Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Wireless Operations in the 3650-3700 MHz Band	)	ET Docket No. 04-151
	)	
Rules for Wireless Broadband Services in the 3650-3700 MHz Band	)	WT Docket No. 05-96
	)	
Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band	)	ET Docket No. 02-380
	)	
Amendment of the Commission's Rules With Regard to the 3650-3700 MHz Government Transfer Band	)	ET Docket No. 98-237

CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION AND COMMENTS TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

THE WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Paul J. Sinderbrand
Adam D. Krinsky

Wilkinson Barker Knauer, LLP
2300 N Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20037-1128
202.783.4141

Its Attorneys

August 11, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Discussion 3

A. The Petitions Demonstrate That The Novel Regulatory Regime Adopted For 3650-3700 MHz Band Does Not Provide Sufficient Interference Protection To Spur Investment .. 3

B. Exclusive-Use Licensing Is Necessary To Ensure Sufficient Quality Of Service And Must Be Part Of Any Revised Regulatory Scheme 7

C. The Commission Should Not Commence Shared-Use Licensing Pending Resolution Of The Issues On Reconsideration 11

D. Any Retained Shared-Use Licensing Scheme Must Be Modified To Facilitate Broadband Deployment In The Band 12

E. The Commission Must Reject SIA's Claims Regarding Interference Above 3700 MHz As Unfounded And Unnecessary 18

III. Conclusion 20

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

By and large, the petitions for reconsideration filed in response to the *Report and Order* in this proceeding strongly support the Commission's goal of providing additional spectrum for broadband use in the 3650-3700 MHz band. Yet overwhelmingly, these supportive petitions express serious concern that the regulatory regime adopted in the *Report and Order* will frustrate the achievement of that goal and instead have the unintended consequence of deterring investment necessary for wireless broadband offerings to thrive in this band.

The petitions filed by the Wireless Communications Association International, Inc. ("WCA") and others clearly establish that the contention-based protocol requirement does not offer sufficient interference protection among system operators to provide the requisite high bandwidth and low latency demanded by emerging broadband applications like Voice of Internet Protocol and live full motion video streaming. Moreover, the Commission's misplaced reliance on contention-based protocols cannot be cured by the requirement that fixed and base stations be registered because registration fails to provide non-exclusive licensees with a guarantee against interference from newcomers.

WCA submits, and most others agree, that the best way to ensure investment in wireless broadband use of the 3650-3700 MHz band is to provide for at least some exclusive-use licensing in the band. Although some petitioners suggest that exclusive-use licensing should be extended only to the 50 largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas ("MSAs"), WCA believes that limiting exclusive-use licensing (and the resulting interference protection) to only those markets could deprive millions of Americans of access to viable 3650-3700 MHz services. Residents all across the country – whether they live in large or small markets – deserve access to a broadband provider that can assure the high bandwidth and low latency emerging new applications demand.

Given that Motorola, Inc. and WCA have proposed licensing regimes that would result in exclusive licenses outside the 50 largest MSAs, WCA urges the Commission not to accept applications or issue shared-use licenses for *any* portion of the country, pending resolution of the issues on reconsideration. With the future of the 3650-3700 MHz band unsettled, too much is at stake for public policy decisions to be affected by the premature introduction of shared-use operations across the band.

To the extent the Commission retains any shared-use licensing in the band, the Commission should clarify that the *Report and Order* does not require that industry agree upon a single protocol. The petitions confirm WCA's fear that delay in broadband deployment would be inevitable if use of the band is foreclosed until a single protocol is developed. Moreover, the record confirms the need to clarify, if any contention-based protocol requirement is retained, that protocols that avoid contention through the assignment of time frames or otherwise meet the requirement. The Commission must also clarify the extent to which an incumbent non-exclusive licensee is required to modify its operations to accommodate newcomers. Requiring an incumbent shared-use licensee to make substantial modifications to its system to accommodate a

newcomer would substantially deter investment in the band by those otherwise willing to accept the limitations of a shared-use arrangement.

Lastly, the Commission should reject the proposals by the Satellite Industry Association ("SIA") that the Commission require licensees in the 3650-3700 MHz band to attenuate out-of-band emissions above 3700 MHz by 71.25 + 10log(P) dB and to decrease the maximum permissible power to some unspecified level. In adopting the obligation that licensees attenuate out-of-band emissions above 3700 MHz by 43 + 10log(P) dB, the Commission noted that the limit "is very conservative, especially for coded digital signals" and "has been applied successfully for many of our wireless services." SIA's proposal is predicated on the unsubstantiated claim that a minimum carrier/interference ratio of at least 22 dB is required. Moreover, SIA acknowledges that its proposal would be overly restrictive were the Commission to adopt an exclusive-use licensing regime. As to SIA's proposed restriction on 3650-3700 MHz power, C Band receiver front ends that do not provide sufficient adjacent channel rejection should not govern regulatory decisions for operation in nearby bands.

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Wireless Operations in the 3650-3700 MHz Band	)	ET Docket No. 04-151
	)	
Rules for Wireless Broadband Services in the 3650-3700 MHz Band	)	WT Docket No. 05-96
	)	
Additional Spectrum for Unlicensed Devices Below 900 MHz and in the 3 GHz Band	)	ET Docket No. 02-380
	)	
Amendment of the Commission's Rules With Regard to the 3650-3700 MHz Government Transfer Band	)	ET Docket No. 98-237

CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION AND COMMENTS TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

The Wireless Communications Association International, Inc. ("WCA"), by its attorneys and pursuant to Section 1.429 of the Commission's Rules, hereby submits its opposition and comments in response to the various petitions seeking reconsideration of the *Report and Order* in the above-captioned proceeding.[1]

I. INTRODUCTION

With one exception, the petitions for reconsideration filed in response to the *Report and Order* uniformly support the Commission's goal for the 3650-3700 MHz band – to provide additional spectrum for broadband use.[2] Yet, overwhelmingly these supportive petitions express

---

[1] *Wireless Operations in the 3650-3700 MHz Band*, Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 20 FCC Rcd 6502 (2005) ["*Report and Order*"].

[2] *See* Petition of the Wireless Communications Ass'n Int'l, Inc. for Reconsideration, ET Docket No. 04-151 *et al*. (filed June 10, 2005) ["WCA Petition"]; Petition of BRN Phoenix, Inc. for Partial Reconsideration, ET Docket No. 04-151 *et al.* (filed June 10, 2005) ["BRN Petition"]; Petition of the Enterprise Wireless Alliance for Reconsideration, ET Docket No. 04-151 *et al*. (filed June 10, 2005) ["EWA Petition"]; Petition of Intel Corp., Redline Communications Inc., and Alvarion, Inc. for Reconsideration, ET Docket No. 04-151 *et al.* (filed June 10, 2005) ["Vendors Petition"]; Petition of Motorola, Inc. for Reconsideration, ET Docket No. 04-151 *et al.* (filed June 10, 2005) ["Motorola Petition"]; Petition of Redline Communications Inc. for Reconsideration, ET Docket No. 04-

serious concern that the regulatory regime adopted in the *Report and Order* will frustrate achievement of the Commission's goal and instead have the unintended consequence of deterring investment necessary for wireless broadband offerings to thrive in the 3650-3700 MHz band.[3] Fortunately, several of the petitions also provide the Commission with useful suggestions for modifying the 3650-3700 MHz rules and policies so as to achieve the objectives shared by the Commission and industry.

If one thing is certain from the petitions, it is that merely easing access to the 3650-3700 MHz band will not spur widespread broadband investment. The record before the Commission clearly establishes that as manufacturers and service providers consider the potential utility of the band for delivering broadband services, the lack of any regulatory mechanism for assuring superior quality of service ("QoS") is an overriding concern.[4] As Voice over Internet Protocol ("VoIP"), live full motion video streaming and other new applications that require substantial bandwidth and low latency evolve, users are increasingly demanding not just any broadband connection, but one that delivers the requisite high QoS on a consistent basis. Yet, the record also demonstrates that the 3650-3700 MHz rules as currently configured do not provide the interference protection that

---

151 *et al*. (filed June 10, 2005) ["Redline Petition"]; Petition of WiMAX Forum for Reconsideration, ET Docket No. 04-151 *et al*. (filed June 10, 2005) ["WiMAX Petition"]. The sole exception is the petition filed by the Satellite Industry Association ("SIA"), which would cripple efforts to deploy wireless broadband services in the 3650-3700 MHz band in the name of protecting satellite operations above 3700 MHz. *See* Petition of the Satellite Industry Association for Partial Reconsideration, ET Docket No. 04-151 *et al*. (filed June 10, 2005) ["SIA Petition"]. However, as discussed *infra* at Section II.E, SIA has failed to establish that wireless broadband operations in accordance with the technical requirements set forth in the *Report and Order* will cause undue harmful interference above 3700 MHz and thus its petition should be denied.

[3] *See* WCA Petition at 3-4; EWA Petition at 5; Vendors Petition at 10, 21; WiMAX Petition at 9.

[4] *See* Vendors Petition at 13 n.25, 21; Motorola Petition at 2-3; WiMAX Petition at 9 ("the WiMAX Forum does not believe that a contention protocol, as described in the Report and Order, will result in sufficiently high confidence levels for longer term QoS of services in this band. Such a lack of confidence could negatively impact capital investment for significant deployments.").

assures the level of QoS necessary to meet marketplace demands.[5] Although the parties to this proceeding do not all agree on a single solution, the overwhelming consensus is that the *Report and Order's* non-exclusive licensing regime, even when coupled with mandatory use of contention-based protocols and a fixed and base station registration requirement, fails to provide the level of interference protection needed to drive significant investment in the band.

On reconsideration, the Commission now has the opportunity to revise its licensing and interference protection scheme to spur investment and innovation in the band. WCA below sets forth its views on the various proposals advanced in the pending petitions for doing so. In addition, WCA demonstrates that SIA's assertion that broadband deployment at 3650-3700 MHz jeopardizes satellite service above 3700 MHz is unfounded and unnecessary.

II. DISCUSSION

A. The Petitions Demonstrate That The Novel Regulatory Regime Adopted For 3650-3700 MHz Band Does Not Provide Sufficient Interference Protection To Spur Investment

Virtually all of the wireless broadband industry petitioners share with WCA a single, overriding concern about the current regulatory regime: "the absence of reliable interference protection standards will discourage manufacturer and user interest in the Band."[6] As Intel Corporation, Redline Communications, Inc. ("Redline") and Alvarion, Inc. (collectively, the "Vendors") state, not only does the current regulatory scheme fail to solve the "tragedy of the

---

[5] *See* WCA Petition at 13; Motorola Petition at 2-3; Vendors Petition at 7-17; WiMAX Petition at 4, 9; EWA Petition at 2.

[6] EWA Petition at 2. *See also* Motorola Petition at 2-3 ("[e]xclusive allocations will allow Wireless Internet Service Providers ('WISPs') and other service providers to rapidly deploy broadband services at 3650 MHz supporting mobile, transportable or fixed backhaul applications with a certain Quality of Service ('QoS').") (footnote omitted); WCA Petition at 2 ("WCA fears that the regulatory regime adopted for the 3650-3700 MHz band will have the unintended consequence of deterring the investment necessary for wireless broadband offerings to thrive in this band."); WiMAX Petition at 9 (current rules will not "result in sufficiently high confidence levels for longer term QoS of services in this band" and "[s]uch a lack of confidence could negatively impact capital investment for significant deployments.").

commons" problem inherent in the non-exclusive-use of spectrum for long-range communications, it "will have significant unintended negative consequences for the deployment of wireless broadband services in both rural and congested areas."[7] Given the Commission's objective of maximizing the utility of the 3650-3700 MHz band for wireless broadband service offerings, it is patent that the Commission must revise the regulatory regime, particularly the non-exclusive licensing system that relies upon the use of contention-based protocols and station registration to avoid interference among users.

The petitions submitted by WCA and others establish that the contention-based protocol requirement does not offer sufficient interference protection among system operators to ensure the requisite high bandwidth and low latency demanded by emerging broadband applications such as VoIP. In its petition, WCA demonstrated that "contention-based protocols . . . cannot guarantee that each of an unlimited number of non-exclusive-users will experience the speed and latency levels necessary for a successful business."[8] The petitions for reconsideration filed by others reflect widespread agreement that reliance on the contention-based protocol requirement to protect against interference severely constrains the band's potential for the delivery of wireless broadband services.[9] For example, the WiMAX Forum "does not believe that a contention protocol, as

---

[7] Vendors Petition at 2-3, 7.

[8] WCA Petition at 9.

[9] *See* Vendors Petition at 7-17; Motorola Petition at 4-5; WiMAX Petition at 4, 9-10. Although WCA intends to respond more fully to the August 3, 2005 "Comments" submitted by the Wireless Internet Service Provider's Association ("WISPA") in its forthcoming reply, WISPA's filing provides further evidence that a contention-based protocol alone is inadequate to assure efficient use of the spectrum. *See* Comments of WISPA in Reply to Petition for Reconsideration in regarding 3650Mhz, ET Docket No. 04-151, at 2 (filed Aug. 3, 2005) ["WISPA Comments"]. While WISPA calls for retention of shared-use licensing and would have the Commission believe that the contention-based protocol requirement is "as good as having a licensed band," it also is compelled to suggest that the Commission: (i) allocate time frames that would be for the exclusive use of each given licensee operating in an area; (ii) regulate transmissions that do not include "payload data;" (iii) establish a minimum "airtime to data transferred" ratio; (iv) prevent any system from using "more than 25% of the spectrum for a single sector, in a multisector system, or an omnidirectional system"; (v) limit any point-to-point system to use no more than "1/3 of the spectrum"; (vi) impose a spectrum density requirement; (vii) establish priorities among various users contending for the same spectrum at the same time; and (viii) channelize the band. *Id* at 1-2. The very fact that WISPA feels

described in the Report and Order, will result in sufficiently high confidence levels for longer term QoS of services in this band."[10] Even assuming that the contention-based protocol rule is clarified as suggested by WCA in its petition and discussed in more detailed below,[11] the petitioners make clear that a protocol requirement can only do so much to manage potential interference among multiple providers of wireless broadband offerings.[12] For parties interested in high QoS broadband, an interference protection regime that relies on contention-based protocols does not provide the bandwidth certainty or low latency required to drive investment in the band. Ultimately, Motorola is correct in concluding that the problems inherent in a contention-based protocol "make it very difficult to deploy any services that require a specific QoS in the 3650 MHz band."[13]

---

compelled to advance this laundry list (albeit long after the deadline for filing petitions for reconsideration) evidences that the current rules are far from adequate to address interference among licensed, non-exclusive users.

[10] WiMAX Petition at 9.

[11] *See infra* Section II.D.1.

[12] The petitions clearly establish that contention-based protocols "work best in small areas" where the service is short range and low power. *See* Motorola Petition at 4. The Vendors succinctly note that "listen before talk" approaches "can work acceptably in [] small, uncongested environments, but *bandwidth falls off a cliff* when the numbers of simultaneous users and resultant traffic increase." Vendors Petition at 14 (footnote omitted) (emphasis in original). Motorola, Inc. ("Motorola") similarly observes that "[w]here the transmitting device intends to transmit over a long distance, not only is there greater probability that multiple users also will be attempting to access the spectrum at that same time, but there also is reduced throughput because more users must remain silent for longer periods of time to avoid interference." Motorola Petition at 4. *See also* EWA Petition at 5-6 ("[a]s the size of the coverage area increases, so does the possibility of network overlap and, thus, potential interference. Prophylactic measures that may be effective in bands where each system has a very limited range are not necessarily adequate when the required service areas are larger."). Not only does the number of simultaneous users (and thus congestion) increase as systems serve longer distances, but the "hidden node" problem becomes more likely to result in interference. *See* WCA Petition at 8 n.14; Vendors Petition at 16-17; Motorola Petition at 5.

Indeed, logic suggests that if a contention-based protocol were sufficient to avoid interference among multiple users of non-exclusive spectrum, the Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Avoidance ("CSMA/CA") protocol employed by Wi-Fi devices under the IEEE 802.11 standard would have precluded the interference experienced by wireless internet service providers ("WISPs") using the unlicensed 2.4 GHz band in congested urban areas. Of course, it does not, because long-range Wi-Fi use by WISPs was not intended when the standard was drafted and CSMA/CA was never intended to solve the problem of interference among long-range users.

[13] Motorola Petition at 5.

In addition to reliance on the "contention-based protocol" requirement, the *Report and Order* suggests that the mandatory registration of fixed and base stations will promote deployment in the 3650-3700 MHz band.[14] However, the problematic reliance on contention-based protocols cannot be cured by the requirement that fixed and base stations be registered because registration is not accompanied by interference protection. Throughout the *Report and Order* the Commission consistently states that terrestrial licensees will not be entitled to interference protection based upon prior registration of facilities.[15] WCA's petition establishes that, as a result, the registration rule fails to provide non-exclusive licensees with sufficient certainty that they will be able to provide services with the QoS the marketplace demands.[16] Indeed, WCA notes that:

> the Commission not only subjects established facilities to interference from newcomers, but appears to have imposed on those who are first to deploy an obligation to modify their facilities to accommodate newcomers. At least in theory, a system operator could deploy a state-of-the-art network, develop a large subscriber base that highly values its service, and then be required to make network modifications to accommodate a newcomer. Suffice it to say that this is not likely to promote investment in the band.[17]

Motorola and the Vendors share WCA's concern that the rules surrounding registration and its consequences will not promote investment in the band.[18] Indeed, WCA wholeheartedly concurs with the Vendors that:

> [r]egardless of whether or not the FCC clarifies this obligation, the new rules are likely to encourage inefficient use of the 3650 MHz band. On the one hand, if the Commission does not clarify the obligation of new users to make "every effort … to … minimize… interference," there is a significant risk of squatting by

---

[14] *See Report and Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 6508.

[15] *Id*. at 6508-10.

[16] *See* WCA Petition at 9-12.

[17] *Id*. at 11-12 (footnotes omitted).

[18] *See* Vendors Petition at 9 ("[i]nterpreted most strictly, the rule could require new entrants to take all technically feasible actions to avoid interference – even if such actions would be economically impracticable. Indeed, it is unclear what technical and economic tradeoffs new users are expected to make in order to protect incumbents."); Motorola Petition at 5.

> incumbents. On the other hand, if the FCC does clarify the obligation of new entrants with too much rigor or specificity, it risks erecting barriers that would effectively preclude new users from entering the market. Either way, the new rules are likely to result in inefficient use of the 3650 MHz band.[19]

Thus, the current regulatory regime must be modified on reconsideration if the Commission desires widespread broadband deployment in the 3650-3700 MHz band.

B. Exclusive-Use Licensing Is Necessary To Ensure Sufficient Quality Of Service And Must Be Part Of Any Revised Regulatory Scheme

Given the failure of the current regulatory structure to provide sufficient interference protection, WCA submits – and the vast majority of others agree – that the best way to ensure investment in wireless broadband use of the 3650-3700 MHz band is to provide for at least some exclusive-use licensing in the band. The petitions for reconsideration of the *Report and Order* offer various proposals, presenting the Commission with a wide range of options on reconsideration.

For example, Motorola suggests the Commission auction two 25 MHz exclusive-use licenses in every market.[20] The Vendors propose exclusive-use licensing of the entire band in the 50 largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas ("MSAs") and application of the Commission's non-exclusive approach (but without a contention-based protocol requirement) everywhere else.[21] WCA supports creation of one 25 MHz block to be auctioned on an MSA/Rural Service Area ("RSA") basis, with the remaining 25 MHz block available on a non-exclusive licensing basis to be regulated under the approach set forth in the *Report and Order* (subject to certain clarifications

---

[19] Vendors Petition at 9.

[20] *See* Motorola Petition at 6 ("[t]he combination of exclusive licensed use along with flexible technical standards and secondary market leasing provisions will offer the most efficient and rapid deployment of wireless broadband services across the U.S. using this new band.").

[21] *See* Vendors Petition at 19-24.

and revisions suggested by WCA and discussed *infra*).[22] And, although the WiMAX Forum does not endorse any particular licensing scheme for those MSAs that are "more congested areas," it supports retention of the existing approach (but without any contention-based protocol requirement) for other markets.[23]

WCA appreciates that reasonable people can disagree over the particulars of exclusive-use licensing. What is clear, however, is that WCA and others *all* share the view expressed by the Vendors:

> [c]ompanies are more willing to risk capital investments where they can better control spectrum access and thus create optimum QoS for their subscribers. . . . Without such exclusivity, the Commission risks non-deployment of promising new wireless technologies in the 3650 MHz band and thus the most efficient use of this spectrum.[24]

The various options advanced in the petitions present the Commission with stark choices, particularly with respect to whether exclusive-use licensing should be extended to markets smaller than the 50 largest MSAs. In WCA's view, assured interference protection (and the resulting assured high bandwidth and low latency demanded by innovative new applications like VoIP) is a matter of concern to system operators in both large and small markets. As such, limiting exclusive-use licensing (and the resulting interference protection) to only the 50 largest MSAs could deprive millions of Americans of access to viable 3650-3700 MHz services.[25]

---

[22] *See* WCA Petition at 12.

[23] *See* WiMAX Petition at 8-9.

[24] Vendors Petition at 21-22 (footnote omitted).

[25] Even if one accepts the argument that the risk of interference among competing service providers is small in the most rural parts of the country, an exclusive-use licensing scheme limited to the 50 largest MSAs would leave many urban and suburban areas without access to high QoS wireless broadband. Those include, for example, Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT; Honolulu, HI; Tulsa, OK; Dayton, OH; Tucson, AZ; Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY; New Haven-Milford, CT; Fresno, CA; Raleigh-Cary, NC; and Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA – the 51st to 60th most populous MSAs. Indeed, even were the Commission to extend exclusive-use licensing to areas in the top 100 MSAs, residents of highly populated areas where multiple service providers are likely would be denied the benefits of exclusive licensing. *See* WiMAX Petition at 7-9. To assist the Commission in understanding those areas that

As the Commission considers the future of the 3650-3700 MHz band, it should recognize that non-exclusive access in this band is not essential to making broadband available in rural areas. While the Commission's recent broadband deployment statistics reflect significant broadband growth in rural areas,[26] there is more progress to be made in less densely populated areas of the country where broadband is unavailable. However, any marketplace demand for low QoS wireless broadband in those unserved areas can be satisfied by the 900 MHz and 2.4 GHz bands. In other words, since there is no broadband in these areas, then there is no wireless broadband, and since there is no wireless broadband it is safe to assume that the 900 MHz and 2.4 GHz bands are sufficiently non-congested in these areas that they can be used to meet initial marketplace demand. Thus, providing more shared-use spectrum at 3650-3700 MHz will not advance the Commission's objective of assuring the availability of broadband service to all Americans.

Accordingly, WCA believes that merely extending low QoS broadband to unserved rural areas should not be the policy objective of this proceeding. Rather, providing rural users with the high QoS necessary to support VoIP, live full motion video streaming and other emerging applications that require high capacity and low latency should be the goal – as assured high QoS is simply not possible in the unlicensed bands where rural wireless broadband services currently operate. The record is clear that users of non-exclusive spectrum, even in more rural areas of the country, are seeking access to exclusive-use spectrum to ensure that they can meet marketplace

---

would not receive the benefit of exclusive licensing under the Vendors and WiMAX Forum approaches, WCA is annexing as Attachment A, a listing of all MSAs in size order.

[26] A July 2005 Commission report demonstrates that access to high-speed internet services in highly rural areas has increased substantially in recent years. *See* News Release, FCC, *Federal Communications Commission Releases Data on High-Speed Services for Internet Access, High-Speed Connections to the Internet Increased 34% During 2004 for a Total of 38 Million Lines in Service* (rel. July 7, 2005) ("*July 2005 Report*"). The Commission recently determined that in the context of wireless services, a "rural area" is comprised of those areas with a population density of 100 persons per square mile or less. *See Facilitating the Provision of Spectrum-Based Services to Rural Areas and Promoting Opportunities for Rural Telephone Companies to Provide Spectrum-Based Services,* Report and Order, 19 FCC Rcd 19078, 19087 (2004). By examining highly rural areas – areas with no more than 67 people per square mile – the *July 2005 Report* reflects that 96% of zip codes have at least one high-speed internet subscriber whereas in December 2000, only 76.1% of zip codes had at least on high-speed internet subscriber. *See July 2005 Report* at Table 14.

demands.[27] As WCA noted in its petition, the National Telecommunications Cooperative Association recently reported that a survey of its members found, "[t]hough inexpensive and readily available, [unlicensed spectrum] is far from an ideal solution: 54% of those survey respondents utilizing unlicensed spectrum indicated they had experienced difficulties with interference."[28]

Thus, WCA urges the Commission to assure that all Americans, including those living outside the 50 largest MSAs, have access to emerging broadband applications, like VoIP, that require the high QoS only exclusive licensing can assure. WCA will view with interest the filings by other parties regarding whether that goal is best achieved by exclusive-use licensing of only 25 MHz as WCA proposed, or whether the entire 50 MHz should be licensed for exclusive-use.

It is because of this need to promote investment in wireless broadband deployments in the 3650-3700 MHz band that WCA must oppose the proposal by the EWA to retain the non-exclusive licensing regime but require prior frequency coordination at least until such time as effective contention-based protocols can be developed.[29] First, as EWA itself acknowledges, "there is no record support confirming that [equipment that effectively mitigates interference through

---

[27] Although Enterprise Wireless Alliance ("EWA") does not propose exclusive licensing, it does recognize that "[i]f the Commission intends rural WISPs . . . to rely on the Band for the delivery of new and innovative services as described in the R&O, EWA believes further interference measures must be implemented." EWA Petition at 6. However, as discussed *infra*, WCA does not believe that EWA's proposal to rely on prior coordination of frequency usage until effective contention-based technology can be developed is a viable alternative to exclusive-use licensing.

[28] WCA Petition at 13 n.25 (*quoting* Comments of National Telecommunications Cooperative Ass'n, GN Docket No. 04-163, at 3 (filed April 22, 2005) (footnote omitted)). Similarly, Virginia Communications, Inc. ("VCI"), the owner of the CommSpeed service that provides wireless broadband in several rural communities, has reported to the Commission that:

> Over the past 3 years, VCI has deployed equipment utilizing both licensed and unlicensed spectrum. Our experience has been that, while unlicensed systems have required less advanced preparation compared with the engineering and licensing requirements of licensed systems, we have been able to provide more consistent and reliable service to our customers using licensed systems.

Comments of Virginia Communications, Inc., GN Docket No. 04-163, at 2 (filed June 2, 2004).

[29] *See* EWA Petition at 7-8.

contention-based protocols] will be available in any foreseeable future."[30] Indeed, given the problems inherent in reliance on contention-based protocols to mitigate interference, the Commission cannot assume that such equipment will be developed any time soon. Second, while WCA appreciates that prior coordination may be an effective tool to promote sharing among the various enterprise users represented by EWA, such coordination fails to provide the degree of spectrum certainty that wireless broadband service providers require. Broadband services in the 3650-3700 MHz are likely to be wide area, consumer-based services where ubiquitous coverage is essential. Thus, they are fundamentally different from enterprise services where coverage areas are generally smaller and facilities are designed to serve critical locations, rather than an entire region.[31] As such, reliance upon a prior coordination requirement (rather than exclusive-use licensing) would deprive a prospective operator of the absolute assurance that it could deploy new facilities where needed, when needed, within its service area. Indeed, exclusive-use licensing is the only avenue for ensuring prospective wireless broadband providers interference-free access to the spectrum necessary to provide a viable service.

C. The Commission Should Not Commence Shared-Use Licensing Pending Resolution Of The Issues On Reconsideration

In its petition, Redline suggests that in light of the Vendors' proposal for exclusive-use licensing within the 50 largest MSAs, the Commission should not issue shared-use licenses or accept registrations for facilities located within the 50 largest MSAs.[32] WCA certainly agrees with the sentiment behind this proposal – allowing premature deployment of facilities by shared-use

---

[30] *Id.* at 7.

[31] A prior coordination requirement can work effectively for enterprise services because multiple users can share the spectrum through careful system designs. The same cannot be said of broadband services that require ubiquitous interference-free coverage over wide areas.

[32] *See* Redline Petition at 3.

licensees would undercut the Commission's ability on reconsideration to move to any of the exclusive-use licensing systems proposed in the various petitions, whether it is Motorola's, WCA's or the Vendors'. However, given that both Motorola and WCA have proposed licensing regimes that would result in exclusive licenses issued for all MSAs and RSAs, WCA submits that the Commission should not be accepting applications or issuing shared-use licenses for *any* portion of the country until it rules upon the pending petitions for reconsideration.[33] With the future of the 3650-3700 MHz band unsettled, too much is at stake for public policy decisions to be affected by the premature introduction of shared-use operations across the band. Given the variety of licensing proposals identified in the petitions, WCA believes the more prudent step would be to expeditiously address the issues raised on reconsideration before commencement of any licensing system – whether shared-use or exclusive-use – in the 3650-3700 MHz band.

D. Any Retained Shared-Use Licensing Scheme Must Be Modified To Facilitate Broadband Deployment In The Band

Unless the Commission adopts the Motorola proposal to license two 25 MHz blocks across the country, some regime will be necessary for regulating access to and use of the non-exclusive spectrum. In its petition, WCA identified several concerns regarding the manner in which non-exclusive spectrum is regulated, and the petitions filed by others reflect additional concerns that should be resolved on reconsideration to provide the industry with necessary clarity and avoid future disputes.[34]

1. The Commission Must Clarify That There Is No Requirement For A Single, Industry-Wide Contention-Based Protocol And Must Reject A Call To Mandate Adoption Of One Company's Technology

---

[33] *See* WCA Petition at 12-19; Motorola Petition at 2.

[34] *See* WCA Petition at 9-20; *see also* EWA Petition at 4-8; Vendors Petition at 18-20; WiMAX Petition at 7-8.

As WCA observed in its petition, the contention-based protocol requirement has caused much confusion within the industry, both as to whether a single, industry-standard protocol is required and as to whether technologies that avoid contention before it occurs (through prior allocation of time frames or other approaches) are permissible in the band.[35] The petitions filed by others confirm this confusion. For example, the Vendors and Motorola appear to believe that the Commission requires the use of a "listen before talk" protocol to satisfy the contention-based protocol requirement, while Redline asserts "it is not entirely clear whether the Commission intended to exclude IEEE 802.16/WiMAX devices by their definition of a contention based protocol."[36] The WiMAX Forum, meanwhile, appears to believe that the Commission has required industry to agree upon a single contention-based protocol.[37] Thus, the Commission should clarify both that the *Report and Order* does not require the industry to agree upon a single protocol and that protocols designed to avoid contention, such as those (like IEEE 802.16) that assign time frames to individual users, satisfy the contention-based protocol requirement.

Clarifying that the contention-based requirement does not compel a single protocol is critical to achieving the Commission's goal of rapid deployment in the band.[38] Like WCA, the

---

[35] *See* WCA Petition at 5.

[36] *See* Vendors Petition at 11-12; Motorola Petition at 5-6; Redline Petition at 2. It is worth noting that WISPA also suggests that "WiMAX and possibly other polled radio implementations (i.e. Motorola Canopy) are seemingly incompatible" with the contention-based protocol requirement. WISPA Comments at 2. Strangely, while WISPA contends that its membership is "divided as to their position on whether or not the rule needs to be modified to specifically permit a WiMAX-type system," WISPA also calls for the Commission to mandate the use of technology that would avoid contention by allocating time frames among licensees. *Id.* Such an approach, of course, does not assure QoS when every time a new non-exclusive licensee enters a market every incumbent must cede capacity (time frames) to the newcomer. To the contrary, it would almost assure diminishing QoS – as one operator succeeds, others will follow it into the market and thus diminish the ability of the first operator to maintain the high bandwidth and low latency that may be critical to its customers. In the end, the result will be a classic "tragedy of the commons."

[37] *See* WiMAX Petition at 10.

[38] WCA made clear that the *Report and Order* does not require a single, industry-wide protocol but instead clearly envisions that multiple protocols will be utilized as it calls for the use of "some type of contention-based protocol"

WiMAX Forum observes that a single protocol requirement "could delay operator deployments and incur additional R&D investments by manufacturers."[39] Others agree.[40] As WCA noted in its petition, at present there are numerous technologies based upon IEEE 802.11, 802.16, 802.20 and proprietary approaches to spectrum sharing that all have the potential to use the 3650-3700 MHz band, and that all take different approaches to coexistence of multiple users within the band. Thus, undesirable delay in broadband deployment would be inevitable if use of the band is foreclosed until a single protocol is developed. Indeed, the record confirms WCA's fear that vendors may well conclude that they are better served by taking advantage of the economies of scale associated with the global market, rather than attempt to develop a specialized product for the U.S. market that meets a single protocol requirement.[41]

As such, the Commission must squarely reject the petition of BRN Phoenix, Inc. ("BRN"), which advocates the designation of a specific technology – one to which BRN acknowledges it holds patents – "as *the* contention-based protocol ('CPB') [sic] for fixed terrestrial systems operating in the 3.65 GHz band."[42] For the reasons set forth above and in WCA's petition, WCA firmly opposes the designation of any technology mandate (whether the technology be BRN's or

---

and leaves it to industry and standards bodies to establish appropriate "*protocols*." WCA Petition at 5 (*quoting Report and Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 6523-24 (emphasis added)).

[39] WiMAX Petition at 10.

[40] *See* EWA Petition at 7; Motorola Petition at 5-6.

[41] *See* WCA Petition at 7 ("[v]endors may well conclude that they are better served by taking advantage of the economies of scale associated with the global market, rather than attempt to develop a specialized product for the US market. Again, it must be emphasized that the 3650-3700 MHz band is part of one of the few bands that have substantial international use for wireless broadband, and unique "US-only" rules ultimately will not redound to the benefit of US consumers."); WiMAX Petition at 10 ("a U.S.-specific protocol could diminish the ability for U.S. service providers to take advantage of 'off the shelf' equipment already available and capable of operating in this band.").

[42] BRN Petition at 1-2, n.4 (emphasis added). In particular, BRN seeks designation of "the advanced antenna system method ('AAS Standard') using orthogonal frequency division multiple access ('OFDMA') modulation as described in Section 8.4.4.7 of the IEEE Standard 802.16-2004." *Id.* Although BRN expresses a willingness to waive the license fee for its patents, it does so "to permit fixed applications within this band only, but not for other purposes." *Id.* at 2-3, n.4.

any other company's) as "the" contention-based protocol. Indeed it is telling that while BRN concedes that the *Report and Order* refuses to involve the Commission in specifying a contention-based protocol standard, BRN provides no rationale for the Commission to depart from that approach.[43] Even assuming for purposes of argument that the Commission determines that it (as opposed to industry) should specify a single contention-based protocol, this reconsideration proceeding is neither the time nor the place for the Commission to be evaluating any particular technology. Particularly in light of BRN's refusal to make public fundamental information regarding its technology,[44] WCA and other interested parties are in no position to express any view as to whether BRN's technology satisfies industry requirements, and certainly cannot address whether BRN's technology is so superior to other potential alternatives that it should be imposed on the industry as a Commission-mandated standard.

Clarifying that any contention-based protocol requirement can be satisfied by an approach that avoids direct contention through the prior allocation of time frames or otherwise is consistent with the intent of the *Report and Order*. For example, such an approach is inherent in the IEEE 802.16 standard for WiMAX and, as WCA noted in its petition, the *Report and Order* makes clear that technologies based upon the IEEE 802.16 standard can be introduced in the band.[45] More importantly, WCA is unable to imagine any public policy objective that would be served by rejecting the use of technologies that avoid contention before it occurs.

---

[43] *See id.* at 4-10.

[44] *See* Letter to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC, from Ronald E. Quirk, Jr., Counsel to BRN Phoenix, Inc., ET Docket No. 04-151 *et al.*, at 2 (filed June 17, 2005) (asserting confidential treatment because its *ex parte* presentation contained proprietary information concerning equipment the company is developing and how it will be used in implementing wireless broadband service).

[45] *See* WCA Petition at 6 n.11, *citing Report and Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 6503 ("[t]he licensing scheme that we adopt for this band will provide an opportunity for the introduction of a variety of new wireless broadband services and technologies, *such as WiMax*.") (emphasis added) (footnote omitted).

In short, WCA reiterates its suggestion that the Commission expressly declare that technologies that avoid contention (through the allocation of time frames or otherwise) satisfy its rules and that no single protocol is required.[46] As WCA noted in its petition, "[a]ppropriately crafted, there may be little harm in requiring users of non-exclusive spectrum to employ some protocol to manage access to the spectrum, so long as that requirement affords flexibility in the selection of protocols and recognizes the inherent limitations of any protocol."[47] Yet, WCA appreciates that the WiMAX Forum, Vendors and others suggest that the Commission eliminate the contention-based protocol requirement completely and WCA would not object to that result.[48]

2. The Commission Should Clarify The Rights And Obligations Associated With Registration By Shared-Use Licensees

Like WCA, others express concern that the registration rules do not provide shared-use licensees with sufficient certainty regarding their entitlement to interference protection and their obligations to mitigate interference to others.[49]

Regarding interference mitigation to newcomers, WCA urges the Commission to clarify the extent to which an incumbent non-exclusive licensee is required to modify its operations to accommodate newcomers.[50] The confusion caused by the Commission's current approach is illustrated by the Vendors, who note:

> [c]ritical ambiguities in the new rules are likely to lead to inefficient use of the 3650 MHz band. The rules state that "[l]icensees should … make every effort to ensure that their fixed and base stations operate at a location, and with technical parameters, that will minimize the potential to cause and receive interference." Yet,

---

[46] *Id*. at 10 n.17 (suggesting revision to new Section 90.7).

[47] *Id*. at 9.

[48] *See* WiMAX Petition at 10; Motorola Petition at 4-6; Vendors Petition at 18-24.

[49] *See* WCA Petition at 11; Vendors Petition at 10; EWA Petition at 3.

[50] *See* WCA Petition at 12 n.22.

> the Commission does not define what it means by "every effort … to … minimize… interference."[51]

As WCA explained in its petition, requiring an incumbent shared-use licensee to make substantial modifications to its system to accommodate a newcomer would substantially deter investment in the band by those that might otherwise be willing to accept the limitations of a shared-use arrangement.[52] It is one thing to say a licensee must accept interference from newcomers, it is quite another to say that a licensee that has made a substantial investment in a state-of-the-art system designed to limit interference from newcomers must modify that system to avoid interference to newcomers (particularly to newcomers that might not deploy a system designed to protect itself against interference).

With respect to acceptance of interference, WCA must take issue with the suggestion by EWA that the first shared-use licensee in an area should be entitled to absolute interference protection. EWA suggests that the Commission adopt a "first-in-time" concept, under which "[n]ew entrants are obligated to correct interference they cause, even if they are operating in accordance with the rules" and, if new entrants determine that spectrum is adequate for entry they can deploy operations "secure that any interference arising thereafter will be the newcomer's responsibility."[53] This approach tends to unduly reward the first entrant, and as the Vendors demonstrate, inevitably leads to disputes over spectrum warehousing.[54]

---

[51] Vendors Petition at 9 (footnote omitted).

[52] *See* WCA Petition at 11-12.

[53] EWA Petition at 6.

[54] *See* Vendors Petition at 8.

E. The Commission Must Reject SIA's Claims Regarding Interference Above 3700 MHz As Unfounded And Unnecessary

In its petition, SIA urges the Commission to require licensees in the 3650-3700 MHz band to attenuate out-of-band emissions above 3700 MHz by 71.25 + 10log(P) dB and decrease the maximum permissible power to some unspecified level either across the 3650-3700 MHz band or just in the 3675-3700 MHz portion of the band.[55] However, SIA's proposals would severely, and unnecessarily, limit the utility of the 3650-3700 MHz band for broadband deployments and thus should be rejected.

In the *Report and Order*, the Commission imposed on 3650-3700 MHz licensees an obligation to attenuate out-of-band emissions above 3700 MHz by 43 + 10log(P) dB below transmitter power.[56] The Commission noted that "this limit is very conservative, especially for coded digital signals which generally decay more rapidly and produce lower levels of out of band emission than analog signals."[57] In addition, the Commission observed that "the limit specified in this section is a generic limit that has been applied successfully for many of our wireless services" and that "this requirement is consistent with the out of band emission limit specified in several of the Commission rule parts . . . for wireless devices including higher power devices."[58]

Despite the Commission's reasoning, SIA now seeks a reduction of almost 29 dB in permissible out-of-band emissions above 3700 MHz. SIA's argument is predicated on its unsubstantiated claim that a minimum carrier/interference ratio of at least 22 dB is required. While SIA contends that this minimum requirement is "derived from hard-line data gathered from actual

---

[55] *See* SIA Petition at 3-4.

[56] *See Report and Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 6528.

[57] *Id.*

[58] *Id.*

operation,"[59] SIA provides *no* evidentiary support for this assertion. Certainly, if SIA desires such a dramatic increase in interference protection, it must do more to establish the level of interference protection it claims to need.

In any event, SIA implicitly acknowledges that its proposal could prove to be overly restrictive. It concedes that "it may be reasonable to set higher limits for OOB emissions" when an exclusive-use licensing regime such as that employed for the Personal Communications Service under Part 24 is utilized.[60] SIA reasons that such licensing would obviate its concerns over out-of-band emissions "because of the controlled nature of service deployment, more stringent equipment manufacturing standards, and licensee accountability."[61] *Of course, an exclusive licensing scheme is exactly what the overwhelming majority of petitioners in this proceeding have sought.*[62]

With respect to SIA's claims regarding the potential for receiver overload, it is interesting to note that five years ago, when the Commission examined a C-Band earth station's ability "to reject interference from adjacent band signals" emitted by potential 3650-3700 MHz operations, it rejected calls to impose intrusive regulation and concluded that "the signal rejection capability of FSS earth stations would be based upon receivers filtering capabilities."[63] Ultimately, receiver front ends that do not provide sufficient adjacent channel rejection should not govern regulatory decisions for operation in nearby bands.

---

[59] SIA Petition at 8 n.21.

[60] *Id*. at 10.

[61] *Id.*

[62] *See infra* at Section II.B.

[63] *Amendment of the Commission's Rules With Regard to the 3650-3700 MHz Government Transfer Band*, First Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 15 FCC Rcd 20488, 20532-33 (2000).

III. CONCLUSION

The record before the Commission establishes that as manufacturers and service providers consider the potential utility of the 3650-3700 MHz band for delivering broadband services, the lack of any regulatory mechanism for assuring superior QoS is an overriding deterrent to investment. The adoption of a regulatory regime that provides at least some spectrum in this band for exclusive-use licensing to be auctioned based on MSA/RSA boundaries is essential to ensure that all Americans – whether living in urban, suburban or rural areas – have wireless access to the VoIP and other emerging applications that require high bandwidth and low latency. Adoption on reconsideration of rules and policies along the lines outlined above will spur investment in broadband use of the 3650-3700 MHz band across the nation.

THE WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL, INC.

By: /s/ Paul J. Sinderbrand
Paul J. Sinderbrand
Adam D. Krinsky

Wilkinson Barker Knauer, LLP
2300 N Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20037-1128
202.783.4141

Its attorneys

August 11, 2005

ATTACHMENT A

LISTING OF METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS IN SIZE ORDER

Census 2000 PHC-T-29. Ranking Tables for Population of Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Micropolitan Statistical Areas, Combined Statistical Areas, New England City and Town Areas, and Combined New England City and Town Areas: 1990 and 2000
(Areas defined by the Office of Management and Budget as of June 6, 2003.)

Table 3a. Population in Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas Ranked by 2000 Population for the United States and Puerto Rico: 1990 and 2000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and 1990 Census.
Internet Release date: December 30, 2003

[For information on confidentiality and nonsampling error, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf1.pdf. For information on definitions, see http://www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/aboutmetro.html]
(x) Not applicable.

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area Metropolitan Division Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population		Change 1990 to 2000	
					April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
			United States					
35620		1	New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA[2]	Metropolitan Statistical Area	18,323,002	16,846,046	1,476,956	8.8
35620	20764	(x)	Edison, NJ	Metropolitan Division	2,173,869	1,898,386	275,483	14.5
35620	35004	(x)	Nassau-Suffolk, NY[3]	Metropolitan Division	2,753,913	2,609,212	144,701	5.5
35620	35084	(x)	Newark-Union, NJ-PA	Metropolitan Division	2,098,843	1,960,063	138,780	7.1
35620	35644	(x)	New York-Wayne-White Plains, NY-NJ	Metropolitan Division	11,296,377	10,378,385	917,992	8.8
31100		2	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	12,365,627	11,273,720	1,091,907	9.7
31100	31084	(x)	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA	Metropolitan Division	9,519,338	8,863,164	656,174	7.4
31100	42044	(x)	Santa Ana-Anaheim-Irvine, CA	Metropolitan Division	2,846,289	2,410,556	435,733	18.1
16980		3	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	9,098,316	8,182,076	916,240	11.2
16980	16974	(x)	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL	Metropolitan Division	7,628,412	6,894,440	733,972	10.6
16980	23844	(x)	Gary, IN	Metropolitan Division	675,971	643,037	32,934	5.1
16980	29404	(x)	Lake County-Kenosha County, IL-WI	Metropolitan Division	793,933	644,599	149,334	23.2
37980		4	Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE	Metropolitan Statistical Area	5,687,147	5,435,468	251,679	4.6
37980	15804	(x)	Camden, NJ	Metropolitan Division	1,186,999	1,127,972	59,027	5.2
37980	37964	(x)	Philadelphia, PA	Metropolitan Division	3,849,647	3,728,909	120,738	3.2
37980	48864	(x)	Wilmington, DE-MD-NJ	Metropolitan Division	650,501	578,587	71,914	12.4
19100		5	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	5,161,544	3,989,294	1,172,250	29.4
19100	19124	(x)	Dallas-Plano-Irving, TX	Metropolitan Division	3,451,226	2,622,562	828,664	31.6
19100	23104	(x)	Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	Metropolitan Division	1,710,318	1,366,732	343,586	25.1
33100		6	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	5,007,564	4,056,100	951,464	23.5

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
33100	22744	(x)	Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach-Deerfield Beach, FL	Metropolitan Division	1,623,018	1,255,488	367,530	29.3
33100	33124	(x)	Miami-Miami Beach-Kendall, FL	Metropolitan Division	2,253,362	1,937,094	316,268	16.3
33100	48424	(x)	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach, FL	Metropolitan Division	1,131,184	863,518	267,666	31.0
47900		7	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,796,183	4,122,914	673,269	16.3
47900	13644	(x)	Bethesda-Frederick-Gaithersburg, MD	Metropolitan Division	1,068,618	907,235	161,383	17.8
47900	47894	(x)	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	Metropolitan Division	3,727,565	3,215,679	511,886	15.9
26420		8	Houston-Baytown-Sugar Land, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,715,407	3,767,335	948,072	25.2
19820		9	Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,452,557	4,248,699	203,858	4.8
19820	19804	(x)	Detroit-Livonia-Dearborn, MI	Metropolitan Division	2,061,162	2,111,687	-50,525	-2.4
19820	47644	(x)	Warren-Farmington Hills-Troy, MI	Metropolitan Division	2,391,395	2,137,012	254,383	11.9
14460		10	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,391,344	4,133,895	257,449	6.2
14460	14484	(x)	Boston-Quincy, MA	Metropolitan Division	1,812,937	1,715,269	97,668	5.7
14460	15764	(x)	Cambridge-Newton-Framingham, MA	Metropolitan Division	1,465,396	1,398,468	66,928	4.8
14460	21604	(x)	Essex County, MA	Metropolitan Division	723,419	670,080	53,339	8.0
14460	40484	(x)	Rockingham County-Strafford County, NH	Metropolitan Division	389,592	350,078	39,514	11.3
12060		11	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,247,981	3,069,425	1,178,556	38.4
41860		12	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	4,123,740	3,686,592	437,148	11.9
41860	36084	(x)	Oakland-Fremont-Hayward, CA	Metropolitan Division	2,392,557	2,082,914	309,643	14.9
41860	41884	(x)	San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City, CA	Metropolitan Division	1,731,183	1,603,678	127,505	8.0
40140		13	Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	3,254,821	2,588,793	666,028	25.7
38060		14	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	3,251,876	2,238,480	1,013,396	45.3
42660		15	Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	3,043,878	2,559,164	484,714	18.9
42660	42644	(x)	Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	Metropolitan Division	2,343,058	1,972,961	370,097	18.8
42660	45104	(x)	Tacoma, WA	Metropolitan Division	700,820	586,203	114,617	19.6
33460		16	Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,968,806	2,538,834	429,972	16.9
41740		17	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,813,833	2,498,016	315,817	12.6
41180		18	St. Louis, MO-IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,698,687	2,580,897	117,790	4.6
12580		19	Baltimore-Towson, MD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,552,994	2,382,172	170,822	7.2
38300		20	Pittsburgh, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,431,087	2,468,289	-37,202	-1.5
45300		21	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,395,997	2,067,959	328,038	15.9
19740		22	Denver-Aurora, CO[1]	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,179,240	1,666,883	512,357	30.7
17460		23	Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,148,143	2,102,248	45,895	2.2
17140		24	Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,009,632	1,844,917	164,715	8.9
38900		25	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,927,881	1,523,741	404,140	26.5

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
28140		26	Kansas City, MO-KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,836,038	1,636,528	199,510	12.2
40900		27	Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,796,857	1,481,102	315,755	21.3
41940		28	San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,735,819	1,534,274	201,545	13.1
41700		29	San Antonio, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,711,703	1,407,745	303,958	21.6
36740		30	Orlando, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,644,561	1,224,852	419,709	34.3
18140		31	Columbus, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,612,694	1,405,168	207,526	14.8
39300		32	Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,582,997	1,509,789	73,208	4.8
47260		33	Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,576,370	1,449,389	126,981	8.8
26900		34	Indianapolis, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,525,104	1,294,217	230,887	17.8
33340		35	Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,500,741	1,432,149	68,592	4.8
29820		36	Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,375,765	741,459	634,306	85.5
16740		37	Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,330,448	1,024,643	305,805	29.8
35380		38	New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,316,510	1,264,391	52,119	4.1
34980		39	Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,311,789	1,048,216	263,573	25.1
12420		40	Austin-Round Rock, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,249,763	846,227	403,536	47.7
32820		41	Memphis, TN-MS-AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,205,204	1,067,263	137,941	12.9
15380		42	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY[2]	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,170,111	1,189,288	-19,177	-1.6
31140		43	Louisville, KY-IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,161,975	1,055,973	106,002	10.0
25540		44	Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,148,618	1,123,678	24,940	2.2
27260		45	Jacksonville, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,122,750	925,213	197,537	21.4
40060		46	Richmond, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,096,957	949,244	147,713	15.6
36420		47	Oklahoma City, OK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,095,421	971,042	124,379	12.8
13820		48	Birmingham-Hoover, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,052,238	956,844	95,394	10.0
40380		49	Rochester, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	1,037,831	1,002,410	35,421	3.5
41620		50	Salt Lake City, UT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	968,858	768,075	200,783	26.1
14860		51	Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	882,567	827,645	54,922	6.6
26180		52	Honolulu, HI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	876,156	836,231	39,925	4.8
46140		53	Tulsa, OK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	859,532	761,019	98,513	12.9
19380		54	Dayton, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	848,153	843,835	4,318	0.5
46060		55	Tucson, AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	843,746	666,880	176,866	26.5
10580		56	Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	825,875	809,443	16,432	2.0
35300		57	New Haven-Milford, CT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	824,008	804,219	19,789	2.5
23420		58	Fresno, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	799,407	667,490	131,917	19.8
39580		59	Raleigh-Cary, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	797,071	541,100	255,971	47.3

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
36540		60	Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	767,041	685,797	81,244	11.8
37100		61	Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	753,197	669,016	84,181	12.6
49340		62	Worcester, MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	750,963	709,705	41,258	5.8
24340		63	Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	740,482	645,914	94,568	14.6
10900		64	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	740,395	686,688	53,707	7.8
10740		65	Albuquerque, NM	Metropolitan Statistical Area	729,649	599,416	130,233	21.7
12940		66	Baton Rouge, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	705,973	623,853	82,120	13.2
10420		67	Akron, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	694,960	657,575	37,385	5.7
44140		68	Springfield, MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	680,014	672,970	7,044	1.0
21340		69	El Paso, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	679,622	591,610	88,012	14.9
12540		70	Bakersfield, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	661,645	543,477	118,168	21.7
45780		71	Toledo, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	659,188	654,157	5,031	0.8
45060		72	Syracuse, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	650,154	659,864	-9,710	-1.5
17900		73	Columbia, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	647,158	548,335	98,823	18.0
24660		74	Greensboro-High Point, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	643,430	540,030	103,400	19.1
39100		75	Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	621,517	567,109	54,408	9.6
28940		76	Knoxville, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	616,079	534,917	81,162	15.2
30780		77	Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	610,518	535,034	75,484	14.1
49660		78	Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	602,964	613,622	-10,658	-1.7
42260		79	Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	589,959	489,483	100,476	20.5
48620		80	Wichita, KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	571,166	511,111	60,055	11.7
32580		81	McAllen-Edinburg-Pharr, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	569,463	383,545	185,918	48.5
44700		82	Stockton, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	563,598	480,628	82,970	17.3
42540		83	Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	560,625	575,264	-14,639	-2.5
24860		84	Greenville, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	559,940	472,153	87,787	18.6
16700		85	Charleston-North Charleston, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	549,033	506,875	42,158	8.3
17820		86	Colorado Springs, CO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	537,484	409,482	128,002	31.3
25420		87	Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	509,074	474,242	34,832	7.3
31540		88	Madison, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	501,774	432,323	69,451	16.1
12260		89	Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	499,684	435,763	63,921	14.7
27140		90	Jackson, MS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	497,197	446,941	50,256	11.2
38860		91	Portland-South Portland, ME	Metropolitan Statistical Area	487,568	441,257	46,311	10.5
29460		92	Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	483,924	405,382	78,542	19.4
19780		93	Des Moines, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	481,394	416,346	65,048	15.6
16860		94	Chattanooga, TN-GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	476,531	433,210	43,321	10.0

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
37340		95	Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	476,230	398,978	77,252	19.4
29540		96	Lancaster, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	470,658	422,822	47,836	11.3
14260		97	Boise City-Nampa, ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	464,840	319,596	145,244	45.4
42220		98	Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	458,614	388,222	70,392	18.1
29620		99	Lansing-East Lansing, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	447,728	432,674	15,054	3.5
33700		100	Modesto, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	446,997	370,522	76,475	20.6
19660		101	Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	443,343	370,712	72,631	19.6
36260		102	Ogden-Clearfield, UT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	442,656	351,799	90,857	25.8
15980		103	Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	440,888	335,113	105,775	31.6
22420		104	Flint, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	436,141	430,459	5,682	1.3
20500		105	Durham, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	426,493	344,625	81,868	23.8
49180		106	Winston-Salem, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	421,961	361,448	60,513	16.7
44060		107	Spokane, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	417,939	361,364	56,575	15.7
37860		108	Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	412,153	344,406	67,747	19.7
30460		109	Lexington-Fayette, KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	408,326	348,428	59,898	17.2
15940		110	Canton-Massillon, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	406,934	394,106	12,828	3.3
18580		111	Corpus Christi, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	403,280	367,786	35,494	9.7
41500		112	Salinas, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	401,762	355,660	46,102	13.0
33660		113	Mobile, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	399,843	378,643	21,200	5.6
42060		114	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	399,347	369,608	29,739	8.0
46700		115	Vallejo-Fairfield, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	394,542	340,421	54,121	15.9
23060		116	Fort Wayne, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	390,156	354,435	35,721	10.1
13140		117	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	385,090	361,226	23,864	6.6
49620		118	York-Hanover, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	381,751	339,574	42,177	12.4
31700		119	Manchester-Nashua, NH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	380,841	336,073	44,768	13.3
39340		120	Provo-Orem, UT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	376,774	269,407	107,367	39.9
19340		121	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	376,019	368,151	7,868	2.1
43340		122	Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	375,965	359,687	16,278	4.5
39740		123	Reading, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	373,638	336,523	37,115	11.0
11700		124	Asheville, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	369,171	308,001	61,170	19.9
44180		125	Springfield, MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	368,374	298,818	69,556	23.3
47300		126	Visalia-Porterville, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	368,021	311,921	56,100	18.0
37900		127	Peoria, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	366,899	358,552	8,347	2.3
45940		128	Trenton-Ewing, NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	350,761	325,824	24,937	7.7
41420		129	Salem, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	347,214	278,024	69,190	24.9

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
22220		130	Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	347,045	239,464	107,581	44.9
33860		131	Montgomery, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	346,528	305,175	41,353	13.6
39900		132	Reno-Sparks, NV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	342,885	257,193	85,692	33.3
21780		133	Evansville, IN-KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	342,815	324,858	17,957	5.5
26620		134	Huntsville, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	342,376	293,047	49,329	16.8
25860		135	Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	341,851	292,409	49,442	16.9
22180		136	Fayetteville, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	336,609	297,422	39,187	13.2
15180		137	Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	335,227	260,120	75,107	28.9
28660		138	Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	330,714	268,822	61,892	23.0
21660		139	Eugene-Springfield, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	322,959	282,912	40,047	14.2
11460		140	Ann Arbor, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	322,895	282,937	39,958	14.1
45220		141	Tallahassee, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	320,304	259,096	61,208	23.6
40420		142	Rockford, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	320,204	283,719	36,485	12.9
11260		143	Anchorage, AK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	319,605	266,021	53,584	20.1
38940		144	Port St. Lucie-Fort Pierce, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	319,426	251,071	68,355	27.2
43780		145	South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	316,663	296,529	20,134	6.8
28020		146	Kalamazoo-Portage, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	314,866	293,471	21,395	7.3
16620		147	Charleston, WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	309,635	307,689	1,946	0.6
46540		148	Utica-Rome, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	299,896	316,633	-16,737	-5.3
42340		149	Savannah, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	293,000	258,060	34,940	13.5
26580		150	Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	288,649	288,189	460	0.2
40220		151	Roanoke, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	288,309	268,398	19,911	7.4
24580		152	Green Bay, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	282,599	243,698	38,901	16.0
17980		153	Columbus, GA-AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	281,768	266,450	15,318	5.7
21500		154	Erie, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	280,843	275,572	5,271	1.9
20260		155	Duluth, MN-WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	275,486	269,230	6,256	2.3
48900		156	Wilmington, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	274,532	200,124	74,408	37.2
22900		157	Fort Smith, AR-OK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	273,170	234,078	39,092	16.7
14500		158	Boulder, CO[1]	Metropolitan Statistical Area	269,814	208,949	60,865	29.1
30700		159	Lincoln, NE	Metropolitan Statistical Area	266,787	229,091	37,696	16.5
35980		160	Norwich-New London, CT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	259,088	254,957	4,131	1.6
36100		161	Ocala, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	258,916	194,833	64,083	32.9
42100		162	Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	255,602	229,734	25,868	11.3
43900		163	Spartanburg, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	253,791	226,800	26,991	11.9

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
12100		164	Atlantic City, NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	252,552	224,327	28,225	12.6
13780		165	Binghamton, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	252,320	264,497	-12,177	-4.6
22660		166	Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	251,494	186,136	65,358	35.1
34940		167	Naples-Marco Island, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	251,377	152,099	99,278	65.3
31180		168	Lubbock, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	249,700	229,940	19,760	8.6
42020		169	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	246,681	217,162	29,519	13.6
25060		170	Gulfport-Biloxi, MS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	246,190	207,875	38,315	18.4
29180		171	Lafayette, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	239,086	208,740	30,346	14.5
26100		172	Holland-Grand Haven, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	238,314	187,768	50,546	26.9
16300		173	Cedar Rapids, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	237,230	210,640	26,590	12.6
23540		174	Gainesville, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	232,392	191,263	41,129	21.5
17300		175	Clarksville, TN-KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	232,000	189,279	42,721	22.6
14740		176	Bremerton-Silverdale, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	231,969	189,731	42,238	22.3
28700		177	Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	230,014	211,365	18,649	8.8
31340		178	Lynchburg, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	228,616	206,226	22,390	10.9
11100		179	Amarillo, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	226,522	196,144	30,378	15.5
45820		180	Topeka, KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	224,551	210,257	14,294	6.8
25180		181	Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	222,771	192,774	29,997	15.6
49420		182	Yakima, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	222,581	188,823	33,758	17.9
31420		183	Macon, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	222,368	206,616	15,752	7.6
12700		184	Barnstable Town, MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	222,230	186,605	35,625	19.1
47380		185	Waco, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	213,517	189,123	24,394	12.9
32900		186	Merced, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	210,554	178,403	32,151	18.0
16580		187	Champaign-Urbana, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	210,275	202,848	7,427	3.7
40980		188	Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	210,039	211,946	-1,907	-0.9
36500		189	Olympia, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	207,355	161,238	46,117	28.6
17020		190	Chico, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	203,171	182,120	21,051	11.6
11540		191	Appleton, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	201,602	174,801	26,801	15.3
44100		192	Springfield, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	201,437	189,550	11,887	6.3
15540		193	Burlington-South Burlington, VT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	198,889	177,059	21,830	12.3
34820		194	Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	196,629	144,053	52,576	36.5
26380		195	Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	194,477	182,842	11,635	6.4
30980		196	Longview, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	194,042	180,053	13,989	7.8
29340		197	Lake Charles, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	193,568	177,394	16,174	9.1
22500		198	Florence, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	193,155	176,195	16,960	9.6

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
29700		199	Laredo, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	193,117	133,239	59,878	44.9
46220		200	Tuscaloosa, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	192,034	176,173	15,861	9.0
28420		201	Kennewick-Richland-Pasco, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	191,822	150,033	41,789	27.9
39540		202	Racine, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	188,831	175,034	13,797	7.9
43620		203	Sioux Falls, SD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	187,093	153,500	33,593	21.9
17780		204	College Station-Bryan, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	184,885	150,998	33,887	22.4
21140		205	Elkhart-Goshen, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	182,791	156,198	26,593	17.0
45860		206	Torrington, CT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	182,193	174,092	8,101	4.7
27740		207	Johnson City, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	181,607	160,369	21,238	13.2
32780		208	Medford, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	181,269	146,389	34,880	23.8
24540		209	Greeley, CO[1]	Metropolitan Statistical Area	180,926	131,817	49,109	37.3
29140		210	Lafayette, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	178,541	158,848	19,693	12.4
28740		211	Kingston, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	177,749	165,304	12,445	7.5
14020		212	Bloomington, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	175,506	156,669	18,837	12.0
46340		213	Tyler, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	174,706	151,309	23,397	15.5
29740		214	Las Cruces, NM	Metropolitan Statistical Area	174,682	135,510	39,172	28.9
22020		215	Fargo, ND-MN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	174,367	153,296	21,071	13.7
16820		216	Charlottesville, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	174,021	143,885	30,136	20.9
45460		217	Terre Haute, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	170,943	166,578	4,365	2.6
23020		218	Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	170,498	143,776	26,722	18.6
34740		219	Muskegon-Norton Shores, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	170,200	158,983	11,217	7.1
33740		220	Monroe, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	170,053	162,881	7,172	4.4
39140		221	Prescott, AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	167,517	107,714	59,803	55.5
41060		222	St. Cloud, MN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	167,392	148,976	18,416	12.4
30100		223	Lebanon, NH-VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	167,387	155,133	12,254	7.9
13380		224	Bellingham, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	166,814	127,780	39,034	30.5
12020		225	Athens-Clarke County, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	166,079	136,025	30,054	22.1
11340		226	Anderson, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	165,740	145,196	20,544	14.1
37620		227	Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	164,624	161,907	2,717	1.7
47940		228	Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	163,706	158,640	5,066	3.2
40340		229	Rochester, MN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	163,618	141,945	21,673	15.3
39820		230	Redding, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	163,256	147,036	16,220	11.0
35660		231	Niles-Benton Harbor, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	162,453	161,378	1,075	0.7
10180		232	Abilene, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	160,245	148,004	12,241	8.3

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
49740		233	Yuma, AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	160,026	106,895	53,131	49.7
27100		234	Jackson, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	158,422	149,756	8,666	5.8
10500		235	Albany, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	157,833	146,574	11,259	7.7
27900		236	Joplin, MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	157,322	134,910	22,412	16.6
36780		237	Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	156,763	140,320	16,443	11.7
42580		238	Seaford, DE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	156,638	113,229	43,409	38.3
29420		239	Lake Havasu City-Kingman, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	155,032	93,497	61,535	65.8
48540		240	Wheeling, WV-OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	153,172	159,301	-6,129	-3.8
36860		241	Ottawa-Streator, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	153,098	148,331	4,767	3.2
24780		242	Greenville, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	152,772	123,308	29,464	23.9
27780		243	Johnstown, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	152,598	163,029	-10,431	-6.4
27500		244	Janesville, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	152,307	139,510	12,797	9.2
48660		245	Wichita Falls, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	151,524	140,375	11,149	7.9
13980		246	Blacksburg-Christiansburg-Radford, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	151,272	140,715	10,557	7.5
37700		247	Pascagoula, MS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	150,564	131,916	18,648	14.1
14060		248	Bloomington-Normal, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	150,433	129,180	21,253	16.5
27340		249	Jacksonville, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	150,355	149,838	517	0.3
39060		250	Pottsville, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	150,336	152,585	-2,249	-1.5
25900		251	Hilo, HI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	148,677	120,317	28,360	23.6
20740		252	Eau Claire, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	148,337	137,543	10,794	7.8
37460		253	Panama City-Lynn Haven, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	148,217	126,994	21,223	16.7
30540		254	Lexington-Thomasville, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	147,246	126,677	20,569	16.2
47220		255	Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	146,438	138,053	8,385	6.1
33780		256	Monroe, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	145,945	133,600	12,345	9.2
19460		257	Decatur, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	145,867	131,556	14,311	10.9
17860		258	Columbia, MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	145,666	122,010	23,656	19.4
10780		259	Alexandria, LA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	145,035	149,082	-4,047	-2.7
12620		260	Bangor, ME	Metropolitan Statistical Area	144,919	146,601	-1,682	-1.1
44220		261	Springfield, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	144,742	147,548	-2,806	-1.9
43580		262	Sioux City, IA-NE-SD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	143,053	131,350	11,703	8.9
40580		263	Rocky Mount, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	143,026	133,235	9,791	7.3
22460		264	Florence, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	142,950	131,327	11,623	8.9
20940		265	El Centro, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	142,361	109,303	33,058	30.2
39460		266	Punta Gorda, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	141,627	110,975	30,652	27.6
25940		267	Hilton Head Island-Beaufort, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	141,615	101,912	39,703	39.0

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
39380		268	Pueblo, CO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	141,472	123,051	18,421	15.0
19300		269	Daphne-Fairhope, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	140,415	98,280	42,135	42.9
27620		270	Jefferson City, MO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	140,052	120,704	19,348	16.0
27460		271	Jamestown-Dunkirk-Fredonia, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	139,750	141,895	-2,145	-1.5
23580		272	Gainesville, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	139,277	95,428	43,849	45.9
49700		273	Yuba City-Marysville, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	139,149	122,643	16,506	13.5
13740		274	Billings, MT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	138,904	121,499	17,405	14.3
20700		275	East Stroudsburg, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	138,687	95,709	42,978	44.9
12980		276	Battle Creek, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	137,985	135,982	2,003	1.5
18180		277	Concord, NH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	136,225	120,005	16,220	13.5
44300		278	State College, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	135,758	123,786	11,972	9.7
38340		279	Pittsfield, MA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	134,953	139,352	-4,399	-3.2
11300		280	Anderson, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	133,358	130,669	2,689	2.1
48260		281	Weirton-Steubenville, WV-OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	132,008	142,523	-10,515	-7.4
26980		282	Iowa City, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	131,676	115,731	15,945	13.8
45900		283	Traverse City, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	131,342	106,497	24,845	23.3
20020		284	Dothan, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	130,861	120,352	10,509	8.7
15500		285	Burlington, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	130,800	108,213	22,587	20.9
41580		286	Salisbury, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	130,340	110,605	19,735	17.8
45500		287	Texarkana, TX-Texarkana, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	129,749	120,132	9,617	8.0
25260		288	Hanford-Corcoran, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	129,461	101,469	27,992	27.6
16540		289	Chambersburg, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	129,313	121,082	8,231	6.8
42140		290	Santa Fe, NM	Metropolitan Statistical Area	129,292	98,928	30,364	30.7
11020		291	Altoona, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	129,144	130,542	-1,398	-1.1
31900		292	Mansfield, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	128,852	126,137	2,715	2.2
27980		293	Kahului-Wailuku, HI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	128,094	100,374	27,720	27.6
29100		294	La Crosse, WI-MN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	126,838	116,401	10,437	9.0
20100		295	Dover, DE	Metropolitan Statistical Area	126,697	110,993	15,704	14.1
21700		296	Eureka-Arcata-Fortuna, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	126,518	119,118	7,400	6.2
48140		297	Wausau, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	125,834	115,400	10,434	9.0
46180		298	Tupelo, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	125,251	107,835	17,416	16.2
24020		299	Glens Falls, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	124,345	118,539	5,806	4.9
34900		300	Napa, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	124,279	110,765	13,514	12.2
25620		301	Hattiesburg, MS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	123,812	109,603	14,209	13.0
31300		302	Lumberton, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	123,339	105,179	18,160	17.3

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
31460		303	Madera, CA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	123,109	88,090	35,019	39.8
34100		304	Morristown, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	123,081	100,591	22,490	22.4
44380		305	Statesville-Mooresville, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	122,660	92,931	29,729	32.0
41140		306	St. Joseph, MO-KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	122,336	115,816	6,520	5.6
36220		307	Odessa, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	121,123	118,934	2,189	1.8
30140		308	Lebanon, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	120,327	113,744	6,583	5.8
48700		309	Williamsport, PA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	120,044	118,710	1,334	1.1
19140		310	Dalton, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	120,031	98,609	21,422	21.7
46660		311	Valdosta, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	119,560	99,244	20,316	20.5
34620		312	Muncie, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	118,769	119,659	-890	-0.7
26140		313	Homosassa Springs, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	118,085	93,515	24,570	26.3
43420		314	Sierra Vista-Douglas, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	117,755	97,624	20,131	20.6
12300		315	Augusta-Waterville, ME	Micropolitan Statistical Area	117,114	115,904	1,210	1.0
22380		316	Flagstaff, AZ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	116,320	96,591	19,729	20.4
24300		317	Grand Junction, CO	Metropolitan Statistical Area	116,255	93,145	23,110	24.8
33260		318	Midland, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	116,009	106,611	9,398	8.8
13460		319	Bend, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	115,367	74,958	40,409	53.9
12220		320	Auburn-Opelika, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	115,092	87,146	27,946	32.1
30020		321	Lawton, OK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	114,996	111,486	3,510	3.1
35100		322	New Bern, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	114,751	102,399	12,352	12.1
19500		323	Decatur, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	114,706	117,206	-2,500	-2.1
22140		324	Farmington, NM	Metropolitan Statistical Area	113,801	91,605	22,196	24.2
24140		325	Goldsboro, NC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	113,329	104,666	8,663	8.3
46940		326	Vero Beach, FL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	112,947	90,208	22,739	25.2
39660		327	Rapid City, SD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	112,818	103,221	9,597	9.3
43100		328	Sheboygan, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	112,646	103,877	8,769	8.4
11500		329	Anniston-Oxford, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	112,249	116,034	-3,785	-3.3
20620		330	East Liverpool-Salem, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	112,075	108,276	3,799	3.5
36300		331	Ogdensburg-Massena, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	111,931	111,974	-43	0.0
48060		332	Watertown-Fort Drum, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	111,738	110,943	795	0.7
47020		333	Victoria, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	111,663	99,394	12,269	12.3
49300		334	Wooster, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	111,564	101,461	10,103	10.0
34060		335	Morgantown, WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	111,200	104,546	6,654	6.4
47580		336	Warner Robins, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,765	89,208	21,557	24.2
43300		337	Sherman-Denison, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,595	95,021	15,574	16.4

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
13020		338	Bay City, MI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,157	111,723	-1,566	-1.4
19260		339	Danville, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,156	108,711	1,445	1.3
33140		340	Michigan City-La Porte, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	110,106	107,066	3,040	2.8
36980		341	Owensboro, KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	109,875	104,681	5,194	5.0
41540		342	Salisbury, MD	Metropolitan Statistical Area	109,391	97,779	11,612	11.9
48740		343	Willimantic, CT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	109,091	102,525	6,566	6.4
31740		344	Manhattan, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	108,999	113,720	-4,721	-4.2
44420		345	Staunton-Waynesboro, VA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	108,988	97,687	11,301	11.6
17660		346	Coeur d'Alene, ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	108,685	69,795	38,890	55.7
30620		347	Lima, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	108,473	109,755	-1,282	-1.2
25500		348	Harrisonburg, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	108,193	88,189	20,004	22.7
27860		349	Jonesboro, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	107,762	93,620	14,142	15.1
14140		350	Bluefield, WV-VA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	107,578	110,940	-3,362	-3.0
21060		351	Elizabethtown, KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	107,547	100,919	6,628	6.6
27180		352	Jackson, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	107,377	90,801	16,576	18.3
38220		353	Pine Bluff, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	107,341	106,958	383	0.4
32940		354	Meridian, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	106,569	103,224	3,345	3.2
41660		355	San Angelo, TX	Metropolitan Statistical Area	105,781	100,087	5,694	5.7
10880		356	Allegan, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	105,665	90,509	15,156	16.7
44940		357	Sumter, SC	Metropolitan Statistical Area	104,646	102,637	2,009	2.0
14540		358	Bowling Green, KY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	104,166	87,030	17,136	19.7
17420		359	Cleveland, TN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	104,015	87,355	16,660	19.1
28100		360	Kankakee-Bradley, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	103,833	96,255	7,578	7.9
30340		361	Lewiston-Auburn, ME	Metropolitan Statistical Area	103,793	105,259	-1,466	-1.4
23460		362	Gadsden, AL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	103,459	99,840	3,619	3.6
10540		363	Albany-Lebanon, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	103,069	91,227	11,842	13.0
49020		364	Winchester, VA-WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,997	84,168	18,829	22.4
34580		365	Mount Vernon-Anacortes, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,979	79,555	23,424	29.4
11780		366	Ashtabula, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	102,728	99,821	2,907	2.9
30860		367	Logan, UT-ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,720	79,415	23,305	29.3
36140		368	Ocean City, NJ	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,326	95,089	7,237	7.6
19060		369	Cumberland, MD-WV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	102,008	101,643	365	0.4
26820		370	Idaho Falls, ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	101,677	88,750	12,927	14.6
29020		371	Kokomo, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	101,541	96,946	4,595	4.7
25220		372	Hammond, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	100,588	85,709	14,879	17.4

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
40700		373	Roseburg, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	100,399	94,649	5,750	6.1
29940		374	Lawrence, KS	Metropolitan Statistical Area	99,962	81,798	18,164	22.2
48300		375	Wenatchee, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	99,219	78,455	20,764	26.5
10300		376	Adrian, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	98,890	91,476	7,414	8.1
37140		377	Paducah, KY-IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	98,765	94,595	4,170	4.4
18500		378	Corning, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	98,726	99,088	-362	-0.4
24220		379	Grand Forks, ND-MN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	97,478	103,181	-5,703	-5.5
22540		380	Fond du Lac, WI	Metropolitan Statistical Area	97,296	90,083	7,213	8.0
27060		381	Ithaca, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	96,501	94,097	2,404	2.6
43140		382	Shelby, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	96,287	84,714	11,573	13.7
33540		383	Missoula, MT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	95,802	78,687	17,115	21.8
13900		384	Bismarck, ND	Metropolitan Statistical Area	94,719	83,831	10,888	13.0
35260		385	New Castle, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	94,643	96,246	-1,603	-1.7
44980		386	Sunbury, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	94,556	96,771	-2,215	-2.3
48580		387	Whitewater, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	93,759	75,000	18,759	25.0
18260		388	Cookeville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	93,417	78,306	15,111	19.3
15260		389	Brunswick, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	93,044	82,207	10,837	13.2
46100		390	Tullahoma, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	93,024	79,785	13,239	16.6
31020		391	Longview-Kelso, WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	92,948	82,119	10,829	13.2
21460		392	Enterprise-Ozark, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	92,744	89,873	2,871	3.2
17220		393	Clarksburg, WV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	92,144	91,509	635	0.7
46020		394	Truckee-Grass Valley, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	92,033	78,510	13,523	17.2
36700		395	Orangeburg, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	91,582	84,803	6,779	8.0
23900		396	Gettysburg, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	91,292	78,274	13,018	16.6
21300		397	Elmira, NY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	91,070	95,195	-4,125	-4.3
20380		398	Dunn, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	91,025	67,822	23,203	34.2
35420		399	New Philadelphia-Dover, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90,914	84,090	6,824	8.1
40660		400	Rome, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	90,565	81,251	9,314	11.5
32740		401	Meadville, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90,366	86,169	4,197	4.9
41100		402	St. George, UT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	90,354	48,560	41,794	86.1
16020		403	Cape Girardeau-Jackson, MO-IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	90,312	82,878	7,434	9.0
26860		404	Indiana, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	89,605	89,994	-389	-0.4
20220		405	Dubuque, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	89,143	86,403	2,740	3.2
26300		406	Hot Springs, AR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	88,068	73,397	14,671	20.0
36660		407	Opelousas-Eunice, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	87,700	80,331	7,369	9.2

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
40020		408	Richmond, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	87,454	72,311	15,143	20.9
42700		409	Sebring, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	87,366	68,432	18,934	27.7
46380		410	Ukiah, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	86,265	80,345	5,920	7.4
30500		411	Lexington Park, MD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	86,211	75,974	10,237	13.5
13180		412	Beaver Dam, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	85,897	76,559	9,338	12.2
31860		413	Mankato-North Mankato, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	85,712	82,120	3,592	4.4
49780		414	Zanesville, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	84,585	82,068	2,517	3.1
36460		415	Olean, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	83,955	84,234	-279	-0.3
19180		416	Danville, IL	Metropolitan Statistical Area	83,919	88,257	-4,338	-4.9
20180		417	DuBois, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	83,382	78,097	5,285	6.8
29860		418	Laurel, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	83,107	79,145	3,962	5.0
38540		419	Pocatello, ID	Metropolitan Statistical Area	83,103	73,112	9,991	13.7
31820		420	Manitowoc, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82,887	80,421	2,466	3.1
33220		421	Midland, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82,874	75,651	7,223	9.5
21820		422	Fairbanks, AK	Metropolitan Statistical Area	82,840	77,720	5,120	6.6
46300		423	Twin Falls, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82,626	68,718	13,908	20.2
14100		424	Bloomsburg-Berwick, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82,387	80,937	1,450	1.8
14660		425	Brainerd, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82,249	66,040	16,209	24.5
10700		426	Albertville, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	82,231	70,832	11,399	16.1
12180		427	Auburn, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	81,963	82,313	-350	-0.4
16940		428	Cheyenne, WY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	81,607	73,142	8,465	11.6
37820		429	Pendleton-Hermiston, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	81,543	66,874	14,669	21.9
24500		430	Great Falls, MT	Metropolitan Statistical Area	80,357	77,691	2,666	3.4
45180		431	Talladega-Sylacauga, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	80,321	74,107	6,214	8.4
31260		432	Lufkin, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	80,130	69,884	10,246	14.7
43740		433	Somerset, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	80,023	78,218	1,805	2.3
11180		434	Ames, IA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	79,981	74,252	5,729	7.7
38460		435	Plattsburgh, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,894	85,969	-6,075	-7.1
28580		436	Key West-Marathon, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,589	78,024	1,565	2.0
41780		437	Sandusky, OH	Metropolitan Statistical Area	79,551	76,779	2,772	3.6
40260		438	Roanoke Rapids, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,456	76,314	3,142	4.1
13220		439	Beckley, WV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,220	76,819	2,401	3.1
39020		440	Portsmouth, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	79,195	80,327	-1,132	-1.4
39500		441	Quincy, IL-MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	78,771	76,323	2,448	3.2
18700		442	Corvallis, OR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	78,153	70,811	7,342	10.4

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
18980		443	Cullman, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	77,483	67,613	9,870	14.6
24420		444	Grants Pass, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	75,726	62,649	13,077	20.9
40780		445	Russellville, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	75,608	63,642	11,966	18.8
49220		446	Wisconsin Rapids-Marshfield, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	75,555	73,605	1,950	2.6
23700		447	Gallup, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,798	60,686	14,112	23.3
43860		448	Southern Pines, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,769	59,013	15,756	26.7
34180		449	Moses Lake, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,698	54,758	19,940	36.4
23660		450	Galesburg, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,571	75,574	-1,003	-1.3
28060		451	Kalispell, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,471	59,218	15,253	25.8
47700		452	Warsaw, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,057	65,294	8,763	13.4
48020		453	Watertown-Fort Atkinson, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	74,021	67,783	6,238	9.2
28300		454	Keene, NH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,825	70,121	3,704	5.3
48980		455	Wilson, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,814	66,061	7,753	11.7
31980		456	Marion, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,403	74,169	-766	-1.0
32300		457	Martinsville, VA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,346	73,104	242	0.3
17060		458	Chillicothe, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,345	69,330	4,015	5.8
11980		459	Athens, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,277	58,543	14,734	25.2
35340		460	New Iberia, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	73,266	68,297	4,969	7.3
25980		461	Hinesville-Fort Stewart, GA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	71,914	58,947	12,967	22.0
37020		462	Owosso, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,687	69,770	1,917	2.7
36020		463	Oak Harbor, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,558	60,195	11,363	18.9
18020		464	Columbus, IN	Metropolitan Statistical Area	71,435	63,657	7,778	12.2
22300		465	Findlay, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,295	65,536	5,759	8.8
34340		466	Mount Airy, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,219	61,704	9,515	15.4
42940		467	Sevierville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,170	51,043	20,127	39.4
39980		468	Richmond, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	71,097	71,951	-854	-1.2
37260		469	Palatka, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	70,423	65,070	5,353	8.2
17940		470	Columbia, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	69,498	54,812	14,686	26.8
34780		471	Muskogee, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	69,451	68,078	1,373	2.0
31940		472	Marinette, WI-MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,710	65,468	3,242	5.0
16500		473	Centralia, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,600	59,358	9,242	15.6
14980		474	Bristol, VA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	68,470	64,313	4,157	6.5
14700		475	Branson, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,361	44,639	23,722	53.1
24260		476	Grand Island, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,305	63,022	5,283	8.4
44660		477	Stillwater, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	68,190	61,507	6,683	10.9

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area Metropolitan Division Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population		Change 1990 to 2000	
					April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
14580		478	Bozeman, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,831	50,463	17,368	34.4
33500		479	Minot, ND	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,392	67,609	-217	-0.3
10140		480	Aberdeen, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,194	64,175	3,019	4.7
44620		481	Stevens Point, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,182	61,405	5,777	9.4
42620		482	Searcy, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	67,165	54,676	12,489	22.8
23180		483	Frankfort, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	66,798	58,352	8,446	14.5
16220		484	Casper, WY	Metropolitan Statistical Area	66,533	61,226	5,307	8.7
24940		485	Greenwood, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	66,271	59,567	6,704	11.3
32020		486	Marion, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	66,217	64,274	1,943	3.0
42860		487	Seneca, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	66,215	57,494	8,721	15.2
25740		488	Helena, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	65,765	55,434	10,331	18.6
35900		489	North Wilkesboro, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	65,632	59,393	6,239	10.5
43060		490	Shawnee, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	65,521	58,760	6,761	11.5
26740		491	Hutchinson, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	64,790	62,389	2,401	3.8
32100		492	Marquette, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	64,634	70,887	-6,253	-8.8
38820		493	Port Angeles, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	64,525	56,464	8,061	14.3
16660		494	Charleston-Mattoon, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	64,449	62,314	2,135	3.4
30740		495	Lincolnton, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,780	50,319	13,461	26.8
28900		496	Klamath Falls, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,775	57,702	6,073	10.5
40860		497	Rutland, VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,400	62,142	1,258	2.0
34380		498	Mount Pleasant, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,351	54,624	8,727	16.0
26460		499	Hudson, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	63,094	62,982	112	0.2
24740		500	Greenville, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,977	67,935	-4,958	-7.3
24620		501	Greeneville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,909	55,853	7,056	12.6
22580		502	Forest City, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,899	56,918	5,981	10.5
18300		503	Coos Bay, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,779	60,273	2,506	4.2
42380		504	Sayre, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,761	60,967	1,794	2.9
44780		505	Sturgis, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,422	58,913	3,509	6.0
10460		506	Alamogordo, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,298	51,928	10,370	20.0
11900		507	Athens, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,223	59,549	2,674	4.5
32220		508	Marshall, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	62,110	57,483	4,627	8.0
23380		509	Fremont, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,792	61,963	-171	-0.3
26660		510	Huntsville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,758	50,917	10,841	21.3
36580		511	Oneonta, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,676	60,517	1,159	1.9
18060		512	Columbus, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,586	59,308	2,278	3.8

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
40740		513	Roswell, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,382	57,849	3,533	6.1
29580		514	Lancaster, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,351	54,516	6,835	12.5
32060		515	Marion-Herrin, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	61,296	57,733	3,563	6.2
44580		516	Sterling, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	60,653	60,186	467	0.8
12860		517	Batavia, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	60,370	60,060	310	0.5
41460		518	Salina, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,760	54,935	4,825	8.8
28820		519	Kinston, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,648	57,274	2,374	4.1
16060		520	Carbondale, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,612	61,067	-1,455	-2.4
35940		521	Norwalk, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,487	56,240	3,247	5.8
33980		522	Morehead City, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,383	52,556	6,827	13.0
34860		523	Nacogdoches, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	59,203	54,753	4,450	8.1
18940		524	Crowley, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,861	55,882	2,979	5.3
29300		525	LaGrange, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,779	55,536	3,243	5.8
45660		526	Tiffin-Fostoria, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,683	59,733	-1,050	-1.8
28180		527	Kapaa, HI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,463	51,177	7,286	14.2
17340		528	Clearlake, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,309	50,631	7,678	15.2
10620		529	Albemarle, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,100	51,765	6,335	12.2
12740		530	Barre, VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	58,039	54,928	3,111	5.7
30300		531	Lewiston, ID-WA	Metropolitan Statistical Area	57,961	51,359	6,602	12.9
40820		532	Ruston, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,906	57,450	456	0.8
21420		533	Enid, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,813	56,735	1,078	1.9
36340		534	Oil City, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,565	59,381	-1,816	-3.1
22260		535	Fergus Falls, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,159	50,714	6,445	12.7
38580		536	Point Pleasant, WV-OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	57,026	56,132	894	1.6
22060		537	Faribault-Northfield, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,665	49,183	7,482	15.2
21900		538	Fairmont, WV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,598	57,249	-651	-1.1
29380		539	Lake City, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,513	42,613	13,900	32.6
29060		540	Laconia, NH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,325	49,216	7,109	14.4
43700		541	Somerset, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,217	49,489	6,728	13.6
39780		542	Red Bluff, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	56,039	49,625	6,414	12.9
44340		543	Statesboro, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,983	43,125	12,858	29.8
23860		544	Georgetown, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,797	46,302	9,495	20.5
22100		545	Farmington, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,641	48,904	6,737	13.8
26020		546	Hobbs, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,511	55,765	-254	-0.5
12660		547	Baraboo, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,225	46,975	8,250	17.6

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
47460		548	Walla Walla, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,180	48,439	6,741	13.9
37300		549	Palestine, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,109	48,024	7,085	14.8
24100		550	Gloversville, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	55,073	54,191	882	1.6
33300		551	Milledgeville, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,776	48,438	6,338	13.1
35020		552	Natchez, MS-LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,587	56,184	-1,597	-2.8
38020		553	Phoenix Lake-Cedar Ridge, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,501	48,456	6,045	12.5
34540		554	Mount Vernon, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,500	47,473	7,027	14.8
11620		555	Ardmore, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,452	51,076	3,376	6.6
32380		556	Mason City, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	54,356	54,724	-368	-0.7
42460		557	Scottsboro, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,926	47,796	6,130	12.8
34700		558	Muscatine, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,905	51,499	2,406	4.7
10020		559	Abbeville, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,807	50,055	3,752	7.5
40100		560	Rio Grande City, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,597	40,518	13,079	32.3
34020		561	Morgan City, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,500	58,086	-4,586	-7.9
20140		562	Dublin, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,434	48,317	5,117	10.6
45540		563	The Villages, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,345	31,577	21,768	68.9
24820		564	Greenville, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,309	53,619	-310	-0.6
21020		565	Elizabeth City, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	53,150	47,649	5,501	11.5
30940		566	London, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,715	43,438	9,277	21.4
32620		567	McComb, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,539	50,210	2,329	4.6
23500		568	Gaffney, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,537	44,506	8,031	18.0
22860		569	Fort Polk South, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,531	61,961	-9,430	-15.2
11740		570	Ashland, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,523	47,507	5,016	10.6
27540		571	Jasper, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,511	49,125	3,386	6.9
16180		572	Carson City, NV	Metropolitan Statistical Area	52,457	40,443	12,014	29.7
36620		573	Ontario, OR-ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	52,193	42,472	9,721	22.9
14180		574	Blytheville, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,979	57,525	-5,546	-9.6
25340		575	Harriman, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,910	47,227	4,683	9.9
16100		576	Carlsbad-Artesia, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,658	48,605	3,053	6.3
37740		577	Payson, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,335	40,216	11,119	27.6
31660		578	Malone, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,134	46,540	4,594	9.9
48180		579	Waycross, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,119	48,799	2,320	4.8
19220		580	Danville, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,058	45,686	5,372	11.8
40300		581	Rochelle, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	51,032	45,957	5,075	11.0
15460		582	Burlington, IA-IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	50,564	50,710	-146	-0.3

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
17540		583	Clinton, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	50,149	51,040	-891	-1.7
49100		584	Winona, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,985	47,828	2,157	4.5
37380		585	Palm Coast, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,832	28,701	21,131	73.6
11220		586	Amsterdam, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,708	51,981	-2,273	-4.4
46980		587	Vicksburg, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,644	47,880	1,764	3.7
38420		588	Platteville, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,597	49,264	333	0.7
35740		589	Norfolk, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,538	46,726	2,812	6.0
20780		590	Edwards, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,471	27,935	21,536	77.1
43220		591	Shelton, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,405	38,341	11,064	28.9
28260		592	Kearney, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,141	44,076	5,065	11.5
41820		593	Sanford, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,040	41,374	7,666	18.5
11940		594	Athens, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	49,015	42,383	6,632	15.6
12780		595	Bartlesville, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,996	48,066	930	1.9
23300		596	Freeport, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,979	48,052	927	1.9
24900		597	Greenwood, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,716	46,578	2,138	4.6
34500		598	Mount Vernon, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,666	45,519	3,147	6.9
38100		599	Picayune, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,621	38,714	9,907	25.6
18660		600	Cortland, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,599	48,963	-364	-0.7
35220		601	New Castle, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,508	48,139	369	0.8
37580		602	Paris, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,499	43,949	4,550	10.4
47660		603	Warrensburg, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,258	42,514	5,744	13.5
38620		604	Ponca City, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,080	48,056	24	0.0
23980		605	Glasgow, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	48,070	42,964	5,106	11.9
43380		606	Sidney, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	47,910	44,915	2,995	6.7
24180		607	Granbury, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	47,909	34,341	13,568	39.5
36060		608	Oak Hill, WV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	47,579	47,952	-373	-0.8
20580		609	Eagle Pass, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	47,297	36,378	10,919	30.0
15340		610	Bucyrus, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,966	47,870	-904	-1.9
21220		611	Elko, NV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,942	35,077	11,865	33.8
18900		612	Crossville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,802	34,736	12,066	34.7
27380		613	Jacksonville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,659	41,049	5,610	13.7
47540		614	Wapakoneta, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,611	44,585	2,026	4.5
40460		615	Rockingham, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,564	44,518	2,046	4.6
36180		616	Ocean Pines, MD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,543	35,028	11,515	32.9
31580		617	Madisonville, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,519	46,126	393	0.9

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
30380		618	Lewistown, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,486	46,197	289	0.6
42820		619	Selma, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,365	48,130	-1,765	-3.7
28340		620	Kendallville, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,275	37,877	8,398	22.2
15860		621	Canon City, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,145	32,273	13,872	43.0
13340		622	Bellefontaine, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	46,005	42,310	3,695	8.7
14620		623	Bradford, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,936	47,131	-1,195	-2.5
13260		624	Bedford, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,922	42,836	3,086	7.2
17740		625	Coldwater, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,787	41,502	4,285	10.3
20980		626	El Dorado, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,629	46,719	-1,090	-2.3
26500		627	Huntingdon, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,586	44,164	1,422	3.2
28460		628	Keokuk-Fort Madison, IA-MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,468	46,234	-766	-1.7
38500		629	Plymouth, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,128	42,182	2,946	7.0
18620		630	Corsicana, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,124	39,926	5,198	13.0
17580		631	Clovis, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,044	42,207	2,837	6.7
20060		632	Douglas, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	45,022	35,805	9,217	25.7
15620		633	Cadillac, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,962	38,507	6,455	16.8
47820		634	Washington, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,958	42,283	2,675	6.3
19620		635	Del Rio, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,856	38,721	6,135	15.8
39860		636	Red Wing, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,127	40,690	3,437	8.4
15660		637	Calhoun, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	44,104	35,072	9,032	25.8
32540		638	McAlester, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,953	40,581	3,372	8.3
20420		639	Durango, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,941	32,284	11,657	36.1
14220		640	Bogalusa, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,926	43,185	741	1.7
47620		641	Warren, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,863	45,050	-1,187	-2.6
41220		642	St. Marys, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,664	30,167	13,497	44.7
28500		643	Kerrville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,653	36,304	7,349	20.2
20340		644	Duncan, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	43,182	42,299	883	2.1
25780		645	Henderson, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,954	38,892	4,062	10.4
44260		646	Starkville, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,902	38,375	4,527	11.8
14940		647	Brigham City, UT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,745	36,485	6,260	17.2
45620		648	Thomasville, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,737	38,986	3,751	9.6
14380		649	Boone, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,695	36,952	5,743	15.5
25460		650	Harrison, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,556	35,963	6,593	18.3
45140		651	Tahlequah, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,521	34,049	8,472	24.9
10940		652	Alma, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,285	38,982	3,303	8.5

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
27300		653	Jacksonville, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,153	42,041	112	0.3
34220		654	Moultrie, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,053	36,645	5,408	14.8
40940		655	Safford, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	42,036	34,562	7,474	21.6
33380		656	Minden, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,831	41,989	-158	-0.4
13940		657	Blackfoot, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,735	37,583	4,152	11.0
16460		658	Centralia, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,691	41,561	130	0.3
30260		659	Lewisburg, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,624	36,176	5,448	15.1
15420		660	Burley, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,590	38,893	2,697	6.9
42980		661	Seymour, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,335	37,730	3,605	9.6
23820		662	Gardnerville Ranchos, NV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,259	27,637	13,622	49.3
48820		663	Willmar, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,203	38,761	2,442	6.3
21580		664	Espanola, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,190	34,365	6,825	19.9
20900		665	El Campo, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,188	39,955	1,233	3.1
22780		666	Fort Leonard Wood, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	41,165	41,307	-142	-0.3
30900		667	Logansport, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,930	38,413	2,517	6.6
16380		668	Celina, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,924	39,443	1,481	3.8
38740		669	Poplar Bluff, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,867	38,765	2,102	5.4
15740		670	Cambridge, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,792	39,024	1,768	4.5
39420		671	Pullman, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,740	38,775	1,965	5.1
17380		672	Cleveland, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,633	41,875	-1,242	-3.0
13660		673	Big Rapids, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,553	37,308	3,245	8.7
48940		674	Wilmington, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,543	35,415	5,128	14.5
23780		675	Garden City, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,523	33,070	7,453	22.5
43460		676	Sikeston, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,422	39,376	1,046	2.7
12140		677	Auburn, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,285	35,324	4,961	14.0
22700		678	Fort Dodge, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,235	40,342	-107	-0.3
46460		679	Union City, TN-KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,202	39,988	214	0.5
34460		680	Mount Sterling, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	40,195	34,345	5,850	17.0
29980		681	Lawrenceburg, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,926	35,303	4,623	13.1
32860		682	Menomonie, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,858	35,909	3,949	11.0
29220		683	La Follette, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,854	35,079	4,775	13.6
10100		684	Aberdeen, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,827	39,936	-109	-0.3
40620		685	Rolla, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,825	35,248	4,577	13.0
38700		686	Pontiac, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,678	39,301	377	1.0
13420		687	Bemidji, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,650	34,384	5,266	15.3

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area Metropolitan Division Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population		Change 1990 to 2000	
					April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
40500		688	Rockland, ME	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,618	36,310	3,308	9.1
13620		689	Berlin, NH-VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,570	41,233	-1,663	-4.0
19580		690	Defiance, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,500	39,350	150	0.4
42740		691	Sedalia, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,403	35,437	3,966	11.2
10860		692	Alice, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,326	37,679	1,647	4.4
32260		693	Marshalltown, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,311	38,276	1,035	2.7
39940		694	Rexburg, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,286	34,611	4,675	13.5
47180		695	Vincennes, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,256	39,884	-628	-1.6
35060		696	Natchitoches, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	39,080	36,689	2,391	6.5
21380		697	Emporia, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,965	37,753	1,212	3.2
46500		698	Urbana, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,890	36,019	2,871	8.0
37060		699	Oxford, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,744	31,826	6,918	21.7
12380		700	Austin, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,603	37,385	1,218	3.3
42300		701	Sault Ste. Marie, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,543	34,604	3,939	11.4
21540		702	Escanaba, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,520	37,780	740	2.0
45700		703	Tifton, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,407	34,998	3,409	9.7
34260		704	Mountain Home, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,386	31,186	7,200	23.1
35700		705	Nogales, AZ	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,381	29,676	8,705	29.3
26340		706	Houghton, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,317	37,147	1,170	3.1
32660		707	McMinnville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,276	32,992	5,284	16.0
47500		708	Walterboro, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,264	34,377	3,887	11.3
15900		709	Canton, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,250	38,080	170	0.4
38260		710	Pittsburg, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,242	35,568	2,674	7.5
25580		711	Hastings, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,190	36,748	1,442	3.9
16340		712	Cedartown, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,127	33,815	4,312	12.8
26540		713	Huntington, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	38,075	35,427	2,648	7.5
13060		714	Bay City, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,957	36,928	1,029	2.8
25300		715	Hannibal, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,915	36,158	1,757	4.9
30820		716	Lock Haven, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,914	37,182	732	2.0
42420		717	Scottsbluff, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,770	36,877	893	2.4
15220		718	Brownwood, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,674	34,371	3,303	9.6
18820		719	Crawfordsville, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,629	34,436	3,193	9.3
40540		720	Rock Springs, WY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,613	38,823	-1,210	-3.1
43180		721	Shelbyville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,586	30,411	7,175	23.6
42780		722	Selinsgrove, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,546	36,680	866	2.4

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
37500		723	Paragould, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,331	31,804	5,527	17.4
20540		724	Dyersburg, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,279	34,854	2,425	7.0
48460		725	West Plains, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,238	31,447	5,791	18.4
35500		726	Newton, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,213	34,795	2,418	6.9
32460		727	Mayfield, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,028	33,550	3,478	10.4
13540		728	Bennington, VT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,994	35,845	1,149	3.2
11140		729	Americus, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,966	33,816	3,150	9.3
18740		730	Coshocton, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,655	35,427	1,228	3.5
38380		731	Plainview, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,602	34,671	1,931	5.6
46740		732	Valley, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,583	36,876	-293	-0.8
20460		733	Durant, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,534	32,089	4,445	13.9
23620		734	Gainesville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,363	30,777	5,586	18.1
49060		735	Winfield, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,291	36,915	-624	-1.7
17700		736	Coffeyville, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,252	38,816	-2,564	-6.6
17500		737	Clewiston, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,210	25,773	10,437	40.5
23340		738	Fremont, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,160	34,500	1,660	4.8
35140		739	Newberry, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,108	33,172	2,936	8.9
37940		740	Peru, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,082	36,897	-815	-2.2
19940		741	Dixon, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,062	34,392	1,670	4.9
36900		742	Ottumwa, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	36,051	35,687	364	1.0
29900		743	Laurinburg, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,998	33,754	2,244	6.6
35820		744	North Platte, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,939	33,932	2,007	5.9
36380		745	Okeechobee, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,910	29,627	6,283	21.2
18460		746	Cornelia, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,902	27,621	8,281	30.0
18340		747	Corbin, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,865	33,326	2,539	7.6
40180		748	Riverton, WY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,804	33,662	2,142	6.4
11820		749	Astoria, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,630	33,301	2,329	7.0
45380		750	Taylorville, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,372	34,418	954	2.8
10220		751	Ada, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,143	34,119	1,024	3.0
41260		752	St. Marys, PA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,112	34,878	234	0.7
47340		753	Wabash, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,960	35,069	-109	-0.3
34140		754	Moscow, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,935	30,617	4,318	14.1
26780		755	Hutchinson, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,898	32,030	2,868	9.0
15580		756	Butte-Silver Bow, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,606	33,941	665	2.0
18420		757	Corinth, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,558	31,722	2,836	8.9

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
15780		758	Camden, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,534	36,400	-1,866	-5.1
26940		759	Indianola, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,369	32,867	1,502	4.6
20820		760	Effingham, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,264	31,704	2,560	8.1
12900		761	Batesville, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,233	31,192	3,041	9.7
34660		762	Murray, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,177	30,735	3,442	11.2
16900		763	Chester, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	34,068	32,170	1,898	5.9
23140		764	Frankfort, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,866	30,974	2,892	9.3
20660		765	Easton, MD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,812	30,549	3,263	10.7
16260		766	Cedar City, UT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,779	20,789	12,990	62.5
23940		767	Gillette, WY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,698	29,370	4,328	14.7
36940		768	Owatonna, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,680	30,729	2,951	9.6
33820		769	Monroe, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,647	30,339	3,308	10.9
13700		770	Big Spring, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,627	32,343	1,284	4.0
19540		771	Decatur, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,625	31,095	2,530	8.1
35460		772	Newport, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,565	29,141	4,424	15.2
26260		773	Hope, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,542	31,722	1,820	5.7
33940		774	Montrose, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,432	24,423	9,009	36.9
21260		775	Ellensburg, WA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,362	26,725	6,637	24.8
42900		776	Seneca Falls, NY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,342	33,683	-341	-1.0
11420		777	Angola, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,214	27,446	5,768	21.0
33060		778	Miami, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,194	30,561	2,633	8.6
15020		779	Brookhaven, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,166	30,278	2,888	9.5
28380		780	Kennett, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,155	33,112	43	0.1
44500		781	Stephenville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	33,001	27,991	5,010	17.9
19760		782	De Ridder, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,986	30,083	2,903	9.6
31380		783	Macomb, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,913	35,244	-2,331	-6.6
10820		784	Alexandria, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,821	28,674	4,147	14.5
10660		785	Albert Lea, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,584	33,060	-476	-1.4
27020		786	Iron Mountain, MI-WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,560	31,421	1,139	3.6
30060		787	Lebanon, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,513	27,158	5,355	19.7
37220		788	Pahrump, NV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,485	17,781	14,704	82.7
19980		789	Dodge City, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,458	27,463	4,995	18.2
13300		790	Beeville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,359	25,135	7,224	28.7
11580		791	Arcadia, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,209	23,865	8,344	35.0
29660		792	Laramie, WY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	32,014	30,797	1,217	4.0

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
28780		793	Kingsville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,963	30,734	1,229	4.0
44860		794	Sulphur Springs, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,960	28,833	3,127	10.8
16420		795	Central City, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,839	31,318	521	1.7
31500		796	Madison, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,705	29,797	1,908	6.4
18100		797	Columbus, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,662	29,820	1,842	6.2
47980		798	Watertown, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,437	27,672	3,765	13.6
27660		799	Jennings, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,435	30,722	713	2.3
10980		800	Alpena, MI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,314	30,605	709	2.3
30660		801	Lincoln, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,183	30,798	385	1.3
37540		802	Paris, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,115	27,888	3,227	11.6
12820		803	Bastrop, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,021	31,938	-917	-2.9
43500		804	Silver City, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	31,002	27,676	3,326	12.0
32500		805	Maysville, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,892	29,695	1,197	4.0
19900		806	Dillon, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,722	29,114	1,608	5.5
27940		807	Juneau, AK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,711	26,751	3,960	14.8
15700		808	Cambridge, MD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,674	30,236	438	1.4
17260		809	Clarksdale, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,622	31,665	-1,043	-3.3
14780		810	Brenham, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,373	26,154	4,219	16.1
29780		811	Las Vegas, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,126	25,743	4,383	17.0
33180		812	Middlesborough, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	30,060	31,506	-1,446	-4.6
45340		813	Taos, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,979	23,118	6,861	29.7
28620		814	Kill Devil Hills, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,967	22,746	7,221	31.7
46420		815	Union, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,881	30,337	-456	-1.5
47780		816	Washington, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,820	27,533	2,287	8.3
46780		817	Van Wert, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,659	30,464	-805	-2.6
32980		818	Merrill, WI	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,641	26,993	2,648	9.8
45980		819	Troy, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,605	27,595	2,010	7.3
32700		820	McPherson, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,554	27,268	2,286	8.4
14820		821	Brevard, NC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,334	25,520	3,814	14.9
22620		822	Forrest City, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,329	28,497	832	2.9
28860		823	Kirksville, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,147	28,813	334	1.2
34300		824	Mountain Home, ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	29,130	21,205	7,925	37.4
13500		825	Bennettsville, SC	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,818	29,361	-543	-1.8
11060		826	Altus, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,439	28,764	-325	-1.1
47860		827	Washington, OH	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,433	27,466	967	3.5

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
12460		828	Bainbridge, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,240	25,511	2,729	10.7
15100		829	Brookings, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,220	25,207	3,013	12.0
24460		830	Great Bend, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,205	29,382	-1,177	-4.0
49540		831	Yazoo City, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,149	25,506	2,643	10.4
34420		832	Mount Pleasant, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	28,118	24,009	4,109	17.1
45580		833	Thomaston, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,597	26,300	1,297	4.9
35860		834	North Vernon, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,554	23,661	3,893	16.5
18860		835	Crescent City North, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,507	23,460	4,047	17.3
25700		836	Hays, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,507	26,004	1,503	5.8
22340		837	Fitzgerald, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,415	24,894	2,521	10.1
22820		838	Fort Morgan, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,171	21,939	5,232	23.8
33420		839	Mineral Wells, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	27,026	25,055	1,971	7.9
48100		840	Wauchula, FL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,938	19,499	7,439	38.2
35580		841	New Ulm, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,911	26,984	-73	-0.3
25380		842	Harrisburg, IL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,733	26,551	182	0.7
27700		843	Jesup, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,565	22,356	4,209	18.8
43260		844	Sheridan, WY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,560	23,562	2,998	12.7
30420		845	Lexington, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,508	21,868	4,640	21.2
48340		846	West Helena, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,445	28,838	-2,393	-8.3
14340		847	Boone, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	26,224	25,186	1,038	4.1
46620		848	Uvalde, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,926	23,340	2,586	11.1
33020		849	Mexico, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,853	23,599	2,254	9.6
31620		850	Magnolia, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,603	25,691	-88	-0.3
24380		851	Grants, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,595	23,794	1,801	7.6
18220		852	Connersville, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,588	26,015	-427	-1.6
44900		853	Summerville, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,470	22,242	3,228	14.5
45740		854	Toccoa, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,435	23,257	2,178	9.4
32140		855	Marshall, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,425	24,789	636	2.6
46860		856	Vernal, UT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,224	22,211	3,013	13.6
47420		857	Wahpeton, ND-MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,136	25,664	-528	-2.1
19700		858	Deming, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	25,016	18,110	6,906	38.1
33620		859	Moberly, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	24,663	24,370	293	1.2
24700		860	Greensburg, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	24,555	23,645	910	3.8
29260		861	La Grande, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	24,530	23,598	932	3.9
27220		862	Jackson, WY-ID	Micropolitan Statistical Area	24,250	14,611	9,639	66.0

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
46260		863	Tuskegee, AL	Micropolitan Statistical Area	24,105	24,928	-823	-3.3
21980		864	Fallon, NV	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,982	17,938	6,044	33.7
14420		865	Borger, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,857	25,689	-1,832	-7.1
17180		866	City of The Dalles, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,791	21,683	2,108	9.7
32180		867	Marshall, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,756	23,523	233	1.0
22980		868	Fort Valley, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,668	21,189	2,479	11.7
37420		869	Pampa, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,631	24,992	-1,361	-5.4
43540		870	Silverthorne, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,548	12,881	10,667	82.8
11660		871	Arkadelphia, AR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,546	21,437	2,109	9.8
19860		872	Dickinson, ND	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,524	23,940	-416	-1.7
38200		873	Pierre Part, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,388	22,753	635	2.8
24980		874	Grenada, MS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	23,263	21,555	1,708	7.9
13100		875	Beatrice, NE	Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,993	22,794	199	0.9
42500		876	Scottsburg, IN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,960	20,991	1,969	9.4
15820		877	Campbellsville, KY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,927	21,146	1,781	8.4
37660		878	Parsons, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,835	23,693	-858	-3.6
30220		879	Levelland, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,716	24,199	-1,483	-6.1
30580		880	Liberal, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,510	18,743	3,767	20.1
36820		881	Oskaloosa, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	22,335	21,522	813	3.8
18380		882	Cordele, GA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,996	20,011	1,985	9.9
32340		883	Maryville, MO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,912	21,709	203	0.9
27420		884	Jamestown, ND	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,908	22,241	-333	-1.5
33580		885	Mitchell, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,880	20,497	1,383	6.7
21860		886	Fairmont, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,802	22,914	-1,112	-4.9
43940		887	Spearfish, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,802	20,655	1,147	5.6
49460		888	Yankton, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,652	19,252	2,400	12.5
15060		889	Brookings, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,137	19,327	1,810	9.4
49380		890	Worthington, MN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,832	20,098	734	3.7
44540		891	Sterling, CO	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,504	17,567	2,937	16.7
39220		892	Price, UT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,422	20,228	194	1.0
26220		893	Hood River, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,411	16,903	3,508	20.8
44740		894	Storm Lake, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,411	19,965	446	2.2
20300		895	Dumas, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,121	17,865	2,256	12.6
25100		896	Guymon, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,107	16,419	3,688	22.5
39700		897	Raymondville, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	20,082	17,705	2,377	13.4

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area / Metropolitan Division / Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population April 1, 2000	Population April 1, 1990	Change 1990 to 2000 Number	Change 1990 to 2000 Percent
15140		898	Brownsville, TN	Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,797	19,437	360	1.9
48780		899	Williston, ND	Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,761	21,129	-1,368	-6.5
21740		900	Evanston, WY	Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,742	18,705	1,037	5.5
38180		901	Pierre, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,253	17,270	1,983	11.5
39260		902	Prineville, OR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,182	14,111	5,071	35.9
25820		903	Hereford, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	18,561	19,153	-592	-3.1
49260		904	Woodward, OK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	18,486	18,976	-490	-2.6
31060		905	Los Alamos, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	18,343	18,115	228	1.3
38780		906	Portales, NM	Micropolitan Statistical Area	18,018	16,702	1,316	7.9
13860		907	Bishop, CA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	17,945	18,281	-336	-1.8
43980		908	Spencer, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	17,372	17,585	-213	-1.2
26700		909	Huron, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	17,023	18,253	-1,230	-6.7
11860		910	Atchison, KS	Micropolitan Statistical Area	16,774	16,932	-158	-0.9
25660		911	Havre, MT	Micropolitan Statistical Area	16,673	17,654	-981	-5.6
44020		912	Spirit Lake, IA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	16,424	14,909	1,515	10.2
43660		913	Snyder, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	16,361	18,634	-2,273	-12.2
45020		914	Sweetwater, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	15,802	16,594	-792	-4.8
29500		915	Lamesa, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	14,985	14,349	636	4.4
46900		916	Vernon, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	14,676	15,121	-445	-2.9
28540		917	Ketchikan, AK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	14,070	13,828	242	1.8
28980		918	Kodiak, AK	Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,913	13,309	604	4.5
45260		919	Tallulah, LA	Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,728	12,463	1,265	10.2
46820		920	Vermillion, SD	Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,537	13,186	351	2.7
37780		921	Pecos, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,137	15,852	-2,715	-17.1
11380		922	Andrews, TX	Micropolitan Statistical Area	13,004	14,338	-1,334	-9.3

Metro/ Micro Area Code	Metro Div. Code	2000 Pop. Rank	Metropolitan Statistical Area Metropolitan Division Micropolitan Statistical Area	Legal/Statistical Area Description	Population		Change 1990 to 2000	
					April 1, 2000	April 1, 1990	Number	Percent
			Puerto Rico					
41980		1	San Juan-Caguas-Guaynabo, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	2,509,007	2,322,271	186,736	8.0
10380		2	Aguadilla-Isabela-San Sebastián, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	312,602	272,580	40,022	14.7
38660		3	Ponce, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	264,919	256,506	8,413	3.3
41900		4	San Germán-Cabo Rojo, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	136,212	119,597	16,615	13.9
49500		5	Yauco, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	118,063	106,138	11,925	11.2
32420		6	Mayagüez, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	115,048	115,583	-535	-0.5
25020		7	Guayama, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	83,570	80,131	3,439	4.3
21940		8	Fajardo, PR	Metropolitan Statistical Area	78,533	72,127	6,406	8.9
17620		9	Coamo, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	37,597	33,837	3,760	11.1
46580		10	Utuado, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	35,336	34,980	356	1.0
42180		11	Santa Isabel, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	21,665	19,318	2,347	12.1
10260		12	Adjuntas, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	19,143	19,451	-308	-1.6
27580		13	Jayuya, PR	Micropolitan Statistical Area	17,318	15,527	1,791	11.5

[1] Broomfield County, CO was formed from parts of Adams, Boulder, Jefferson, and Weld Counties, CO on November 15, 2001 and is coextensive with Broomfield city. For purposes of defining and presenting data for metropolitan statistical areas, Broomfield city is treated as if it were a county at the time of the 1990 and 2000 censuses.

[2] Title changed subsequent to the June 6, 2003 Office of Management and Budget Definition.

[3] Title and code changed subsequent to the June 6, 2003 Office of Management and Budget Definition.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Michelle A. Bynum, hereby certify that on this 11th day of August, 2005 I served the foregoing "Consolidated Opposition and Comments to Petitions for Reconsideration" by depositing true copies thereof with the United States Postal Service, first class postage pre-paid and addressed to the following:

Mark E. Crosby
Enterprise Wireless Alliance
8484 Westpark Drive, Suite 630
Mclean, VA 22102

Elizabeth R. Sachs
Lukas, Nace, Gutierrez & Sachs, Chartered
1650 Tysons Blvd., Suite 1500
McLean, VA 22102

Mitch Vine
Redline Communications Inc.
302 Town Center Blvd.
Markham, ON, Canada, L3R 0E8

Jon Herzog
Goodwin Procter LLP
Exchange Place
Boston, MA 02109

Ronald E. Quirk Jr.
Venable LLP
575 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Steve B. Sharkey
Robert D. Kubik
Motorola, Inc.
1350 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

David Cavossa
Satellite Industry Association
1730 M Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036

Marjorie J. Dickman
Intel Corporation
1634 I Street NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006

Margaret LaBrecque
WiMAX Forum
3231-C Business Park Drive, #131
Vista, CA 92081

Marlon K. Schafer
Wireless Internet Service Provider's Association
Box 489
Odessa, WA 99159

/s/ Michelle A. Bynum
Michelle A. Bynum