

1996 Population Estimates for Utah

Peter Donner, Economist
Demographic and Economic Analysis
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

Revised: December 2, 1998

Continuing its rapid growth, Utah's population passed the 2 million mark during 1996, according to the Utah Population Estimates Committee (UPEC). The state's population grew 43,336, or 2.2 percent, between July 1, 1995 and July 1, 1996, from 1,959,026 to 2,002,362. The growth of 43,336 resulted from 40,371 births less 10,918 deaths, plus net in-migration of 13,883. Utah's population still ranks 34th in the nation, as it has for almost a decade now, though the state's growth rate during 1996 was more than twice the national rate of 0.9 percent. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates Utah is the third fastest growing state in the nation. As will be discussed in detail below, compared to the nation, Utah's population growth is characterized by a high birth rate, low death rate, and high migration rate.

This article presents the UPEC estimates of population for the state, multi-county districts (MCDs) and the counties and discusses the method used to develop the estimates. The next section analyzes Utah's 1996 population estimates. Following sections describe the historical context of Utah's population growth, components of population change, UPEC and the methods it uses to estimate population, population issues specific to Utah, and the U.S. Bureau of the Census population estimates for Utah.

1996 Estimates

As Table 1 and Figure 1 show, Utah has now experienced six consecutive years of net in-migration. The 1996 level of 13,883 more people moving into the state than out is down significantly from the record 22,831 observed during 1994. During the past six years, the number of people moving into the state is estimated to exceed the number moving out by about 108,000, which is a bit more than the population of West Valley City. Even with this large net in-migration, 60 percent of Utah's population growth since 1990 has come from natural increase, the difference between births and deaths. Natural increase since 1990 totals about 166,000, while total population growth has been almost 274,000. The concepts of natural increase and net migration are discussed in more detail in the section on components of population change.

As Table 2 shows, with a population increase of 12,580 in 1996, Salt Lake County accounted for almost 30 percent of the state's overall 43,336 increase, while Utah County's increase of 9,272 accounted for over 20 percent. The four urbanized Wasatch Front Counties--Davis, Salt Lake, Utah and Weber--grew by 29,421 people, accounting for almost 70 percent of the state's overall increase. As Figure 2 depicts, Washington County had the fastest growth rate, 6.4 percent, followed by Grand and Summit Counties, each of which grew 5.3 percent. Beaver, Iron, and Sanpete Counties each grew more than 4.0 percent. In addition to being the fastest growing county, Washington also had the largest net in-migration, 3,455, followed by Utah with 2,591. Davis and Salt Lake each had net in-migration of more than 1,000. With a decline of 226, from 13,414 in 1995 to 13,188 in 1996, San Juan was the only county to lose population. San Juan's decline was the result of 414 net out-migration, which was the largest out migration in the state. Uintah and Millard were the only other counties to experience net out-migration during 1996. All of the MCDs experienced both population growth and net in-migration during 1996.

Figure 2 pictures an interesting feature of Utah's population growth. The semi-rural counties surrounding the Wasatch Front urban area are growing faster than the urban core. Sanpete, Wasatch, Summit, Juab, and Tooele Counties are all growing faster than the four urbanized counties. To a large extent, the growth in these counties on the urban periphery results from the expansion of the Wasatch Front urban area. While these peripheral counties will retain their rural character for the foreseeable future, their growth will be increasingly tied to the urban core.

A perplexing feature of Utah's recent population growth is that the state's annual job growth has generally been in the five percent range since 1993 while annual population growth has been in the two percent range. In numeric terms, job growth has been somewhat less than 50,000 while population growth has been somewhat more than 40,000, so that the number of jobs created during the past few years has been about 20 percent greater than the population increase. Part of this disparity results because temporary workers not residing in Utah are not counted in the population. Two other sources of the disparity include an increasing portion of the population working and an increasing portion of workers holding more than one job. Changing household composition, particularly relatively fewer two parent households with children, also contributes to the unusual relationship between population growth and job growth. This dynamic nature of Utah's job market is making it increasingly difficult to estimate the state's population.

Historical Context

Utah's population reached 1 million during 1966 and 2 million during 1996, 30 years later. Table 3 presents the UPEC population estimates for the state, the MCDs, and the counties since 1940 for selected years. During this period, the state's fastest growth occurred during the 1970s, when the population increased at a 3.3 percent average annual rate. During the 1940s and 1950s, the state's population increased about 2.5 percent per year, which contrasts with the 1960s and 1980s, when the population increased less than 2.0 percent per year. The growth rate for the first half of the 1990s, 2.5 percent per year, represents a return to the relatively high rates of growth seen during the 1940s and 1950s, but is still substantially below the growth of the 1970s. If the present high rate of growth continues through the close of the 1990s, Utah's population will climb by almost one-half million persons. Put another way, if present trends continue, the amount of population growth in Utah during the ten years of the 1990s will be about the same as the growth in the century following the arrival of the Mormon pioneers.

Reflecting the fact that it has almost half of Utah's population, Salt Lake County's growth pattern most closely mirrors the state's. As with the state as a whole, Salt Lake County experienced fairly rapid growth during the 1940s, 2.7 percent per year, even more rapid growth during the 1950s, 3.3 percent per year, a slowdown in the 1960s, 1.8 percent per year, rapid growth during the 1970s, 3.1 percent per year, another slowdown in the 1980s, 1.5 percent per year, and a resurgence of growth during the first half of the 1990s, 2.1 percent per year. Salt Lake County deviated slightly from the state in that the growth of the 1950s was relatively more rapid compared to other periods, while the growth of the 1970s and 1990s was relatively slower

compared to other periods.

A number of counties have had growth patterns substantially different from the state's. While Utah's population grew very strongly in both the 1940s and the 1950s, 12 counties actually had declining populations in both decades. Juab County's population had the greatest percentage decline during this period, about 2.5 percent per year, from 7,400 in 1940 to 4,500 in 1960. During 1996, Juab's population finally surpassed the 1940 level. In Garfield, Piute and Rich Counties, however, the 1996 population was lower than in 1940. Although the 1960s and 1980s were slow growth periods for the state as a whole, some counties still grew extremely rapidly during these two decades. During the 1960s, Davis and Morgan Counties grew at more than twice the state average, 4.3 and 3.8 percent per year, respectively, while Washington and Summit Counties grew at more than twice the state average during the 1980s, 6.4 and 4.2 percent per year, respectively. During both the 1970s and the first half of the 1990s, every county has grown, though in the 1970s Beaver County had the lowest growth rate, 1.3 percent per year, and in the first half of the 1990s, Rich County had the lowest, 0.7 percent per year.

Components of Population Change

Population change is comprised of two components: natural increase and net migration. In turn, both of these have two components as well. Natural increase is the number of births less the number of deaths. Net migration is in-migration less out-migration, or the number of people moving into a place less the number of people moving out. Table 1 and Figure 1 present the components of Utah's population change from 1950 to 1996, by fiscal year, or as of July 1 each year. Table 2 presents the components of population change from 1995 to 1996 for the counties and MCDs.

Natural Increase

Natural increase is computed from records maintained by the Bureau of Vital Records in the Utah Department of Health. As presented in Table 2, natural increase in Utah during 1996 was 29,453, which was the difference between 40,371 births and 10,918 deaths. The largest natural increase recorded since 1950 was 33,483 in 1980. The largest number of births, however, was 41,774 in 1982. Of course, the reason natural increase was larger in 1980 than in 1982, even though there were more births in 1982, is that the number of deaths was proportionately higher in 1982. While the number of births has varied dramatically from one period to the next, the number of deaths, for the most part, has increased slowly and steadily since 1950.

Net migration

Net migration is positive when in-migration exceeds out-migration and negative when out-migration exceeds in-migration. When net migration is positive, net in-migration has occurred and when net migration is negative, net out-migration has occurred. In the population

estimates developed by UPEC, net migration is not estimated directly. Rather, net migration is computed as the implied difference between estimated population change and natural increase as computed from the records maintained by the Department of Health. No attempt is made to estimate net migration directly. In addition, no attempt is made to estimate the components of net migration, in-migration and out-migration.

Thus far, the 1990s have been a period of sustained net in-migration. While the recent level of in-migration has been greater than at any other time, migration rates (net migration as a percent of the base or previous year population), were higher during the 1970s, as well as a few years in the 1950s and 1960s.

While it is not known where these recent migrants came from, data from the Internal Revenue Service and the 1990 Census highlight some interesting points: California dominates the flow of interstate migration to and from Utah; the extended Salt Lake area has strong migration ties with the major metropolitan areas south and or west of Utah, such as Los Angeles, Phoenix, Portland, Seattle and Las Vegas; and, employment-related migration accounts for the vast majority of population movement to and from Utah.¹

Utah Population Estimates Committee (UPEC)

UPEC develops and agrees upon the official population estimates for Utah and the 29 counties in the state. Coordination and staffing of UPEC is the responsibility of the Demographic and Economic Analysis Section of the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. UPEC membership includes representatives from state government, universities, and other organizations with a knowledge of the data used in making population estimates. A list of UPEC members appears on the back cover.

In addition to staffing UPEC, the Demographic and Economic Analysis section represents the state in the Federal-State Cooperative for Population Estimates. This program, administered by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, facilitates the exchange of data used in making population estimates. The program also provides a forum for dialog which can improve the quality of state and county estimates made by both parties. Bureau of the Census population estimates by county are discussed later in this article.

Methods

For the most part, UPEC has traditionally developed population estimates using a method based on school enrollment in combination with a method based on membership in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS). In 1995 and again in 1996, UPEC added a third

¹For more detail on the characteristics of the people migrating to and from Utah, see Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, Utah Migration Database: Sources, Methods, Limitations, and Analysis (Salt Lake City: Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, June 1994).

method based on tax return data from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Each of these methods will be discussed in more detail below. Table 4 presents the population estimates and implied net migration resulting from each method. The IRS method yielded the highest state total population, 2,003,604, followed by the school enrollment method, 1,999,942, and the LDS method, 1,988,016. As discussed in more detail below, the ultimate estimates were based on the average of the three methods with judgement used in Cache, Grand, Piute, Salt Lake, Sevier and Weber Counties.

Periodically, as circumstances warrant, UPEC augments the school enrollment and LDS methods with another method such as the IRS method or a method based on employment data. Given the strong performance of Utah's economy during 1996, UPEC felt the average of the school enrollment and LDS estimates resulted in unreasonably small population growth. The two methods combined yielded population growth of about 35,000 with net in-migration of about 5,500. Even more disturbing was that two methods implied net out-migration in Salt Lake County of about 5,500.

School Enrollment Method

The school enrollment method uses changes in school enrollment as an indicator of net migration. This method compares a county's survived enrollment (calculated by applying a survival rate of 99.98 percent to the enrollment count), in grades 1 to 8 for the year prior to the estimate year, to enrollment in grades 2 to 9 for the estimate year. The difference between these two enrollment totals is taken to be net student migration for the county. Total net migration from the school enrollment method for the county is then derived by multiplying the county's student migration estimate by the county-specific total population-to-student ratio. This ratio is defined as the total population estimate of the county for the prior year divided by the same year's enrollment in grades 1 to 8.

The school enrollment population estimate is computed by adding natural increase and net migration to the previous year's population. This method is limited in estimating migration among the retired, college students, single persons, and other groups that are not represented in school enrollment estimates.

LDS Membership Method

The LDS Church maintains membership records which allow a relatively precise count of the LDS population by county. UPEC relies on this data to estimate the state and county populations. Traditionally, UPEC has assumed the ratio of the total population to LDS membership remains constant relative to the 1990 Census count. Given the dramatic in-migration of non-LDS people to Utah during the 1990s, however, this assumption of a constant LDS ratio has been problematic. In counties where the non-LDS population is growing faster than the LDS population, such as Summit, Grand, and, recently, Salt Lake, the assumption of a constant LDS ratio leads to unreasonably small population estimates. Statewide, assuming a

constant LDS ratio resulted in estimated net out-migration of 21,000, with net out-migration of 15,000 in Salt Lake County, and significant out-migration in a number of other counties. One of the most glaring problems with the constant LDS ratio assumption was in Summit County where LDS membership grew over 4 percent but the method resulted in estimated out-migration of almost 3,000. Because of these problems, UPEC revised the LDS method.

The revised LDS method applies the growth rate in LDS membership in a particular county to the previous year's population estimate for the county. If the LDS method was the only method used to estimate population, this procedure would be the same as maintaining a constant LDS ratio. Since the previous year's estimate is derived from several methods, the revised LDS method allows the LDS ratio to change. In addition to using the revised LDS method to compute 1996 estimates, the 1995 estimates were revised as well.

IRS Tax Exemption Method

The IRS tax exemption method uses the growth in exemptions reported on tax returns filed with the IRS as an indicator of population growth. The growth rate in exemptions for the previous calendar year is applied to the previous fiscal year population to estimate the current fiscal year population. This method is relatively accurate as long as the tax code is stable and the percent of the population filing tax returns does not vary dramatically from year to year.

Judgement in Selected Counties

As mentioned above, with the exception of Cache, Grand, Piute, Salt Lake, Sevier and Weber Counties, the preliminary estimate settled upon by UPEC was the average of the school enrollment, LDS and IRS methods. The explanation for UPEC's judgement in the six counties is as follows:

Cache: LDS method seemed unrealistically low, so the average of school enrollment and IRS was used;

Grand: LDS method seemed unrealistically low, so the average of school enrollment and IRS was used;

Piute: LDS method seemed unrealistically high and school enrollment method seemed unrealistically low, so IRS method was used:

Salt Lake: the IRS method was used since the others seemed unrealistically low;

Sevier: school enrollment method seemed unrealistically high, so the average of LDS and IRS was used.

Salt Lake: LDS and school enrollment methods seemed unrealistically low, so IRS was used.

In these six counties, UPEC believed the chosen method resulted in a more accurate population estimate than the average of the three methods.

Population Issues: Crude Birth and Death Rates and Population Density

Two distinguishing features of Utah's population are its birth and death rates and its density. Crude birth and death rates are simply the number of births and deaths as a percent of the total population.² Compared to the nation, Utah has consistently had a high crude birth rate and a low crude death rate. Utah's population density is interesting because the state is one of the most urban states in the nation, but it is one of the least densely populated.³

Crude Birth and Death Rates

A large part of the reason Utah has a relatively high crude birth rate and a relatively low crude death rate is that its population is younger on average than the nation's. Comparing birth and death rates for specific ages, Utah is much closer to the nation, but, even after adjusting for age, the state still has higher birth rates and lower death rates.

Crude birth and death rates for Utah and the U.S. are compared in Figure 3 for 1950 to 1995.⁴ Utah's crude birth rate has consistently been about one-half percentage point above the nation's. During the late 1970s, Utah's crude birth rate increased dramatically while the nation's remained essentially constant so that Utah was a full percentage point above the nation. During that time, Utah's birth rate was almost twice the nation's. Recently, Utah's birth rate has been about one-third greater than the nation's.

As Figure 3 depicts, crude death rates for both Utah and the U.S. tend to be more stable

²Crude refers to the fact that simply dividing births or deaths by the population is a relatively unsophisticated measure of the underlying demographic trends within a given population. Demographers prefer to use what are known as fertility rates when analyzing births and mortality rates when analyzing deaths. For a more detailed discussion of the particular demographic features of Utah's population, see Heaton, Tim B., Chadwick, Bruce A., and Hirschl, Tom A., editors, *Utah in the 1990s: A Demographic Perspective* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1996). The chapter by Pam Perlich, "The Age Structure of Utah's Population," details the impact of Utah's particular age structure on its population growth, and is available on the internet at <http://www.governor.state.ut.us/dea>. The chapters by Tim B. Heaton, "Birth Capital of the Nation," and Lisa King Hirschl, "Health and Mortality," discuss the particular features of Utah's culture which help explain our high fertility and low mortality.

³The U.S. Census Bureau defines the urban population as that population living in urbanized areas or in places of 2,500 or more persons outside urbanized areas. Urbanized areas are places with at least 50,000 people and a population density of 1,000. The Census measures the percent of each state's population that is urban during each decennial census. During the first part of this century, Utah was one of the 10 most urbanized states in the nation, though only about half the population was urban. By World War II, though the share of Utah's population classed as urban increased, the state ranked in the top 20 rather than the top 10. While the share Utah's population classed as urban continued to increase in the post-War period, Utah did not rank in the top 10 urban states until 1980, when it ranked eighth. In 1990, with 87 percent of its population urban, Utah ranked as the sixth most urban state in the nation. More details concerning how the Census deals with urban issues may be found on the Internet at <http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/ur-def.html>.

⁴Birth and death rates are often expressed in terms of 1,000 population, but the convention in this article is total births and deaths as a percent of total population.

through time than crude birth rates, though both are about 10 percent lower now than in 1950. Utah's crude death rate has consistently been at least one-quarter percentage point below the nation's. During the 1970s and 1980s, however, Utah's death rate dropped more rapidly than the nation's, so that by 1995, Utah's death rate of 0.56 percent, was just 63 percent of the national rate of 0.88 percent.

Population Density

Population density is the number of persons living in a given area. Since a common measure of land area is square miles, density is commonly measured as persons per square mile. For a given area, then, density is the total population divided by the number of square miles encompassed by the area. Using U.S. Bureau of the Census population estimates, Utah's population density can be compared with other parts of the nation. In 1996, Utah had 24.3 persons per square mile, compared to 75.0 for the country as a whole. At 1,076.7, New Jersey had the highest density of any state, almost 14 percent more than Rhode Island, the second most densely populated state, with 947.6 persons per square mile. Closer to home, the mountain region,⁵ which includes Utah, had a density of 18.8 persons per square mile. Arizona was the most densely populated state in the region, with 39.0 persons per square mile, while Wyoming was the least densely populated, with 5.0 persons per square mile.

Figure 3 depicts population density by county in Utah during 1996. Salt Lake County, at 1,110.4 persons per square mile, and Davis County, at 721.3, are the most densely populated counties in the state. Weber, Utah and Cache Counties are the next most densely populated counties. These five counties are significantly more densely populated than the rest of the state. After these five, Washington, at 30.0 persons per square mile, is the most densely populated county. At 0.8 persons per square mile, Garfield is the least densely populated county.

U.S. Bureau of the Census Population Estimates

The U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch, prepares post-censal population estimates for states, counties and sub-county areas. These estimates utilize different methodologies and, in some cases, different base data than UPEC. Since estimates prepared by UPEC generally include more recent data, consider a variety of methodologies and information sources, and incorporate the informed judgement of local people who are familiar with local indicators of population growth, they are widely utilized as the preferred source.

Estimates prepared by the Bureau of the Census, however, may be preferred in applications that require comparisons with other states or that are identified in statute as the source to be used. Utah statute explicitly states that Bureau of the Census numbers be used in

⁵The Census Bureau defines the mountain region to include: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

calculating the state spending limitation and allocating local option sales taxes and class B and C road monies. Bureau of the Census estimates are also used by other federal data agencies and are currently the only statewide source of city estimates.

Generally, estimates prepared by the Bureau of the Census and the UPEC are reasonably close, although there are notable exceptions from year to year and county to county. The main differences in the two sources of estimates are the timing of input data, methodologies, and release of data. UPEC uses more current birth, death, and migration indicators. The Bureau of the Census methods rely heavily on IRS tax return data (as an indicator of migration) and Medicare and group quarters data.

There is a fairly significant difference in the formulation process of the estimates. The Census Bureau first develops a total U.S. population estimate using national vital records and migration estimates. These two databases are reliable and result in a reasonable estimate of the nation's population. The national population estimate includes detail by single year of age, sex, and race. Separately from the national estimate, an estimate for each county in the nation is developed. (The Census Bureau county estimate methodology is described in more detail below.) In a typical estimate year, in a typical county, estimates at the county level are developed for the population under age 65 and 65 and over. The totals of the 3,000 plus individual county population estimates for these two age groups are used to develop control factors. These control factors are then applied to each county estimate so the total of the controlled estimates equals the national population estimates for the two age groups. The process of controlling county population estimates to a separately determined national population estimate can introduce error to the estimating process. In addition, as described in more detail below, the Census made a number of special adjustments to its estimating technique for the counties in Utah. The resulting estimates in several counties do not appear to be realistic in UPEC's opinion.

In contrast to the Census, UPEC examines data at the county level for its methodologies. The state estimate is then simply the sum of the independently produced county estimates.

The Census Bureau recently revised state population estimates for 1990 through 1995 and produced new estimates for 1996. The Census 1996 estimate of 2,000,494 for Utah's population is 0.1 percent less than the UPEC estimate of 2,002,362. Since both the Census and UPEC estimated Utah's population grew 2.2 percent during 1996, the main explanation for this discrepancy is simply the accumulation of differences from previous years.

A comparison of the revised Census estimates for 1994 through 1996 with UPEC's estimates is presented in Table 5. Among the counties, the largest percent differences between the Census and UPEC occur among relatively small counties such as Garfield, Grand, and Juab, where the percentage differences are large, but numeric differences are small. The largest numeric difference is in Salt Lake County, where the Census estimates the 1996 population to be 827,818, which is 8,958 (or 1.1 percent) more than UPEC's estimate of 818,860.

In general, the Census methodology tends to underestimate population in major university-influenced counties, specifically Utah, Iron, and, in the past, Cache. This occurs because IRS migration data miss many student in-migrants (those who have not filed a tax return prior to attending college), but capture a large number of student out-migrants (those who now file a tax return and leave school, possibly with dependents). UPEC's methods may not perform as well as some of the Bureau's techniques, however, in counties with a proportionately smaller LDS population or counties where school enrollment is a poor indicator of migration.

As mentioned above, for 1994 and 1995, the Census Bureau made special adjustments to the estimates in Cache, Iron, Salt Lake, and Utah Counties. Based on challenges from local officials, the Census Bureau has increased its 1994 estimates for a number of cities in Iron, Salt Lake and Utah Counties and increased its 1995 Cache County estimate. The procedure the Census follows when it accepts a locally produced estimate for a given city is to change the population estimate for both the city and the city's county. In this round of estimates, the Census developed a state total for Utah as a whole and then forced the sum of the county totals to equal the state total, which may have introduced substantial error to some of the county estimates. The counties containing the cities with increased 1994 estimates had higher estimates for 1994, 1995, and 1996 than would have been the case if their cities had not challenged the original 1994 estimate. Likewise, those counties without cities challenging the 1994 estimate had lower estimates.

The Census procedure has introduced a particularly glaring error in Cache County's population estimates. Because no city in Cache County challenged its 1994 estimate, the revised 1994 county estimate declined by more than 1,500 from 75,888 to 74,358. However, based on the challenge from local officials, Cache County's 1995 estimate was revised up more than 5,000 from 77,298 to 82,451. Thus, the Census growth estimate for Cache County during 1995 is 8,093 (or 10.1 percent), which compares to UPEC's estimated growth of 1,948 (or 2.5 percent). The Census estimated Cache County's population grew 1,259 (or 1.5 percent), from 82,451 to 83,710 during 1996, which compares to UPEC's estimated growth of about 1,844 (or 2.3 percent). Based on a variety of data sources (e.g., school enrollment, LDS membership, IRS exemptions, job growth, and housing permits), it is UPEC's opinion the underlying dynamics governing population growth in Cache County did not significantly change between 1995 and 1996. Even if growth in Cache County did slow significantly from 1995 to 1996, in UPEC's opinion, it is not credible to maintain, as the Census does, the rate of growth declined by a factor of seven from 10.9 percent to 1.5 percent. Thus, it is UPEC's opinion the 1995 and 1996 Census estimates are reasonable, but the 1994 estimate is not. UPEC will be working with the Census Bureau, through the Federal State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates, to resolve the inconsistency with Cache County's estimates and other population estimate issues impacting Utah.

Bureau of the Census Methods⁶

The Bureau of the Census utilizes a method known as the Tax Return method (previously called Administrative Records method) to derive county estimates.⁷ This procedure relies on federal income tax data to measure the net inter-county migration of the population under 65 years old, reported resident birth and death statistics to estimate natural change, and data on Medicare enrollees to estimate the population 65 years and older.

Tax data for two successive years are used to determine the number of persons whose county of residence changed during the period. From this series a net migration rate is calculated and applied to the household population base under age 65. The resultant estimates of net migration are combined with independent estimates of the population 65 years and over, inmates of institutions, college students in dormitories, military personnel living in barracks, and the other components of population change (resident births and deaths, immigration from abroad, and net movement of military barracks personnel to the civilian population) to yield an estimate of total population.

Conclusion

This article has provided a historical and current description of the significant features of population change in Utah. Utah's high birth rates, low death rates, and migration trends have been highlighted, as have the patterns of population change in 1996 among Utah's multi-county districts and counties. To make data users more familiar with how population estimates are developed in Utah, UPEC and its methods have been discussed. The population estimates prepared by the Bureau of the Census and the methods it uses have also been described, with a brief comparison of how the Bureau's population estimates differ from those prepared by UPEC. For more information about Utah population data contact the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget.

⁶More detail on the Bureau of the Census methodology is available in the document "Methodology for Estimates of State and County Total Population," which is on the Internet at <http://www.census.gov/population/methods/stco.txt>.

⁷Sub-county estimates also utilize the Tax Return method, but, in addition, use county controlled, artificial natural increase data and do not separately estimate the 65 and over population.

Table 1
Utah Population Estimates and Components of Population Change: 1950 to 1995

Year	July 1st Population	Percent Change	Increase	Net Migration	Net Migration as a Percent of Previous Year's Population	Natural Increase	Fiscal Year Births	Fiscal Year Deaths	
1950	1950	696,000	3.6%	25,000	8,774	1.3%	16,226	21,178	4,952
	1951	706,000	1.4%	10,000	(7,046)	-1.0%	17,046	21,981	4,935
	1952	724,000	2.5%	18,000	(209)	-0.0%	18,209	23,251	5,042
	1953	739,000	2.0%	15,000	(3,522)	-0.5%	18,522	23,658	5,136
	1954	750,000	1.5%	11,000	(7,906)	-1.1%	18,906	23,944	5,038
1955	1955	783,000	4.2%	33,000	13,589	1.8%	19,412	24,454	5,042
	1956	809,000	3.2%	26,000	6,372	0.8%	19,629	24,787	5,158
	1957	826,000	2.1%	17,000	(3,058)	-0.4%	20,058	25,518	5,460
	1958	845,000	2.2%	19,000	(972)	-0.1%	19,972	25,724	5,753
	1959	870,000	2.9%	25,000	5,330	0.6%	19,671	25,515	5,844
1960	1960	900,000	3.3%	30,000	9,980	1.1%	20,021	25,959	5,938
	1961	936,000	3.8%	36,000	15,608	1.7%	20,392	26,431	6,039
	1962	958,000	2.3%	22,000	1,802	0.2%	20,199	26,402	6,203
	1963	974,000	1.6%	16,000	(3,148)	-0.3%	19,148	25,583	6,435
	1964	978,000	0.4%	4,000	(13,924)	-1.4%	17,924	24,398	6,474
1965	1965	991,000	1.3%	13,000	(3,515)	-0.4%	16,515	23,053	6,538
	1966	1,009,000	1.8%	18,000	2,330	0.2%	15,670	22,431	6,761
	1967	1,019,000	1.0%	10,000	(6,092)	-0.6%	16,092	22,775	6,683
	1968	1,029,000	1.0%	10,000	(6,372)	-0.6%	16,372	23,071	6,699
	1969	1,047,000	1.7%	18,000	1,124	0.1%	16,876	23,713	6,837
1970	1970	1,066,000	1.8%	19,000	327	0.0%	18,674	25,601	6,927
	1971	1,101,000	3.2%	35,000	14,800	1.4%	20,200	27,407	7,207
	1972	1,135,000	3.0%	34,000	14,090	1.3%	19,910	27,146	7,236
	1973	1,170,000	3.0%	35,000	14,955	1.3%	20,045	27,562	7,517
	1974	1,200,000	2.5%	30,000	8,620	0.7%	21,380	28,876	7,496
1975	1975	1,236,000	2.9%	36,000	12,949	1.1%	23,051	30,566	7,515
	1976	1,275,000	3.1%	39,000	12,605	1.0%	26,395	33,773	7,378
	1977	1,320,000	3.4%	45,000	15,886	1.2%	29,114	36,709	7,595
	1978	1,368,000	3.5%	48,000	17,422	1.3%	30,578	38,265	7,687
	1979	1,420,000	3.7%	52,000	19,712	1.4%	32,288	40,134	7,846
1980	1980	1,474,000	3.7%	54,000	20,517	1.4%	33,483	41,591	8,108
	1981	1,515,000	2.7%	41,000	7,601	0.5%	33,399	41,511	8,112
	1982	1,558,000	2.8%	43,000	9,630	0.6%	33,370	41,774	8,404
	1983	1,595,000	2.3%	37,000	4,789	0.3%	32,211	40,557	8,346
	1984	1,622,000	1.7%	27,000	(2,757)	-0.2%	29,757	38,643	8,886
1985	1985	1,643,000	1.3%	21,000	(7,585)	-0.5%	28,585	37,508	8,923
	1986	1,663,000	1.2%	20,000	(8,355)	-0.5%	28,355	37,145	8,790
	1987	1,678,000	0.9%	15,000	(11,656)	-0.7%	26,656	35,469	8,813
	1988	1,690,000	0.7%	12,000	(14,526)	-0.9%	26,526	35,648	9,122
	1989	1,706,000	0.9%	16,000	(10,633)	-0.6%	26,633	35,549	8,916
1990	1990	1,729,000	1.3%	23,000	(3,619)	-0.2%	26,619	35,569	8,950
	1991	1,775,000	2.6%	46,000	18,961	1.1%	27,039	36,312	9,273
	1992	1,822,000	2.6%	47,000	19,746	1.1%	27,254	36,813	9,559
	1993	1,866,000	2.4%	44,000	17,427	1.0%	26,573	36,573	10,000
	1994	1,916,000	2.6%	50,000	22,831	1.2%	27,169	37,480	10,311
1995	1995	1,959,026	2.2%	43,422	15,561	0.8%	27,861	38,271	10,410
	1996	2,002,362	2.2%	43,336	13,883	0.7%	29,453	40,371	10,918

Source: Utah Population Estimates Committee

Notes

1. From 1950 to 1970 fiscal year births and deaths are estimated by averaging calendar year births and deaths in the two years that are partially covered by each fiscal year. From 1971 to 1996, actual fiscal year births and deaths are shown.
2. Before 1995, the Utah Population Estimates Committee rounded its population estimates. The estimated increase from 1994 to 1995 is based on the unrounded estimate for 1994, 1,915,604.

Table 2
 Components of Population Change in Utah by County and Multi-County District
 July 1, 1994 and July 1, 1995

County/District	Population		Population Change 1995-96		Components of Change 1995-96			
	1995	1996	Numerical	Percent	Births	Deaths	Natural Increase	Net Migration
Beaver	5,378	5,606	228	4.2%	119	49	70	158
Box Elder	38,830	39,484	654	1.7%	682	244	438	216
Cache	80,254	82,098	1,844	2.3%	1,963	378	1,585	259
Carbon	21,051	21,420	369	1.8%	294	192	102	267
Daggett	788	803	15	1.9%	9	3	6	9
Davis	214,994	219,644	4,650	2.2%	4,164	819	3,345	1,305
Duchesne	13,646	14,032	386	2.8%	243	105	138	248
Emery	10,669	10,810	141	1.3%	153	65	88	53
Garfield	4,308	4,386	78	1.8%	55	35	20	58
Grand	8,352	8,798	446	5.3%	114	47	67	379
Iron	26,927	28,030	1,103	4.1%	576	150	426	677
Juab	7,174	7,445	271	3.8%	132	42	90	181
Kane	5,880	5,956	76	1.3%	77	43	34	42
Millard	11,880	11,958	78	0.7%	178	97	81	(3)
Morgan	6,527	6,693	166	2.5%	103	35	68	98
Piute	1,462	1,508	46	3.1%	14	11	3	43
Rich	1,807	1,822	15	0.8%	20	6	14	1
Salt Lake	806,280	818,860	12,580	1.6%	15,981	4,667	11,314	1,266
San Juan	13,414	13,188	(226)	-1.7%	242	54	188	(414)
Sanpete	19,216	19,999	783	4.1%	335	149	186	597
Sevier	17,350	17,683	333	1.9%	277	144	133	200
Summit	22,367	23,562	1,195	5.3%	350	64	286	909
Tooele	29,522	30,492	970	3.3%	554	178	376	594
Uintah	24,235	24,275	40	0.2%	391	158	233	(193)
Utah	308,607	317,879	9,272	3.0%	8,070	1,389	6,681	2,591
Wasatch	12,168	12,585	417	3.4%	225	86	139	278
Washington	68,475	72,888	4,413	6.4%	1,473	515	958	3,455
Wayne	2,315	2,389	74	3.2%	51	38	13	61
Weber	175,150	178,069	2,919	1.7%	3,526	1,155	2,371	548
Bear River	120,891	123,404	2,513	2.1%	2,665	628	2,037	476
Wasatch Front	1,232,473	1,253,758	21,285	1.7%	24,328	6,854	17,474	3,811
Mountainlands	343,142	354,026	10,884	3.2%	8,645	1,539	7,106	3,778
Six County	59,397	60,982	1,585	2.7%	987	481	506	1,079
Five County	110,968	116,866	5,898	5.3%	2,300	792	1,508	4,390
Uintah Basin	38,669	39,110	441	1.1%	643	266	377	64
Southeast	53,486	54,216	730	1.4%	803	358	445	285
State	1,959,026	2,002,362	43,336	2.2%	40,371	10,918	29,453	13,883

Source: Utah Population Estimates Committee

Urban Core	1,505,031	1,534,452	29,421	2.0%	31,741	8,030	23,711	5,710
------------	-----------	-----------	--------	------	--------	-------	--------	-------

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

Table 3
 July 1 Population Estimates for Utah
 by County and Multi-County District, Selected Years 1940 to 1996

County/District	July 1 Population Estimates								Average Annual Growth Rates for the Period							40s & 50:	60s	70s	80s	90s	40s & 50:	40-95
	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	1995	1996	1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990-96	1995-96							
Beaver	4,900	4,800	4,300	3,850	4,400	4,800	5,378	5,606	-0.2%	-1.1%	-1.1%	1.3%	0.9%	2.6%	4.2%	1	0	0	0	0	-12.24%	ERR
Box Elder	18,900	19,800	25,500	28,150	33,500	36,500	38,830	39,484	0.5%	2.6%	1.0%	1.8%	0.9%	1.3%	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	34.92%	ERR
Cache	29,900	33,600	36,100	42,550	57,700	70,500	80,254	82,098	1.2%	0.7%	1.7%	3.1%	2.0%	2.6%	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	20.74%	ERR
Carbon	18,700	24,800	21,200	15,750	22,400	20,200	21,051	21,420	2.9%	-1.6%	-2.9%	3.6%	-1.0%	1.0%	1.8%	0	0	0	0	0	13.37%	ERR
Daggett	600	400	1,200	650	750	700	788	803	-4.0%	11.6%	-5.9%	1.4%	-0.7%	2.3%	1.9%	0	0	0	0	0	*****	ERR
Davis	15,500	31,200	65,600	99,600	148,000	188,000	214,994	219,644	7.2%	7.7%	4.3%	4.0%	2.4%	2.6%	2.2%	0	1	0	0	0	*****	ERR
Duchesne	8,700	8,100	7,200	7,400	12,700	12,600	13,646	14,032	-0.7%	-1.2%	0.3%	5.5%	-0.1%	1.8%	2.8%	1	0	0	0	0	-17.24%	ERR
Emery	7,000	6,300	5,500	5,150	11,600	10,669	10,810	10,810	-1.0%	-1.3%	-0.7%	8.5%	-1.2%	0.8%	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	-21.43%	ERR
Garfield	5,300	4,100	3,500	3,150	3,700	3,950	4,308	4,386	-2.5%	-1.6%	-1.0%	1.6%	0.7%	1.8%	1.8%	1	0	0	0	0	-33.96%	ERR
Grand	2,200	1,900	6,400	6,600	8,250	6,600	8,352	8,798	-1.5%	12.9%	0.3%	2.3%	-2.2%	4.9%	5.3%	0	0	0	0	0	*****	ERR
Iron	8,400	9,700	10,900	12,300	17,500	20,900	26,927	28,030	1.4%	1.2%	1.2%	3.6%	1.8%	5.0%	4.1%	0	0	0	0	0	29.76%	ERR
Juab	7,400	5,900	4,500	4,600	5,550	5,800	7,174	7,445	-2.2%	-2.7%	0.2%	1.9%	0.4%	4.2%	3.8%	1	0	0	0	0	-39.19%	ERR
Kane	2,600	2,300	2,700	2,450	4,050	5,150	5,880	5,956	-1.2%	1.6%	-1.0%	5.2%	2.4%	2.5%	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	3.85%	ERR
Millard	9,700	9,300	7,900	7,050	9,050	11,300	11,880	11,958	-0.4%	-1.6%	-1.1%	2.5%	2.2%	0.9%	0.7%	1	0	0	0	0	-18.56%	ERR
Morgan	2,600	2,500	2,800	4,050	4,950	5,550	6,527	6,693	-0.4%	1.1%	3.8%	2.0%	1.2%	3.2%	2.5%	0	1	0	0	0	7.69%	ERR
Piute	2,200	1,900	1,400	1,150	1,350	1,250	1,462	1,508	-1.5%	-3.0%	-1.9%	1.6%	-0.8%	3.2%	3.1%	1	0	0	0	0	-36.36%	ERR
Rich	2,000	1,700	1,700	1,600	2,150	1,750	1,807	1,822	-1.6%	0.0%	-0.6%	3.0%	-2.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	-15.00%	ERR
Salt Lake	213,700	279,000	387,800	461,500	625,000	728,000	806,280	818,860	2.7%	3.3%	1.8%	3.1%	1.5%	2.0%	1.6%	0	0	0	0	0	81.47%	ERR
San Juan	4,600	5,300	8,900	9,700	12,400	12,600	13,414	13,188	1.4%	5.3%	0.9%	2.5%	0.2%	0.8%	-1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	93.48%	ERR
Sanpete	15,900	13,800	11,100	11,000	14,800	16,300	19,216	19,999	-1.4%	-2.2%	-0.1%	3.0%	1.0%	3.5%	4.1%	1	0	0	0	0	-30.19%	ERR
Sevier	12,300	12,000	10,600	10,150	14,900	15,400	17,350	17,683	-0.2%	-1.2%	-0.4%	3.9%	0.3%	2.3%	1.9%	1	0	0	0	0	-13.82%	ERR
Summit	8,600	6,700	5,700	5,900	10,400	15,700	22,367	23,562	-2.5%	-1.6%	0.3%	5.8%	4.2%	7.0%	5.3%	1	0	0	1	0	-33.72%	ERR
Tooele	8,800	15,000	18,000	21,600	26,200	26,700	29,522	30,492	5.5%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%	0.2%	2.2%	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	*****	ERR
Uintah	10,000	10,300	11,700	12,800	20,700	22,200	24,235	24,275	0.3%	1.3%	0.9%	4.9%	0.7%	1.5%	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	17.00%	ERR
Utah	56,900	83,000	108,300	139,300	220,000	266,000	308,607	317,879	3.8%	2.7%	2.5%	4.7%	1.9%	3.0%	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	90.33%	ERR
Wasatch	5,800	5,500	5,300	5,950	8,650	10,100	12,168	12,585	-0.5%	-0.4%	1.2%	3.8%	1.6%	3.7%	3.4%	1	0	0	0	0	-8.62%	ERR
Washington	9,200	9,800	10,400	13,900	26,400	49,100	68,475	72,888	0.6%	0.6%	2.9%	6.6%	6.4%	6.8%	6.4%	0	0	0	1	0	13.04%	ERR
Wayne	2,300	2,200	1,700	1,450	1,950	2,150	2,315	2,389	-0.4%	-2.5%	-1.6%	3.0%	1.0%	1.8%	3.2%	1	0	0	0	0	-26.09%	ERR
Weber	57,100	85,000	112,100	126,700	145,000	159,000	175,150	178,069	4.1%	2.8%	1.2%	1.4%	0.9%	1.9%	1.7%	0	0	0	0	0	96.32%	ERR
Bear River	50,800	55,100	63,300	72,300	93,350	108,750	120,891	123,404	0.8%	1.4%	1.3%	2.6%	1.5%	2.1%	2.1%	12	2	0	2	0		
Wasatch Front	297,700	412,700	586,300	713,450	949,150	1,107,250	1,232,473	1,253,758	3.3%	3.6%	2.0%	2.9%	1.6%	2.1%	1.7%							
Mountainlands	71,300	95,200	119,300	151,150	239,050	291,800	343,142	354,026	2.9%	2.3%	2.4%	4.7%	2.0%	3.3%	3.2%							
Six County	49,800	45,100	37,200	35,400	47,600	52,200	59,397	60,982	-1.0%	-1.9%	-0.5%	3.0%	0.9%	2.6%	2.7%							
Five County	30,400	30,700	31,800	35,650	56,050	83,900	110,968	116,866	0.1%	0.4%	1.1%	4.6%	4.1%	5.7%	5.3%							
Uintah Basin	19,300	18,800	20,100	20,850	34,150	35,500	38,669	39,110	-0.3%	0.7%	0.4%	5.1%	0.4%	1.6%	1.1%							
Southeast	32,500	38,300	42,000	37,200	54,650	49,700	53,486	54,216	1.7%	0.9%	-1.2%	3.9%	-0.9%	1.5%	1.4%							
State	552,000	696,000	900,000	1,066,000	1,474,000	1,729,000	1,959,026	2,002,362	2.3%	2.6%	1.7%	3.3%	1.6%	2.5%	2.2%							

Source: Utah Population Estimates Committee

-39.19%

Notes

1. Before 1995, the Utah Population Estimates Committee rounded its population estimates.

Table 4
 July 1, 1996 Utah Population Estimates by County and Multi-County District
 An Average of Three Methods with Judgement in Selected Counties

County/District	July 1, 1995 Population	Natural Increase	School Enrollment		LDS		IRS		Average of Three Methods		Estimate Based on Judgement in Select Counties	
			July 1, 1996 Population	Implied Net Migration	July 1, 1996 Population	Implied Net Migration						
Beaver	5,378	70	5,555	107	5,592	144	5,672	224	5,606	158	5,606	158
Box Elder	38,830	438	40,139	871	39,220	(48)	39,092	(176)	39,484	216	39,484	216
Cache	80,254	1,585	82,427	588	80,699	(1,140)	81,768	(71)	81,631	(208)	82,098	259
Carbon	21,051	102	21,845	692	21,038	(115)	21,378	225	21,420	267	21,420	267
Daggett	788	6	847	53	788	(6)	773	(21)	803	9	803	9
Davis	214,994	3,345	219,718	1,379	218,994	655	220,220	1,881	219,644	1,305	219,644	1,305
Duchesne	13,646	138	14,246	462	13,852	68	13,997	213	14,032	248	14,032	248
Emery	10,669	88	11,031	274	10,706	(51)	10,694	(63)	10,810	53	10,810	53
Garfield	4,308	20	4,335	7	4,416	88	4,407	79	4,386	58	4,386	58
Grand	8,352	67	8,883	464	8,416	(3)	8,712	293	8,670	251	8,798	379
Iron	26,927	426	28,325	972	27,508	155	28,258	905	28,030	677	28,030	677
Juab	7,174	90	7,432	168	7,396	132	7,506	242	7,445	181	7,445	181
Kane	5,880	34	5,936	22	5,856	(58)	6,077	163	5,956	42	5,956	42
Millard	11,880	81	12,141	180	11,929	(32)	11,803	(158)	11,958	(3)	11,958	(3)
Morgan	6,527	68	6,716	121	6,619	24	6,743	148	6,693	98	6,693	98
Piute	1,462	3	1,633	168	1,450	(15)	1,508	43	1,530	65	1,508	43
Rich	1,807	14	1,860	39	1,802	(19)	1,803	(18)	1,822	1	1,822	1
Salt Lake	806,280	11,314	813,320	(4,274)	811,185	(6,409)	818,860	1,266	814,455	(3,139)	818,860	1,266
San Juan	13,414	188	12,858	(744)	13,590	(12)	13,116	(486)	13,188	(414)	13,188	(414)
Sanpete	19,216	186	20,129	727	19,796	394	20,071	669	19,999	597	19,999	597
Sevier	17,350	133	18,491	1,008	17,683	200	17,682	199	17,952	469	17,683	200
Summit	22,367	286	23,679	1,026	23,380	727	23,626	973	23,562	909	23,562	909
Tooele	29,522	376	30,675	777	30,632	734	30,170	272	30,492	594	30,492	594
Uintah	24,235	233	24,136	(332)	24,349	(119)	24,339	(129)	24,275	(193)	24,275	(193)
Utah	308,607	6,681	319,078	3,790	316,569	1,281	317,989	2,701	317,879	2,591	317,879	2,591
Wasatch	12,168	139	12,664	357	12,486	179	12,605	298	12,585	278	12,585	278
Washington	68,475	958	72,127	2,694	72,970	3,537	73,567	4,134	72,888	3,455	72,888	3,455
Wayne	2,315	13	2,348	20	2,421	93	2,399	71	2,389	61	2,389	61
Weber	175,150	2,371	177,368	(153)	176,674	(847)	178,769	1,248	177,604	83	178,069	548
Bear River	120,891	2,037	124,426	1,498	121,721	(1,207)	122,663	(265)	122,937	9	123,404	476
Wasatch Front	1,232,473	17,474	1,247,797	(2,150)	1,244,104	(5,843)	1,254,762	4,815	1,248,888	(1,059)	1,253,758	3,811
Mountainlands	343,142	7,106	355,421	5,173	352,435	2,187	354,220	3,972	354,026	3,778	354,026	3,778
Six County	59,397	506	62,174	2,271	60,675	772	60,969	1,066	61,273	1,370	60,982	1,079
Five County	110,968	1,508	116,278	3,802	116,342	3,866	117,981	5,505	116,866	4,390	116,866	4,390
Uintah Basin	38,669	377	39,229	183	38,989	(57)	39,109	63	39,110	64	39,110	64
Southeast	53,486	445	54,617	686	53,750	(181)	53,900	(31)	54,088	157	54,216	285
State	1,959,026	29,453	1,999,942	11,463	1,988,016	(463)	2,003,604	15,125	1,997,188	8,709	2,002,362	13,881

Source: Utah Population Estimates Committee

Notes

1. In most counties, the estimate is the average of the estimates produced from each of the three methods. The counties where the average of the three methods was not used, and the method used in these counties are as follows: Cache--average of IRS and School Enrollment; Grand--average of IRS and School Enrollment; Piute--IRS; Salt Lake--IRS; Sevier--average of IRS and LDS; and Weber--average of IRS and School Enrollment.

Table 5
 Comparison of Bureau of the Census and Utah Population Estimates Committee
 July 1 Utah Population Estimates by County and Multi-County District

County/District	Utah Population Estimates Committee			Bureau of the Census			Numeric Difference			Percent Difference		
	1994	1995	1996	1994	1995	1996	1994	1995	1996	1994	1995	1996
Beaver	5,138	5,378	5,606	5,081	5,301	5,591	57	77	15	1.1%	1.4%	0.3%
Box Elder	38,480	38,830	39,484	37,987	38,483	39,177	493	347	307	1.3%	0.9%	0.8%
Cache	78,306	80,254	82,098	74,358	82,451	83,710	3,948	(2,197)	(1,612)	5.0%	-2.7%	-2.0%
Carbon	21,146	21,051	21,420	19,967	20,115	20,437	1,179	936	983	5.6%	4.4%	4.6%
Daggett	773	788	803	716	725	752	57	63	51	7.4%	8.0%	6.4%
Davis	212,124	214,994	219,644	206,265	209,883	214,990	5,859	5,111	4,654	2.8%	2.4%	2.1%
Duchesne	13,453	13,646	14,032	13,354	13,522	13,778	99	124	254	0.7%	0.9%	1.8%
Emery	10,585	10,669	10,810	10,318	10,308	10,402	267	361	408	2.5%	3.4%	3.8%
Garfield	4,202	4,308	4,386	3,974	4,033	4,076	228	275	310	5.4%	6.4%	7.1%
Grand	7,948	8,352	8,798	7,522	7,638	7,826	426	714	972	5.4%	8.5%	11.0%
Iron	25,243	26,927	28,030	24,571	26,062	26,875	672	865	1,155	2.7%	3.2%	4.1%
Juab	6,793	7,174	7,445	6,256	6,536	6,845	537	638	600	7.9%	8.9%	8.1%
Kane	5,691	5,880	5,956	5,679	5,858	5,751	12	22	205	0.2%	0.4%	3.4%
Millard	11,869	11,880	11,958	11,719	11,924	12,019	150	(44)	(61)	1.3%	-0.4%	-0.5%
Morgan	6,359	6,527	6,693	6,216	6,458	6,660	143	69	33	2.2%	1.1%	0.5%
Piute	1,445	1,462	1,508	1,371	1,391	1,404	74	71	104	5.1%	4.9%	6.9%
Rich	1,828	1,807	1,822	1,762	1,782	1,799	66	25	23	3.6%	1.4%	1.3%
Salt Lake	791,788	806,280	818,860	802,672	815,529	827,818	(10,884)	(9,249)	(8,958)	-1.4%	-1.1%	-1.1%
San Juan	13,362	13,414	13,188	13,263	13,498	13,221	99	(84)	(33)	0.7%	-0.6%	-0.3%
Sanpete	18,788	19,216	19,999	18,487	19,047	19,883	301	169	116	1.6%	0.9%	0.6%
Sevier	16,918	17,350	17,683	16,390	16,745	17,156	528	605	527	3.1%	3.5%	3.0%
Summit	21,072	22,367	23,562	21,151	22,768	23,988	(79)	(401)	(426)	-0.4%	-1.8%	-1.8%
Tooele	29,288	29,522	30,492	28,251	28,754	29,558	1,037	768	934	3.5%	2.6%	3.1%
Uintah	24,662	24,235	24,275	23,989	24,377	24,472	673	(142)	(197)	2.7%	-0.6%	-0.8%
Utah	298,413	308,607	317,879	302,052	310,642	319,694	(3,639)	(2,035)	(1,815)	-1.2%	-0.7%	-0.6%
Wasatch	11,841	12,168	12,585	11,214	11,528	12,046	627	640	539	5.3%	5.3%	4.3%
Washington	63,381	68,475	72,888	63,770	68,706	73,161	(389)	(231)	(273)	-0.6%	-0.3%	-0.4%
Wayne	2,305	2,315	2,389	2,220	2,284	2,371	85	31	18	3.7%	1.3%	0.8%
Weber	172,404	175,150	178,069	168,946	171,965	175,034	3,458	3,185	3,035	2.0%	1.8%	1.7%
Bear River	118,615	120,891	123,404	114,107	122,716	124,686	4,508	(1,825)	(1,282)	3.8%	-1.5%	-1.0%
Wasatch Front	1,211,962	1,232,473	1,253,758	1,212,350	1,232,589	1,254,060	(388)	(116)	(302)	-0.0%	-0.0%	-0.0%
Mountainlands	331,326	343,142	354,026	334,417	344,938	355,728	(3,091)	(1,796)	(1,702)	-0.9%	-0.5%	-0.5%
Six County	58,117	59,397	60,982	56,443	57,927	59,678	1,674	1,470	1,304	2.9%	2.5%	2.1%
Five County	103,654	110,968	116,866	103,075	109,960	115,454	579	1,008	1,412	0.6%	0.9%	1.2%
Uintah Basin	38,889	38,669	39,110	38,059	38,624	39,002	830	45	108	2.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Southeast	53,041	53,486	54,216	51,070	51,559	51,886	1,971	1,927	2,330	3.7%	3.6%	4.3%
State	1,915,604	1,959,026	2,002,362	1,909,521	1,958,313	2,000,494	6,083	713	1,868	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%

Source: Utah Population Estimates Committee and the U.S. Bureau of the Census

Utah Population Estimates Committee

Jim Robson
Utah Foundation

Barry Nangle
Utah Department of Health

Ron Durtschi
Mountain Fuel Supply

Frank Hachman
University of Utah

Yun Kim
Utah State University

Ken Jensen
Utah Department of Employment Security

Tom Williams
Utah State Tax Commission

Gery Moore
Utah Department of Health

Walter Busse
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints

Jeff White
Utah State Board of Regents

Patty Bowles
Utah State Office of Education

T. Ross Reeve
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

Natalie Gochnour
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

Brad Barber, Chair
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget