Cluster Analysis of Utah's Cities and Towns
The mission of the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) has changed little since 1907. For one hundred years, ULCT has provided a strong, unified advocacy voice for Utah’s municipalities. In addition, a key purpose for ULCT is to present information and research regarding demographic and economic trends that potentially impact municipal public policy. Often this analysis requires grouping or clustering of cities. It is challenging to determine which variables should direct this grouping. Often grouping is dictated solely by population size or regional location. However, this surface grouping misses some of the more telling city dynamics. In an attempt to find a more accurate grouping, ULCT, in partnership with the Brigham Young University Romney Institute of Management, University of Utah Center for Public Policy & Administration (CPPA) and Utah State University, have clustered cities together based on demographic, financial, and economic characteristics.¹

**How is clustering useful?**

The clustering or grouping of cities provides a number of useful opportunities. First, this grouping will fine-tune fiscal policy analysis. For example, often ULCT is asked to identify the fiscal health of Utah’s municipalities. The diversity of cities makes it virtually impossible to aggregate the financial health. For instance, the financial health of Utah’s cities varies based on the differing levels of property and sales tax dependence. However, a grouping of cities helps pinpoint what factors are contributing to the financial state for a number of cities that share a similar makeup. Thus, this clustering will enhance our understanding of tax dependency in different cities, and likewise our understanding of what implications this dependency creates.

Second, clustering will improve attempts to identify demographic or economic trends. Demographic changes affect Utah statewide, but this changing burden, or benefit, does not individually impact communities the same way. Identifying a number of descriptive characteristics for groups of cities will improve the policymaking discussion as we evaluate legislation that impacts a variety of policy issues. One size fits all policy solutions rarely work for Utah cities and the clustering will improve our ability to anticipate what policies will best suit different types of cities.

¹ The cluster analysis approach is similar to the methodology applied by the League of Minnesota Cities and the Washington Association of Cities. For more detail on the specific methodology or cluster outcomes for these states please visit these websites:

Minnesota: http://www.lmnc.org/pdfs/ClusteringMinnesotaCities0803.pdf
Washington: http://www.awcnet.org/stateofthecities/soc05/cluster_profiles.htm
Third, the clustering of cities lends itself to natural benchmarking or comparison partners. One benefit of clustering is bridging geographic and population divides. As shown in the 12 identified clusters (with the exception of Salt Lake City), cities cluster from various regions of the state. Cities and towns will often be better served comparing their services with cluster neighbors, rather than geographic neighbors. This clustering may also provide a unifying effect by tying communities together that previously saw little in common.

**The variables used for clustering are:**

- 2005 population
- Percent population change 2000-2005
- Household median income (2000 Census data)
- 2003 Primary residential land value
  - Per capita residential land value
- 2003 Commercial and industrial land value
  - Per capita commercial and industrial land value
- 2003 Property tax revenue
  - Per capita property tax revenue
- 2003 Sales tax revenue
  - Per capita sales tax revenue

**Why these variables?**

ULCT selected these variables in order to paint a demographic, fiscal, and economic picture for each city. Population is a key variable in determining size of city and overall potential services needed. Population change is an important variable indicating the changing character of a community and likewise the changing role of municipal government. Household median income indicates the economic nature of the community, as well as potential ability for residents to pay taxes. Residential land value and commercial land value are included in the analysis to differentiate the core makeup of the community -- commercial versus residential composition. These variables are also considered on a per capita basis. Finally, to frame the fiscal picture, 2005 property and sales tax revenue (two of three primary municipal tax revenue sources) are included for each city. Similar to the residential and commercial property values, the tax revenue data indicates the economic character of each community.

**Cluster Analysis**

The purpose of statistical clustering determines common traits across a variety of factors. This SPSS analysis grouped each city and town with like communities, within the framework of twelve distinct clusters. Salt Lake City remained the only outlying city not clustering with any like cities. This city stands alone as cluster L or simply as the Capital City. Of the twelve clusters, seven share a dominant urban dynamic, while the other five are primarily rural. Many of these clusters, both within the urban and rural description, cross geographical boundaries.

The figure below indicates the list of clusters falling within a larger categorization of urban and rural. However, this categorization cannot be limited to on or off the Wasatch Front. The high levels of population growth off the Wasatch Front are changing the urban structure of Utah. For example, a recent US Census Bureau report rated St. George City as the fastest growing metro area in the United States from April 2000 to July 2006.2

---

2 U.S. Census Bureau, April 2007.
What are the clusters?

A. **Major Population Centers** (10 Cities)
   These cities represent major economic and residential communities. These communities are older, established cities and together represent 30% of the entire state population. These cities have a much larger population density compared to the other clusters. The economies in these cities are diversified, offering a range of service-oriented professional jobs to manufacturing employment. In addition, most of these cities function as large retail hubs. Higher education institutions are also a unique economic factor shared by many of these cities.

B. **Commercial Centers** (17 Cities)
   The commercial property per capita ($6,133) in these cities is second only to the major city cluster. These cities are diversified cities that have a larger population and function as both residential and commercial centers for their surrounding region. Many of these are communities are growing at a modest rate. These cities largely have older established downtowns that have provided retail opportunities to neighboring communities for years.

C. **High Growth Communities** (10 Cities)
   The incredible rate of growth from 2000 to 2005 is the primary variable linking these communities together. The overall household median income for these cities is also relatively high. Most of these high growth communities are newly incorporated cities that have changed dramatically in a short period of time. The economy in these cities varies significantly, however most have very low commercial sales and sales tax revenue.

D. **Residential Transitioning Communities** (33 Cities)
   Low commercial property along with relatively high residential property value per capita cluster these communities together. Many of the residents of these communities commute to larger neighboring
cities. Traditionally these cities have a rural or agricultural heritage; however many in this cluster are now transitioning into urban outskirt communities with growing populations and moderately increasing commercial property.

E. **High Income Residential** (20 Cities)
These communities represent the highest median household incomes in the state of Utah. The income level, along with residential property tax value, are the two most significant variables tying these cities together. Most of these residents commute to a neighboring major city. Geographically this cluster is unique because of the Wasatch Front dominance, each city in this group except Oakley are along the Wasatch Front.

F. **Urban Edge Cities** (12 Cities)
This group represents a wide variance along most of the clustering variables. However, the one consistent factor is the close geographic proximity each of these cities share with a larger central city. This cluster is distinctive from the other clusters due to its high commercial and industrial property value, along with high sales tax revenue per capita. Overall these cities have a moderate population size and have experienced moderate growth since 2000. On average these communities have very low square mile land area and high population density.

G. **Resort Communities** (6 Cities)
These communities are identified by unique geographic location, proximity to either mountain ski resorts or National/State parks. These communities are all relatively small in population, but serve a much larger daytime population especially during heightened tourist seasons. Each of these communities currently assesses an additional 1.0% resort community sales tax. The cities in this cluster are grouped together for two primary reasons: high commercial and industrial property value and sales tax revenue per capita.

H. **Natural Resource/Mining Based Communities** (26 Cities)
Many of these communities are located across central Utah. In addition, these cities and towns have an economic history steeped in a mining or natural resource based industry. Overall these cities are smaller in population with stagnant population growth (overall average growth from 2000 to 2005 is 1.5%). These communities still have moderate commercial and industrial property value. Additionally, many share incorporation dates during WWI era when mining was critical to the Utah economy.

I. **Old Established Communities** (19 Cities)
One common characteristic tying together these cities and towns is their historic nature. The “youngest” community (Lewiston) in this cluster incorporated in 1921. A majority of these communities are also located in central Utah. Most of these communities experienced a slight decline in population between 2000 and 2005.

J. **Traditional Agricultural** (30 Cities)
This cluster represents the most geographically diverse grouping, ranging from cities in Iron or Washington County to Box Elder and Cache County. This cluster is unique from the other rural clusters due to their increasing populations. Unlike the old established communities (of similar size) these cities grew by an average of 11% from 2000 to 2005. Most of these cities are towns are traditional agricultural communities that are transitioning more toward a residential makeup. Many residents in these communities rely less on the agricultural economy, but are commuting to a neighboring economic or commercial center.
K. Small Towns (61 Cities)
These towns represent the unique and diverse small towns in Utah. Many of these towns are located in either Western or Central Utah. These towns have very little commercial and industrial property, representing the smallest per capita commercial land in the state. The population in these towns is stable -- either reporting slight decline or increase in the past five years.

L. Capital City (1 City)
Salt Lake City is the capital and most populated city in Utah. Salt Lake City is the economic headquarters for the Wasatch Front, providing a balance of industrial, service-oriented, professional, and business industries. Salt Lake City, known as the “Crossroads of the West” is also a key transportation hub for the state of Utah and the larger western Rocky Mountain region. For these reasons, Salt Lake City is an outlier that does not cluster with any other city.

Table 1: Description of each cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of Cities</th>
<th>Example City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Major Population Cities</td>
<td>Largest population base, minimal growth, established communities, large commercial centers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provo, St. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Commercial Centers</td>
<td>Larger population, significant commercial and industrial regional centers, growing communities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cedar City, Logan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C High Growth Communities</td>
<td>Communities with highest growth rates, high household income, low commercial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cedar Hills, Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Residential Transitioning</td>
<td>Modest commercial property, increasing growth, many transitioning communities</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Providence, Midway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E High Income Residential</td>
<td>Highest median household income, moderate growth, low commercial</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Farmington, Bountiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Edge Cities</td>
<td>High per capita commercial and industrial property, moderate population size and population growth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>North Logan, South Ogden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Resort Communities</td>
<td>Low population, high commercial property, high per capita revenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Park City, Alta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H NR/Mining Based</td>
<td>Older, low growth rural communities, small commercial property</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Duchesne, Castle Dale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Old Established Communities</td>
<td>Older communities, low or declining population, some commercial component</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Escalante, Manti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Traditional Agricultural</td>
<td>Traditional agricultural communities, primarily residential with increasing population, some growing commercial element</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hyrum, Fillmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Small Towns</td>
<td>Smallest population, older established communities with low or declining growth, low commercial property</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Hatch, Scofield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Capital City</td>
<td>Economic center of the state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics

Understanding demographic trends is essential to both policymaking and policy review. The demographics of Utah are especially unique compared to national averages. Utah currently has the highest fertility rate and the highest household size in the nation.\(^3\) In addition, Utah has the lowest median age, but maintains the third highest life expectancy in the nation.\(^4\) Utah overall is unique from the national average; however, there is significant demographic diversity locally. For example, table 2 indicates that some cities in Utah have nearly twice the population percentage of residents over the age of 64. This demographic diversity has implications to both municipal finance and services. In addition, due to the aging baby boomers and increasing life expectancy, the over 64 population is becoming a more significant percentage of the state’s population. The aging boom is creating new challenges and opportunities for municipal government. The Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget predicts that by 2040 Utah’s over 65 dependency ratio will double. This increase will be felt statewide, but will impact individual cities differently.

Table 2: Cluster Population Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER TYPE</th>
<th>Incorporation Data</th>
<th>Population % Growth 00-05</th>
<th>% Population under 5-17</th>
<th>% Population over 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cities</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Centers</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Growth</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>194.4%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Transitioning</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Edge Cities</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Communities</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR/Mining Based</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Established</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Ag.</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 U.S. Census Bureau; 2005 Population estimates Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget

In 2006, Utah’s population grew by 2.7% or by an increase of 67,000 new Utahns. The above table indicates the types of cities that are absorbing most of this growth. Projections indicate that Utah’s population will continue to grow at near the same rate or higher. The population growth has largely occurred in booming suburbs, or ‘boomburbs’, where cities have grown by incredible portions in a short period of time. Most of these booming areas transition from once farmland to incredible residential neighborhoods.

---

\(^3\) 2007 Economic Report to the Governor (ERG). Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget.

\(^4\) 2007 ERG.
Economy

It is difficult to capture the economy of a city through a single variable. Often the economic industries are varied and complicated to quantify. However, a simple variable is overall commercial and industrial property value within a city. This number provides a general representation of the city’s economy, without getting to the details of what type of services or professions occupy the commercial property. In addition, to the commercial and industrial land value sales tax revenue data indicates the amount of retail available in a city. See table 3 for the cluster averages across these variables.

Table 3: Economic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER TYPE</th>
<th>Commercial and Industrial Property</th>
<th>Commercial and Industrial Per Capita</th>
<th>Sales Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Sales Tax Revenue Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cities</td>
<td>$912,407,721</td>
<td>$11,773</td>
<td>$12,727,315</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Centers</td>
<td>$249,280,237</td>
<td>$10,599</td>
<td>$3,617,223</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Growth</td>
<td>$48,257,016</td>
<td>$5,187</td>
<td>$1,146,280</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Transitioning</td>
<td>$7,880,196</td>
<td>$4,120</td>
<td>$211,389</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>$82,195,543</td>
<td>$3,732</td>
<td>$1,544,002</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Cities</td>
<td>$95,738,690</td>
<td>$13,959</td>
<td>$1,445,081</td>
<td>$256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City</td>
<td>$5,395,609,980</td>
<td>$30,296</td>
<td>$42,756,404</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Communities</td>
<td>$76,569,265</td>
<td>$39,036</td>
<td>$1,065,027</td>
<td>$786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR/Mining Based</td>
<td>$9,680,462</td>
<td>$3,623</td>
<td>$271,195</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Established</td>
<td>$6,947,705</td>
<td>$2,619</td>
<td>$239,020</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Ag.</td>
<td>$10,819,791</td>
<td>$5,018</td>
<td>$265,215</td>
<td>$111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>$2,149,349</td>
<td>$9,342</td>
<td>$31,033</td>
<td>$116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>$574,794,663</td>
<td>$11,609</td>
<td>$5,443,265</td>
<td>$198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Tax Commission, Utah League of Cities and Towns, Utah State Auditor

The overall economy of Utah has been incredibly strong the last three years. The strength of this economy is not limited to one industry or one region. In 2006, job growth in Utah was at 5.2%, the highest rate since the mid 1990s. Financial activities and professional or business services continue to lead all industries as a percent of gross domestic product. Around one third of the state GDP is a result of financial activity or professional service industries.

Total construction value reached an all-time high statewide in 2006. In addition, mining and natural gas related jobs increased by 18.0% in 2006. Cash receipts from agricultural production also continue to increase. Agriculture cash receipts increased by 5.7% from 2004 to 2005 and economic forecasts predict continued growth. Tourism, another key economic industry to many communities, increased in 2006. Total spending by travelers and tourists increased to $5.8 million in 2006, a 7.7% increase from 2005. All of these industries have strengthened state and municipal government.

---

5 2007 ERG.
6 Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis
Residential

The residential makeup of a city is also significant in determining city types. Cities often balance the priorities of open space, affordable housing, and new development. Residential property indicates the character of community. The clustering analysis considered primary residential land and building value for each city. This analysis also considered the residential property value per capita for each community. Property tax revenue for 2005, aggregate and per capita, shapes the land and residential features of a city. This property tax number indicates both the residential and commercial value component. Salt Lake City and resort communities are especially high along these variables. Residential transitioning and traditional agricultural communities are the lowest per capita property tax generating cities. The natural resource/mining based communities have the lowest residential property value among the clusters.

Table 4: Residential Property Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER TYPE</th>
<th>Primary Residential Property Value</th>
<th>Property Value Per Capita</th>
<th>Property Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Property Tax Revenue Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cities</td>
<td>$1,743,796,191</td>
<td>$22,287</td>
<td>$6,094,930</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Centers</td>
<td>$435,554,653</td>
<td>$17,853</td>
<td>$1,548,705</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Growth</td>
<td>$232,982,487</td>
<td>$22,201</td>
<td>$559,125</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Transitioning</td>
<td>$52,589,283</td>
<td>$24,284</td>
<td>$108,293</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>$416,325,016</td>
<td>$29,481</td>
<td>$1,012,286</td>
<td>$64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Cities</td>
<td>$163,504,271</td>
<td>$21,605</td>
<td>$493,664</td>
<td>$58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City</td>
<td>$5,055,390,082</td>
<td>$28,386</td>
<td>$61,511,360</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Communities</td>
<td>$155,049,925</td>
<td>$43,308</td>
<td>$1,255,870</td>
<td>$671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR/Mining Based</td>
<td>$21,981,073</td>
<td>$11,567</td>
<td>$105,694</td>
<td>$53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Established</td>
<td>$30,400,517</td>
<td>$17,404</td>
<td>$117,222</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Ag.</td>
<td>$40,388,453</td>
<td>$16,029</td>
<td>$125,289</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>$4,275,562</td>
<td>$15,140</td>
<td>$16,643</td>
<td>$205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>$696,019,793</td>
<td>$22,462</td>
<td>$6,037,964</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Tax Commission, Utah League of Cities and Towns, Utah State Auditor

Residential properties accounted for nearly 70% of all new construction statewide. In 2006, construction activity for residential properties reached an all-time high of $5.1 billion, a 9.4% increase from 2005.\(^7\) Residential homes are often divided into two groups: single family units and multifamily units. Single family units continue to make up most of the new residential development, outnumbering new multifamily units 3.6 to 1 (20,500 to 5,700).\(^8\) Sixty percent of all new residential growth occurred in Salt Lake, Utah, and Washington County. In 2006, the cities leading the way in new single family home construction were Lehi (1,649 new homes), South Jordan (1,088), St. George (1,078), Eagle Mountain (893), and Riverton (716).\(^9\) Affordable housing is becoming an increasingly important issue for municipal government. This issue is

---

\(^7\) Source: University of Utah, David Eccles School of Business, Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR)

\(^8\) Source: 2007 Economic Report to the Governor, pg. 159.

\(^9\) BEBR Construction Information Database
especially significant in the Wasatch Front, where a once under-valued real estate market is beginning to catch-up in appreciation.

Summary
Each city and town in Utah is unique and diverse. The unique character of our cities is what makes Utah a great place to live. This high quality of life in Utah largely depends on the strength of statewide municipal government. No cluster or grouping is perfect. This ULCT analysis groups cities based on common characteristics across all variables, yet there are still some outliers within clusters. However, each of these clusters provides an interesting picture of city types in Utah. This picture is helpful in determining demographic and economic statewide trends. Primarily this clustering increases the ability to evaluate potential policy implications through a better understanding of common city compositions.

Methodology
The analytical methodology employed for this is a two-way cluster analysis in SPSS. Individual city name operated as the categorical variable. A predetermined set of clusters was specifically fixed at 12, after a trial run of 8 and 15 cluster analyses. The eleven used variables were standardized, none were weighted. The SPSS output provided a descriptive by cluster, cluster frequencies, and created a new cluster membership variables. Salt Lake City is the only Utah city that operated as a complete outlier and did not cluster with any other cities. ULCT staff reviewed cluster memberships and identified additional outliers within clusters. A small number of outlying cities were moved to a new cluster membership that appeared to represent a more broad and consistent grouping (this occurred for Springdale, Panguitch, Moab, and Vernal).
## Appendix A:

### CLUSTER A: Major Cities
- Layton
- Murray
- Ogden
- Orem
- Provo
- Sandy
- St. George
- Taylorsville
- West Jordan
- West Valley City

### CLUSTER B: Commercial Centers
- American Fork
- Brigham City
- Cedar City
- Clearfield City
- Hurricane
- Lehi
- Logan
- Midvale
- Payson
- Pleasant Grove
- Roy
- South Salt Lake
- Spanish Fork
- Springville
- Tooele
- Vernal
- Washington

### CLUSTER C: High Growth Communities
- Cedar Hills
- Centerville
- Clinton
- Eagle Mountain
- Harrisville
- Herriman
- Lindon
- Saratoga Springs
- Syracuse
- West Haven

### CLUSTER D: Residential Transitioning
- Amalga
- Bear River

### CLUSTER E: High Income Residential
- Alpine
- Bluffdale
- Bountiful
- Cottonwood Heights
- Draper
- Elk Ridge
- Farmington
- Fruit Heights
- Highland
- Holladay
- Hooper
- Kaysville
- Mapleton
- North Ogden
- Oakley

### CLUSTER F: Urban Edge Cities
- Farr West
- Heber City
- Marriott-Slaterville
- Naples
- North Logan
- North Salt Lake
- Riverdale
- Smithfield
- South Ogden
- Tremonton
- Washington Terrace
- Woods Cross

### CLUSTER G: Resort Communities
- Alta
- Brian Head
- Moab
- Panguitch
- Park City
- Springdale

### CLUSTER H: Natural Resource/Mining Based
- Blanding
- Castle Dale
- Cleveland
- Duchesne
- East Carbon
- Enterprise
- Eureka
- Ferron
- Gunnison
- Helper
- Hildale
- Hinckley
- Huntington
- Levan
- Minersville
- Monticello
- Myton
- Oak City
Orangeville  
Price  
Roosevelt  
Spring City  
Wellington  
Wendover  

**CLUSTER I: Old Established Communities**  
Annabellla  
Aurora  
Centerfield  
Clarkston  
Elsinore  
Escalante  
Fairview  
Fountain Green  
Garland  
Lewiston  
Manti  
Monroe  
Moroni  
Mt. Pleasant  
Newton  
Parowan  
Parowan  
Richfield  
Richmond  
Salina  

**CLUSTER J: Traditional Agricultural**  
Ballard  
Beaver  
Coalville  
Corinne  
Delta  
Enoch  
Ephraim  
Fillmore  
Genola  

Goshen  
Grantsville  
Green River  
Henefer  
Honeyville  
Hyrum  
Kamas  
Kanab  
La Verkin  
Milford  
Mona  
Nephi  
Nibley  
Orderville  
Redmond  
Rush Valley  
Santaquin  
Toquerville  

**CLUSTER K: Small Towns**  
Altamont  
Alton  
Antimony  
Bicknell  
Big Water  
Boulder  
Cannonville  
Castle Valley  
Circleville  
Clawson  
Cornish  
Elmo  
Emery  
Fayette  
Fielding  
Glendale  
Glenwood  
Hanksville  
Hatch  
Henrieville  
Holden  
Howell  
Joseph  
Junction  
Kanarraville  
Kanosh  
Kingston  
Kooshareem  
Leamington  
Loa  
Lyman  
Lynndyl  
Manila  
Marysvale  
Mayfield  
Meadow  
New Harmony  
Ophir  
Paragonah  
Plymouth  
Portage  
Randolph  
Rockville  
Rocky Ridge  
Scipio  
Scofield  
Sigurd  
Snowville Town  
Sterling  
Sunnyside  
Tabiona  
Torrey  
Trenton  
Tropic  
Vernon  
Vineyard  
Virgin  
Wales  
Woodruff