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Because we live in an era of unprecedented change, the need to anticipate and prepare for what lies ahead has become central to the work and the mission of government. Increasingly, knowledge and information are the tools that enable policymakers in every arena to glimpse the shape of things to come, seize opportunities as they arise and avoid costly mistakes.

To bring a future-oriented perspective to decisionmaking in the Commonwealth, the General Assembly created the Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center in 1992. After careful planning and preparation by its Board of Directors, the Center was launched in mid-1993.

Unique to the U.S. public policy landscape, the Center strives to enrich understanding of trends and forces influencing the future of the Commonwealth and to lend a long-term perspective to policymaking. The work of the Center includes research, policy analysis, strategic planning, communications with all branches of government, and public outreach.

To ensure its independence and its ability to serve all branches of government, as well as citizens of the Commonwealth, the Center is governed by a balanced 21-member board. Four representatives from the executive branch and six from the legislative branch are joined by eleven at-large members, six of whom are appointed by the Governor and five by the Legislative Research Commission. Academics, business owners, and community leaders join together with policymakers to help shape the research agenda and facilitate the work of the Center.

The Center’s ambitious agenda is designed to increase knowledge about issues on Kentucky’s horizon, guide planning efforts throughout state government, and engage citizens and policymakers in preparing for the future. Initiatives include:
• A biennial report on trends influencing the future of the Commonwealth. The sixth edition, *Visioning Kentucky’s Future: Measures and Milestones 2004*, introduces the State of the Commonwealth Index, and incorporates an inclusive citizen vision, goals for realizing it, and measures of progress, as well as the results of a statewide citizen survey that asks Kentuckians whether they think we are making progress on these important goals.

• Research into timely topics of importance to the state’s future. Recently published studies explore such issues as parental involvement in education, potential economic benefits from higher postsecondary education attainment, and the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003. Current research projects are looking at the contours and consequences of Kentucky’s population without health insurance and economic development strategies for Kentucky’s future.

• **Foresight.** With a circulation of over 8,000, the Center’s quarterly publication informs a broad audience of Kentuckians about the Center’s work, examines emerging issues, and features articles on a variety of issues, ranging from hemp to health care.

• A statewide scanning program. Scanning Kentucky engages Kentuckians in an effort to identify signposts of change. Scans are compiled in a database and top trends are published quarterly.

• Public outreach. Citizens and policymakers are kept up-to-date through speaking engagements and annual conferences. Center staff frequently present the findings and recommendations of studies to legislative committees, civic gatherings, and education groups. The annual conference usually attracts between 300 and 400 citizens and policymakers.

*To obtain more information about the Center, be placed on the mailing list, or request free copies of publications,* contact the Center at:

**THE KENTUCKY LONG-TERM POLICY RESEARCH CENTER**

111 St. James Court  
Frankfort, KY 40601-8486  
Phone: (502) 564-2851 or (800) 853-2851  
Fax: (502) 564-1412 or (800) 383-1412  
e-mail: ltprc@lrc.ky.gov  
www.kltprc.net
TRENDS AT A GLANCE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Soil Erosion Rates: Cropland (tons/acre/yr.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Soil Erosion Rates: Pastureland (tons/acre/yr.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms: Average Net Income ($ constant 2003)</td>
<td>16,205</td>
<td>15,912</td>
<td>18,884</td>
<td>14,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms: Average Size (acres)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms: Cash Receipts, Crops ($ constant 2003 bil.)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms: Cash Receipts, Livestock ($ constant 2003 bil.)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms: Number in Kentucky (thousands)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Production (millions of pounds)</td>
<td>442.25</td>
<td>479.79</td>
<td>524.38</td>
<td>455.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco: Value of Production ($ constant 2003 mil.)</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROPRIATIONS AND REVENUE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget: Total Revenues ($ constant 2003 mil.)</td>
<td>-13,132</td>
<td>-14,299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund: Appropriations ($ constant 2003 mil.)</td>
<td>-5,829</td>
<td>-5,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund: Expenditures ($ constant 2003 mil.)</td>
<td>-5,093</td>
<td>-5,192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy Day Fund Balance ($ current mil.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy Day Fund Balance (% of General Fund Revenue)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government Bond Rating (Moody's)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government Bond Rating (Standard &amp; Poor's)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Revenue Elasticity (5-year averages)</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Who Organized Group to Help Community (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Who Participated in Grp. to Help Community (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults With Leadership Development Training (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Contributions (% of population)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Contributions ($ constant 2003, avg./return)</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Pride (% extremely proud)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Pride (% not proud at all)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Pride (% somewhat proud)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Places (listings)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Places (properties)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Housing Units: No Heat (%)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Housing Units: No Kitchen (%)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Housing Units: No Plumbing (%)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Housing Units: Overcrowded (%)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborliness (% no one to call when needed)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (% who can usually trust others)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering for Community Activities (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Participation: Presidential Elections (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,784</td>
<td>10,590</td>
<td>15,781</td>
<td>15,999</td>
<td>14,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453.69</td>
<td>328.58</td>
<td>395.54</td>
<td>497.93</td>
<td>443.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,534</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>16,257</td>
<td>17,142</td>
<td>18,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,976</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>7,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,544</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>5,963</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>6,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 597  | 619  | 652  | 703  | 737  | 793  | 832  | 823  | -    | -    | -    |
| -    | -    | 41   | -    | 33   | 39   | 43   | 36   | -    | -    | -    |
| -    | -    | 5    | -    | 8    | 5    | 5    | 4    | -    | -    | -    |
| 597  | 619  | 652  | 703  | 737  | 793  | 832  | 823  | -    | -    | -    |
| -    | 2,830 | 2,906 | 2,934 | 2,967 | 2,983 | 3,000 | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| -    | 38,651 | 38,914 | 39,725 | 39,899 | 41,204 | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 0.2  | -    |
| -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 1.7  | -    |
| -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 1.8  | -    |
| -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | 2.1  | -    | -    | -    |
| -    | 7    | -    | 9    | -    | 8    | -    | 11   | -    | 7    | -    |
| -    | 56   | -    | 57   | -    | 57   | -    | 60   | -    | 61   | -    |
| -    | 56   | -    | 60   | -    | 60   | -    | 58   | -    | 67   | -    |
| -    | 49   | -    | -    | -    | 51   | -    | -    | -    | 59   | -    |
### DEMOGRAPHICS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (thousands)</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td>3,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Under 5 Years (thousands)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 5 to 19 Years (thousands)</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 20 to 64 Years (thousands)</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 65 Years and Over (thousands)</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: White (thousands)</td>
<td>3,399</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>3,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Black or African American (thousands)</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Hispanic or Latino (thousands)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults Who Have Started a Business (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Pay per Job: Average ($ constant 2003)</td>
<td>27,673</td>
<td>27,647</td>
<td>28,250</td>
<td>27,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Access at Home (% Households)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Establishments per 100,000 People</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Access (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Diversity: Dynamic (national ranking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Diversity: Sectoral (national ranking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Firms (thousands)</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rates/Persons with Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports (national ranking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports: Manufacturing ($ constant 2003 mil.)</td>
<td>4,988</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,807</td>
<td>5,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports: Total Value ($ constant 2003 mil.)</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>6,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment in Ky. ($ constant 2003 bil.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSP: Per Capita ($ constant 2003)</td>
<td>25,727</td>
<td>25,600</td>
<td>26,669</td>
<td>26,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate (%)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income: Per Capita ($ constant 2003)</td>
<td>21,732</td>
<td>21,834</td>
<td>22,525</td>
<td>22,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income: Per Capita as Percentage of US Avg. (%)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Access (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force Participation Rate: Men (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force Participation Rate: Women (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents per 10,000 Business Establishments</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Age 65 and Older (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Children (%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Female Head of Family (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Male Head of Family (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages: Women’s (as a % of men’s)</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages: Average ($ constant 2003)</td>
<td>27,647</td>
<td>27,613</td>
<td>28,232</td>
<td>27,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3,823</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>3,881</td>
<td>3,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>2,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>3,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>27,838</td>
<td>27,857</td>
<td>28,094</td>
<td>28,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>27,832</td>
<td>28,095</td>
<td>28,420</td>
<td>29,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>22,628</td>
<td>22,794</td>
<td>23,283</td>
<td>23,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>27,842</td>
<td>27,862</td>
<td>28,111</td>
<td>28,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EDUCATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th Grade NAEP Math Results</strong> (% at or above basic)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT Average Composite Score</strong></td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts Programs Participation</strong> (millions of times, adults)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts Programs Participation</strong> (millions of times, youth)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Attainment Rate (%)</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College-Going Rates: Recent H.S. Graduates (%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible Four-Yr.-Olds Enrolled in Ed. Programs (%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expulsions</strong> (board policy violations)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expulsions</strong> (Part I law violations)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expulsions</strong> (Part II law violations)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expulsions</strong> (weapons-related)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free Lunch Prog. Participation: Eligible Children (%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduced Lunch Prog. Participation: Elig. Children (%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Attainment Rate (%)</strong></td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Drop Out Rate (%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Students’ Alcohol Abuse</strong> (% female)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Students’ Alcohol Abuse</strong> (% male)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Students’ Marijuana Use</strong> (% female)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Students’ Marijuana Use</strong> (% male)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Use</strong> (% of population)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nontrad’l. Undergrad. Students: State Institutions (%)</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents Volunteering for School Activities (%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents Who Read to Their Children Daily (%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent-Teacher Conferences</strong> (% of elementary students)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent-Teacher Conferences</strong> (% of high school students)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent-Teacher Conferences</strong> (% of middle school students)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio of Pupils to Computers</strong> (15 highest income districts)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio of Pupils to Computers</strong> (15 lowest income districts)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spending/Pupil</strong> (highest 20% of dist., $ const. 2003 thous.)</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spending/Pupil</strong> (lowest 20% of dist., $ const. 2003 thous.)</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.6</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suspensions</strong> (board policy violations)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suspensions</strong> (Part I law violations)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suspensions</strong> (Part II law violations)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Preparation</strong> (% without major or minor in field)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## HEALTH AND WELFARE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Births to Teens 15-17</strong> (per 100,000)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Births with First Trimester Care (%)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Abuse Reports: Emotional</strong> (per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Abuse Reports: Physical</strong> (per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Abuse Reports: Sexual</strong> (per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Care Affordability</strong> (% satisfied)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Care Availability</strong> (% satisfied)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$6.3</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 40   | 39   | 37   | 35   | 32   | 30   | 29   | 26   | -    | -    | -    |
| 83   | 84   | 85   | 86   | 86   | 87   | 87   | 87   | -    | -    | -    |
### HEALTH AND WELFARE (Continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elder Care Affordability (% extremely satisfied)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Care Affordability (% somewhat satisfied)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Care Availability (% extremely satisfied)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Care Availability (% somewhat satisfied)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance (%)</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization: Adequately Immunized Two-Yr.-Olds (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese (%)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight (%)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Safety (% always feel safe)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Safety (% sometimes or usually feel safe)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Discrimination Complaints</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking Rate (%)</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninsured Population (%)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JUDICIARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Handled by Public Defenders (avg. number/yr.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Index (rate per 100,000 persons)</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>3,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Actions Against Attorneys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Actions Against Judges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crimes: Reported Incidents (per 1 million pop.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crimes: Reported Offenses (per 1 million pop.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Violations (informal complaints)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,892</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Violations (sworn complaints)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests (Part I crimes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests (Part II crimes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism Rates (%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Emissions: Per Capita (lbs.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality (% of people in counties that meet standards)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door-to-Door Garbage Collection: Households (millions)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered or Threatened Species</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Drinking Water Access (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Sewage Access (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber Production: Board Feet (millions)</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored Waterways (% impaired)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Preserves: Acres Dedicated</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>8,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Preserves</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Participation (% households)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Disposed in Landfills (millions of tons)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Discharges: Per Capita (lbs.)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberland Growing Stock: Hardwood (millions of cu. ft.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberland Growing Stock: Softwood (millions of cu. ft.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Land Releases: Per Capita (lbs.)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality (% of pop. served by no-violations systems)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TRENDS AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,352</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,352</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,008</td>
<td>9,262</td>
<td>9,874</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,005</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,826</td>
<td>7,774</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,081</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>3,741</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments to Boards &amp; Commissions (% African Am.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments to Boards &amp; Commissions (% women)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities With Active Main Street Programs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Seats Held by Women (%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Residents per 100 Government Employees</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>4,542</td>
<td>4,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges: Deficient (%)</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges: Functionally Obsolete</td>
<td>4,527</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>3,272</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges: Structurally Deficient</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate (per 100 million vehicle miles)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit Miles: Urban (state ranking)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Highways in Fair or Better Condition (%)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Interstate: Pavement in Poor Condition (%)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Primary Roads: Narrow Lanes (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Primary Roads: Pavement in Poor Condition (%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Interstate: Congested (%)</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Interstate: Pavement in Poor Condition (%)</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>4,679</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,383</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| -    | 34.3 | 34.8 | 33.7 | 33.4 | 32.6 | 32.1 | 31.5 | 31.24| -    | -    |
| 3,196| 3,083| 3,203| 3,292| -    | -    | 3,272| 3,230| 2,202| -    | -    |
| 1,647| 1,598| 1,413| 1,411| -    | -    | 1,202| 1,187| 474  | -    | -    |
| 1.74 | 1.78 | 1.72 | 1.73 | 1.84 | 1.70 | 1.75 | 1.83 | 1.95 | -    | -    |
| 29   | 30   | 28   | 28   | 27   | 29   | 29   | 29   | 28   | 29   | -    |
| 91   | 90   | 89   | 89   | 85   | 84   | 83   | 79   | 83   | -    | -    |
| 5.20 | 7.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -    | -    |
| 15.84| 14.71| 16.25| 16.17| 16.17| 14.53| 14.79| 14.19| -    | -    | -    |
| 2.90 | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -    | -    |
| 36.70| 44.70| -    | 49.30| 44.90| 38.80| 36.00| 49.80| 52.84| -    | -    |
| 15.50| -    | 3.54 | 2.63 | 3.98 | 6.64 | 5.24 | 3.48 | 3.49 | -    | -    |
**Publications & Other Products**

*Center publications and products examine public policy with an eye to the future.* Available free of charge at the Center’s web site or by request in printed form, they include:

๑ **FORESIGHT.** This periodical has been published since 1994 and features articles on a variety of issues. In 2003 and 2004, articles covered the adequacy of Kentucky’s public school funding, how state budget shortfalls affect postsecondary education, regional profiles for both Eastern and Western Kentucky, a review of state efforts to insure the uninsured, the Certificate of Need program, the introduction of the State of the Commonwealth Index, and the new economy of rural America.

๑ **Visioning Kentucky’s Future: Measures and Milestones 2004** (December 2004) The Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center for the first time has combined its biennial trends report with its companion visioning project in a single volume. The sixth trends report and the fifth in a series of volumes focusing on the status of 26 long-term goals derived from a citizen vision of the Commonwealth’s future, the report includes benchmarks or indicators that are measures of the progress made toward each goal and the results of a statewide opinion poll that gauged citizen assessments of progress and the importance of each goal. Also included is the introduction of the State of Commonwealth Index, a single number that summarizes Kentucky’s overall quality of life relative to other states over time. Based on data for 1990 to 2001 derived from national surveys and studies of various indicators of well-being in the states, the State of the Commonwealth Index includes factors ranging from teen pregnancy, poverty, and voter participation rates to toxic releases to air, water, and land.
Policy Note 17: Three Future Scenarios Show Potential Economic Benefits of Rising Rates of Postsecondary Educational Attainment (October 2004) The Kentucky Postsecondary Education Improvement Act of 1997 (HB 1) sought to improve Kentucky’s system of higher education, increase the number of college graduates, and, by 2020, achieve “a standard of living or quality of life that meets or exceeds the national average.” Here we examine the potential effects on per capita personal income (PCI) and the state’s tax capacity were the percentage of working-age Kentuckians with at least a bachelor’s degree to meet the national average in 2020 as envisioned by this landmark legislation.

Policy Note 16: Parental Involvement in Education: A Public Good by Private Means (September 2004) The spotlight on the role parents play in their children’s education will surely brighten in the future as researchers continue to show how parental involvement affects student success and schools continue to implement the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which stresses increased parental involvement.


At the Crossroads: Prospects for Kentucky’s Educational Future, From Preschool to Postsecondary (June 2004) These proceedings from the Center’s tenth annual conference, held with joint support from the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority and the Kentucky Higher Education Student Loan Corporation, “The Student Loan People,” and the partnership of the state’s leading education agencies and organizations, highlight distinguished, nationally recognized speakers on prospects for our education future and a panel discussion by state leaders taped and later aired by Kentucky Educational Television.

Policy Note 14: Retirement Systems Will Require a Bigger Share of State Funds (October 2003) Public and private pension programs across the country are experiencing financial shortfalls, a situation that workers, retirees, taxpayers, and policymakers will be dealing with for years to come. Here we present our analysis of Kentucky’s largest public employee retirement systems and some possible long-term fiscal consequences.
Policy Note 13: Online Government Use Growing Rapidly (June 2003) For some, the “dot.com bust” is the last word on electronic communication. But such impressions are as disconnected as those who eschew computers altogether. Even during today’s prolonged economic downturn, online commerce has made impressive gains, living up to a surprising number of predictions, and home computers have become the televisions of the era in which we live. Governments are at the forefront of this electronic revolution, creating increasingly inviting, accessible, and useable Web sites where citizens can gain ready access to information, download documents and forms, acquire government products, and access services, in the process saving themselves time and effort, and saving cash-strapped governments. Indeed, in the toughest fiscal times states and localities have faced since World War II, some believe that e-government can help government agencies maintain—and even improve—key services. Here we examine evidence about the progress of online government and the receptivity of citizens to those services.

Policy Note 12: Future Impact of Nursing Shortage Uncertain Here (June 2003) High job growth and declining graduates do not bode well for future supplies of nurses. Shortages of key medical personnel, most notably registered nurses (RNs), are occurring in health care facilities across the nation. Hospitals in particular, where RNs comprise the largest component of the labor force and deliver most of the patient care, are experiencing acute shortages in some parts of the country. Of the estimated 168,000 unfilled jobs in U.S. hospitals in 2001, 126,000 were for RNs. And the situation may worsen. Demographics portend an explosion of demand for the care RNs provide and aging Baby Boomers will need. Nursing is predicted to have the third highest level of job growth (26 percent) among all occupations by 2010, but supply has been stalled by declining nursing school enrollments and professional flight. The nursing shortage has begun to exert upward pressure on wages, contribute to rising health care costs, and, research suggests, affect patient outcomes. While an oversupply of RNs is predicted for Kentucky over the long term, hospitals are already experiencing shortages that are affecting operations and increasing costs.

The Road Ahead: Uncertainty and Opportunity in a Changed World (December 2002) As part of its mission to advise and inform the Governor, the General Assembly, and the public about the long-term implications of trends and policies, the Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center presents the 2002 biennial trends report, the fifth in this series. There are 13 chapters written by nine different authors from six different agencies or organizations.

Planning for the Future (September 2002) This report is largely an analysis of findings from a 2000 survey developed jointly with the University of
Kentucky (UK) Sanders-Brown Center on Aging and conducted by the UK Survey Research Center. It offers critical insight into the implications of Kentucky’s aging population.

**Measures and Milestones 2002** (June 2002) Part of the Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center’s mission is to serve as a catalyst for change in the way government decisions are made by providing insight into the broader context. To do so, the Center was charged with responsibility for considering the long-term implications of policy, critical trends, and emerging issues that may have a significant impact on the state. This is the fourth in a series of volumes focusing on the status of 26 long-term goals derived from a citizen vision of the Commonwealth’s future. The report includes benchmarks or indicators that are measures of the progress made toward each goal and the results of a statewide opinion poll that gauged citizen assessments of progress and the importance of each goal.

**Policy Note 11: Experience with Elder Care Services Diminishes Satisfaction** (June 2002) The structure of Medicaid’s delivery of elder care services affects overall cost, quality, and public satisfaction. As our population ages, the needs of frail elders who are unable to care adequately for themselves are expected to tax society’s resources and challenge its capacity to respond in new and creative ways to diverse needs. Today, state-run and financially strapped Medicaid programs pay the largest share of the tab for long-term care services. In 1998, Medicaid financed 39 percent of these services compared with the 29 percent paid for out of pocket by seniors and their families and 7 percent by private health insurers; Medicare, elders’ main source of health insurance, financed just 18 percent of long-term care services. Created to serve the poor, Medicaid is nevertheless the program that once financially independent elders and their families often turn to when resources are exhausted. Thus, the structure of Medicaid’s delivery of these services to elders has a significant impact on their affordability and accessibility. Survey data show that most Kentuckians have limited experience with elder care services, but nevertheless express opinions about its availability in their community and its affordability. Those with experience, however, are less likely to express satisfaction.

**Financing State and Local Government: Future Challenges and Opportunities** (May 2002) These proceedings from the Center’s 2001 conference, which focused on financing state and local government, highlight distinguished, nationally recognized speakers and a panel discussion by state leaders taped and later aired by Kentucky Educational Television.

**Policy Note 10: Enhancing the Promise of Online Education in Kentucky** (May 2002) The possibility of attaining a formal education online
will be a key to the success of the Council on Postsecondary Education’s ambitious goals. The Kentucky Virtual University (KYVU) presents an online portal through which users anywhere in the world can take courses and earn degrees offered by universities, colleges, and technical schools located throughout the state. With its capacity to nullify geographic distance and enable students to “go to class” as their schedules permit, the success or failure of KYVU will help determine the success or failure of the Council on Postsecondary Education’s (CPE) goal to increase Kentucky’s postsecondary enrollment 50 percent by 2020. Moreover, people with higher levels of education tend to earn higher wages, participate more actively in their communities, experience fewer health problems, and enjoy a generally higher quality of life than their less-educated counterparts. Thus, the ever-growing power to provide formal education anytime, anywhere over the Internet raises the stakes in the struggle to bridge the digital divide.

Policy Note 9: Digital Divide Persists Despite Rising Technology Use (April 2002) State and local governments, nonprofits, and the private sector could be called upon to assume greater responsibility to help close the gaps in technology use. The tools of the Information Age continue to spread throughout our homes, schools, and workplaces despite the dot-com debacle and NASDAQ decline over the last two years. The enduring importance of information technology is illustrated by the continued expansion of Internet hosts and rising computer and Internet use. While computer and Internet use is “increasing for people regardless of income, education, age, race, ethnicity, or gender,” a digital divide persists, especially along income and education lines. For a variety of reasons, access to and utilization of computers and the Internet are important. Nonetheless, the federal government appears to be curtailing its efforts to bridge the digital divide.

Listening to Kentucky High Schools: Why Some High Schools Miss, Meet, and Exceed Predicted Postsecondary Outcomes (April 2002) The Center completes a three-volume exploration of higher education with this report. In light of the Commonwealth’s goal of increasing postsecondary enrollment by 50 percent over the next 20 years, the Center has reported on a cost-benefit analysis of some of the social benefits of higher education and the results of a survey of high school students. Here we report on findings from case studies of four Kentucky high schools that were selected based upon the relationship of postsecondary outcomes predicted by a comprehensive data analysis and actual college-going rates. From this look at the experiences, the programs, and the personalities of these schools, we glean insight into some of the intangible ingredients that cannot be captured in a quantitative analysis, the stuff that helps make high schools work.
Policy Note 8: Revenue Modernization and Future Education Expenditures (November 2001) Policymakers recognize the importance of education and have significantly increased funding in recent years to achieve ambitious education goals. Improving the educational status of our population has become a central goal for the Commonwealth, the only tried and true path to reducing poverty, increasing personal income and our standard of living. In a number of initiatives since 1990, Kentucky policymakers have set ambitious education goals and significantly increased funding to achieve them. The 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA), for example, increased primary and secondary school funding by about $400 million per year. More recently, Kentucky policymakers turned their attention to postsecondary education, and in the spring of 1997 the legislature passed House Bill 1. This measure reformulated Kentucky’s postsecondary education system and committed the Commonwealth to spend dramatically more funds. Indeed, since 1997 state support for postsecondary education has increased 45 percent, to about $1.1 billion per year. In addition to general fund support, Kentucky has also provided an additional $230 million in a “Bucks for Brains” program. These are substantial investments for a state that has many demands placed on its budget.

Financing State and Local Government: Future Challenges and Opportunities (November 2001) In conjunction with the University of Kentucky Martin School of Public Policy and Administration, the Center reports here on tax policy in the Commonwealth. This collection of articles by some of the state’s leading experts considers the underlying principles and purposes of tax systems and examines the Commonwealth’s overall tax structure in light of these, considering the adequacy of our current system over the long term, its fairness to families and businesses, and its competitiveness. This report also explores the implications of economic and demographic trends for the future and the challenges and opportunities that efforts to reform and modernize our tax system face in view of their history here and, more recently, in other states.

Talking Back: Kentucky High School Students and Their Future Education Plans (October 2001) This report presents results of a survey designed to learn what Kentucky high school students think about the pursuit of learning opportunities after high school and how they are investing their time in anticipation of possible postsecondary education attendance.

Policy Note 7: Are Technology Investments Yielding Dividends for Kentucky Students? (October 2001) Whether high school students opt to pursue postsecondary education or enter the job market after high school, they will find that computing skills are integral to the way we live and work. Recognizing this, policymakers emphasized technology and its use in schools as one strand of the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 (KERA). Since its
inception in 1992, the Kentucky Education Technology System has spent approximately $640 million on basic technology equipment in the schools, including wiring schools to the Internet, achieving a 6 to 1 student-to-computer ratio and providing every teacher with a workstation. As public investment in education technology grows, it is vital that we determine what the returns are to students and to the state at large.

Purpose, Publications, and Products 2001 (August 2001) This guide to the Center’s work includes a subject index to its reports and a comprehensive CD-ROM that features 43 videotaped interviews with some of Kentucky’s most forward-looking citizens.

Policy Note 6: Prescription Drug Coverage for Seniors (August 2001) As health care’s focus shifts from the institution to the individual, the role of prescription drugs is becoming increasingly important, particularly for the elderly, who are more likely to have chronic conditions that are often treatable with modern drugs. Partly state-financed Medicaid helps low-income elders with the costs of drugs, but many seniors without prescription drug coverage are ineligible. Moreover, those without coverage typically pay more, sometimes substantially more, than the insured who benefit from negotiated drug discounts. Our survey data show that Kentucky’s growing older population is likely to need and to expect help with meeting the costs of prescription drugs.

Policy Note 5: Are Kentuckians Financially Prepared for Retirement? (August 2001) The 2000 Census shows that half a million Kentuckians, or about 12.5 percent of the state’s population, is age 65 or older. By 2020, demographers at the University of Louisville project that older Kentuckians will number about 718,000 or 16.7 percent of the population, and by 2025, Kentucky’s 65 and over population is expected to rank 14th among states. As the state’s population ages, so too will the number of people considering themselves “retired.” The extent to which these individuals are financially prepared for retirement has important budget implications for both state and local governments.

The Conference Proceedings: Kentucky and the New Economy & Challenges for the New Century (July 2001) These proceedings provide gavel-to-gavel presentations and discussions from the Center’s seventh annual conference, which was held at the Northern Kentucky Convention Center in Covington. Featured speakers included Chuck Martin, CEO of Net Future Institute, Dr. C. Eugene Steuerle, a Senior Fellow with the Urban Institute, and a panel of distinguished Kentuckians led through a discussion of Kentucky’s future by Bill Goodman, host of KET’s Kentucky Tonight.
Policy Note 4: Anticipating Future Needs for Long-Term Care (June 2001) The aging of the population poses many challenges, not the least of which is anticipating ways of providing quality long-term care for those who will need it. Unprecedented growth in the older U.S. population is expected between 2010 and 2030 when Baby Boomers begin retiring. Kentucky’s pre-retirement-age population grew significantly between 1990 and 2000; the number of Kentuckians ages 45-54, for example, increased 46 percent. By 2020, Kentucky’s 65 and older citizens are expected to comprise nearly 17 percent of the population. Though medical advances, healthier lifestyles, and higher incomes will no doubt alter the aging process, the sheer numbers of older people combined with increased longevity will inevitably increase demand for long-term care.

Policy Note 3: Kentucky’s Brain Drain Unplugged (June 2001) Many attribute Kentucky’s loss of educated youth to a perceived lack of opportunity here. Between 1970 and 1995, metropolitan Louisville alone experienced a net loss of about 25,000 residents born during the 1960s. Plugging this “brain drain” has been identified as an important public policy goal by political, education, and economic leaders across the state. Indeed, one rationale for the three-year-old Kentucky Educational Excellence Scholarship (KEES) program is to retain more of Kentucky’s best students. Studies show that students are more likely to locate in the state where they receive their college education, whether or not it is their native state. This Policy Note identifies some factors associated with attending college out of state, shows where Kentucky fits nationally with respect to the migration of college students, and offers suggestions on stemming the flow.

Education and the Common Good: Social Benefits of Higher Education in Kentucky (June 2001) This report explores the wider implications of the Commonwealth’s increased investments in postsecondary education in recent years, as exemplified by the Postsecondary Education Improvement Act of 1997. The results show that the benefits resulting from investments in postsecondary education are far-reaching and substantial. A range of societal benefits accrue, from better health to increased voluntarism, as education levels increase.

Policy Note 2: Meeting the Cost of Managing Solid Waste (May 2001) The recent debate about how best to achieve universal garbage collection and curb illegal dumping in Kentucky raised familiar issues. To some local officials, proposed mandatory door-to-door collection was yet another unfunded mandate, a state edict without the funding to implement it. The debate also illustrated the gaps between urban and rural areas, which typically have widely
dispersed populations and weak tax bases from which to finance public services. Thus, the crux of the matter is how best to help fund the development of convenient, comprehensive solid waste management systems at the local level, support state-level administration, and focus anew on the long-term, statutory goal of waste reduction.

Policy Note 1: Do Students Work Too Much? (May 2001) From fast food restaurants to supermarkets, businesses depend on teenagers for labor, and, in turn, teens rely on these jobs to buy cars, auto insurance, clothes, and compact discs. An estimated 45 percent of Kentucky teens age 16 to 19 were employed in 1999. While a job can help teenagers learn responsibility, punctuality, and interpersonal skills, a growing body of research suggests that too many hours of after-school employment can have a detrimental effect on schoolwork. A National Academy of Sciences study found that when teens work long hours (more than 20 hours a week), it often leads to lower grades, and students who consistently work more than 20 hours a week tend to complete less schooling. Another study finds that more than one third of students who work say they take easier classes so their jobs won’t hurt their grades. In response, lawmakers in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Alabama have sought limits on the hours teens can work. Some research, however, suggests that more fundamental factors cause both long work hours and low school performance. One researcher concluded that adolescents who worked longer hours were already less academically inclined and that their drop in GPA was not necessarily the result of their work schedule.

Challenges for the New Century (December 2000) As part of its mission to advise and inform the Governor, the General Assembly, and the public, the Center’s fourth biennial trends report revisits the major trends that are influencing the Commonwealth’s future. This report looks at Kentucky and the New Economy, how some are prospering in this system while others are languishing, and the wider demographic context within which government will operate as it attempts to manage the change ahead.

Visioning Kentucky’s Future: Measures and Milestones 2000 (April 2000) The third in our Visioning Kentucky’s Future series, this volume presents the second biennial assessment of the state’s progress on 26 long-term goals. It includes the results of a statewide citizen survey that asks Kentuckians where they think we stand on these important goals for the future of the Commonwealth. The report also presents data on a number of trends affecting the state’s ability to achieve the 26 long-term goals and preferred vision for the future.

Collecting Taxes in the Cyberage (December 1999) An estimated 30 percent of the American population age 14 and over will have purchased
something online by 2002. However, according to most estimates, only a small percentage of the sales and use tax owed on these purchases is ever paid. This creates an alarming trend for state and local governments since many depend heavily on sales tax revenue to finance government operations and programs. The purpose of this report is to educate the public and policymakers about the range of issues surrounding this topic, provide estimates on the long-term implications for the state budget, and discuss the policy options for enhancing compliance to the use tax.

What Next for Kentucky Health Care? (November 1999) The possibilities for medical science appear virtually unlimited, yet a growing number of Americans do not have access to necessary primary and preventive health care because they cannot afford it. Despite sustained job growth and record low unemployment, the nation’s uninsured population increased by an average of 1 million people a year over the past decade, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. Without a structural remedy for this persistent flaw in our system, public and private responses to the rising cost of health care may further limit inclusion. Thus, the dilemma of access to health care in the United States may become more complicated and more difficult to resolve. The report examines national and state trends that are affecting access to health care, analyzes the difficult course of reform Kentucky has taken, and offers perspectives from state leaders in health care. Further, we examine some model state and community initiatives that have successfully closed gaps in access to health care and conclude with policy recommendations.

Child Care in Kentucky: Current Status and Future Improvements (October 1999) It will surprise almost no one to learn that the research on child development tells us that the quality of child care has a lifelong effect on children, and, by extension, their parents and society. Depending on the nature of the care, that effect can be positive or negative. Unfortunately, research done by the Kentucky Long-Term Policy Center shows that child care in Kentucky, like most of the other states, is not high quality. This report attempts to answer these basic questions about child care in Kentucky: (a) Why is quality child care important?; (b) What do we know about the quality of child care?; (c) How can we improve the quality of child care?; and (d) What will it cost to enhance the quality of child care?

The Future Well-Being of Women in Kentucky (April 1999) Here, in a series of articles prepared by staff and by some of the state’s leading policy experts, we focus on the implications of economic, political, and social trends for the future well-being of women in Kentucky. We consider a range of issues, from the difficult balance between work and family to the jobs and wages Kentucky women are likely to find in the marketplace, from the “feminization”
of higher education to the consequences of welfare reform, from gaps in political leadership to the fundamental issues of health and personal safety.

**Kentucky’s Teachers: Charting a Course for KERA’s Second Decade** (March 1999) This report, which was prepared by Stephen Clements, an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation at the University of Kentucky, outlines mounting national evidence of the importance of teacher quality to student performance. The report cites a number of trends that will influence the quality of Kentucky’s teaching force in the years to come, including the anticipated retirement within the next three years of as many as a quarter of those currently teaching and predicted shortages of teachers in some subject areas. Additionally, the report examines the roles that teacher training, alternative certification, professional development, and teacher salaries play in teacher quality.

**The Leadership Challenge Ahead** (December 1998) The Center’s third biennial trends report examines four broad trends affecting Kentucky: the rise of the wired community, a shifting economic paradigm, a deepening divide, and changing governmental responsibilities. A CD-ROM accompanying the report compiles five years of work at the Center. It contains 12 full books, the Kentucky State Budget Game, and several articles that appeared in *Foresight*, the Center’s quarterly publication.

**Civil Society in Kentucky** (October 1998) This report presents an analysis of ties that bind us and a directory of 156 small-scale civic projects across the Commonwealth. It offers an assessment of Kentucky’s civil society and then examines three factors that affect it: leadership development programs, government involvement, and funding. It is designed to be a source of ideas and contact information for policymakers, organizations, informal groups, and private citizens who want to strengthen civil society in their communities.

**Entrepreneurs and Small Business—Kentucky’s Neglected Natural Resource** (June 1998) Here we report on the rising importance of entrepreneurship to development and Kentucky’s capacity to grow from within. The document includes results from a series of surveys on the entrepreneurial experiences of Kentuckians, small business owners, bankers, venture capital firms in surrounding states, and Kentucky businesses with web sites. The report concludes with a series of recommendations on how to enhance the state’s entrepreneurial capacity.

**Visioning Kentucky’s Future: Measures and Milestones 1998** (May 1998) The second in our Visioning Kentucky’s Future series, this volume presents the first biennial assessment of the state’s progress on 26 long-term goals. In addition, it includes the results of a first-ever, statewide citizen survey.
that asks Kentuckians where they think we stand on these important goals for the future of the Commonwealth. Also, the report presents data on a number of trends affecting the state’s ability to achieve the 26 long-term goals and preferred vision for the future.

**Measures and Milestones: Charting Our Path to Prosperity, The Conference Proceedings** (May 1998) Here we present the conference proceedings from the Center’s 1997 conference, which focused on community building and setting benchmarks for measuring progress.

**The Circuits Come to Town: An Analysis of Technology Use and Electronic Delivery of Government Services in Kentucky** (December 1997) This report on technology use in Kentucky and public readiness for online government services examines the relationships between a number of socioeconomic factors and one’s likelihood of using a number of technologies, ranging from computers and the Internet to ATMs. The report offers several recommendations on how to broaden the use of technology by Kentucky citizens.

**The Kentucky State Budget Game** (September 1997) An interactive learning tool, this computer game puts players, students and interested citizens alike, in the seat of power. They make tough policy choices, balance the budget, and watch public support rise and fall. The game can be downloaded from the Center’s website or purchased at cost on diskette.

**Exploring the Frontier of the Future** (December 1996) The Center’s second biennial trends report includes 30 articles by leading experts on the trends influencing the Commonwealth’s future. The wide-ranging report covers topics from housing and human rights to technology and transportation. The authors come from the private, public, and nonprofit sectors, from the University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville, and the regional universities.

**Forecasting Kentucky’s Environmental Futures** (July 1996) A collaborative effort between the Center, the Kentucky Institute for the Environment and Sustainable Development at the University of Louisville, and the Cabinet for Natural Resources and Environmental Protection to forecast possible environmental futures. This report examines policy alternatives and identifies directions for policy change that hold the promise of sustainable development that enhances both the socioeconomic well-being and the quality of the physical environment of the people of Kentucky.

**Choosing Prosperity: Maximizing Returns on Public Investment in Workforce Development** (April 1996) With recognition of the unique strengths and weaknesses the Commonwealth brings to the challenge of developing the full potential of its labor force, we examine current assets and
liabilities, the array of institutional responses we have brought to the challenge of workforce development, and ways of balancing differences between public and private roles and maximizing returns on investments in workforce development.

- **$5.8 Billion and Change: An Exploration of the Long-Term Budgetary Impact of Trends Affecting the Commonwealth** (March 1996) An analysis of alternative future budgetary scenarios, driven by key trends influencing the future of the state. Some of the questions this report seeks to answer are: Does Kentucky have a structural deficit? Will the current revenue structure (taxes, fees, investments, governmental transfers, etc.) support the current level of services in coming years, or will spending cutbacks be necessary in order to maintain a balanced budget? Alternative scenarios are presented suggesting what the future might hold.

- **Scanning Kentucky 1995** (March 1996) In 1994, the Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center established a statewide scanning program to monitor emerging issues that may have a significant impact on the Commonwealth. The Center has collected and analyzed scans on a broad range of topics, considered their possible impact on various state agencies, and identified those individual scans with the most significant implications for Kentucky. The results of these efforts are presented here, with a summary of scans from 1995.

- **Visioning Kentucky’s Future** (December 1995) Results of a ground-breaking effort to capture the ideas of citizens in a vision for the future of the Commonwealth, goals for realizing it, and benchmarks for measuring our progress. This publication is the product of an extraordinarily inclusive process, which invited and encouraged citizens to contribute at public forums, in written comments and suggestions, and as participants in a working conference sponsored by the Center. It strives to capture a vision of what Kentuckians want our state to be. Like this document, the process of arriving at our desired destination cannot be achieved by any state agency or organization in isolation. In order to be valid, it must remain a collective effort, one that routinely engages citizens from across the Commonwealth.

- **Reclaiming Community, Reckoning with Change: Rural Development in the Global Context** (December 1995) A report on the transformational potential of broad civic engagement and initiatives focused on increasing the capacity of communities to engage in self-development. Reversing the decline many of our rural communities have experienced demands that we connect with the global community and enhance the capacity of communities to negotiate this demanding new international environment. Ultimately, change in the larger, global context will either propel improved
circumstances throughout rural Kentucky in the 21st Century or ensure its continued marginalization.

**Farms, Factories and Free Trade: Rural Kentucky in the Global Economy** (December 1995) An in-depth look at global prospects for rural industries and strategies for success. We begin this report by asking how globalization might affect two cornerstones of Kentucky’s rural economy—agriculture and manufacturing. Next, we report the results of a survey of rural manufacturing firms, and explore the question of whether rural firms are prepared for an era of increased competition and increased opportunity. Following the survey is a special section from Dr. R.E. Burnett, Assistant Director of the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky. Dr. Burnett explains why many small and rural firms aren’t well-prepared for globalization and suggests what can be done to help these firms. We conclude with a discussion of emerging strategies which enable rural firms to help themselves become more competitive.

**Scanning Kentucky 1994** (March 1995) In 1994, the Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center established a statewide scanning program to monitor emerging issues that may have a significant impact on the Commonwealth. The Center has collected and analyzed scans on a broad range of topics, considered their possible impact on various state agencies, and identified those individual scans with the most significant implications for Kentucky. The results of these efforts are presented here, with a summary of scans from 1994.

**The Context of Change: Trends, Innovations and Forces Affecting Kentucky’s Future** (December 1994) This inaugural biennial trends report of the Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center examines three broad topics. First, we outline some of the demographic trends that are likely to influence the people and the families who will form the communities of tomorrow. Secondly, we turn to an array of changes that are shifting the economic floor beneath Kentuckians and increasing the difficulty and the complexity of the pursuit of prosperity. Finally, we discuss some of the many cornerstones that provide an effective foundation for progress, including both physical infrastructure and increasingly important human potential.

**The Future of Burley Tobacco: Potential Outcomes, Points of Leverage and Policy Recommendations** (September 1994) The purpose of this research project was to identify the factors affecting tobacco’s future; ascertain their likely outcome over the next 10 years; delineate their potential consequences on future burley quotas; understand the economic implications of a changing burley quota; and develop recommendations for policymakers that facilitate a best case scenario and hedge against a worst case scenario. It is, quite
simply, a quantitative analysis of factors that are likely to influence the market for burley tobacco and, in turn, the livelihoods of Kentucky tobacco farmers over the next decade.
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