

Utah Economic and Business Review

Bureau of Economic and Business Research David Eccles School of Business University of Utah

Highlights

- Salt Lake County is the economic, political, and cultural center of Utah and is expected to remain so for the foreseeable future. The county is currently home to nearly 40% of Utah residents and generates about half of all jobs in the state.
- When the demographic characteristics and trends of Salt Lake County are compared to those of the rest of the state, it is quite clear that policies designed to target state averages miss the mark. Although the signature Utah population characteristics influence the county, they are much more pronounced elsewhere in the state. Further, Salt Lake County's demographics are much more similar to the nation than are those of the rest of Utah, and will become more so in the future.
- Salt Lake County has an older and more diverse population with smaller households than the rest of the state. The national post-WWII baby boom age wave is much more prominent in the Salt Lake County population, while the early 1980s Utah baby boom age wave and its echo dominate the age structure elsewhere in Utah.
- If trends continue, the 60 and older population in Salt Lake County will surpass its school-age population by 2033 and exceed it by over 70,000 by 2050. The oldest age group in the population, those 85 years and older, will increase twelve-fold, from just over 8,700 in 2000 to over 103,000 in 2050. This means that nearly half (46.3 percent) of all Utahns 85 years and older will reside in Salt Lake County in 2050.
- The retirement-age dependency ratio for Salt Lake County is projected to reach 39.9, which is even higher than the 37.0 projected for the U.S. The combined dependency ratio of 96.1 for Salt Lake County in 2050 will surpass the state of Utah's 1970 dependency ratio. Because of the absolute and relative increases in the oldest age groups, Salt Lake County will face challenges that it has never experienced. While in the past it has confronted a very high youth dependency ratio, it will for the first time have the simultaneous occurrence of high youth and high retirement-age dependency ratios.

September/October 2006November/December 2006Volume 66 Numbers 9 & 10Volume 66 Numbers 11 & 12

Salt Lake County's Distinctive Demographics: Implications for the Future^{*}

Pamela S. Perlich, Senior Research Economist

Salt Lake County is the economic, political, and cultural center of Utah. The county is currently home to nearly 40% of Utah residents and generates about half of all jobs in the state. It remains the most populous county, with a million of the state's 2.6 million residents,² and its daytime population swells by more than 50,000 to accommodate in-commuters from surrounding counties. Salt Lake County has maintained a central yet evolving role within the state since its inception.

Because of its relative size, Salt Lake County dominates all standard state-level demographic and economic metrics. The truly distinctive character of Salt Lake County within Utah becomes particularly evident when it is compared to the rest of the state, rather than to the state as a whole. This paper focuses on key population characteristicsage and sex structure, race and ethnic composition, and household sizes of Salt Lake County, and examines how these compare to the balance of Utah. What emerges from this analysis is that the county is much more similar to the nation than is the rest of the state, which truly embodies the more classic "Utah demographics." These differences have significant implications for the future of Salt Lake County. This analysis begins with an identification and comparison of historical demographic characteristics of Salt Lake County with those elsewhere in Utah. The second half of the paper is an exploration of how these differential patterns and trends will impact the future of the county.

Past and Current Demographic Trends and Characteristics

Utah perennially ranks at the extremes among states on most basic population characteristics. Its highest-in-the-nation fertility rate combines with long-term net in-migration to generate rapid rates of population growth, a youthful population, a high number of children per capita, and large average household size. While Salt Lake County shares these rankings relative to the nation, these signature Utah demographics are much more pronounced elsewhere in Utah. That is, Salt Lake County has a higher median age and smaller household size than the rest of the state. In addition, it is more racially and ethnically

^{&#}x27;This study is part of a much larger study of Salt Lake County demographics and socioeconomics which has been commissioned by Salt Lake County Aging Services.

diverse and has a higher share of foreign born. And, as is shown later in the paper, these differences in demographic characteristics eventually translate into quite distinct demographic futures, and for Salt Lake County, one which is much more similar to that of the nation.

Age Structure and Sex Ratios

Salt Lake County's median age in 2000 was 28.9, as compared to 25.9 elsewhere in Utah and 35.1 for the nation. The county's higher median age is the result of a greater share of working-age persons than the rest of the state. While the county had 40.2 percent of the state's total population in the 2000 census, it had only 37.3 percent of the state's population less than 25 years old, and 38.6 percent of the state's population 60 years and older (Figure 1). However, 43.6 percent of the state's middle working-age group, ages 25 to 60 years old, were residents of Salt Lake County in 2000. As a





result, the youth and retirement-age dependency ratios are lower in Salt Lake County than in the rest of the state.

The dependency ratio is a commonly used measure of age structure. The youth dependency ratio is the number of persons less than 18 years old per 100 working-age persons (18 to 65 years old), while the retirement-age dependency ratio is the number of persons 65 years and older per 100 working-age persons. The sum of these two components is the total dependency ratio. As shown in Figure 2, in 2000 the youth dependency ratio was 49.6 in Salt Lake County as compared to 57.6 for the rest of the state and 41.5 in the U.S. The retirement-age dependency ratio in 2000 was 13.2 in Salt Lake County as compared to 15.2 for the state and 20.1 for the nation. Utah's early 1980s baby boom and its current echo boom are much less dominant in the county's age structure than in that of the rest of the state, while the age wave

Figure 2 Dependency Ratios in 2000: Salt Lake County, Rest of Utah, and U.S.



Source: BEBR computations from Bureau of the Census data, Census 2000, SF1. Note: Components may not sum to totals due to rounding.

corresponding to the national post-WWII baby boom is much more prominent in Salt Lake County than elsewhere in Utah. This is illustrated in Figure 3.

The national baby boom is generally defined as beginning in 1946, peaking in 1957, and ending in 1964. The echo from this boom began about 1976, peaked in 1990, and ended around 2000. In contrast, Utah's post-WWII baby boom peaked in 1962, and resulting echo peaked in the early 1980s. An additional echo is now underway, with record births for nine of the past ten years. While the national baby boom peak in 1957 exceeded that of its echo's peak in 1990, each of Utah's echoes has surpassed the prior boom or echo.

As shown in Figure 4, the age-specific sex ratios for Salt Lake County follow the same basic pattern as the rest of the state, with the notable exception of the 15 through 19, 20 through 24, 30 through 34, and 65 years and older age groups. In Salt Lake County, males outnumber females for 5-year age groups

Figure 3 Population by Age and Sex, 2000



Source: BEBR computations from Bureau of the Census data, Census 2000, SF1.



under 50, while males are nearly equal to females in the 50through-54 age group, and females outnumber males for all five-year age groups 55 years and older. The pattern is similar in the rest of Utah, with the exception of the 15 through 19 and 20 through 24-year- old age groups. In these age groups, the male-to-female ratio is less than one for the rest of the state outside of Salt Lake County. The sex ratio for the U.S. is nearly identical to Salt Lake County for all five-year age groups less than 25 years old. Beyond 25 years old, Salt Lake County has higher sex ratios than the U.S.

This difference in the sex ratio in the 15 through 19 and 20 through 24-year-old age groups is most likely an indication of a lower young male participation rate in out-of-state religious service (missions) in Salt Lake County than in the rest of the state in general. Labor force participation rates are higher for both males and females aged 16 through 19 and 20 through 24 in Salt Lake County as compared to the rest of the state. Also, school enrollment for male and female residents in Salt Lake County ages 15 through 19 and 20 through 24 is lower than comparable rates for the rest of the state.³ The male-tofemale ratio for the 25 through 29 is somewhat higher and the 30 through 39-year-old age groups is substantially higher in Salt Lake County. Given the magnitude of large construction projects underway in 2000, this could be a reflection of the temporary construction worker population, which is mostly male. While many of the signature statewide demographic characteristics are present in exaggerated form outside Salt Lake County, they are much less evident in Salt Lake County. Younger persons (ages 15 through 24) who reside in Salt Lake County are much more likely to be in the labor force rather than in school compared to their counterparts elsewhere in the state.

For both Salt Lake County and the balance of Utah (excluding Salt Lake County), the male-to-female ratio is less than one for all 5-year age groups 55 years and older, and this ratio declines

in older age groups. The ratio dips below one for the U.S. by the 40 through 44 year old age group. However, the male-tofemale ratio is higher in the older age groups outside of Salt Lake County, while the sex ratio of Salt Lake County in these older age groups only slightly exceeds that of the nation. This means that a greater share of the older population in the U.S. is female as compared to Salt Lake County, and a greater share of the older population in Salt Lake County is female as compared to the rest of the state. Possible explanations include differential migration patterns of the older population within Utah as well as differing race and ethnic composition of the U.S., Salt Lake County, and the rest of Utah.⁴

Households and Group Quarters

Of the 295,141 Salt Lake County households counted in the 2000 census, 81,039 were classified as non-family households, composing about half of the state's nonfamily household total⁵ (Table 1). Family households were 72.5 percent of households in the county, as compared to 79.1 percent for the rest of the state. Salt Lake County had a larger proportion of 1-person households and a smaller share of 4-person or greater households, as compared to the rest of the state. The average household size in Salt Lake County was 3.00 persons, as compared to 3.22 persons per household elsewhere in Utah. Family households had an average of 3.53 persons, somewhat less than the 3.60 persons in the rest of the state.

Persons in group quarters (dormitories, correctional facilities, nursing homes, etc.) were enumerated to be 14,380 or 1.6

Table 1 Households by Type and Size: Salt Lake County and the Rest of Utah, 2000

	Salt Lak	e County	Rest o	of Utah
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Total households	295,141	100.0%	406,140	100.0%
Family households	214,102	72.5%	321,192	79.1%
Male householder	164,808	55.8%	265,261	65.3%
Female householder	49,294	16.7%	55,931	13.8%
Nonfamily households	81,039	27.5%	84,948	20.9%
Male householder	39,885	13.5%	39,230	9.7%
Living alone	28,212	9.6%	27,601	6.8%
Female householder	41,154	13.9%	45,718	11.3%
Living alone	33,154	11.2%	35,789	8.8%
HOUSEHOLD SIZE				
Total households	295,141	100.0%	406,140	100.0%
1-person household	61,366	20.8%	63,390	15.6%
2-person household	84,769	28.7%	118,135	29.1%
3-person household	48,820	16.5%	66,597	16.4%
4-person household	45,755	15.5%	65,942	16.2%
5-person household	27,270	9.2%	44,125	10.9%
6-person household	14,995	5.1%	27,691	6.8%
7-or-more-person household	12,166	4.1%	20,260	5.0%

Source: BEBR computations from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 SF1, QT-P10.

percent of the Salt Lake County population in 2000, somewhat less than the 2.0 percent share for the rest of the state. The county has nearly 60 percent of the state's correctional facility population because of the presence of the state prison. This results in over half (56 percent) of the state's institutionalized male population aged 18 through 64 residing in the county.6

Race and Ethnicity

The Salt Lake County minority population more than tripled from 1980 to 2000 to reach 171,190 or 19.1 percent of the population (Figure 5). This share is significantly higher than the 14.7 percent of the state as a whole and the 11.8 percent share for the rest of the state (state minus Salt Lake County). Among all counties, Salt Lake County has the numerically largest minority population, and the county's minorities account for 52 percent of the state minority population. Hispanics were 62 percent of the Salt Lake County minority population in 2000. The 2005 American Community Survey (ACS) of households estimates the minority share of Salt Lake County has increased to 22.0 percent and the minority share of the state population has increased to 16.4 percent. Salt Lake County has the highest share of minorities of any county in Utah except San Juan County, which has the largest American Indian population in the state. As shown in Table 2, Salt Lake County has a greater share of the state's population of all but one major race and ethnic minority groups (American Indian) than its share in the state's total population (40.2 percent) in general.7

The county's largest minority is Hispanic or Latino, which in 2000 was 11.9 percent of the county population as compared to 7.1 percent of the rest of the state (excluding Salt Lake County). According to estimates from the 2005 ACS, the Hispanic share of the household population increased to 14.7





Sources: Bureau of the Census, Perlich (2002), BEBR computations. Note: Prior to 1970, minority is non-White. For 1970 and beyond, minority is non-White (may be Hispanic or non-Hispanic) plus Hispanic (may be of any race).

percent in Salt Lake County and 10.9 percent in the state. Salt Lake County also has a significantly higher share of non-Hispanic Asian persons in its minority population (2.5 percent in 2000) than the rest of the state (1.0 percent). Nearly threequarters of the state's Pacific Islander population resides in Salt Lake County.

By 1990, over half the state's minorities lived in Salt Lake County. According to decennial census counts, Salt Lake County's total population increased by 172,431 from 1990 to 2000. Of this, 96,799 or 56.1 percent of the increase was contributed by growth of the minority population and 63,140 or 36.6 percent was contributed by growth of the Hispanic population (Table 3). At the state level, 34.7 percent of the population growth in the 1990s was minority and 22.9

> percent was Hispanic. The proportions have increased since 2000.

Foreign Born

Much of the increase in the minority populations is attributable to immigration, which has increased significantly over the past 20 years to reach historic levels. Since 1990, Utah has become a new immigrant destination. Within the state, Salt Lake County has received a greater share of immigrants than the rest of the state in general. While the county is home to 40.2 percent of the state's total population, it has nearly 6 in 10

Table 2 Race and Ethnicity of the Population (2000)

	Salt Lake	County	Salt Lake County's Share of State
Race and Ethnicity of the Population	Population	Share	Population Group
Total	898,387	100.0%	40.2%
Not Hispanic or Latino	791,600	88.1%	39.0%
White alone	727,197	80.9%	38.2%
Black or African American alone	8,501	0.9%	52.7%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	6,487	0.7%	24.3%
Asian alone	22,716	2.5%	62.3%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	10,865	1.2%	73.4%
Some other race alone	912	0.1%	46.8%
Two or more races	14,922	1.7%	47.7%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic or Latino	106,787	11.9%	53.0%
Minority	171,190	19.1%	52.0%

Table 3 Contributions to Salt Lake County Population Increase: Total, Minority, and Hispanic – 1970 to 2000

	Total	Minorit y	Hispanic										
	Population												
1970	458,607	22,483	17,078										
1980	619,066	48,884	30,867										
1990	725,956	74,391	43,647										
2000	898,387	171,190	106,787										
10-Year Increase													
1970-80	160,459	26,401	13,789										
1980-90	106,890	25,507	12,780										
1990-2000	172,431	96,799	63,140										
Share of	10-Year County	Total Population	Increase										
1970-80	100.0%	16.5%	8.6%										
1980-90	100.0%	23.9%	12.0%										
1990-2000	100.0%	56.1%	36.6%										

Source: BEBR computations from decennial census counts.

of the state's foreign born population. The foreign born were estimated to be 10.4 percent of the total population of Salt Lake County in the 2000 census and 11.6 percent of household population in 2005, according to the ACS. At the state level, foreign born were 7.1 percent of the total population in the 2000 census and 7.9 percent of the household population in the 2005 ACS.

Salt Lake County has almost two-thirds of the state's European foreign born population (including 82.4 percent of the Eastern European foreign born), almost two-thirds of the state's Asian foreign born, and over two-thirds of the state's foreign born from Africa and Oceania. Notably, nearly 9 in 10 of the state's Polynesian foreign born (87.7 percent) reside in Salt Lake County. The county is also home to well over half (55.7 percent) of the Latin American foreign born in the state. Salt Lake County has become an international melting pot in the state (Table 4).

The foreign born population is more heavily concentrated in the working ages and also has a higher male-to-female ratio that the native born population. Much of this population is working in construction, hospitality, landscaping, other service occupations, agriculture, and manufacturing. The foreign born are currently young and significant subpopulations (notably Hispanic/Latino) have fertility rates higher than the native born.⁸

Projected Demographic Trends and Characteristics

The Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget produces projections of population by age and sex and employment by industry for counties in Utah to the year 2050. The 2005

Table 4 Place of Birth of the Foreign Born Population (2000)

	Salt Lake	Share of County	
Tatal	County	Foreign Born 100.0%	State
Total	93,276		58.8%
	16,262	17.4%	63.4%
Northern Europe	3,664	3.9%	50.1%
Western Europe	5,251	5.6%	59.8%
Southern Europe	1,005	1.1%	54.7%
Eastern Europe	6,328	6.8%	82.4%
Europe,	14	0.0%	38.9%
Asia	18,294	19.6%	64.5%
Eastern Asia	5,255	5.6%	52.8%
South Central Asia	3,085	3.3%	73.8%
Southeastern Asia	8,171	8.8%	69.1%
Western Asia	1,709	1.8%	74.1%
Asia, n.e.c.	74	0.1%	64.9%
Africa	1,731	1.9%	71.7%
Oceania	5,107	5.5%	77.2%
Australia and New Zealand		0.9%	52.5%
Melanesia	47	0.1%	38.2%
Micronesia	175	0.2%	56.3%
Polynesia	4,089	4.4%	87.7%
Latin America	48,987	52.5%	55.7%
Caribbean	586	0.6%	57.7%
Central America	41,327	44.3%	55.8%
Mexico	37,232	39.9%	56.0%
Other Central America	4,095	4.4%	53.6%
Costa Rica	254	0.3%	57.2%
El Salvador	1,520	1.6%	47.5%
Guatemala	1,333	1.4%	55.8%
Honduras	533	0.6%	61.6%
Nicaragua	247	0.3%	61.0%
Panama	139	0.1%	52.1%
Other Central America	69	0.1%	93.2%
South America	7,074	7.6%	55.5%
Argentina	570	0.6%	32.9%
Bolivia	224	0.2%	52.3%
Brazil	1,382	1.5%	55.1%
Chile	694	0.7%	49.4%
Colombia	957	1.0%	66.0%
Ecuador	441	0.5%	49.6%
Guyana	49	0.1%	62.8%
Peru	1,423	1.5%	60.4%
Venezuela	1,148	1.2%	72.6%
Other South America	186	0.2%	59.0%
North America	2,888	3.1%	37.3%
Born at sea	7	0.0%	100.0%

Sources: BEBR computations of Census 2000, SF3.

Note: The abbreviation n.e.c. stands for not elsewhere classiefied.

baseline demographic projections for Salt Lake County are reviewed below.

Population Size and Change

Salt Lake County's total population is projected to increase to 1.7 million by 2050 (Table 5 and Exhibit 1). This represents an average annual rate of growth from 2000 to 2050 of 1.2 percent, lower than what is projected for the state as a whole: 1.8 percent. The county's share of the state population is expected to decline from 40.2 percent in 2000 to 31.0 percent in 2050.° Still, the county will be the most populous for the foreseeable future. Salt Lake County will remain the employment center in the state as well, although its share of Utah's total employment (wage and salary jobs plus self-

Salt Lake County's Distinctive Demographics: Implications for the Future

Exhibit 1 Salt Lake County Projected Components of Population Change 2000-2050

Salt Lake County Projected Population		1,700,000 ± 43%			1,400,000 † 737%	1,300,000 + + 35%	1,200,000 + + 33%	⇒ 1.100.000 + 31% at	1 000 000 + 29%	Choro of Ctoto		-		Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2005 Baseline.		Salt Lake County:	Projected Components of Population Change	-	_					5,000 to Natural Increase				-3,000 - 2005 2010 2015 2020 2025 2030 2035 2040 2045 2050	Source: Governor's Office of Planminand Budet 2005 Baseline			Salt Lake County:	Projected Year-Over Rates of Population Change		2.5%	2 00/		1.5% -		1.0% - V				2000 2005 2010 2015 2020 2025 2030 2035 2040 2045 2050		Source: Utah Population Estimates Committee
Change	2.0%	1.0%	1 4%	1 60/	1.0 /0	0/0	1.6%	1.5%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%	18%	1 7%	1.7%	1.6%	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	%0.I	%6.0	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	%6.0
- 11	4,303	-3 587	479	1 504	-,-00+ 0 1 4 E	2 + C	1,944	1,468	2,697	3.544	4.061	4 152	4 053	3.642	3,102	2,529	2,135	1,814	1,549	1,037	624	32	202-	CAC-	-1.078	-1,557	-2,058	-2,381	-2,703 2,053	-2,303	-3.100	-3,212	-3,308	-3,406	-3,471	-3.564	-3,596	-3,669	-3,675	-3,686	-3,693	-3,652	-3,002	-3,644	-3,710	-3,776
Increase Migration	13,170	12,872	13,380	13 107	10,101	10,401	13,381	13,557	13,706	13.940	14.212	14 424	14 654	14.977	15,177	15,369	15,410	15,492	15,688	15,836	15,895	16,043 16,070	16,070	10,101	16,463	16,589	16,710	16,824	17,020	17.122	17,170	17,249	17,332	17,418	11,479	17,588	17,638	17,737	17,771	17,810	17,846	17,834	11,8/0	17,923	17,980	18,034
	4,009 F 000	5 151	5,131	5 207	2000	0,090	5,490	5,543	5,610	5.675	5 744	5,816	5,888	5.962	6,037	6,113	6,196	6,279	6,368	6,459	6,554	6,659 e 7eo	0,/00 6 870	0,0/9 6 997	7,119	7,248	7,381	7,517	CC0, 1	7.939	8.087	8,234	8,384	8,532	0,004 0,026	0,000 8 985	9,133	9,274	9,419	9,560	9,695	9,829 0,677	9,955	10,205	10,324	10,440
Births	10,040	18 023	18.511	18 504	10,004	10,021	18,8/1	19,100	19,316	19.615	19,956	20,240	20,542	20.939	21,214	21,482	21,606	21,771	22,056	22,295	22,449	22,702	22,040	23,00U	23,582	23,837	24,091	24,341	24,000	25.061	25.257	25,483	25,716	25,950	20,103	26.573	26,771	27,011	27,190	27,370	27,541	27,663	27,831	28,128	28,304	28,474
_	902,111	927 564	940,465	055 166	001,000	910,140 000 040	986,073	1,001,098	1,017,501	1.034.985	1.053,258	1 071 834	1 090 541	1.109.160	1,127,439	1,145,337	1,162,882	1,180,188	1,197,425	1,214,298	1,230,817	1,246,892	1,202,112	1,210,290	1,309,168	1,324,200	1,338,852	1,353,295	1,001,442	1.395.630	1.409.700	1,423,737	1,437,761	1,451,773	1,405,787	1,4/9,72	1,507,858	1,521,926	1,536,022	1,550,146	1,564,299	1,578,481	1,592,695 1 606 042	1,621,221	1,635,491	1,649,749
Population																											2027			_									2041		2043			2047	2048	2049

	Popula	tion	Schoo Popul (Ages :	ation	Retirem Popul (65 Yeai	ation	Old Populat Years	ion (85	Total Emp	loyment	House	holds
Year	Total	Share of State	Total	Share of State	Total	Share of State	Total	Share of State	Total	Share of State	Total	Share of State
2000	902,777	40.2%	193,653	38.1%	72,990	38.2%	8,727	39.6%	666,674*	47.9%*	297,064	42.0%
2010	1,053,258	37.2%	219,762	35.4%	91,360	37.3%	11,268	36.8%	775,094	45.7%	362,825	38.5%
2020	1,230,817	35.3%	262,078	34.4%	144,742	38.7%	14,214	34.5%	934,300	44.8%	429,889	36.4%
2030	1,381,519	33.8%	286,172	33.3%	207,509	39.0%	29,322	41.4%	1,074,747	43.1%	493,268	34.8%
2040	1,521,926	32.4%	309,767	31.9%	270,198	38.7%	65,451	46.1%	1,202,626	40.8%	551,047	33.2%
2050	1,663,994	31.0%	336,835	30.5%	338,704	35.3%	103,570	46.3%	1,343,534	38.9%	608,614	31.8%

Table 5 Summary Projections for Salt Lake County: 2000-2050

Source: Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2005 Baseline Projections. *Data are for 2001.

employment) is projected to decrease from 48 percent in 2001 to 39 percent in 2050. Total employment in the county is expected to increase from about 667,000 to 1.3 million jobs over this period.

While the projections show continued population growth in Salt Lake County, net in-migration is projected to turn negative in 2022, with net out-migration projected for the remainder of the projection period. Implicit in the projections are assumptions about spatial development patterns and population densities. If population densities increase more rapidly in the county than assumed in the projections, net outmigration would be moderated or perhaps reversed. Natural increase (annual births minus annual deaths) is projected to become increasingly positive. The number of households in Salt Lake County is projected to increase more rapidly than population—more than doubling from 2000 (297,064) to 2050 (608,614). The result is a decline in persons per



Figure 6 Projected Persons per Household: Salt Lake County, the Rest of Utah, and the U.S.

household, from 2.99 in 2000 to a projected 2.67 in 2050. In the rest of the state, persons per household are projected to decline from 3.22 to 2.78. Nationally, average household size is expected to fall from 2.59 to 2.42 (Figure 6). Much of this decline in household size is attributable to the aging of the population.

Age Structure

As is true for the state in general, the above-replacement-level fertility rate is assumed to continue, generating successively larger numbers of births in Salt Lake County. The statewide age waves will also continue to create successive echoes and to impact the age structure of the county. Recent Utah birth cycles peaked in 1962 and 1980-1982, and the echo boom currently underway will possibly peak around 2011. The national Baby Boom peaked in 1957, while its echo peaked in 1990 at a lower level than the original boom. In contrast to



Figure 7 Projected Median Age: Salt Lake County, State of Utah, and the U.S.

Exhibit 2 Salt Lake County Population Projections By Sex and Five Year Age Group 2000 - 2050

										Char	nge: 2000 to	2050
Sex	Age	2000	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2040	2050	Amount	Percent	Share
Male	Less than 5 years old	41,574	49,888	53,777	56,490	58,985	61,881	67,510	71,897	30,323	72.9%	4.0%
	5-9 years old	38,204	47,447	50,616	54,122	56,387	58,499	64,019	69,128	30,924	80.9%	4.1%
	10-14 years old	37,567	42,000	48,098	50,922	54,038	55,965	60,546	66,055	28,488	75.8%	3.7%
	15-19 years old	39,761	36,591	40,438	45,789	48,099	50,714	54,140	59,265	19,504	49.1%	2.6%
	20-24 years old 25-29 years old	43,185 40,787	35,215 42,923	36,500	39,285	43,957	45,520	49,286	53,342	10,157	23.5% 32.8%	1.5%
	30-34 years old	35,718	42,923	39,656 43,854	40,324 40,030	42,754 40,079	46,986 41,972	50,713 47,205	54,159 51,121	13,372	43.1%	2.0%
	35-39 years old	33,773	40,790	48,357	43,883	39,695	39,380	44,960	48,542	14,769	43.7%	1.9%
	40-44 years old	32,655	35,533	41,010	48,215	43,410	39,025	40,268	45,353	12,698	38.9%	1.7%
	45-49 years old	29,194	33,274	35,596	40,767	47,675	42,664	37,859	43,307	14,113	48.3%	1.9%
	50-54 years old	23,366	31,772	32,966	35,123	40,021	46,684	37,390	38,641	15,275	65.4%	2.0%
	55-59 years old	16,635	27,928	31,120	32,163	34,208	38,850	40,262	35,886	19,251	115.7%	2.5%
	60-64 years old	12,038	21,873	26,937	29,875	30,782	32,762	43,415	34,658	22,620	187.9%	3.0%
	65-69 years old	9,261	14,920	20,646	25,287	27,927	28,705	34,678	35,597	26,336	284.4%	3.5%
	70-74 years old	8,150	10,160	13,593	18,787	22,878	25,155	27,754	36,788	28,638	351.4%	3.8%
	75-79 years old	6,531	6,924	8,678	11,572	16,022	19,372	21,649	26,319	19,788	303.0%	2.6%
	80-84 years old	4,168	5,044	5,265	6,636	8,821	12,289	15,906	17,985	13,817	331.5%	1.8%
	85 years old and over	2,767	3,962	4,561	5,588	8,230	13,132	30,603	49,245	46,478	1679.7%	6.1%
	Total	455,334	534,146	581,668	624,858	663,968	699,555	768,163	837,288	381,954	83.9%	50.2%
	Median Age	28.3	31.2	32.6	33.2	33.5	33.6	34.0	34.4	_		
omale	Less than 5 years old	39,284	47 247	50,925	53,484	55,822	E0 E 47	63,864	68,016	1 20 722	72 10/	3.8%
emale			47,247				58,547			28,732	73.1%	3.8%
	5-9 years old 10-14 years old	35,888 35,570	45,432 39,729	47,978 46,083	51,273 48,287	53,384 51,189	55,337 52,962	60,523 57,212	65,357 62,409	29,469	82.1% 75.5%	3.5%
	15-19 years old	37,959	36,386	40,085	46,390	48,189	50,740	54,061	59,133	20,039	55.8%	2.8%
	20-24 years old	41,093	36,312	37,335	40,390	46,250	47,549	51,376	55,498	14,405	35.1%	1.9%
	25-29 years old	37,426	38,767	37,446	37,859	40,654	45,515	48,723	51,883	14,457	38.6%	1.9%
	30-34 years old	32,028	41,561	39,602	37,816	37,731	40,077	45,626	49,267	17,239	53.8%	2.3%
	35-39 years old	31,860	37,610	42,043	39,760	37,647	37,272	44,047	47,126	15,266	47.9%	2.0%
	40-44 years old	31,986	32,086	37,940	42,102	39,571	37,264	38,976	44,438	12,452	38.9%	1.6%
	45-49 years old	28,867	31,668	32,255	37,890	41,839	39,164	36,348	43,058	14,191	49.2%	1.9%
	50-54 years old	23,391	31,475	31,544	32,029	37,465	41,252	36,269	37,992	14,601	62.4%	1.9%
	55-59 years old	17,039	28,093	31,123	31,089	31,527	36,793	37,829	35,165	18,126	106.4%	2.4%
	60-64 years old	12,939	22,396	27,436	30,304	30,199	30,636	39,301	34,594	21,655	167.4%	2.8%
	65-69 years old	10,710	15,858	21,596	26,343	29,032	28,869	34,227	35,116	24,406	227.9%	3.2%
	70-74 years old	10,017	11,500	14,874	20,259	24,591	27,051	27,438	35,073	25,056	250.1%	3.3%
	75-79 years old	8,942	8,727	10,287	13,288	18,147	21,878	23,738	28,381	19,439	217.4%	2.6%
	80-84 years old	6,484	6,959	7,023	8,356	10,793	14,868	19,357	19,875	13,391	206.5%	1.8%
	85 years old and over Total	5,960	7,306	7,792	8,626	11,170	16,190	34,848	54,325	48,365	811.5%	6.4%
		447,443 29.5	519,112 31.9	563,669 32.8	605,959	645,200	681,964	753,763	826,706	379,263	84.8%	49.8%
	Median Age	29.5	31.9	32.8	33.3	33.6	33.7	34.5	35.2			
otal	Less than 5 years old	80,858	97,135	104,702	109,974	114,807	120,428	131,374	139,913	59,055	73.0%	7.8%
0.01	5-9 years old	74.092	92.879	98.594	105.395	109,271	113.836	124.542	134.485	60.393	81.5%	7.9%
	10-14 years old	73,137	81,729	94,181	99,209	105,227	108,927	117,758	128,464	55,327	75.6%	7.3%
	15-19 years old	77,720	72,977	80,825	92,179	96,288	100,927	108,201	118,398	40,678	52.3%	5.3%
	20-24 years old	84,278	71,527	73,835	80,089	90,207	93,069	100,662	108,840	24,562	29.1%	3.2%
	25-29 years old	78,213	81,690	77,102	78,183	83,408	92,501	99,436	106,042	27,829	35.6%	3.7%
	30-34 years old	67,746	89,463	83,456	77,846	77,810	82,049	92,831	100,388	32,642	48.2%	4.3%
	35-39 years old	65,633	78,400	90,400	83,643	77,342	76,652	89,007	95,668	30,035	45.8%	3.9%
	40-44 years old	64,641	67,619	78,950	90,317	82,981	76,289	79,244	89,791	25,150	38.9%	3.3%
	45-49 years old	58,061	64,942	67,851	78,657	89,514	81,828	74,207	86,365	28,304	48.7%	3.7%
	50-54 years old	46,757	63,247	64,510	67,152	77,486	87,936	73,659	76,633	29,876	63.9%	3.9%
	55-59 years old	33,674	56,021	62,243	63,252	65,735	75,643	78,091	71,051	37,377	111.0%	4.9%
	60-64 years old	24,977	44,269	54,373	60,179	60,981	63,398	82,716	69,252	44,275	177.3%	5.8%
	65-69 years old	19,971	30,778	42,242	51,630	56,959	57,574	68,905	70,713	50,742	254.1%	6.7%
	70-74 years old	18,167	21,660	28,467	39,046	47,469	52,206	55,192	71,861	53,694	295.6%	7.1%
	75-79 years old	15,473	15,651	18,965	24,860	34,169	41,250	45,387	54,700	39,227	253.5%	5.2%
	80-84 years old	10,652	12,003	12,288	14,992	19,614	27,157	35,263	37,860	27,208	255.4%	3.6%
	85 years old and over	8,727	11,268	12,353	14,214	19,400	29,322	65,451	103,570	94,843	1086.8%	12.5%
	Total Modian Age	902,777	1,053,258	1,145,337	1,230,817	1,309,168	1,381,519	1,521,926	1,663,994	761,217	84.3%	100.0%
	Median Age	28.9	31.5	32.7	33.2	33.5	33.6	34.2	34.8	_		

Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2005 Baseline.

Note: The far right column indicates the percentage of the total population increase that is accounted for by the given age group.

the national age waves, each Utah echo has surpassed the previous in magnitude. Utah's post war boom peaked in 1960, and has had two subsequent echoes, peaking in the early 1980s and again expected to peak by 2011.

Aging Population

As shown in Figure 7, median ages of Salt Lake County, the State of Utah, and the U.S. will increase significantly from 2000 to 2050. For the nation, median age is expected to increase by 3.7 years, from 35.4 in 2000 to 39.1 in 2050. By comparison, the Utah median age in 2000 was significantly lower, at 27.2 years, and should reach 34.0 years by 2050, an increase of 6.8 years. For Salt Lake County, median age is expected to increase by 5.9 years, going from 28.9 to 34.8 by 2050. The gap between the Salt Lake County and U.S. median ages will narrow from 6.5 years in 2000 to 4.3 years in 2050. The aging of the population is the combined result of increasing life expectancy and an increase in the share of the population in older age groups.

The changing age structure leading to this increasing median age in Salt Lake County is shown Figure 8. While the number of persons under 5 years old outnumbered those 65 and older in 2000, by 2013 the ranking reverses, with the 65and-older population eventually being more than double this youngest age group by 2050. Similarly, the 60 years and older population in Salt Lake County will surpass the school age population (5 through 17 years old) by 2033 and exceed it by over 70,000 by 2050. The number of persons at least 85 years old is projected to increase by a factor of nearly 12, from just over 8,700 in 2000 to over 103,000 in 2050. Further age detail is shown in Exhibit 2.

If these projections are correct, Salt Lake County will have 31.0 percent of the total state population in 2050 (Figure 9). And Salt Lake County's shares of Utah's younger and workingage groups will be nearly proportionate to its share of the total population. By 2050, Salt Lake County will have 30.5 percent



Figure 8 Selected Age Group Projections for Salt Lake County

of the state's population less than five years old, 30.7 percent of the state's school-age population, and 29.7 percent of Utah's working-age population. However, in the older age groups, the growth is projected to be so rapid that Salt Lake County will have 35.3 percent of the state's population 65 years and older and nearly half (46.3 percent) of the persons at least 85 years old living in the state in 2050.

Between 2000 and 2050, projections indicate that the total population of Salt Lake County will increase by 761,217. Over one-third (34.9 percent) or over a quarter of a million of this increase (265,714) will occur in the 65 years and older age group. One-eighth (94,843) of the increase in the county's population from 2000 to 2050 will be in the 85 years and older age group. While the total population of the county is expected to increase by 84.3 percent from 2000 to 2050, the projected 65-and-older population will increase by 423.7 percent and the 85-and-older population will increase by over one thousand (1,086.8) percent.

The 65-and-older population will be the most rapidly growing age group in Utah. The expected concentration of the state's older population in Salt Lake County results in an age distribution that is quite different from the rest of the state. This distinctive concentration of the older age groups in Salt Lake County is clearly visible when comparing the population pyramids of Salt Lake County and the rest of Utah. This is shown in Figures 10 and 11.

Increasing Retirement Age Dependency Ratio

As explained above, the dependency ratio is the number of non-working- age persons (those less than 18 and those at least 65 years old) per 100 working-age (18 to 65 years old) persons. The two major components of this measure are the youth and retirement-age components. The shifting age structure and increasing median age is evident in the increasing retirement-age component of the dependency ratio. Projected dependency ratios for Salt Lake County are shown

Figure 9 Salt Lake County Projected Share of the State of Utah: Total Population and Selected Age Groups, 2000-2050



Source: BEBR computations from Utah Govenor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2005 Baseline Projections.









in Figure 12, while those for the balance of the state are shown in Figure 13. By 2050 the retirement-age component is projected to increase to 39.9 persons per 100 working-age persons in Salt Lake County, significantly higher than the 30.9 for the rest of the state and even higher than the 37.0 that is projected for the nation. For Salt Lake County, the increasing proportion of persons over the age of 65 begins in the decade of the 2010s and continues for the foreseeable future. By 2050, over one in five Salt Lake County residents (20.4 percent) is projected to be at least 65 years old. This is nearly identical to the 20.7 percent projected for the U.S., and is higher than the 17.8 percent projected for the State of Utah and the 16.7 percent share projected for the state outside of Salt Lake County.

Again, the distinctiveness of Salt Lake County's age structure within Utah is striking. By 2050, the youth component of the Salt Lake County dependency ratio (56.2 per 100 working-age

persons) is somewhat higher than that of the rest of the state (53.8 per 100 working age persons). The retirement-age component of the dependency ratio in 2050 is projected to be significantly higher in Salt Lake County (39.9 persons at least 65 years old per 100 working-age persons) than in the rest of the state (30.9 persons at least 65 years old per 100 working-age persons). The combined result for Salt Lake County by 2050 is a total of 96.1 nonworking-age persons per 100 working-age persons per 100 working-age persons. This is higher that the total dependency ratio of 90 for the State of Utah in 1970.¹⁰ The relative shares of these age groups in the Salt Lake County population from 2000 to 2050 are shown in Figure 14.

Conclusion

Salt Lake County will certainly retain its dominant economic, demographic, and cultural role in Utah for the foreseeable future. Although other counties within the state may have more rapid growth rates (on a percentage basis), Salt Lake County will continue to contribute the largest absolute numbers to all major economic and demographic metrics. Because of this numeric dominance, the truly unique character of Salt Lake County is often obscured by comparing it to the state as a whole. However, when the characteristics and trends of Salt Lake County are compared to those of the rest of the state, it is quite clear that policies designed to target state averages miss the mark. Although the signature Utah population characteristics influence the county, they are much more pronounced elsewhere in the state. Further, Salt Lake County's demographics are much more similar to the nation than are those of the rest of Utah, and will become more so in the future.

Salt Lake County has a younger population, larger household sizes, and less ethnic and racial diversity than the nation. Also, it has an older and more diverse population with smaller households than the rest of the state. The national post-WWII baby boom age wave is much more prominent in the Salt Lake County population, while the early 1980s Utah baby boom age wave and its echo dominate the age structure elsewhere in Utah. If trends continue, the 60 and older population in Salt Lake County will surpass the school-age population by 2033 and exceed it by over 70,000 by 2050. The oldest age group in the population, those 85 years and older, will increase twelve-fold, from just over 8,700 in 2000 to over 103,000 in 2050. This means that nearly half (46.3 percent) of all Utahns 85 years and older will reside in Salt Lake County in 2050. The retirement-age dependency ratio for Salt Lake County is projected to reach 39.9, which is even higher than the 37.0 projected for the U.S. The combined dependency ratio of 96.1 for Salt Lake County in 2050 will surpass the state of Utah's 1970 dependency ratio. Because of the absolute and relative increases in the oldest age groups, Salt Lake County will face challenges that it has never experienced. While in the past it has confronted a very high





youth dependency ratio, it will for the first time have the simultaneous occurrence of high youth and a high retirementage dependency ratios.

Beyond these significant differences in age structure, Salt Lake County attracts more immigrants and more ethnically and culturally diverse populations than does the rest of Utah. These current and future populations will generally join the ranks of the working-age population and eventually the retirement-aged as well. By 2050, many of the 85 and older population will be people who moved to Salt Lake County in their prime working years in the 1990s. Increasingly, their descendents will join others in their generations to shape the future of Salt Lake County and Utah.





Figure 13 State of Utah Less Salt Lake County Dependency Ratio



Source: Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2005 Baseline Projections. Components may not sum to totals due to rounding.

Endnotes

¹Utah Population Estimates Committee. ²Bureau of the Census, Census 2000, SF3, QT-P19 and PCT23.

³Mortality rates vary by race and ethnicity.

⁴Households are classified by the Bureau of the Census as comprising related individuals, called family households, and nonrelated individuals, call nonfamily households.

⁵U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 2000, SF1, QT-P12. ⁶Pamela S. Perlich. 2002. *Utah Minorities: The Story Told by 150 Years of Census Data.* Salt Lake City: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Utah.

⁷Pamela S. Perlich, 2004. "Immigrants Transform Utah: Entering a New Era of Diversity." *Utah Economic and Business Review*, Volume 64, Numbers 5 and 6, May/June 2004.

⁸Counties with more rapid growth rates include adjacent, commuter counties to Salt Lake as well as Cache, Washington, and Iron.

⁹Pamela S. Perlich, 1996. "Age Structure," pages 19-30 from Heaton, Hirshchl, and Chadwick, eds., *Utah in the 1990s: A Demographic Perspective.*

Bureau of Economic and Business Research University of Utah 1645 East Campus Center Drive, Room 401 Salt Lake City , Utah 84112-9302

Address Service Requested

NON-PROFIT ORG. U.S. POSTAGE PAID Salt Lake City, UT Permit No. 1529

UTAH ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS REVIEW



Michael K. Young President

Office of Technology Venture Development Jack W. Brittain Vice President

Bureau of Economic and Business Research James A. Wood Director



Jordan Bate Jan E. Crispin John C. Downen Diane S. Gillam Alan E. Isaacson Francis X. Lilly Pamela S. Perlich Nathan Schaff

Research Staff

Research Assistant Senior Economist Research Analyst Administrative Officer Research Analyst Research Analyst Senior Research Economist Research Assistant

http://www.business.utah.edu/bebr

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

VOLUME 66 NOs. 9, 10, 11 & 12