RESEARCH REPORT

A publication providing statistical information on Howard County demographics, socioeconomic and employment trends and patterns. Available from the Department of Planning and Zoning by calling (410) 313-4370.

## Howard County Population Growth - 2000 to 2003

## Introduction

The Census Bureau recently released their intercensal population estimates for the period from April 1, 2000, the time of the last Decennial Census, to July 1, 2003. The population estimates are based on growth by three components of change: 1) natural population increase (births minus deaths), 2) international migration and 3) internal or domestic migration. This report summarizes these estimates from the Census Bureau providing regional and state comparisons. In addition, the Bureau's estimates are compared to the Department of Planning and Zoning's (DPZ) population growth estimates based on new housing units. Historic population growth for Howard County is also discussed. Later this year, sometime in the summer of 2004, the Census Bureau will provide growth estimates for the same time period by age, sex and race.

## Howard County Population Growth

The table below summarizes population growth in Howard County since the 2000 Census was taken on April 1 of that year. Components of population growth are included in the table.

Howard County Population Increase by Component of Change
April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2003

| Population Component | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { April } 1 \\ 2000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { July } 1 \\ 2000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { July } 1 \\ 2001 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { July } 1 \\ 2002 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { July } 1 \\ 2003 \end{gathered}$ | Total | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| + Births |  | 882 | 3,535 | 3,577 | 3,570 | 11,564 |  |
| Deaths |  | 304 | 1,295 | 1,293 | 1,342 | 4,234 |  |
| = Net Natural Increase |  | 578 | 2,240 | 2,284 | 2,228 | 7,330 | 44.6\% |
| + Internal Migration |  | 844 | 2,614 | 1,316 | 745 | 5,519 | 33.6\% |
| + International Migration |  | 290 | 1,143 | 1,145 | 1,142 | 3,720 | 22.7\% |
| + Residual |  | 13 | (35) | (68) | (56) | (146) | -0.9\% |
| = Population Increase |  | 1,725 | 5,962 | 4,677 | 4,059 | 16,423 | 100.0\% |
| \% Population Increase |  | 0.7\% | 2.4\% | 1.8\% | 1.6\% | 6.6\% |  |
| Total Population | 247,842 | 249,567 | 255,529 | 260,206 | 264,265 |  |  |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch, April 2004

Over the three and a quarter year period, the County's population increased by an estimated 16,423 residents, from 247,842 on April 1, 2000 to 264,265 on July 1, 2003, a 6.6 percent increase. Annually, over that time period, population growth has slowed with an increase of 5,962 residents from 2000 to 2001, a smaller increase of 4,677 residents from 2001 to 2002, and only 4,059 additional residents from 2002 to 2003, the smallest increase since 1980 to 1981, more than 20 years ago.

Looking at the various component of population growth, 44.6 percent of the growth over the entire time period was due to natural population increase (births minus deaths), 33.6 percent due to internal or domestic migration and 22.7 percent was due to international migration. ${ }^{1}$ The charts below summarize the components on an annual basis.


[^0]

It is clear that while the natural population increase and international migration has remained relatively constant from 2000 to 2003, internal migration has slowed considerably, from 2,614 residents in the 2000 to 2001 time period, when it was the greatest component, to only 745 residents in the 2002 to 2003 time period, when it was the smallest of the three components. Why this has occurred can only be speculated given that the detailed domestic migration data showing where residents came and went is not available yet. One possible explanation could be that the slowdown is a result of the limited supply of housing as well as the sharp increase in prices over the last few years prompting residents to choose to move to other further out counties like Carroll or Frederick where housing may be more affordable.

## Comparisons to DPZ's Construction Report Estimates

The Department of Planning and Zoning's Research Division tracks residential building completions on a monthly basis. The results are summarized in DPZ's Construction Report. ${ }^{2}$ Population growth is also estimated in this report based on the type of units built, estimated household size and vacancy rates. The table on the next page compares the population estimated in the Construction Report to the Census Bureau's estimates discussed above.

Based on building completions, it is estimated that the County grew by 17,253 residents from April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2003. This is 830 more residents than the 16,423 estimate provided by the Census Bureau, a difference of about 5 percent. By looking at the annual data, for the latest period from 2002 to 2003, the results were almost identical with a difference of only 12 people,

[^1]less than a three tenths of one percent difference. From April, 2000 to July 2001, the difference was also relatively modest at only 2.2 percent. For the middle period, from July 2001 to July 2002, however, the difference was comparatively large at 14.4 percent, with the building completion methodology estimating 673 more residents compared to the Census Bureau's estimates based on their methodology discussed above.

Howard County Population Increase Based on New Unit Construction Compared to Census Bureau Population Estimates
April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2003

|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { April 1 } \\ 2000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { July } 1 \\ 2001 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { July } 1 \\ 2002 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { July } 1 \\ 2003 \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DPZ Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Units |  | 2,780 | 2,104 | 1,439 | 6,323 |
| New Population (1) |  | 7,856 | 5,350 | 4,047 | 17,253 |
| Total Population (2) | 247,842 | 255,698 | 261,048 | 265,095 |  |
| Census Bureau |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Population |  | 7,687 | 4,677 | 4,059 | 16,423 |
| Total Population | 247,842 | 255,529 | 260,206 | 264,265 |  |
| Difference |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population (DPZ - CB) |  | 169 | 673 | (12) | 830 |
| Percent Diff in Growth Est. |  | 2.20\% | 14.4\% | -0.3\% | 5.1\% |
| Percent Diff in Total Pop. |  | 0.07\% | 0.32\% | 0.31\% |  |

(1) Population Estimates based on new units times vacancy factors times household size by unit type. See DPZ's Construction Report for further details.
(2) DPZ future estimates begin with the 2000 Census population of 247,842 as a base.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch, April 2004 Howard County DPZ Construction Report


Given that both methodologies are estimates based on various factors, it is difficult to say which is closer to the truth. A number of factors could impact the Census Bureau's estimates such as a fallacy in their assumption that foreign immigration to Howard County maintains the same proportionate share of the national total as it did over the previous five years. On the other hand, the Construction Report assumes that household size countywide has not changed since 2000. If household size declines just slightly, then the total population estimates could be overestimated. In general, however, the two methodologies are relative consistent with a difference of only about 5 percent for the entire timeframe, providing a good set of checks and balances to ensure that neither is significantly off base.

## An Historical Perspective

In 1969 the population of Howard County was only 60,092 , about 22 percent of the 264,265 residents living in the County in 2003. This represents an average annual growth rate of $4.45 \%$ over the 34 year period. In general, this growth has been relatively steady from one year to the next, although there have been peaks and valleys. In recent years, growth rates have steadily declined since 1999.

The first table below summarizes the cumulative population growth, whereas the subsequent two tables show the annual and percent annual growth, respectively. As indicated earlier, from 2002 to 2003 Howard County grew by the smallest amount in terms of new residents since 1981. In terms of the rate of growth, or percentage growth from one year to the next, the smallest level over the 1969 to 2003 analysis period occurred from 2002 to 2003 at only 1.6 percent. The rate was 1.8 percent from 2001 to 2002, the first time the rate was below 2 percent. This is to be expected given the growth limits imposed by General Plan 2000 in conjunction with a larger population base. Annual growth rates at these lower levels are anticipated into the future.




## Howard County Compared to Other Maryland Jurisdictions

The table below summarizes the population growth from April, 2000 to July 2003 for each Maryland jurisdiction organized by region. Maryland as a whole grew by 212,423 residents, a 4.0 percent increase, resulting in a statewide ranking of $14^{\text {th }}$ greatest in the U.S. in terms of numbers of residents and $16^{\text {th }}$ greatest in percentage growth.

Howard County's growth rate of 6.6 percent is higher than the Maryland average and the 8 th greatest in the State. In absolute numbers, Howard ranked 6th. Montgomery County had the greatest population increase with 45,540 new residents, almost 2.8 times the increase in Howard. This is followed by Prince George's $(37,201)$, Baltimore County $(22,892)$, Frederick $(18,385)$, Anne Arundel $(16,964)$ and then Howard $(16,423)$. Three jurisdictions actually lost population. Baltimore City lost the most with 22,484 residents, continuing a decades old trend. Allegany lost 1,262 residents and Dorchester lost 62.

COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE FOR MARYLAND'S JURISDICTIONS, 2000-2003

|  | CUMULATIVE TOTALS - APRIL 1, 2000 TO JULY 1, 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Population 7/1/2003 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { CHANGE } \\ & \underline{00-103} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PCT. } \\ & \text { CNG. } \\ & 00-103 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Census Population 4/1/2000 | Births | Deaths | Net Natural Increase |  | International Migration | Internal Migration* | Residual |  |  |  |
| MARYLAND | 5,296,486 | + 241,352 - | 144,272 = | 97,080 | + | 72,453 + | 38,668 + | $4,222=$ | 5,508,909 | 212,423 | 4.0\% |
| BALTIMORE REGION | 2,512,431 | + 110,391 - | 77,064 = | 33,327 | + | 18,503 + | 2,548 + | 5,312 = | 2,572,121 | 59,690 | 2.4\% |
| Anne Arundel County | 489,656 | + 22,256 - | 11,708 $=$ | 10,548 | + | 2,416 + | 4,375 + | -375 = | 506,620 | 16,964 | 3.5\% |
| Baltimore County | 754,292 | + 29,984 - | 25,269 = | 4,715 | + | 7,163 + | 11,701 + | -687 = | 777,184 | 22,892 | 3.0\% |
| Carroll County | 150,897 | + 6,052 - | 3,941 = | 2,111 | + | $229+$ | 9,888 + | $82=$ | 163,207 | 12,310 | 8.2\% |
| Harford County | 218,590 | + 9,382 - | 5,076 = | 4,306 | + | $541+$ | 8,748 + | -10 = | 232,175 | 13,585 | 6.2\% |
| Howard County | 247,842 | + 11,564 - | 4,234 = | 7,330 | + | 3,720 + | 5,519 + | $-146=$ | 264,265 | 16,423 | 6.6\% |
| Baltimore City | 651,154 | + 31,153 | 26,836 = | 4,317 | + | 4,434 + | $-37,683+$ | 6,448 = | 628,670 | -22,484 | -3.5\% |
| SUBURBAN WASHINGTON REGION | 1,870,133 | + 93,818 - | 39,398 = | 54,420 | + | 51,527 + | -3,433 + | $\underline{-1,388}=$ | 1,971,259 | 101,126 | 5.4\% |
| Frederick County | 195,277 | + 9,368 - | $4,386=$ | 4,982 | + | 1,007 + | 12,208 + | $188=$ | 213,662 | 18,385 | 9.4\% |
| Montgomery County | 873,341 | + 42,796 - | 18,138 = | 24,658 | + | 33,868 + | -12,313 + | -673 = | 918,881 | 45,540 | 5.2\% |
| Prince George's County | 801,515 | + 41,654 - | 16,874 = | 24,780 | + | 16,652 + | -3,328 + | -903 = | 838,716 | 37,201 | 4.6\% |
| SOUTHERN MARYLAND REGION | 281,320 | + 13,012 - | 6,173 $=$ | 6,839 | + | $557+$ | 20,765 + | $432=$ | 309,913 | 28,593 | 10.2\% |
| Calvert County | 74,563 | + 3,171 - | 1,660 = | 1,511 | + | $153+$ | 7,703 + | $180=$ | 84,110 | 9,547 | 12.8\% |
| Charles County | 120,546 | + 5,698 - | 2,656 = | 3,042 | + | $228+$ | 9,014 + | $219=$ | 133,049 | 12,503 | 10.4\% |
| St. Mary's County | 86,211 | + 4,143- | 1,857 = | 2,286 | + | $176+$ | 4,048 + | $33=$ | 92,754 | 6,543 | 7.6\% |
| WESTERN MARYLAND REGION | 236,699 | + 8,520 - | 8,137 $=$ | 383 | + | $309+$ | 3,261 + | -139 = | 240,513 | 3,814 | 1.6\% |
| Allegany County | 74,930 | + 2,328 - | 2,892 = | -564 | + | $55+$ | -682 + | -71 = | 73,668 | -1,262 | -1.7\% |
| Garrett County | 29,846 | + 1,043 - | 1,025 = | 18 | + | $13+$ | $198+$ | -26 = | 30,049 | 203 | 0.7\% |
| Washington County | 131,923 | + 5,149 - | $4,220=$ | 929 | + | $241+$ | $3,745+$ | -42 = | 136,796 | 4,873 | 3.7\% |
| UPPER EASTERN SHORE REGION | 209,295 | + 8,292 - | $\underline{6,767}=$ | 1,525 | + | $705+$ | 10,460 + | $80=$ | 222,065 | 12,770 | 6.1\% |
| Caroline County | 29,772 | + 1,283- | 1,046 = | 237 | + | $188+$ | $673+$ | -9 = | 30,861 | 1,089 | 3.7\% |
| Cecil County | 85,951 | + 3,757 - | 2,408 = | 1,349 | + | $172+$ | 5,193 + | $81=$ | 92,746 | 6,795 | 7.9\% |
| Kent County | 19,197 | + $537-$ | $760=$ | -223 | + | $98+$ | $614+$ | -6 = | 19,680 | 483 | 2.5\% |
| Queen Anne's County | 40,563 | + 1,529 | 1,181 = | 348 | + | $143+$ | 2,998 + | $56=$ | 44,108 | 3,545 | 8.7\% |
| Talbot County | 33,812 | + 1,186 - | 1,372 = | -186 | + | $104+$ | $982+$ | -42 = | 34,670 | 858 | 2.5\% |
| LOWER EASTERN SHORE REGION | 186,608 | + 7,319 - | 6,733 $=$ | 586 | + | $852+$ | 5,067 + | $\underline{-75}=$ | 193,038 | 6,430 | 3.4\% |
| Dorchester County | 30,674 | + 1,078 - | 1,337 = | -259 | + | $39+$ | $187+$ | -29 = | 30,612 | -62 | -0.2\% |
| Somerset County | 24,747 | + 831 | 837 = | -6 | + | $120+$ | $589+$ | -3 = | 25,447 | 700 | 2.8\% |
| Wicomico County | 84,644 | + 3,741 - | 2,641 = | 1,100 | + | $502+$ | 1,219 + | -90 = | 87,375 | 2,731 | 3.2\% |
| Worcester County | 46,543 | + 1,669 - | 1,918 = | -249 | + | $191+$ | 3,072 + | $47=$ | 49,604 | 3,061 | 6.6\% |

[^2]Observing the individual components of growth, clear patterns of the shifting populations become apparent. Statewide, about 45 percent of the growth was due to natural population increase ( 97,080 births minus deaths). About 36 percent was due to international migration $(72,453)$ and 18 percent from internal or domestic migration $(38,688)$. Montgomery County by far received the most international migrants, with 33,868 , almost half the statewide total. This is followed by Prince George's with 16,652 immigrants representing almost a quarter of the statewide total. Howard County ranked $5^{\text {th }}$ after Baltimore County and Baltimore City with 3,720 immigrants, about 5 percent of the statewide total.

Howard ranked $7^{\text {th }}$ in the number of internal or domestic migrants with 5,519. Frederick had the most with 12,208 followed by Baltimore County with 11,701 and then Carroll $(9,888)$. Interestingly, Baltimore City lost 37,683 residents due to domestic migration more than offsetting the growth it received from international migration and natural increase. Montgomery County also lost 12,313 residents due to domestic migration as did Prince George's $(3,328)$ and Allegany (682).

In general, and as expected, the natural population increase was greater for the larger counties in proportion to size. Counties on the eastern shore and the western part of the State experienced slight declines in population where deaths exceeded births. This is due to the relatively older populations living in these counties with proportionately less numbers of younger families. The charts below summarize the growth including the individual growth components.


Percentage Population Growth - April 2000 to July 2003


Growth from International Migration - April 2000 to July 2003



Growth from Natural Increase - April 2000 to July 2003


## Regional Comparisons Over Time

The following table shows the yearly population change estimates between 2000 and 2003 by growth component for central Maryland jurisdictions. The subsequent charts show the results graphically. Similar to the results for Howard County discussed earlier, two of the three components, international migration and natural population change, remain relatively flat from one year to the next for all jurisdictions. That is, the population increases from these components do not vary much remaining relatively consistent on an annual basis. Internal or domestic migration, however, does change over the this time period for each of the jurisdictions.

Some of the major observations include: 1) an increase in net domestic in migration over time in Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, and Frederick (with the exception of the last year for Frederick); 2) a decrease in net domestic migration over time in Howard, Anne Arundel, Prince George's, and Montgomery, with Anne Arundel and Prince George's experiencing net out migration beginning in the $3^{\text {rd }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ years, respectively. Montgomery shows net out domestic migration for all years with greater amounts over time. 3) Baltimore City shows net out domestic migration for all years, but decreasing amounts each year. This may be due to greater numbers of young adults moving into revitalized areas around the Inner Harbor in recent years.

## Population Growth by Component by Year for Central Maryland Counties

| Maryland Jurisdiction | International Migration |  |  |  | Internal Migration (1) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4/1/2000- $7 / 1 / 2000-7 / 1 / 2001-$ $7 / 1 / 2002-$ <br> $7 / 1 / 2000 \quad \underline{7 / 1 / 2001} \quad \underline{7 / 1 / 2002} \quad \underline{ }$   |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|r} \hline 4 / 1 / 2000- \\ \hline 7 / 1 / 2000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 / 1 / 2000- \\ 7 / 1 / 2001 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 1 / 2001- \\ & \underline{7 / 1 / 2002} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7 / 1 / 2002- \\ & \underline{7 / 1 / 2003} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Anne Arundel County | 228 | 730 | 747 | 711 | 585 | 2,207 | 1,769 | (186) |
| Baltimore County | 554 | 2,203 | 2,204 | 2,202 | 590 | 3,177 | 3,762 | 4,172 |
| Carroll County | 18 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 518 | 2,265 | 3,848 | 3,257 |
| Harford County | 48 | 164 | 167 | 162 | 449 | 1,803 | 3,147 | 3,349 |
| Howard County | 290 | 1,143 | 1,145 | 1,142 | 844 | 2,614 | 1,316 | 745 |
| Baltimore City | 342 | 1,364 | 1,365 | 1,363 | $(3,416)$ | $(12,495)$ | $(11,338)$ | $(10,434)$ |
| Frederick County | 82 | 308 | 310 | 307 | 783 | 4,006 | 4,826 | 2,593 |
| Montgomery County | 2,617 | 10,417 | 10,422 | 10,412 | (95) | $(1,211)$ | $(3,524)$ | $(7,483)$ |
| Prince George's County | 1,306 | 5,116 | 5,126 | 5,104 | $(1,136)$ | 1,832 | $(1,117)$ | $(2,907)$ |
|  | $+\quad$ Net Natural Change (Births-Deaths) $=$ |  |  |  | Total Population (2) |  |  |  |
| Maryland Jurisdiction | $\begin{array}{llll} \hline \text { 4/1/2000- } & 7 / 1 / 2000 & 7 / 1 / 2001- & 7 / 1 / 2002- \\ 7 / 1 / 2000 & \underline{7 / 1 / 2001} & \underline{7 / 1 / 2002} & \underline{7 / 1 / 2003} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  | 4/1/2000- $7 / 1 / 2000-7 / 1 / 2001-$ $7 / 1 / 2002-$  <br> $7 / 1 / 2000$ $7 / 1 / 2001$ $7 / 1 / 2002$ $7 / 1 / 2003$ |  |  |  |
| Anne Arundel County | 935 | 3,191 | 3,252 | 3,170 | 1,748 | 6,128 | 5,768 | 3,695 |
| Baltimore County | 579 | 1,651 | 1,359 | 1,126 | 1,723 | 7,031 | 7,325 | 7,500 |
| Carroll County | 183 | 713 | 635 | 580 | 719 | 3,048 | 4,554 | 3,907 |
| Harford County | 406 | 1,284 | 1,307 | 1,309 | 903 | 3,251 | 4,621 | 4,820 |
| Howard County | 578 | 2,240 | 2,284 | 2,228 | 1,712 | 5,997 | 4,745 | 4,115 |
| Baltimore City | 424 | 1,321 | 1,236 | 1,336 | $(2,650)$ | $(9,810)$ | $(8,737)$ | $(7,735)$ |
| Frederick County | 427 | 1,548 | 1,503 | 1,504 | 1,292 | 5,862 | 6,639 | 4,404 |
| Montgomery County | 1,971 | 7,897 | 7,672 | 7,118 | 4,493 | 17,103 | 14,570 | 10,047 |
| Prince George's County | 1,962 | 7,877 | 7,610 | 7,331 | 2,132 | 14,825 | 11,619 | 9,528 |

(1) Represents the movement of domestic migrants as well as federal personnel and their families to and from overseas assignments.
(2) Not including residual adjustments.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch
Prepared by the Maryland Department of Planning, Planning Data Services, April 2004.


Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch, April 2004


Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch, April 2004


Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch, April 2004



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Census Bureau estimates natural population increase from vital statistics records (birth and death certificates). Internal migration estimates are based on an analysis of IRS tax records from one year to the next for those under 65 and Medicare enrollment records for those 65 and over. Data from the Armed Forces are also used. Foreign immigration estimates are based on national level data distributed down to the County level based on the previous five years immigration determined from the 2000 Census. The residual component is used to adjust the County totals slightly to match the national growth total. See the following Census web site for a detailed explanation of the methodology http://eire.census.gov/popest/topics/methodology/states.php

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ See the following web site for the Construction Report: http://www.co.ho.md.us/DPZ/Research/dpz research.htm

[^2]:    * Represents the movement of domestic migrants as well as federal personnel and their families to and from overseas assignments.

    Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch, April 2004
    Prepared by the Maryland Department of Planning, Planning Data Services

