118331091	134897442	2304690	-1177667	-0.87
1993	124570964	138273772	3376330	-106027	-0.08
1994	130517765	140959192	2685420	-796937	-0.57
1995	135260856	142023892	1064701	-2417656	-1.7
1996	141360695	144187906	2164014	-1318343	-0.91
1997	149327565	149327565	5139659	1657302	1.11
1998	161042530	157821682	8494117	5011760	3.18
1999	172078384	165195245	7373562	3891205	2.36
2000	187111593	174013783	8818538	5336181	3.07

EMPLOYMENT

Year	Value	Change	Deviation	%Deviation
1969	1546829	0	0	0
1970	1579734	32905	-22196	-1.41
1971	1618189	38455	-16646	-1.03
1972	1667964	49775	-5326	-0.32
1973	1722489	54525	-576	-0.03
1974	1755495	33006	-22095	-1.26
1975	1775487	19992	-35109	-1.98
1976	1803567	28080	-27021	-1.5
1977	1852213	48646	-6455	-0.35
1978	1927282	75069	19968	1.04
1979	1989586	62304	7203	0.36
1980	2027170	37584	-17517	-0.86
1981	2052751	25581	-29520	-1.44
1982	2056252	3501	-51600	-2.51
1983	2120560	64308	9207	0.43
1984	2253186	132626	77525	3.44
1985	2382829	129643	74542	3.13
1986	2509977	127148	72047	2.87
1987	2642149	132172	77071	2.92
1988	2749641	107492	52391	1.91
1989	2824890	75249	20148	0.71
1990	2858498	33608	-21493	-0.75
1991	2791759	-66739	-121840	-4.36
1992	2781002	-10757	-65858	-2.37
1993	2827096	46094	-9007	-0.32
1994	2860240	33144	-21957	-0.77
1995	2913551	53311	-1790	-0.06
1996	2952105	38554	-16547	-0.56
1997	3015129	63024	7923	0.26
1998	3078562	63433	8332	0.27
1999	3175123	96561	41460	1.31
2000	3310059	134936	79835	2.41

POPULATION

Year	Value	Change	Deviation	%Deviation
1969	2983912	0	0	0
1970	3048875	64963	15489	0.51
1971	3098045	49170	-304	-0.01
1972	3163102	65057	15583	0.49
1973	3178494	15392	-34082	-1.07
1974	3183067	4573	-44901	-1.41
1975	3204590	21523	-27951	-0.87
1976	3219203	14613	-34861	-1.08
1977	3220039	836	-48638	-1.51
1978	3242642	22603	-26871	-0.83
1979	3245124	2482	-46992	-1.45
1980	3266262	21138	-28336	-0.87
1981	3321358	55096	5622	0.17
1982	3361545	40187	-9287	-0.28
1983	3411617	50072	598	0.02
1984	3484327	72710	23236	0.67
1985	3559580	75253	25779	0.72
1986	3646331	86751	37277	1.02
1987	3738922	92591	43117	1.15
1988	3828498	89576	40102	1.05
1989	3895185	66687	17213	0.44
1990	3936904	41719	-7755	-0.2
1991	3994176	57272	7798	0.2
1992	4053539	59363	9889	0.24
1993	4109779	56240	6766	0.16
1994	4164663	54884	5410	0.13
1995	4212186	47523	-1951	-0.05
1996	4267192	55006	5532	0.13
1997	4326258	59066	9592	0.22
1998	4392813	66555	17081	0.39
1999	4477130	84317	34843	0.78
2000	4567091	89961	40487	0.89

****** End of Report ******

This page is intentionally left blank.

Appendix G.2

Population Estimate Calculations

The following tables list the data and calculations for the population estimates presented in Section 4.10.2.1.2. The number and percentage of Fort Belvoir employees by location, as well as the number of Arlington (WHS and DoD) and NGA employees by location, was derived by VHB (2006). The transportation model assumed that 50 percent of the current Arlington employees and 50 percent of the current NGA employees would be redistributed as the current Fort Belvoir employees are distributed. It was assumed that one employee represents one household. The percentage of households that are family households (65 percent) and nonfamily households (35 percent) is from the U.S. Census Bureau Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) Demographic Characteristics for 2005 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006c). The average family size (3.27 persons) also is from the U.S. Census Bureau Washington MSA Demographic Characteristics for 2005 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006c). The number of children per family (1.8) is from the 2000 Census, Average Number of Children Per Family for Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Table G.2-1
Home zip code of existing Fort Belvoir employees

District	Location	Derived number of employees	Fort Belvoir % of employees by location
A	Arlington/Alexandria	986	4%
B	Northern Fairfax Co./Loudoun Co.	1,601	7%
C	Southern Fairfax Co.	8,607	38%
D	Prince William Co.	5,116	23%
E	Near South (Fredericksburg/Stafford Co)	2,069	9%
F	Remainder of Virginia	1,613	7%
G	District of Columbia	266	1%
H	Prince Georges Co.	1,045	5%
I	Montgomery Co.	240	1%
J	Remainder of Maryland	949	4%
	Total	22,492	100%

Source: VHB 2006

Table G.2-2
Calculations for Arlington (WHS and DoD) employees

District	Location	Home zip code of existing Arlington (WHS & DOD) employees	Assume 50% would move by 2011	Percent distribution of current Fort Belvoir employees by location	Arlington redistribution based on current Fort Belvoir distribution	Percentage that would be family households	Number that would be family households	Percentage that would be nonfamily households	Number that would be nonfamily households
A	Arlington/ Alexandria	1,302	651	4%	203	0.65	132	0.35	71
B	Northern Fairfax Co./Loudoun Co.	1,349	675	7%	329	0.65	214	0.35	115
C	Southern Fairfax Co.	1,638	819	38%	1,769	0.65	1,150	0.35	619
D	Prince William Co.	1,230	615	23%	1,051	0.65	683	0.35	368
E	Near South (Fredericksburg/ Stafford Co)	557	279	9%	425	0.65	276	0.35	149
F	Remainder of Virginia	358	179	7%	331	0.65	215	0.35	116
G	District of Columbia	437	219	1%	55	0.65	36	0.35	19
H	Prince Georges Co.	1,149	575	5%	215	0.65	140	0.35	75
I	Montgomery Co.	336	168	1%	49	0.65	32	0.35	17
J	Remainder of Maryland	889	445	4%	195	0.65	127	0.35	68
	Total	9,245	4,623	100%	4,623		3,005		1,618

Table G.2-3
Calculations for NGA Employees

District	Location	Derived number of employees	Assume 50% would move by 2011	Percent distribution of current Fort Belvoir employees by location	NGA redistribution based on current Fort Belvoir distribution	Percentage that would be family households	Number that would be family households	Percentage that would be nonfamily households	Number that would be nonfamily households
A	Arlington/ Alexandria	574	287	4%	167	0.65	109	0.35	59
B	Northern Fairfax Co./Loudoun Co.	2,313	1,157	7%	293	0.65	191	0.35	103
C	Southern Fairfax Co.	649	325	38%	1,591	0.65	1,034	0.35	557
D	Prince William Co.	645	323	23%	963	0.65	626	0.35	337
E	Near South (Fredericksburg/ Stafford Co)	95	48	9%	377	0.65	245	0.35	132
F	Remainder of Virginia	306	153	7%	293	0.65	191	0.35	103
G	District of Columbia	399	200	1%	42	0.65	27	0.35	15
H	Prince Georges Co.	791	396	5%	209	0.65	136	0.35	73
I	Montgomery Co.	1,218	609	1%	42	0.65	27	0.35	15
J	Remainder of Maryland	1,384	692	4%	167	0.65	109	0.35	59
	Total		4,187	99%	4,145		2,694		1,451

Table G.2-4
Estimated redistribution of population due to Fort Belvoir BRAC action

District	Location	Number of employees (i.e., households) that would be redistributed (Arlington + NGA)	Number redistributed that would be family households	Average Family Size	Family Pop	Average number of children per family	Total number of children (18 and under) in family households	Total number of adults in family households	Number redistributed that would be non-family households	Total number of adults in non-family households	Total population that would be redistributed
A	Arlington/ Alexandria	370	229	3.27	749	1.80	411	338	123	461	872
B	Northern Fairfax Co./Loudoun Co.	622	401	3.27	1,311	1.80	720	591	216	806	1,527
C	Southern Fairfax Co.	3,360	2176	3.27	7,115	1.80	3,909	3,206	1,172	4,378	8,287
D	Prince William Co.	2,014	1317	3.27	4,307	1.80	2,366	1,941	709	2,650	5,016
E	Near South (Fredericksburg/ Stafford Co)	805	515	3.27	1,685	1.80	926	759	277	1,037	1,963
F	Remainder of Virginia	625	401	3.27	1,311	1.80	720	591	216	806	1,527
G	District of Columbia	97	57	3.27	187	1.80	103	84	31	115	218
H	Prince Georges Co.	424	286	3.27	936	1.80	514	422	154	576	1,090
I	Montgomery Co.	91	57	3.27	187	1.80	103	84	31	115	218
J	Remainder of Maryland	363	229	3.27	749	1.80	411	338	123	461	872
	Total	8,768	5,669		18,537	1.80	10,184	8,353	3,052	11,406	21,590