uebr

Utah Economic and Business Review

Volume 56

Numbers 11 and 12

November / December 1996

BEBR

David Eccles School of Business

Bureau of Economic and Business Research

University of Utah

INCOME AND SPENDING PATTERNS OF UTAH RESIDENTS SKIING AT UTAH RESORTS

Robert W. Huber
Research Assistant

The University of Utah's Bureau of Economic and Business Research conducted three surveys of skiers at Utah ski areas in recent years. These surveys were conducted during the winters of 1989-1990, 1990-1991, and 1993-1994. While the primary objective of the surveys was to measure the economic impact of nonresident skiers on the Utah economy, many questions were raised about the activities of resident skiers as well. This article focuses on the income and spending patterns of Utah residents skiing at Utah ski areas. Two questions are addressed: Is household income an important factor in determining which ski areas Utah residents use, or is proximity of residence a more important factor? And, how much are Utah residents spending on skiing, and what differences in spending are there between Utah residents who use different Utah ski areas? Both spending on ski equipment and expenditures in direct connection with individual daily ski trips are considered and are addressed separately.

The results indicate that residence is an important factor in Utah residents' choice of ski areas. There is also a slight tendency for Utah residents with the highest incomes to ski in Summit County, but region of residence is much more important. Utah resident skiers in Summit County spent by far the most on ski equipment. Utah residents skiing outside Salt Lake and Summit counties spent the least on ski equipment. However, the results show that Utah residents skiing in Summit County spent the least amount on both ski expenses and food during ski trips. Resident skiers at Southern Utah resorts spent the greatest amount on food.

This article summarizes the results of an analysis of the spending of Utah residents who were surveyed while skiing at Utah ski areas. The study was completed by Mr. Huber in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of Science degree in Statistics.

METHODOLOGY

The data for this study are from the three surveys conducted by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research. The surveys were done during the winters of 1989-1990, 1990-1991, and 1993-1994. For convenience, the surveys are referred to as the 1990, 1991, and 1994 surveys, respectively. The primary objective of each of the three surveys was to measure the economic impact of spending by skiers from outside the state. This study uses only the data from Utah residents.

In order to maintain the confidentiality of information for Utah ski areas that are completely on privately owned land, the results of this study are condensed into five ski area locality groups. The localities are designated as follows:

- Little Cottonwood Canyon (Salt Lake County)
  Alta, Snowbird
- Big Cottonwood Canyon (Salt Lake County)
  Brighton, Solitude
- Summit County
  Deer Valley, Park City, Wolf Mountain
- Northern Utah
  Beaver Mountain, Nordic Valley, Powder Mountain, Snow Basin
- Southern Utah
  Brian Head, Elk Meadows, Sundance

In addition to the above groupings of ski areas, the skier's residence in Utah is divided into four geographical regions, each composed of several counties.

- North
  Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Weber
- East
  Daggett, Duchesne, Morgan, Summit, Uintah, Wasatch
- Salt Lake
  Davis, Salt Lake, Tooele
- South
  Beaver, Carbon, Emery, Garfield, Grand, Iron, Juab, Kane, Millard, Piute, San Juan, Sanpete, Sevier, Utah, Washington, Wayne

The allocation of interviews among ski areas was designed to provide an approximately equal percentage sample of the ski visits at each area (Table 1). Interviews were allocated based on the number of skier visits to each area during the previous year.

In the three surveys, a total of 4,720 skiers were contacted, of which 4,336 resulted in usable interviews. There were 1,759 Utah residents in the three years of the survey. The 579 Utah residents in the 1990 survey were not included in the results regarding spending by skiers because those questions were not part of that survey.

Table 1
Number of Interview Days by Ski Area Locality

Ski Area Locality	1990	1991	1994	Totals
Little Cottonwood Canyon	44.00	52.00	58.17	154.17
Big Cottonwood Canyon	23.83	26.33	32.50	82.67
Summit County	43.67	53.67	68.83	166.17
Northern Utah	11.00	15.00	16.00	42.00
Southern Utah	11.00	17.00	16.00	44.00
All Localities	133.50	164.00	191.50	489.00

All dollar values related to spending in the combined data file were adjusted to 1994 dollars using the consumer price index (CPI). Income was not adjusted and is presented in current dollars. Income was not adjusted because the surveys collected both continuous and categorical income data. Since the categorical income cannot be easily adjusted, the continuous data were left unadjusted also. Statistical tests were performed on the data to detect significant differences between skiers at the different groups of ski areas. Continuous data on income and expenditures on skiing were analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test. Chi-square tests compared categorical data related to ski areas, residence, and categorical income data. In addition to the chi-square tests, loglinear analysis was used to find significant interactions between the data.

Loglinear analysis is a very useful method of analyzing tables with more than two variables. Tables with only two variables are easy to analyze using a chi-square goodness-of-fit test. With more than two variables, the number of tests required increases rapidly. Loglinear analysis is a method that permits tables of three or more variables to be examined more efficiently, and is readily expandable as more variables are added to the model.

The study is limited by several factors. First of all, some of the survey questions changed each year of the survey and more were added each year. Some questions were removed in later surveys. In addition, some questions have a low response rate that limits the reliability of the results.

In several tables using median amounts, the median is zero. The reader is reminded that a median of zero indicates that more than 50 percent of the respondents to that particular question reported an amount of zero.

ANALYSIS

Income and Residence

The mean, or average income reported by interviewed Utah resident skiers increased from $40,099 to $65,965 between the first and last surveys. Summit County skiers in the sample had the highest reported mean income among skiers who were willing to disclose the actual number. Reported income among Northern Utah skiers increased by the smallest amount overall, but most of that is accounted for by the large decrease from 1990 to 1991. The average skier's income in the Southern Utah locality group was the smallest of the five localities in 1990 and 1991, and declined between the first two surveys. Skiers in the Southern Utah locality reported by far the lowest average income in 1990, but increased enough before the 1994 survey to rank third among all five localities. Median incomes in the sample demonstrated the same type of pattern. Mean and median household incomes by ski area locality are shown in Table 2.

When examining incomes on the basis of skiers' residence, the results are somewhat different. The Kruskal-Wallis test on the combined data is strongly significant, as is the test on the 1991 data. The tests on median incomes in 1990 and 1994 are very close to being considered significant but do not satisfy the criterion established for the study. The median income in the South region decreased in 1991 to less than half of the next smallest median, which may account for the significant test result. However, it was the highest median income in 1994. The mean income in the South region was also the lowest in the first two surveys but the largest of the four regions in 1994 (Table 3).

Median incomes from both the continuous and categorical income data follow a similar pattern. Both Summit County and the East regions still have the highest median incomes when using the categorical income data. The Southern Utah locality and the South region have the lowest incomes in the first two surveys, then the median incomes increase to near or above the overall state median. The Northern Utah locality and North region are in the middle of the income range in the first two surveys but have the lowest median incomes in 1994. The Cottonwood Canyons and the Salt Lake region are in the middle of the range of median incomes. Mean and median household income using categorical income data are presented in Table 4.

Table 2
Mean and Median Annual Household Income Reported by Utah Resident Skiers
By Ski Area Locality, Using Continuous Income Data

Ski Area Locality	Mean Annual Household Income: All Years Combined	Mean: 1990	Mean: 1991	Mean: 1994	Median Annual Household Income: All Years Combined	Median: 1990	Median: 1991	Median: 1994
Little Cottonwood Canyon	$43,333	$39,205	$41,566	$52,346	$35,000	$35,000	$30,000	$46,000
Big Cottonwood Canyon	47,654	37,438	40,576	74,500	35,000	30,000	30,000	51,500
Summit County	59,728	46,667	51,905	89,348	43,500	37,500	40,000	60,000
Northern Utah	40,727	41,096	34,389	50,000	37,000	37,000	35,000	40,500
Southern Utah	40,623	31,588	29,867	55,619	35,000	23,000	20,000	45,000
All Localities	$47,420	$40,099	$42,403	$65,965	$38,000	$35,000	$35,000	$50,000

Table 3
Mean and Median Annual Household Income Reported by Utah Resident Skiers
By Skiers' Residence Region, Using Continuous Income Data

Skier Residence Region	Mean Annual Household Income: All Years Combined	1990	1991	1994	Median Annual Household Income: All Years Combined	1990	1991	1994
North	$41,360	$38,185	$35,805	$55,833	$35,000	$35,000	$35,000	$40,500
East	58,620	47,103	52,548	78,931	45,000	35,000	45,000	65,000
Salt Lake	47,674	41,522	44,790	61,018	37,500	35,000	35,000	50,000
South	44,674	29,033	23,452	81,032	31,000	19,000	16,000	55,000
All Residence Regions	$47,420	$47,420	$42,403	$65,965	$38,000	$35,000	$35,000	$50,000

Table 4
Median Annual Household Income Reported by Utah Resident Skiers
By Ski Area Locality and Residence Region, Using Categorical Income Data

	Median Annual Household Income: All Years Combined	1990	1991	1994
Ski Area Locality				
Little Cottonwood Canyon	$38,525	$36,923	$38,258	$38,141
Big Cottonwood Canyon	37,612	30,769	36,765	43,214
Summit County	42,654	38,182	39,375	47,188
Northern Utah	34,884	36,538	33,190	32,609
Southern Utah	38,010	31,154	35,714	42,188
All Localities	$38,636	$34,724	$37,063	$41,315
Skier Residence Region				
North	$34,058	$34,762	32,955$	$33,088
East	43,750	37,368	39,583	51,923
Salt Lake	39,503	36,022	39,244	39,946
South	34,964	29,000	23,958	43,750
All Residence Regions	$38,636	$34,724	$37,063	$41,315

Analysis of the categorical income data was done by both chi-square tests on each possible pair of variables and by hierarchical loglinear analysis of all three variables together. The results comparing residence and ski area locality are by far the strongest among the three variables. Seventy-six percent of the Utah resident skiers interviewed were skiing at ski areas within their residence regions.

When comparing income and residence, there is a weak relationship that only becomes significant when all three years are analyzed together. The higher incomes are in the East and Salt Lake regions and the lower incomes are in the North and South regions. When the data are separated by years or by ski area locality, income and residence appear to be unrelated.

Similar results are seen when examining ski area locality versus income. When the data are examined by year, there is no relationship between the two variables.

In each individual year, the best loglinear model indicates that the only significant association within the data is the skier's residence and the ski area locality. However, the strength of the slight relationship between income and ski area locality increased in successive years. In 1990 and 1991, the association between ski area locality and income was the least significant association within the data. In 1994, the association between income and residence became the least significant. When the analysis was done with all three years combined, the tests were sensitive enough that the association between ski area locality and income was significant and remained in the model. Despite this, the association between ski area locality and residence was much more significant.

Spending on Ski Equipment

Utah residents who were interviewed spent an average of $538 on ski equipment, clothing and maintenance during the year prior to the date they were interviewed. Skiers interviewed in Summit County spent the most on ski equipment in both surveys.

Skiers interviewed in Little Cottonwood Canyon spent the second-largest amount, while those interviewed outside of Salt Lake and Summit counties spent the least overall. The greatest percent spending increase was in Big Cottonwood Canyon, where the reported ski equipment spending increased by 34 percent. The largest percent decrease in spending was among skiers interviewed in Northern Utah where spending on ski equipment decreased by 10 percent.

The median spending results followed a similar pattern to the mean spending. The greatest median spending was in Summit County and the lowest median results were in both Northern and Southern Utah. As with the mean, the largest percent increase in reported median spending was in Big Cottonwood Canyon, which increased by 29 percent. The largest percent decrease was in Northern Utah at 38 percent.

The major differences in the annual spending figures are that the reported median spending in Summit County and Northern Utah decreased much more than the reported mean spending in the same groups. This would indicate a general decrease in the amount spent, although some skiers still spent larger amounts on ski equipment. Also, the reported median spending in Southern Utah did not change significantly while the mean increased by 34 percent. Mean and median annual spending on ski equipment are shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Mean and Median Annual Spending on Ski Equipment by Utah Resident Skiers
By Ski Area Locality

	Mean Annual Spending			Median Annual Spending		
Ski Area Locality	1991-1994 Combined	1991	1994	1991-1994 Combined	1991	1994
Little Cottonwood Canyon	$570	$541	$597	$434	$421	$480
Big Cottonwood Canyon	459	382	512	315	272	350
Summit County	696	726	666	498	587	410
Northern Utah	379	401	361	217	320	200
Southern Utah	400	328	439	217	217	216
All Localities	$538	$533	$543	$400	$434	$363

Daily Spending on Ski Trips

The average daily amounts reported spent by Utah residents on ski trips decreased in Salt Lake and Summit counties, as well as statewide. Reported daily spending increased by a small amount in Northern and Southern Utah. The results for the amount spent in 1994 on a ski trip in Summit County decreased by 37 percent over the mean amount spent in 1991.

The zero median indicates that more than half of the Utah resident skiers who were interviewed in Summit County spent nothing on skiing on the day of their interview. The reported median amount spent for a day decreased in Little Cottonwood Canyon, from $21 in 1991 to $17 in 1994 (Table 6).

Spending on Food

The results for the amount spent on food on the day of a ski trip decreased by almost half between 1991 and 1994. This statewide decrease was matched approximately by Little Cottonwood Canyon, Summit County and Northern Utah. The only exception to this change was in the Southern Utah locality where the reported spending on food increased by 25 percent.

Even more striking is the decrease in the reported median spending. The median decreased to zero in all ski area localities except Southern Utah. The reported median spending in Little Cottonwood Canyon and Northern Utah was zero in the combined data as well. This indicates that more than half of Utah resident skiers spent nothing on food the day of their ski trip in 1994 (Table 7).

Table 6
Mean and Median Daily Spending on Ski Equipment by Utah Resident Skiers
By Ski Area Locality

Ski Area Locality	Mean Daily Spending 1991-1994 Combined	Mean Daily Spending 1991	Mean Daily Spending 1994	Median Daily Spending 1991-1994 Combined	Median Daily Spending 1991	Median Daily Spending 1994
Little Cottonwood Canyon	$16.33	$18.20	$14.59	$17.00	$21.00	$17.00
Big Cottonwood Canyon	21.37	23.05	20.20	22.00	20.00	23.00
Summit County	12.76	15.70	9.90	0.00	0.00	0.00
Northern Utah	19.61	19.00	20.07	18.00	17.00	18.00
Southern Utah	20.14	18.04	21.28	17.00	17.00	17.00
All Localities	$17.24	$18.54	$16.17	$17.00	$17.00	$16.00

Table 7
Mean and Median Daily Spending on Food by Utah Resident Skiers
By Ski Area Locality

Ski Area Locality	Mean Daily Spending 1991-1994 Combined	Mean Daily Spending 1991	Mean Daily Spending 1994	Median Daily Spending 1991-1994 Combined	Median Daily Spending 1991	Median Daily Spending 1994
Little Cottonwood Canyon	$4.61	$6.26	$3.07	$0.00	$3.00	$0.00
Big Cottonwood Canyon	3.69	3.80	3.61	1.00	2.00	0.00
Summit County	6.06	8.61	3.57	1.50	5.00	0.00
Northern Utah	3.42	4.43	2.65	0.00	4.50	0.00
Southern Utah	8.01	6.89	8.62	4.00	4.00	4.50
All Localities	$4.84	$6.22	$3.69	$1.00	$3.00	$0.00

Use of Season Passes and Resident Discounts

The 1994 survey also asked about Utah residents' knowledge of resident discount ski pass offers. Those who knew about such discounts were also asked through what means skiers learned of resident discount tickets.

Seventy-nine percent of interviewed Utah resident skiers knew about resident discount passes. (Table 8). Skiers interviewed in Summit County were most aware of these discounts while skiers interviewed in Southern Utah were the least aware of them.

Skiers interviewed in Summit County used passes most often. Over half of the Utah residents interviewed in Summit County in 1990 were using a season pass. Little Cottonwood Canyon had the second-largest portion at 43 percent. More striking are the results based on the skier's residence. Seventy-five percent of interviewed East Region residents were using a season pass (Table 9).

The average amount reported spent on season ski passes by Utah resident skiers increased statewide and in all ski area localities except Northern Utah. The largest amount was spent by skiers interviewed in Summit County. The amounts spent on season passes are also included in the figures on annual spending that appear earlier in this report.

A tabulation of medians would show that more than half of all skiers interviewed did not purchase a season pass. This applied to all ski area groups and regions. The only exception was in Summit County in 1994. There the median amount spent was $130. Data on spending for season passes is shown in Table 10.

STUDY CONCLUSIONS

Residence and Incomes

Geography is the most important factor among those surveyed in determining where Utah residents ski. The relationships between income and ski area locality and between income and residence are both weak. One may merely be the result of the other. For example, if higher income individuals tend to live in certain areas of the state, the ski areas in that area would be more likely to see more of those higher-income individuals skiing there. Nevertheless, the relative strength of the three associations indicates the strongest relationship is by far between region of residence and ski area locality.

The increase in the household incomes of skiers interviewed in some ski area groups may seem surprising. The reader is cautioned to take into account the limited sample sizes in the survey.

Table 8
Utah Resident Skiers' Knowledge of Utah Resident Discount Ticket Programs and Means of Information
(percent)

	Total Utah	Summit County	Little Cottonwood Canyon	Northern Utah	Big Cottonwood Canyon	Southern Utah
Aware at all	78.5	91.4	84.0	75.0	71.1	46.8
How learned of program						
Mail	3.2	2.7	2.8	4.9	2.8	4.6
Radio	21.2	20.8	14.0	24.7	29.6	18.2
Television	5.4	7.4	3.5	3.7	7.4	0.0
Billboard	7.4	8.7	7.0	4.9	8.3	4.6
Magazine	1.0	0.7	1.4	0.0	1.9	0.0
Other Means	75.8	77.2	79.7	71.6	70.4	77.3

Table 9
Utah Resident Skiers Using Season Passes in 1990
By Ski Area Locality and Residence Region

	Using Season Pass		Not Using Season Pass	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ski Area Locality				
Little Cottonwood Canyon	60	43	81	57
Big Cottonwood Canyon	13	11	103	89
Summit County	59	53	53	47
Northern Utah	13	14	80	86
Southern Utah	13	25	38	75
All Localities	158	31	355	69
Skier Residence Region				
North	14	17	69	83
East	41	75	14	25
Salt Lake	84	28	214	72
South	19	25	58	75
All Residence Regions	158	31	355	69

Table 10
Mean Spending on Season Passes by Utah Resident Skiers
By Ski Area Locality

	Mean Daily Spending		
Ski Area Locality	1991-1994 Combined	1991	1994
Little Cottonwood Canyon	$150	$124	$174
Big Cottonwood Canyon	123	72	159
Summit County	206	185	227
Northern Utah	40	42	39
Southern Utah	79	63	88
All Localities	$137	$116	$154

Comparing these increases to the increases viewed by skiers' residence reveals that the increases are similar to those observed in each ski area locality with the exception of the South region. The incomes of skiers living in the South region increased by a factor of about 3.5 while incomes of skiers interviewed in the Southern Utah locality approximately doubled. The slight increase in the strength of the association between income and ski area locality could be interpreted to indicate that those skiers in the South region with the highest incomes skied in Summit or Salt Lake counties in increasing numbers in 1994.

Comparing these numbers to the rise in per capita income in Utah indicates that the income of skiers increased much more than for the state as a whole. Per capita income in Utah increased by 23 percent over the years in which the surveys were conducted, while the mean and median incomes of skiers in Utah increased by 65 percent and 43 percent, respectively. The difference between the mean and median increases indicates an increase in the number of skiers with higher incomes well above the median.

Changes in Spending

The most striking results are those regarding daily spending by Utah residents on both skiing and food. A significant percent of Utah residents who ski are spending very little money on the day they ski.

In Summit County, the median amount spent on skiing on the day of the ski trip was zero in both the 1991 and 1994 surveys. Over half of the skiers interviewed at Summit County ski areas spent nothing on skiing the day they were interviewed. The mean amount spent in Summit County decreased from $15.70 in 1991 to $9.90 in 1994. In the other ski area localities, the average amount spent on skiing the day of the interview decreased in both of the Cottonwood Canyons but increased in the Northern and Southern Utah groups.

There are at least two possible factors that can contribute to these results. One is the use of season passes. The other is the use of resident discount tickets purchased at the beginning of the ski season. Unfortunately, the data from the survey are incomplete because the relevant survey questions were not asked each year.

The amounts spent on season passes may still provide some explanation of the results. Skiers in all the ski area localities except Northern Utah spent more on season passes in 1994 than in 1991. The same is true for skiers' residence. Skiers in all the residence regions except the North region spent more in 1994 than in 1991. In addition, although skiers' daily spending results increased in the Southern Utah locality, the mean was much smaller both years than in the Salt Lake and Summit County localities. The median amounts are less useful but they clearly highlight the differences between Summit County, the East residence region, and the rest of the state. Except for those two categories, more than half of the skiers in all ski area localities or residence regions spent nothing on a season pass. Therefore, it appears that skiers who live in the East region or ski in Summit County purchase season ski passes at a greater rate, and therefore buy fewer day passes, than other Utah residents who ski.

Although it was asked only in the 1990 survey, the question about using season passes may also provide relevant information. In the 1990 ski season, 53 percent of skiers interviewed in Summit County were using a season pass, while 43 percent of skiers in Little Cottonwood Canyon reported using a season pass. Of interviewed skiers who lived in the East region, 75 percent were using a season pass while the next-highest percent was the Salt Lake region at 28 percent. The questions about resident discount passes were asked only in the 1994 survey. Although skiers were not asked if they were actually using a discount pass, the fact that more than 91 percent of skiers at Summit County areas knew about them may indicate that more of those skiers were using them.

Since the surveys did not include price information, some uncertainty is unavoidable. Nevertheless, a large number of respondents skiing in Summit County or living in the East region are not paying for their lift passes on the day of the interview. This is consistent with the available data on the use or spending on season passes and the knowledge of discount passes.

The average amount spent on food the day of the ski trip by Utah residents decreased everywhere except in the Southern Utah ski areas. In 1991, the median amount spent on food statewide and in each individual group of ski areas ranged from $2 to $5. In 1994, the median amount was zero statewide and in all ski area localities except Southern Utah. This pattern holds true for the mean amount as well, indicating a general decrease in the amount being spent for food. The mean amount increased in the Southern Utah locality, while the same numbers decreased for the state as a whole and the remaining four ski area localities.

The question of why this decrease occurred must consider two issues: Are Utah resident skiers deciding that the food at ski area restaurants and bars has become too expensive? How many residents are skiing only part of a day and not planning to eat at the ski area at all? The only analysis currently available is speculative. Most Utah ski areas are located within a one-hour drive of many of their customers. This is true of the Cottonwood Canyons and Summit County ski areas, as well as the majority of the Northern and Southern Utah ski areas. This would allow skiers to conveniently carry a lunch from home rather than plan to purchase lunch at the ski area, or purchasing more expensive food at a nearby convenience store. It is also the understanding of the author that the newer high-capacity ski lifts at many Utah ski areas allow skiers to complete more ski runs in a shorter amount of time. Skiers may feel they have completed a full day of skiing much earlier in the day and decide to eat at home or at a restaurant not associated with the ski area. The difference in Southern Utah may be explained partly by the fact that the three ski areas in that group are spread out over a much larger geographic area than the other groups and two of them are not located near major population centers in the state. This may make half-day trips less common and require more skiers to purchase meals away from home.

Utah resident spending on ski equipment, clothing and maintenance does not appear to have as clear a pattern. One might expect the mean and median to increase with income. However, the data are not consistent with that hypothesis. Between 1991 and 1994, the mean and median spending on ski equipment increased among resident skiers in both Cottonwood Canyons. The mean spending increased in Southern Utah as well. However, both the mean and median spending decreased between the two surveys in Summit County and Northern Utah. The median in Southern Utah did not change. In contrast, the mean and median incomes increased between the two surveys in all three of these ski area localities. It is also important to consider the limited reliability of the income data that has been previously discussed.

Without information on the factors that influence decisions to buy ski equipment, no conclusions can be drawn relating to why the differences exist. Ski equipment is not an item that most people purchase every year. However, the data may be useful for determining which groups of skiers tend to spend the most on ski equipment.

SUMMARY

The study found that skiers appear likely to ski at ski areas nearest their homes. The skier's income is only a minor factor and may be more reflective of the general income levels in the region of a given ski area locality rather than a preference for a particular ski area.

Utah residents skiing in Summit County and Salt Lake County spent less on daily ski trips in 1994 than in 1991. Evidence from information on season passes and resident discount tickets indicates that the number of skiers using those methods of paying for ski lift use is greater in those localities than in the other localities.

Except for skiers in the Southern Utah locality, interviewed Utah residents also reported spending much less on food in connection with skiing in the later survey than they reported spending in the earlier survey. The surveys did not include questions directed at the cause of this result. Possible causes such as faster ski lifts, more half-day ski trips and increasing food prices are discussed, but no precise conclusions can be reached due to lack of data.

The average amount spent by Utah residents on ski equipment increased slightly. However, the median amount decreased significantly, indicating that while most skiers spent less on ski equipment, a few individuals spent enough to maintain the average despite the overall decrease.

The skier surveys of 1990-1991, 1991-1992 and 1993-1994 were sponsored by the Utah Ski Association, Utah Travel Council, Utah Transit Authority, Salt Lake Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Park City Chamber of Commerce/Convention and Visitors Bureau. For information on the economic impact of nonresident skier spending see *Utah Economic and Business Review,* Volume 50, Number 8; Volume 51, Numbers 8/9; and Volume 54, Numbers 11/12.

Utah Business Statistics

UTAH DATA	Sept. 1995	Sept. 1996	% Change from Year Ago	12-Month Average This Year	12-Month Average Last Year	12-Month Average % Change
Total Personal Income (seas. adj. at ann. rates, mil. of dol., qtly.)	35,818	38,671p	8.0	37,661	34,840	8.1
New Corporations (no.)	706	611	-13.5	719	702	2.4
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales (no.)	6,933	6,868	-0.9	6,752	6,555	3.0
Agriculture						
Average Prices Received by Farmers (dol.)						
Lambs (cwt.)	82.70	88.00	6.4	84.83	75.39	12.5
Milk, All (cwt.) 1	12.80	15.70	22.7	14.02	12.17	15.2
Barley (per bushel)	2.57	3.08	19.8	3.25	2.39	36.0
Alfalfa Hay, Baled (per ton) 2	86.80	68.00	-21.7	74.02	83.42	-11.3
Commercial Red Meat Production (thous. of lbs.)	36,691	33,400r	-9.0	34,772	36,524	-4.8
Construction						
Total Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	269,244.1	315,475.7	17.2	294,826.9	245,543.0	20.1
Residential	177,468.3	176,047.7	-0.8	179,433.7	142,930.4	25.5
Nonresidential	53,220.1	80,575.8	51.4	79,990.0	72,311.8	10.6
Additions, Alterations, and Repairs	38,555.7	58,852.2	52.6	35,403.2	30,300.8	16.8
New Dwelling Units (no.)	1,965	1,963	-0.1	2,028	1,691	19.9
Employment 3						
Civilian Labor Force (thous.)	1,005.4	1,021.6	1.6	1,005.6	989.9	1.6
Employed	973.8	991.3	1.8	974.1	955.7	1.9
Unemployed	31.6	30.3	-4.1	32.0	34.2	-6.5
Percent of Labor Force	3.1	3.0	-3.2	3.1	3.5	-9.6
Nonagricultural Jobs (thous.)	928.1	978.6	5.4	946.5	895.7	5.7
Mining	8.4	7.9	-6.0	8.0	8.2	-2.0
Contract Construction	60.4	68.3	13.1	60.6	52.7	15.0
Manufacturing	125.3	132.0	5.3	128.7	122.2	5.3
Transportation, Communications, and Utilities	51.7	54.0	4.4	53.0	51.0	3.8
Wholesale Trade	46.5	49.0	5.4	47.3	44.9	5.4
Retail Trade	177.5	185.5	4.5	180.8	171.7	5.3
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	48.8	52.0	6.6	50.2	46.9	7.1
Services 4	247.3	263.5	6.6	251.9	235.0	7.2
Federal Government	31.7	31.2	-1.6	31.2	32.2	-2.9
State Government 5	48.5	50.4	3.9	51.8	50.5	2.6
Local Government 5	82.0	84.8	3.4	83.0	80.5	3.1
Average Weekly Hours						
Mining	45.3	46.1	1.8	45.1	44.8	0.5
Manufacturing	40.0	41.0	2.5	40.1	40.1	0.0
Wholesale Trade	36.0	37.6	4.4	36.4	36.6	-0.4
Retail Trade	28.4	28.2	-0.7	28.2	28.3	-0.3
Amount of Unemployment Compensation (thous. of dol.)	3,678.4	4,677.7	27.2	5,726.6	5,356.4	6.9
Finance (qtly.)						
Total State and National Chartered In-State Banks (no.)	33	34	3.0	33	33	0.0
Total Assets (mil. of dol.)	16,631.7	21,672.0s	30.3	19,127.1	15,926.9	20.1
Total Liabilities (mil. of dol.)	15,262.3	19,920.0s	30.5	17,557.9	14,639.3	19.9
Total Equity Capital (mil. of dol.)	1,369.4	1,752.0s	27.9	1,569.3	1,287.6	21.9
Capital to Assets 6	9.35	9.07	-3.0	9.24	9.25	-0.1
Loan Loss Reserve Ratio	1.85	1.55	-16.2	1.68	1.90	-11.7
Loans to Assets	60.45	63.28	4.7	62.10	61.50	1.0
Temporary Investment Ratio	16.64	10.78	-35.2	12.40	15.41	-19.5
Return on Assets	0.39	0.34	-12.8	0.35	0.34	2.2
Production						
Crude Oil (thous. of bbls.)	1,605.0	1,634.0	1.8	1,626.8	1,666.1	-2.4
Natural Gas (mil. of cu. ft.)	23,891.7	22,980.7	-3.8	24,459.7	26,158.5	-6.5
Coal (thous. short tons)	1,574	2,134p	35.6	2,279	2,086	9.3
Crude Oil to Refineries, Barrels Received (thous. of bbls.)	3,461	3,888	12.3	3,824	3,895e	-1.8
Travel/Tourism						
Air Passengers (total no. on and off, S.L. Int'l. Airport)	1,532,386	1,765,709	15.2	1,712,286	1,518,412	12.8
Highway Traffic Count Across State Lines (both directions)	63,139	64,433	2.0	57,529	54,965	4.7
Visits to State and National Parks and Monuments	2,041,118	2,122,895	4.0	1,444,323	1,378,250	4.8
Utilities						
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	550,905	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	56,177	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	572,001	596,178	4.2	589,309	566,429	4.0
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	662	767	15.9	695	653	6.4
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	633,552	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	338,466	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Utah Business Statistics

UTAH DATA	Sept. 1995	Sept. 1996	% Change from Year Ago	12-Month Average This Year	12-Month Average Last Year	12-Month Average % Change
Davis County						
Nonagricultural Employment (thous.)	71.4	75.0	5.0	72.2	68.7	5.2
Unemployment Rate (seasonally adjusted)	3.3	2.7	−18.2	2.9	3.4	−14.8
Authorized Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	26,806.6	29,060.8	8.4	29,149.0	22,671.2	28.6
New Dwelling Units (no.)	182	262	44.0	223	142	56.8
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales, Owner's County (no.)	545	492	−9.7	450	533	−15.6
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	56,329	NA	NA	NA	55,733	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	4,686	NA	NA	NA	4,585	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	61,062	63,304	3.7	62,523	60,460	3.4
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	72	74	2.8	73	73	−1.1
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Salt Lake County						
Nonagricultural Employment (thous.)	472.9	497.5	5.2	483.9	458.0	5.7
Unemployment Rate (seasonally adjusted)	3.0	2.6	−13.3	2.7	3.2	−15.2
Authorized Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	95,357.1	93,299.3	−2.2	123,204.9	95,440.3	29.1
New Dwelling Units (no.)	628	593	−5.6	745	579	28.6
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales, Owner's County (no.)	3,168	2,705	−14.6	2,891	3,166	−8.7
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	270,441	NA	NA	NA	268,755	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	23,844	NA	NA	NA	23,742	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	254,560	262,313	3.0	260,371	253,225	2.8
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	282	343	21.6	299	276	8.6
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah County						
Nonagricultural Employment (thous.)	128.0	134.3	4.9	128.5	120.5	6.6
Unemployment Rate (seasonally adjusted)	2.9	2.7	−6.9	2.6	3.1	−15.8
Authorized Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	44,758.9	98,271.4	119.6	50,587.6	45,192.6	11.9
New Dwelling Units (no.)	352	383	8.8	317	324	−2.1
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales, Owner's County (no.)	645	567	−12.1	558	572	−2.4
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	63,061	NA	NA	NA	62,129	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	7,411	NA	NA	NA	7,186	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	78,807	83,149	5.5	81,933	77,804	5.3
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	96	110	14.6	102	93	9.4
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Weber County						
Nonagricultural Employment (thous.)	78.6	84.6	7.6	82.0	77.3	6.2
Unemployment Rate (seasonally adjusted)	4.1	3.8	−7.3	3.8	4.5	−13.8
Authorized Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	26,995.2	16,625.9	−38.4	17,709.9	14,611.3	21.2
New Dwelling Units (no.)	145	100	−31.0	118	102	16.0
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales, Owner's County (no.)	419	360	−14.1	388	418	−7.2
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	60,591	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	5,921	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	56,834	58,484	2.9	58,187	56,764	2.5
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	80	86	7.5	83	80	4.4
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

1 Before deductions for hauling and government withholding, but includes quality, quantity and other premiums. Excludes hauling subsidies.
2 Mid-month prices.
3 Some figures are not strictly comparable due to reclassification.
4 Includes services by nonprofit and religious organizations.
5 Includes public schools and college institutions.
6 Includes allowance for loan losses.

p Preliminary.
r Rounded to the nearest hundred thousand.
s Rounded to the nearest million.
e Calculated using estimates for January and February 1995.
NA Not Available.

Sources:

Personal Income	U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.
New Corporations	Utah Department of Commerce, Division of Corporations and Commercial Code.
New Car and Truck Sales	Utah State Tax Commission, Economic and Statistical Unit, *Utah Car and Truck Sales Quarterly Report.*
Agriculture	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Utah Agricultural Statistics Service, *Utah Agriculture.*
Construction Data	Bureau of Economic and Business Research, *Utah Construction Report.*
Employment Data	Utah Department of Employment Security, *Utah Labor Market Report.*
Finance Data	Utah Department of Financial Institutions.
Crude Oil Production	Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, *Oil and Gas Production Report,* and Office of Energy and Resource Planning.
Natural Gas Production	Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, *Oil and Gas Production Report.*
Coal Production	U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration.
Air Passengers	Salt Lake City International Airport, Statistics Division, *Air Traffic Statistics and Activity Report.*
Highway Traffic Count	Utah Department of Transportation, *Automatic Traffic Recorder Data Report.*
Visits to State and National Parks and Monuments	U.S. Forest Service and Utah State Parks and Recreation Department.
Utilities Data	Cooperating Utility Companies.

NATIONAL DATA	Sept. 1995	Sept. 1996	% Change from Year Ago	12-Month Average This Year	12-Month Average Last Year	12-Month Average % Change
U.S. Gross Domestic Product (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)	7,309.8	7,616.3	4.2	7,484.7	7,186.9	4.1
Total Personal Income (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)	6,172.1	6,538.7	5.9	6,364.2	6,032.1	5.5
Industrial Production Index (seasonally adjusted, 1992=100)	113.0	116.0	2.7	114.1	111.6	2.2
Capacity Utilization Rate (seasonally adjusted, percent)	83.9	83.1	-1.0	83.1	84.1	-1.2
Net Exports of Goods & Services (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)	-87.6	-120.2	37.2	-93.2	-102.6	-9.1
Exports of Goods & Services (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)	819.0	844.3	3.1	842.7	788.4	6.9
Imports of Goods & Services (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)	906.6	964.5	6.4	935.9	890.9	5.1
Composite Index of 11 Leading Indicators (1992=100)	101.1	102.5	1.4	101.7	101.0	0.6
Price Indexes						
Consumer Price Indexes (not seasonally adjusted, 1982-84=100)						
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) All Items	153.2	157.8	3.0	155.6	151.4	2.8
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Food and Beverages	149.4	155.0	3.7	152.2	147.9	2.9
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Housing	149.5	153.9	2.9	151.7	147.4	2.9
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Transportation	138.8	143.2	3.2	141.7	138.5	2.3
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Medical Care	222.1	229.4	3.3	226.5	218.3	3.8
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Energy	106.2	111.7	5.2	108.2	105.7	2.4
Producer Price Index (not seasonally adjusted, 1982=100)						
Producer Price Index, All Finished Goods	127.9	131.6	2.9	130.3	127.2	2.4
GDP Implicit Price Deflator (seasonally adjusted, 1992=100, qtly.)	107.9	109.9	1.9	109.2	106.9	2.1
Corporate Profits (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)						
Profits Before Taxes	607.2	635.6	4.7	631.7	590.9	6.9
Profits-Tax Liability	224.5	233.4	4.0	230.5	217.4	6.0
Profits After Taxes	382.8	402.2	5.1	401.2	373.5	7.4
Civilian Employment (seasonally adjusted)						
Labor Force (mil.)	132.5	134.3	1.4	133.4	132.1	0.9
Employment (mil.)	125.0	127.4	1.9	126.1	124.7	1.1
Unemployment Rate	5.6	5.2	-7.1	5.5	5.6	-2.2
Value of New Construction Put In Place						
Total Construction (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)	550.5	572.3	4.0	558.2	544.3	2.5
Private Const.: Residential (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)b	237.7	246.4	3.7	244.0	237.2	2.8
New Housing Units (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)	164.3	176.2	7.2	172.8	163.7	5.6
Private Const.: Nonresidential (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)	134.8	142.2	5.5	136.3	131.6	3.6
Interest Rates						
Federal Funds Rate	5.80	5.30	-8.6	5.41	5.70	-5.1
Discount Rate on New 91-Day Treasury Bills	5.26	5.15	-2.1	5.10	5.52	-7.6
Yield on Long-Term Treasury Bonds	6.63	7.13	7.5	6.70	7.38	-9.2
Average Prime Rate Charged by Banks	8.75	8.25	-5.7	8.39	8.68	-3.4
Mortgage Rate (conventional 1st mortgage, new home, U.S. avg.)	7.50	7.77	3.6	7.47	7.73	-3.4

b Includes residential improvements, not shown separately.

Sources: *Survey of Current Business*, U.S. Department of Commerce: U.S. Gross Domestic Product, Total Personal Income, Export/Import Data, GDP Implicit Price Deflator, Corporate Profits. *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System: Industrial Production Index, Capacity Utilization Rate, Interest Rates. The Conference Board, Inc.: Composite Index of 11 Leading Indicators. *Monthly Labor Review*, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: Consumer Price Indexes, Producer Price Index, National Employment Data. U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census: National Construction Data.

Utah Business Statistics

UTAH DATA	Oct. 1995	Oct. 1996	% Change from Year Ago	12-Month Average This Year	12-Month Average Last Year	12-Month Average % Change
Total Personal Income (seas. adj. at ann. rates, mil. of dol., qtly.)	36,874	NA	NA	NA	35,086	NA
New Corporations (no.)	518	698	34.7	734	697	5.3
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales (no.)	6,114	NA	NA	NA	6,535	NA
Agriculture						
Average Prices Received by Farmers (dol.)						
Lambs (cwt.)	71.00	82.00	15.5	85.74	75.98	12.9
Milk, All (cwt.) 1	12.80	15.20	18.7	14.22	12.19	16.6
Barley (per bushel)	2.92	3.05	4.5	3.26	2.45	33.2
Alfalfa Hay, Baled (per ton) 2	61.00	67.00	9.8	74.10	82.42	-10.1
Commercial Red Meat Production (thous. of lbs.)	36,908	36,000r	-2.5	34,696	36,373	-4.6
Construction						
Total Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	315,201.2	300,013.6	-4.8	293,561.2	243,084.8	20.8
Residential	187,045.0	175,600.4	-6.1	178,480.0	146,385.3	21.9
Nonresidential	76,430.7	98,027.2	28.3	81,789.7	64,049.5	27.7
Additions, Alterations, and Repairs	51,725.5	26,386.0	-49.0	33,291.6	32,650.0	2.0
New Dwelling Units (no.)	2,012	1,880	-6.6	2,017	1,723	17.0
Employment 3						
Civilian Labor Force (thous.)	977.7	1,022.7	4.6	1,007.5	988.6	1.9
Employed	945.8	992.3	4.9	976.0	954.5	2.3
Unemployed	31.9	30.4	-4.7	32.0	34.1	-6.2
Percent of Labor Force	3.3	3.0	-9.1	3.1	3.5	-9.6
Nonagricultural Jobs (thous.)	925.8	977.7	5.6	950.6	899.6	5.7
Mining	8.2	7.8	-4.9	8.0	8.2	-2.5
Contract Construction	59.8	66.9	11.9	61.3	53.3	15.1
Manufacturing	125.6	132.3	5.3	129.1	122.8	5.1
Transportation, Communications, and Utilities	51.8	54.2	4.6	53.1	51.2	3.7
Wholesale Trade	46.5	49.0	5.4	47.6	45.2	5.4
Retail Trade	176.4	185.4	5.1	181.5	172.6	5.2
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	48.7	52.2	7.2	50.5	47.1	7.3
Services 4	242.9	260.2	7.1	253.3	236.2	7.2
Federal Government	31.3	30.4	-2.9	31.2	32.1	-2.8
State Government 5	51.2	53.3	4.1	51.8	50.5	2.7
Local Government 5	83.4	86.0	3.1	83.3	80.7	3.2
Average Weekly Hours						
Mining	43.5	43.4	-0.2	45.1	44.8	0.7
Manufacturing	40.2	40.7	1.2	40.2	40.0	0.4
Wholesale Trade	36.9	37.1	0.5	36.4	36.6	-0.3
Retail Trade	28.7	31.3	9.1	28.4	28.3	0.3
Amount of Unemployment Compensation (thous. of dol.)	4,237.4	3,878.5	-8.5	5,696.7	5,363.4	6.2
Finance (qtly.)						
Total State and National Chartered In-State Banks (no.)	33	35	6.1	33	33	0.5
Total Assets (mil. of dol.)	16,921.6	22,518.0s	33.1	19,593.5	16,061.8	22.0
Total Liabilities (mil. of dol.)	15,527.9	20,687.0s	33.2	17,987.8	14,758.4	21.9
Total Equity Capital (mil. of dol.)	1,393.7	1,831.0s	31.4	1,605.7	1,303.4	23.2
Capital to Assets 6	9.32	9.05	-2.9	9.22	9.27	-0.5
Loan Loss Reserve Ratio	1.81	1.46	-19.3	1.65	1.89	-12.7
Loans to Assets	59.90	63.13	5.4	62.37	61.36	1.6
Temporary Investment Ratio	15.06	10.86	-27.9	12.05	15.46	-22.1
Return on Assets	0.27	0.35	29.6	0.35	0.34	4.7
Production						
Crude Oil (thous. of bbls.)	1,674.7	1,696.3	1.3	1,628.6	1,662.0	-2.0
Natural Gas (mil. of cu. ft.)	22,665.8	23,541.3	3.9	24,532.6	25,679.5	-4.5
Coal (thous. short tons)	2,276	2,601p	14.3	2,306	2,095	10.1
Crude Oil to Refineries, Barrels Received (thous. of bbls.)	3,756	4,096	9.1	3,852	3,874e	-0.6
Travel/Tourism						
Air Passengers (total no. on and off, S.L. Int'l. Airport)	1,470,421	1,677,570	14.1	1,729,549	1,524,387	13.5
Highway Traffic Count Across State Lines (both directions)	56,012	55,901	-0.2	57,520	55,255	4.1
Visits to State and National Parks and Monuments	1,274,388	1,123,783	-11.8	1,431,773	1,380,194	3.7
Utilities						
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	553,245	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	56,270	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	574,039	598,379	4.2	591,337	568,218	4.1
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	658	775	17.8	705	655	7.6
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Utah Business Statistics

UTAH DATA	Oct. 1995	Oct. 1996	% Change from Year Ago	12-Month Average This Year	12-Month Average Last Year	12-Month Average % Change
Davis County						
Nonagricultural Employment (thous.)	71.0	74.7p	5.2	72.6	69.0	5.4
Unemployment Rate (seasonally adjusted)	3.2	2.9p	-9.4	2.9	3.4	-14.5
Authorized Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	34,684.0	32,195.0	-7.2	28,941.6	23,570.5	22.8
New Dwelling Units (no.)	281	257	-8.5	221	155	42.7
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales, Owner's County (no.)	436	NA	NA	NA	525	NA
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	56,578	NA	NA	NA	55,849	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	4,709	NA	NA	NA	4,598	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	61,117	63,524	3.9	62,724	60,615	3.5
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	71	75	5.6	73	73	-0.3
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Salt Lake County						
Nonagricultural Employment (thous.)	471.3	496.7p	5.4	485.7	460.0	5.6
Unemployment Rate (seasonally adjusted)	3.0	2.7p	-10.0	2.7	3.2	-14.8
Authorized Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	119,514.8	122,861.6	2.8	123,483.8	91,309.6	35.2
New Dwelling Units (no.)	565	680	20.4	754	585	28.9
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales, Owner's County (no.)	2,809	NA	NA	NA	3,148	NA
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	271,595	NA	NA	NA	269,071	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	24,098	NA	NA	NA	23,789	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	255,440	262,672	2.8	260,974	253,790	2.8
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	279	345	23.7	305	277	10.1
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah County						
Nonagricultural Employment (thous.)	128.5	134.5p	4.7	129.1	121.2	6.5
Unemployment Rate (seasonally adjusted)	2.8	2.8p	0.0	2.6	3.0	-14.3
Authorized Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	65,601.4	55,258.1	-15.8	49,725.7	44,940.3	10.6
New Dwelling Units (no.)	359	238	-33.7	307	334	-8.1
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales, Owner's County (no.)	548	NA	NA	NA	563	NA
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	63,329	NA	NA	NA	62,316	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	7,399	NA	NA	NA	7,220	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	79,375	83,241	4.9	82,255	78,139	5.3
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	96	109	13.5	103	93	10.2
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Weber County						
Nonagricultural Employment (thous.)	79.3	85.3p	7.6	82.5	77.6	6.3
Unemployment Rate (seasonally adjusted)	4.4	4.2p	-4.5	3.8	4.4	-13.3
Authorized Permit Construction (thous. of dol.)	16,229.9	18,544.1	14.3	17,902.7	14,910.7	20.1
New Dwelling Units (no.)	120	138	15.0	120	106	13.3
New Car, Truck, and Motor Home Sales, Owner's County (no.)	360	NA	NA	NA	411	NA
Electric Customers (residential active meters)	60,289	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Electric Customers (commercial active meters)	5,631	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Natural Gas Customers (residential and commercial)	56,982	58,848	3.3	58,342	56,869	2.6
Natural Gas Customers (industrial)	81	85	4.9	84	80	4.8
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, residential access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Telephone Lines in Service (U.S. West, business access)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

1 Before deductions for hauling and government withholding, but includes quality, quantity and other premiums. Excludes hauling subsidies.
2 Mid-month prices.
3 Some figures are not strictly comparable due to reclassification.
4 Includes services by nonprofit and religious organizations.
5 Includes public schools and college institutions.
6 Includes allowance for loan losses.

p Preliminary.
r Rounded to the nearest hundred thousand.
s Rounded to the nearest million.
e Calculated using estimates for January and February 1995.
NA Not Available.

Sources:

Personal Income	U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.
New Corporations	Utah Department of Commerce, Division of Corporations and Commercial Code.
New Car and Truck Sales	Utah State Tax Commission, Economic and Statistical Unit, *Utah Car and Truck Sales Quarterly Report.*
Agriculture	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Utah Agricultural Statistics Service, *Utah Agriculture.*
Construction Data	Bureau of Economic and Business Research, *Utah Construction Report.*
Employment Data	Utah Department of Employment Security, *Utah Labor Market Report.*
Finance Data	Utah Department of Financial Institutions.
Crude Oil Production	Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, *Oil and Gas Production Report,* and Office of Energy and Resource Planning.
Natural Gas Production	Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, *Oil and Gas Production Report.*
Coal Production	U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration.
Air Passengers	Salt Lake City International Airport, Statistics Division, *Air Traffic Statistics and Activity Report.*
Highway Traffic Count	Utah Department of Transportation, *Automatic Traffic Recorder Data Report.*
Visits to State and National Parks and Monuments	U.S. Forest Service and Utah State Parks and Recreation Department.
Utilities Data	Cooperating Utility Companies.

Bureau of Economic and
Business Research
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Return Postage Guaranteed
(Nonprofit Organization)

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage Paid
Permit No. 1529
Salt Lake City, UT

NATIONAL DATA	Oct. 1995	Oct. 1996	% Change from Year Ago	12-Month Average This Year	12-Month Average Last Year	12-Month Average % Change
U.S. Gross Domestic Product (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)	7,350.6	7,715.4p	5.0	7,515.1	7,209.2	4.2
Total Personal Income (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)	6,206.6	6,541.6	5.4	6,392.1	6,059.0	5.5
Industrial Production Index (seasonally adjusted, 1992=100)	112.5	116.0	3.1	114.4	111.8	2.3
Capacity Utilization Rate (seasonally adjusted, percent)	83.3	82.8	–0.6	83.0	84.1	–1.2
Net Exports of Goods & Services (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)	–67.2	–90.8p	35.1	–95.2	–100.0	–4.8
Exports of Goods & Services (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)	837.0	886.7p	5.9	846.8	794.7	6.6
Imports of Goods & Services (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)	904.2	977.5p	8.1	942.0	894.6	5.3
Composite Index of 11 Leading Indicators (1992=100)	100.9	102.5	1.6	101.8	101.0	0.8
Price Indexes						
Consumer Price Indexes (not seasonally adjusted, 1982-84=100)						
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) All Items	153.7	158.3	3.0	156.0	151.7	2.8
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Food and Beverages	149.8	155.8	4.0	152.7	148.3	2.9
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Housing	149.7	154.0	2.9	152.1	147.8	2.9
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Transportation	139.4	143.9	3.2	142.1	138.8	2.4
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Medical Care	222.9	230.1	3.2	227.1	219.0	3.7
CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Energy	104.5	110.5	5.7	108.7	105.6	2.9
Producer Price Index (not seasonally adjusted, 1982=100)						
Producer Price Index, All Finished Goods	128.7	132.5	3.0	130.6	127.5	2.5
GDP Implicit Price Deflator (seasonally adjusted, 1992=100, qtly.)	108.4	110.3p	1.8	109.4	107.1	2.1
Corporate Profits (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil., qtly.)						
Profits Before Taxes	604.2	NA	NA	NA	593.6	NA
Profits-Tax Liability	218.7	NA	NA	NA	217.8	NA
Profits After Taxes	385.5	NA	NA	NA	375.8	NA
Civilian Employment (seasonally adjusted)						
Labor Force (mil.)	132.5	134.6	1.6	133.6	132.2	1.0
Employment (mil.)	125.2	127.6	1.9	126.3	124.8	1.2
Unemployment Rate	5.5	5.2	–5.5	5.4	5.6	–2.4
Value of New Construction Put In Place						
Total Construction (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)	550.0	580.0	5.5	560.7	545.5	2.8
Private Const.: Residential (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)b	238.0	244.3	2.6	244.5	237.1	3.1
New Housing Units (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)	165.8	176.2	6.3	173.7	163.5	6.2
Private Const.: Nonresidential (seas. adj. at ann. rates, bil. of dol.)	133.9	149.8	11.9	137.6	132.5	3.8
Interest Rates						
Federal Funds Rate	5.76	5.24	–9.0	5.37	5.78	–7.2
Discount Rate on New 91-Day Treasury Bills	5.30	5.01	–5.5	5.08	5.55	–8.5
Yield on Long-Term Treasury Bonds	6.43	6.87	6.8	6.73	7.24	–7.1
Average Prime Rate Charged by Banks	8.75	8.25	–5.7	8.35	8.77	–4.8
Mortgage Rate (conventional 1st mortgage, new home, U.S. avg.)	7.39	7.76	5.0	7.50	7.71	–2.8

p Preliminary. b Includes residential improvements, not shown separately.

Sources: *Survey of Current Business*, U.S. Department of Commerce: U.S. Gross Domestic Product, Total Personal Income, Export/Import Data, GDP Implicit Price Deflator, Corporate Profits. *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System: Industrial Production Index, Capacity Utilization Rate, Interest Rates. The Conference Board, Inc.: Composite Index of 11 Leading Indicators. *Monthly Labor Review*, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: Consumer Price Indexes, Producer Price Index, National Employment Data. U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census: National Construction Data.

The University seeks to provide equal access to its programs, services, and activities to people with disabilities