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Since 1964, the New Hampshire Office of Planning and Development (OPD) at the New Hampshire Department of Business and Economic Affairs has prepared projections or forecasts of future population for the State and its political subdivisions. The projections are used by government agencies and private interests to guide public policy, gauge market potential and estimate future target populations. The projections can be applied directly and unaltered to guide public or private endeavors. The projections can also serve as a point of departure in developing further projection efforts or refining existing ones.

In partnership with the State's Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs), OPD presents the following report New Hampshire: State, County, and Municipal Population Projections: 2020-2050, prepared by OPD's consultant, Robert Scardamalia of RLS Demographics. This report includes details on the state, county, and municipal projections for the period 2020 through 2050 and summarizes the projections' highlights.

These projections are the first iteration and are based on the 2020 U.S. Census, with updated input of vital records information, migration data, and American Community Survey data. The last OPD projections were published in September 2016.

The projections at the state and county level combine census data with birth and death data from the NH Department of State/Division of Vital Records Administration and other sources. It is then used to develop survival and fertility rates and age-specific migration rates. The births and deaths span the decade, with rates specific to New Hampshire.

Reminder: State and county projections (with age detail) are the result of the projection model. Once these numbers are developed, municipal projections are established using the method described in the following section.

The projections are processed by a standard demographic, cohort-component method. This technique breaks the population into 36 age/gender cohorts. Each cohort has its own survival rate and migration rate. Fertility rates are also applied on an age-specific basis. The technique is processed by the model referenced above, programmed by RLS Demographics.

OPD acknowledges Robert Scardamalia of RLS Demographics for producing the projections and developing this report and the RPCs for their valued input and assistance. In addition, OPD thanks Ken Johnson of the Carsey School of Public Policy for his comments during this process.

## Municipal Projections

Municipal level projections are direct products of the projections developed at the state and county levels. OPD uses a geographic step-down protocol, whereby larger geographies are projected first and the lower geographies are projected in conformance with the respective 'parent' geographic area.

In specific terms, this means that OPD projects the 10 counties, then the respective (within counties) municipalities. The sum of the 10 counties is the state total. Population totals for each lower geography must agree with the appropriate higher geography. Details on the municipal projections are described in the section titled Minor Civil Division Projections in this report.

## A Few Words on Projections

Population projections are not predictions. The projection process attempts to identify probable assumptions and then extend those assumptions into the future, via a mathematical technique. By themselves, projections can serve as a general guide to likely future population trends. The projections can also serve as a beginning to alternative projection efforts. Data users are encouraged to use these projections to evaluate other projection efforts. While these projections extend out to 2050, it is important to keep in mind that the longer the forecast span, the greater the chance for errors. As in previous decades, OPD will revisit these projections and adjust the forecast depending on any changes in trends.
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## Executive Summary

This report presents state, county, and municipal level population projections by age and sex for the period 2020 through 2050. The projections are done in five-year intervals and for fiveyear age groupings of the population to 85 and over. The report contains a single set of projections that represent a likely future based on current fertility, mortality, and migration rates as of 2020 and expected changes to 2050 . This is not a prediction of future population but rather the population outcome if the assumptions about future fertility, mortality, and migration actually occur.

## Projection Highlights

- The population of the New Hampshire is projected to reach $1,501,909$ by the year 2050. This projection represents an increase of just over 124,000 or 9.0 percent from the 2020 Census population count of $1,377,533$. In 2030, the state population is projected to be $1,473,285$, and in 2040 the population is projected to increase to $1,511,770$, followed by a decline to 2050. The projected total populations for the state and counties can be found in Table 1.
- The absolute number of births is projected at first to increase slightly, to 65,800 in the period 2025 to 2030. Births will then decline to 59,600 in the 2045 to 2050 period. This short-term increase results from population growth in the number of women between the ages of 30 and 44 and the overall increase in women of childbearing age ( 15 to 49) even with continued low fertility rates by age of mother. The decline reflects continued low fertility rates and declining number of women of childbearing age.
- The number of deaths will increase continuously from 63,500 in the 2020 to 2025 period to 120,000 in the 2045 to 2050 period due to the aging of the Baby Boom generation.
- With the rise in deaths, New Hampshire is projected to experience natural decline (an excess of deaths over births) beginning in the 2025 to 2030 period. By the 2045 to 2050 period the State will see an increasing level of natural decline to 60,500.
- During the 2020 to 2025 period, based on the 2020 Census results and the projections model, New Hampshire is projected to experience net in-migration of 51,600. For the remainder of the projection period net in-migration is projected to be between 50,000 to 52,500 in each 5 -year time period.
- Women of childbearing age, ages 15 to 49, are projected to increase in the short-term from 291,270 in 2020 to 299,300 in 2030 . The number of women will be relatively stable through 2040 and then decline to 295,800 by 2050.

Table 1: Summary of Projected Total Population for New Hampshire and Counties

| State/County | Census <br> Cen | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| New Hampshire | $\mathbf{1 , 3 7 7 , 5 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 3 0 , 6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 7 3 , 2 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 0 1 , 0 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 1 1 , 7 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 0 9 , 9 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 0 1 , 9 0 9}$ |
| Belknap | 63,705 | 66,371 | 68,635 | 69,872 | 70,366 | 70,338 | 70,103 |
| Carroll | 50,111 | 52,293 | 54,023 | 54,939 | 54,935 | 54,273 | 53,293 |
| Cheshire | 76,458 | 77,722 | 78,340 | 78,080 | 77,007 | 75,452 | 73,805 |
| Coos | 31,268 | 31,274 | 31,047 | 30,490 | 29,608 | 28,533 | 27,428 |
| Grafton | 91,118 | 94,984 | 98,030 | 99,463 | 99,711 | 98,998 | 97,777 |
| Hillsborough | 422,937 | 440,881 | 454,896 | 464,900 | 470,211 | 471,760 | 471,369 |
| Merrimack | 153,808 | 159,385 | 164,072 | 167,214 | 168,609 | 168,770 | 168,475 |
| Rockingham | 314,176 | 327,586 | 339,248 | 347,444 | 350,560 | 350,316 | 348,083 |
| Strafford | 130,889 | 136,162 | 140,565 | 144,214 | 146,813 | 148,384 | 149,435 |
| Sullivan | 43,063 | 43,943 | 44,429 | 44,429 | 43,950 | 43,131 | 42,141 |

The method used for projecting the population of New Hampshire counties by age and sex is a standard demographic Cohort-Component model, with baseline data inputs provided by a components of change analysis. The components include:

- Age-specific fertility patterns by age of mother and the summary Total Fertility Rate which will generate future births,
- Age-sex specific migration patterns and the summary Crude Migration Rate which will impact the future number of women of childbearing age and future births,
- Age-sex specific survivorship ratios used to age each age-sex cohort to future projection dates, and
- College enrollment, prison and nursing home residents used to calculate the non-special (household) population to which the fertility, mortality and migration rates will be applied.

Population projections are not a forecast of the future. They are the result of specific assumptions about the course of future demographic characteristics and events. To the extent those assumptions are born out in the future, the projections will be accurate. However, there are many factors, demographic, social, economic and even global that affect future trends.

Some of the factors that have been discussed in the development of these projections include very recent events, such as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, potential migratory effects resulting from climate change, recent indications of slowing large urban growth in favor of smaller areas, improving access to broadband in rural areas and attraction of young people and changing employment and commuting expectations. All of these represent important factors but ones for which there is no clear data. These factors should be kept in mind as the projections are used for local and statewide program implementation and planning.

## New Hampshire Population Change and Projections Overview

The method used for projecting the population of New Hampshire counties by age and sex is a standard demographic Cohort-Component model. This model captures the interactive effects of the population age structure and the components of population change - fertility, mortality and migration. The demographic model provides detailed age and sex population characteristics which is critical to understanding changes in the female population and future births.

Demographic components of change are analyzed to capture the interactive effects of fertility, mortality and migration and how they impact total population change and change by age and sex. This is particularly important for projecting births which are dependent on fertility rates and the number of women of childbearing age. The number of women of childbearing age is a function of the existing age structure and future population change due to migration. This interactive effect is most important in areas of residential change, either growth or decline. Figure 1 illustrates the two phases of the projection process and the various data inputs and outputs.

Figure 1: Projection Process Phases


The State of New Hampshire has grown from 1,316,470 in the 2010 Census to 1,377,529 in the 2020 Census. The 2020 Census captured a larger than expected population when compared to the Census Bureau's 2019 population estimates figure of 1,359,711. The increase between 2010 and 2020 was over 61,000 and reflects a 4.6 percent rate of growth. The rate of growth between the 2000 and 2010 Census was higher at 6.5 percent, indicating that continued growth is likely but not at the earlier high rate. The growth in the State population is not reflected in each of the 10 counties as will be shown below. Absolute growth was highest in Hillsborough County while the fastest rate of growth was in Rockingham at 6.4 percent. Cheshire, Coos and Sullivan all lost population in the last decade with Coos having the largest absolute and percentage change loss.

The higher rate of growth between 2010 and 2020, relative to the 2019 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates, created challenges in reconciling prior Census Bureau estimates and results from the ACS with the new 2020 Census count. This was particularly true for analyzing the age and sex distribution because these detailed data from the 2020 Census will not be available until late 2022 or 2023. When the Census data is released, it will likely show changes in the age distribution (aging of the Baby Boom generation and large Millennial generation) that are not captured in the ACS distributions or in the Census Bureau's Demographic Analysis estimates discussed below.

The percent of population over age 65 in New Hampshire is 18.6 percent based on the 2019 ACS data. This high level reflects an older population than the nation at 16.0 percent. The median age in New Hampshire is 43.0 years compared to 38.2 years in the nation. As with the overall population change, New Hampshire's counties vary in age distribution and median age from a low of 36.8 in Strafford County (with a large college age population) to a high of 53.4 in Carroll County.

## Demographic Cohort-Component Projections

This report presents the New Hampshire county population projections by age and sex for the period 2020 through 2050. The population is projected in 5 -year intervals and for 5 -year age cohorts of the population to 85 and over. The report contains projections for New Hampshire counties based on analysis of current fertility, mortality, and migration rates as of 2020 and age-adjusted data to reflect the total population results of the 2020 Census. Assumptions about the future course of those components of change yield projections to the year 2050. While this is a likely scenario, many factors can alter the course of future events. This is not a prediction of future population but rather the population outcome if the assumptions about future fertility, mortality, and migration are fulfilled.

## Methodology Overview

The model used for the demographic projections is a standard demographic Cohort-Component method. Population is projected forward by 5 -year age-sex cohorts utilizing individual transition rates for fertility, mortality, and migration. The age-sex distribution is produced in 5-year age intervals through age 84 with an open-ended category for population 85 and over. The model is geography independent which means that its design allows for all input data to be defined specifically for each individual county. The model utilizes county specific inputs for fertility, migration, and mortality but could also use state or national rates if local data aren't available. The New Hampshire county populations are large enough to provide accurate fertility data and construction of age-specific fertility rates. However, not all counties are large enough for complete age distributions of deaths and calculation of county specific life tables for males and females. As explained below, the survival distributions use a combination of individual counties and regional aggregated death data for construction of life tables.

Note: It is important to understand that the mortality rates applied here DO NOT take account of changes in mortality as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic due to the lack of data on deaths by age and sex.

## Components of Change Analysis

Following is an overview of the components analysis that is more fully described in the separate report "New Hampshire County Population Projections 2020 to 2050: Demographic Components of Change" located in Appendix A.

The measurement of population change over a given period of time is defined by a simple identity known as the demographic balancing equation. In its simplest form, the equation is stated as:
$P_{1}=P_{0}+B_{(t, t+n)}-D_{(t, t+n)}+M_{(t, t+n)}$
Where: $P_{0}=$ population at the base period,
$P_{1}=$ population at the end of period $n$,
$B=$ births between time $t$ and $t+n$
$D=$ deaths between time $t$ and $t+n$
$\mathrm{M}=$ net migrants between time t and $\mathrm{t}+\mathrm{n}$
The Population Estimates Program of the U.S. Census Bureau utilizes a nationwide methodology for estimating total population, age, race and sex characteristics at the county level which follows this basic balancing equation concept. At the city/town level, the Census Bureau
produces estimates of the total resident population only. ${ }^{1}$ These estimates, along with the 2020 Census population for all cities and towns become the basis for the Minor Civil Division (MCD) projections discussed below. The total population estimates and the 2020 Census results for the New Hampshire counties are used to define the starting point of the projections process.

Table 2 illustrates the application of the balancing equation for each 5 -year period from 2000 to 2020. While the data in Table 2 include the Decennial Census populations for 2000, 2010 and 2020, the 2005 and 2015 figures represent the Census Bureau's estimates. Given the greater increase in population between 2010 and 2020 than the estimates indicated, the 2015 estimate likely understated population growth. This affects the initial calculations of fertility and migration rates. The model was ultimately recalibrated to reflect what had to be higher levels of migration to account for the higher 2020 population count.

Table 2: New Hampshire Historical Components of Change, 2000 to 2020

|  | April 1, <br> 2000 | July 1, <br> 2005 | April 1, <br> 2010 | July 1, <br> 2015 | April 1, <br> 2020 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | $1,235,786$ | $1,298,492$ | $1,316,470$ | $1,336,350$ | $1,377,529$ |
| Population Change | X | 62,706 | 17,978 | 19,880 | 41,179 |
| Percent Change | X | $5.1 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| Cumulative Births | X | 72,571 | 69,253 | 62,555 | 72,337 |
| Cumulative Deaths | X | 49,433 | 50,929 | 55,059 | 49,804 |
| Natural Increase | X | 23,138 | 18,325 | 7,496 | 22,534 |
| Net Migration | X | 39,568 | -347 | 12,384 | $-4,716$ |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | X | $3.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census and Intercensal Estimates of Population. Births and deaths from the New Hampshire Department of State, Division of Vital Records Administration.

The Cohort-Component projection model applies the logic of the balancing equation to the individual age-sex components of the population such that 5-year age cohorts by sex are projected forward in intervals, " n ", of five years to the year 2050.

The projections process is really quite simple and has five basic steps:

1. Special populations (college, prison, and other group quarters populations) are removed from the base period population to remove potential distortions of the underlying rates.
2. Age-specific fertility rates are applied to the mid-period population of women to generate births over the 5-year period.

[^0]3. Survivorship ratios by age and gender are applied to the base year population to determine the number of survivors, who will be in the next 5-year age group at the end of the interval.
4. Age-specific migration rates are applied to the base population to calculate the number of net migrants over the interval.
5. Following the balancing equation, the end period population is equal to the survivors of the initial cohort, plus births during the interval, plus net-migrants during the interval and the addition of special populations removed in Step 1.

At the end of each 5-year interval, births become the new age 0 to 4 population and all other age categories become age $a+5$ (e.g. age 0-4 becomes age 5-9). The last category, 85 and over, is equal to the sum of the population 80 to 84 who have aged to be 85 to 89 , plus the 85 and over population which has aged to be 90 and over. This process is repeated for each 5 -year time period.

## Data Inputs

## 2020 Age-Sex Distribution

An important factor that can affect the results is the estimation of the 2020 age-sex distribution. In the absence of the actual 2020 Census results, the age-sex distribution has been estimated using the Census Bureau's county level Demographic Analysis estimates for April 1, 2020. These estimates use a methodology similar to the demographic balancing equation whereby the 2010 population is "aged" to 2020 incorporating birth, death and estimated migration data. The age-sex structure will closely reflect the structure of the 2010 Census but doesn't account for changes other than the natural aging process.

The Demographic Analysis estimates are subject to what is called "error of closure" which is the measurable error between the estimated population and the actual Census result. This is one of the methods the Census Bureau uses to measure the accuracy of the Decennial Census and the estimates. The estimates can over or understate the Census enumerated population and that difference represents error in the estimates process. Lacking the age-sex data from the 2020 Census, the Demographic Analysis estimates have been made to equal the 2020 Census total population count for each county. This is accomplished by uniformly applying the percent difference between the estimate total and the 2020 Census total to each age-sex group.

## Special Populations

A second issue of importance is special populations. Special populations reside in group quarters and include populations like college students, prisoners, military and nursing home residents. These populations impact the calculations for age-specific fertility and migration rates because they do not reflect the same behavior of the general population. In the case of fertility, college age women are not prone to having children at the same rates as their counterparts who are not in college. In the case of migration, college students do not "age in
place" as the general population. Graduating seniors often do not stay in the location of the college and are replaced each year by incoming freshmen. If these populations are not removed from the total resident population by age and sex, they will distort the resulting fertility and migration rates and create an artificial "bulge" in the age distribution as they age.

New Hampshire is home to a number of colleges and universities with large enrollments. They are primarily located in Cheshire, Grafton, Hillsborough, Merrimack and Strafford counties. The data used here are based on full-time undergraduate and graduate enrollment by age and sex from the National Center for Education Statistics. Prison populations are defined in Cheshire, Coos, Hillsborough, Merrimack, Rockingham and Strafford counties though the populations are relatively small in all but Coos, Hillsborough and Merrimack. Current data by age and sex for 2020 were not available for all facilities and was estimated based on the total inmate counts. Nursing home populations reside in each county. Only the total resident population is available, and the age-sex detail was estimated based on the age-sex distribution in the Census Bureau ACS estimates of nursing home residents for the 2015-2019 period.

## Fertility Analysis

The absolute number of births projected by the Cohort-Component Projections model for each area, in each 5 -year time interval, is calculated by applying age-specific fertility rates to the number of women in the childbearing ages (women age 15 through 49). The number of male and female births is determined by applying the sex ratio at birth based on historical data. The rate is simply the number of births to women of a given age divided by the number of women in that age group. For example, the fertility rate for the 30 to 34 age group is the number of births to women age 30 to 34 divided by the number of women age 30 to 34 .

These age patterns are specific to each county. Birth data for 2019, 2020 and 2021 have been used to construct the age patterns. Births for the three years are averaged and based on the 2020 age distribution of women from the Demographic Analysis estimates. The patterns can be held constant throughout the entire projection period or altered to reflect changing assumptions about the timing of childbearing. Recent fertility data for 2021 from the National Center for Health Statistics indicates an increase in the absolute number of births after the steep decline of 2020 but that one-year change does not necessarily indicate a longer-term trend or increase in fertility rates. Given the long-term low level of fertility rates in the U.S. and continued delayed age of childbearing, the age patterns of fertility have been held constant throughout the 30-year projections interval.

Figure 2 presents the 2020 age-specific fertility rate patterns for Coos County, the smallest county in New Hampshire, and Hillsborough, the largest. There is a clear difference in the timing of fertility with Coos representing continued high levels of fertility in the younger ages peaking in the 25 to 29 age group. Hillsborough illustrates the delay in childbearing typical of more urban areas with peak fertility occurring in the 30 to 34 age group and very low levels for
the 20 to 24 and 25 to 29 -age groups. Note that both counties show low and nearly equal fertility levels for the 15 to 19 population. This has been typical of nationwide declines in fertility among young women.

Figure 2: 2020 Age-Specific Fertility Rates for Coos and Hillsborough Counties


As indicated above, the age pattern of fertility is held constant for the entire projection period, but the number of births generated by the pattern is dependent on the number of women of childbearing age in each age group and the Total Fertility Rate (TFR). The TFR is a summary measure of the number of births a woman will have if her childbearing experience follows the given pattern. A well-known number is the replacement level of fertility which is a TFR of 2.1 children per woman. This reflects the average number of children per woman necessary in a population to replace herself, a male partner and account for women unable to bear children. It is the combination of the age pattern of fertility and the Total Fertility Rate that controls the number of births generated in the Cohort-Component Projection model. Figure 3 illustrates the change in the TFR between 2010 and 2020 New Hampshire counties - each of which experience important declines.


The final TFR used in the projection model, and shown in Table 3, was a result of a calibration process described in the Components report and summarized below. This process showed that adjustment of the TFR's calculated in the Components analysis was necessary to reproduce the actual reported number of births by the Division for Vital Records Administration for the 2010 to 2015 and 2015 to 2020 periods. The TFR's applied for the 2020 to 2025 projection interval shown in Table 3 are all well below the 2.1 replacement level of fertility for all New Hampshire counties. Although the 2021 data indicate an increase in the number of births, there is no indication that fertility levels are beginning a long-term increase. While the future is uncertain, a continued decline in the overall fertility level seems unlikely.

| Table 3: Projected Total Fertility Rates for New Hampshire Counties |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Projected Total Fertility Rate (TFR) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $2020-25$ | $2025-30$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 3 5}$ | $2035-40$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 4 5}$ | $2045-50$ |
| Belknap | 1.680 | 1.680 | 1.680 | 1.680 | 1.680 | 1.680 |
| Carroll | 1.596 | 1.596 | 1.596 | 1.596 | 1.596 | 1.596 |
| Cheshire | 1.544 | 1.544 | 1.544 | 1.544 | 1.544 | 1.544 |
| Coos | 1.754 | 1.754 | 1.754 | 1.754 | 1.754 | 1.754 |
| Grafton | 1.746 | 1.746 | 1.746 | 1.746 | 1.746 | 1.746 |
| Hillsborough | 1.691 | 1.691 | 1.691 | 1.691 | 1.691 | 1.691 |
| Merrimack | 1.958 | 1.958 | 1.958 | 1.958 | 1.958 | 1.958 |
| Rockingham | 1.315 | 1.315 | 1.315 | 1.315 | 1.315 | 1.315 |
| Strafford | 1.701 | 1.701 | 1.701 | 1.701 | 1.701 | 1.701 |
| Sullivan | 1.733 | 1.733 | 1.733 | 1.733 | 1.733 | 1.733 |

## Fertility Assumptions

- The age pattern of fertility defined based on 2019 to 2021 birth data will hold constant through the projection period for each county.
- The TFR resulting from the model calibration for the period 2010 to 2020 will hold constant throughout the projection period for each county.


## Migration

Similar to the modeling of fertility, the projection model generates net migrants by age and sex for each county based upon an age pattern of migration and a specified total absolute level of migration, called the Crude Migration Rate.

The age pattern specifies the age distribution of net migrants and is gender specific. This can be thought of as the propensity to migrate, one age category relative to another, in any given area or time period. The absolute level of net migration is controlled by the specification of the Crude Migration Rate. As with the fertility module, the model has the flexibility to alter assumptions regarding changes in the age pattern of migration and the Crude Migration Rate in each time period.

In most cases, age migration follows a common "life cycle" transition. Migration of the youngest ages are tied to migration of their parents. Migration in the late teens and early 20's is impacted by college attendance and/or entry into the workforce. Migration through the 20's and early 30 's is volatile with exploration, job changes and household formation. The middle ages tend to show more stability in work/career and childrearing until early and traditional retirement ages become primary influences. In the older ages there is often a return from retirement destinations for family and health care services.

In the development of the age-specific migration patterns, rates were calculated for the 2010 to 2015 and 2015 to 2020 periods. There have been significant economic changes over the decade with the earlier half experiencing somewhat lower rates of migration as the nation recovered from the Great Recession. The latter half of the decade was a return to more "normal" patterns until 2020 and the COVID-19 pandemic just as the 2020 Census was being conducted. The impact on the Census count and resulting impact on the migration calculation is unknown. It is known that the enumeration timing was disrupted and that the Non-Response Follow Up operations were delayed until the summer of 2020. This could easily impact areas with high seasonal and second home populations. The timing and closure of many colleges and universities also impacted the count and this could have important impacts on the very narrow college age population.

Figures 4 and 5 illustrate the migration patterns for Coos and Hillsborough counties from the 2010 to 2020 residual migration analysis. Coos County shows variation in migration patterns for the 30 to 64 age groups between the first and second half of the decade while migration of
younger and older age groups is very consistent throughout the decade. Hillsborough County shows a high degree of similarity across all ages through the decade. The differences in Coos may be due to slow recovery from the economic recession in the beginning of the decade versus the improved economic climate of the latter half. In all counties, it is the average migration experience of the two 5 -year periods that is used in the projections model.

Figure 4: Coos County Residual Net Migration Rate 2010-2020


Figure 5: Hillsborough County Residual Net Migration Rate 2010-2020


As with the fertility assumption, the Crude Migration Rates, shown in Table 4, control the absolute level of migration in each projection period. The rates from the Components of Change analysis were used in the same calibration process as the fertility rates to ensure that migration would closely match the migration level implied by the 2020 Census population count.

| County |  | Projected Crude Migration Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2020-25 | 2025-30 | 2030-35 | 2035-40 | 2040-45 | 2045-50 |
| Belknap | Male | 6.00 | 6.00 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 |
|  | Female | 6.00 | 6.00 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 |
| Carroll | Male | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
|  | Female | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| Cheshire | Male | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
|  | Female | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Coos | Male | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
|  | Female | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Grafton | Male | 6.50 | 6.50 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
|  | Female | 6.50 | 6.50 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| Hillsborough | Male | 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
|  | Female | 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Merrimack | Male | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
|  | Female | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| Rockingham | Male | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 |
|  | Female | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 |
| Strafford | Male | 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 |
|  | Female | 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 |
| Sullivan | Male | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
|  | Female | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 |

## Migration Assumptions

- The average age-sex pattern of migration defined based on the 2010 to 2020 Life Table Residual Migration method will hold constant through the projection period for each county.
- The Crude Migration Rate resulting from the model calibration for the period 2010 to 2020 will continue for the 2020 to 2025 period and then allow for variation based on historical trends and input from the New Hampshire regional project team.


## Mortality

Mortality is the least volatile of the three components of change - fertility, migration and mortality. The population is aged by applying age and sex specific survivorship ratios for each 5year period to the base population by 5 -year age group. The model allows for area specific assumptions regarding the change in survivorship. However, there is generally little variation though there are differences by sex. The survivorship ratios are the result of the life table calculation of the probability of survival from one age group to the next. For example, the probability that a 30 - to 34 -year-old male will survive to become age 35 to 39 . A more wellknown result of life table calculations is the life expectancy at birth, which is shown below in Table 5.

Life tables are best constructed for larger population areas - typically over 100,000 population. There is always some probability of death at every age, but small population areas will often not experience any deaths in a particular age group at any given time. This means it is not possible to calculate an appropriate life table. Because of its population size, computation of the life table and survivorship ratios by sex are possible for Hillsborough County but no other New Hampshire counties. For this reason, regional life tables were prepared by creating county groups based on similar demographics characteristics and geography. Groupings included: Belknap and Merrimack; Rockingham and Strafford; Carroll, Coos and Grafton; Cheshire and Sullivan.

In addition to requiring a complete distribution of deaths, the life table analysis requires a more detailed distribution of deaths by age than the fertility or migration analysis. Infant mortality is relatively high in the first year of life requiring a breakdown of the under 5 age group into under 1 and 1 to 4 years. Data for 5 -year age groups are sufficient for the other ages but also need to account for deaths beyond the age of 85 and over. This requires detail for the 85 to 89,90 to 94 and 95 and over population. Current data for these more detailed age group data are not available from the New Hampshire Department of State. As a result, life tables were prepared using a 3-year average of deaths for 2009, 2010 and 2011 centered on the 2010 Census population. Figure 6 illustrates the survival distribution for both males and females in Hillsborough County. This clearly shows the similarity at the younger ages and how survival starts to diverge, and benefit females, after the age of 50 years.

Figure 5: Hillsborough County Survival Rate Distribution for Males and Females


Life expectancy has increased since 2010 and while use of the older data is not ideal, most of the increase is due to greater longevity of the senior population - age groups which have a declining impact on the overall projections. In order to capture some of that increased survival, the U.S. Social Security Administration's latest life table projections are used to update the initial rates and are used in the 2025 to 2030 projection period. Survival distributions for both males and females are held constant for the remaining projection interval. ${ }^{2}$

The difference in survival of males and females is best illustrated by the summary measure of the expectation of life at birth and is shown in Table 5. This is a summary of the entire mortality experience over a lifetime based on the age-specific survivorship ratios. Life expectancy for males in New Hampshire is 81.1 years compared to females at 84.6 years. Here again, it is important to note that these rates do not incorporate any impacts brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. They are based on counts of deaths by age and sex for 2009, 2010 and 2011. More current data has not been made available from the Department of State.
Table 5: Life Expectancy at Birth for New Hampshire Counties

| County | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Hillsborough | 83.0 | 81.2 | 84.7 |
| Belknap/Merrimack | 82.0 | 80.4 | 83.6 |
| Rockingham/Strafford | 83.9 | 82.2 | 85.5 |
| Carroll/Coos/Grafton | 82.0 | 80.0 | 84.1 |
| Cheshire/Sullivan | 81.5 | 79.5 | 83.3 |

[^1]
## Mortality Assumptions

- Life table survival rates are based on county level mortality data for Hillsborough County with the remaining counties based on regional aggregations of mortality data.
- The survival rate distributions based on the 2009 to 2011 mortality data are applied to the population by age and sex for the period 2020 to 2050.
- U.S. Social Security Administration projections of the change in survivorship are applied to the rate distribution for 2020 to 2025 to reflect increased survivorship for the 2025 to 2030 period. In ages where this would produce survival ratios greater than 0.9999 , the rates were constrained to allow a slight probability of death.
- The 2025 to 2030 rate distributions are held constant for the remaining projection periods.

Tables 6 through 16 present the 5 -year summary components of population change for the complete projection period for New Hampshire and each county.

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 1,377,533 | 1,430,601 | 1,473,285 | 1,501,045 | 1,511,770 | 1,509,955 | 1,501,908 |
| Population Change | X | 53,068 | 42,684 | 27,760 | 10,725 | -1,815 | -8,047 |
| Total 5-year Births | X | 64,992 | 65,816 | 64,420 | 61,908 | 59,715 | 59,618 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | X | 63,550 | 74,093 | 88,518 | 103,249 | 114,013 | 120,074 |
| Natural Increase | X | 1,442 | -8277 | -24098 | -41341 | -54298 | -60456 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | X | 51,626 | 50,961 | 51858 | 52066 | 52483 | 52,409 |
| Female Population | 694,955 | 720,851 | 742,461 | 757,122 | 763,553 | 763,699 | 760,499 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 291,269 | 294,789 | 299,311 | 299,149 | 299,427 | 296,534 | 295,846 |

Table 7: Belknap County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | 63,705 | 66,371 | 68,635 | 69,872 | 70,366 | 70,338 | 70,103 |
| Population Change | x | 2,666 | 2,264 | 1,237 | 494 | -28 | -235 |
| Total 5-year Births | x | 2,818 | 2,863 | 2,863 | 2,817 | 2,755 | 2,741 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | x | 3,744 | 4,345 | 5,172 | 5,936 | 6,421 | 6,615 |
| Natural Increase | x | -926 | -1482 | -2309 | -3119 | -3666 | -3874 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | x | 3,592 | 3,746 | 3546 | 3613 | 3638 | 3,639 |
| Female Population | 32,252 | 33,626 | 34,866 | 35,620 | 35,999 | 36,106 | 36,093 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 11,931 | 12,175 | 12,397 | 12,283 | 12,473 | 12,495 | 12,524 |

Table 8: Carroll County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | 50,111 | 52,293 | 54,023 | 54,939 | 54,935 | 54,273 | 53,293 |
| Population Change | x | 2,182 | 1,730 | 916 | -4 | -662 | -980 |
| Total 5-year Births | x | 1,799 | 1,781 | 1,700 | 1,618 | 1,594 | 1,624 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | x | 2,519 | 3,087 | 3,923 | 4,817 | 5,453 | 5,763 |
| Natural Increase | x | -720 | -1306 | -2223 | -3199 | -3859 | -4139 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | x | 2,902 | 3,036 | 3139 | 3195 | 3197 | 3,159 |
| Female Population | 25,270 | 26,426 | 27,421 | 28,055 | 28,240 | 28,085 | 27,745 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 8,067 | 7,942 | 8,074 | 7,980 | 8,094 | 7,982 | 7,896 |

Table 9: Cheshire County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | 76,458 | 77,722 | 78,340 | 78,080 | 77,007 | 75,452 | 73,805 |
| Population Change | X | 1,264 | 618 | -260 | $-1,073$ | $-1,555$ | $-1,647$ |
| Total 5-year Births | X | 3,134 | 2,985 | 2,802 | 2,676 | 2,621 | 2,625 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | X | 3,528 | 4,065 | 4,769 | 5,453 | 5,852 | 5,914 |
| Natural Increase | X | -394 | -1080 | -1967 | -2777 | -3231 | -3289 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | X | 1,658 | 1,698 | 1707 | 1704 | 1676 | 1,642 |
| Female Population | 39,038 | 39,658 | 40,016 | 39,970 | 39,550 | 38,891 | 38,171 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 16,167 | 16,100 | 16,151 | 15,911 | 15,493 | 15,047 | 14,786 |

Table 10: Coos County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | 31,268 | 31,274 | 31,047 | 30,490 | 29,608 | 28,533 | 27,428 |
| Population Change | x | 6 | -227 | -557 | -882 | $-1,075$ | $-1,105$ |
| Total 5-year Births | x | 1,220 | 1,174 | 1,110 | 1,050 | 1,012 | 996 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | x | 2,006 | 2,197 | 2,455 | 2,702 | 2,830 | 2,812 |
| Natural Increase | x | -786 | -1023 | -1345 | -1652 | -1818 | -1816 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | x | 792 | 796 | 788 | 770 | 743 | 711 |
| Female Population | 14,873 | 14,869 | 14,784 | 14,554 | 14,168 | 13,676 | 13,157 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 5,233 | 5,054 | 4,897 | 4,753 | 4,631 | 4,461 | 4,303 |

Table 11: Grafton County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | 91,118 | 94,984 | 98,030 | 99,463 | 99,711 | 98,998 | 97,777 |
| Population Change | x | 3,866 | 3,046 | 1,433 | 248 | -713 | $-1,221$ |
| Total 5-year Births | x | 3,830 | 3,750 | 3,676 | 3,606 | 3,469 | 3,363 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | x | 5,456 | 6,445 | 7,697 | 8,896 | 9,736 | 10,089 |
| Natural Increase | x | $-1,626$ | -2695 | -4021 | -5290 | -6267 | -6726 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | X | 5,492 | 5,741 | 5454 | 5538 | 5554 | 5,505 |
| Female Population | 46,183 | 48,162 | 49,792 | 50,662 | 50,965 | 50,791 | 50,312 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 19,798 | 19,983 | 20,282 | 20,101 | 19,651 | 19,241 | 19,348 |

Table 12: Hillsborough County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | 422,937 | 440,881 | 454,896 | 464,900 | 470,211 | 471,760 | 471,369 |
| Population Change | x | 17,944 | 14,015 | 10,004 | 5,311 | 1,549 | -391 |
| Total 5-year Births | x | 23,227 | 23,672 | 23,150 | 22,218 | 21,466 | 21,505 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | x | 18,954 | 21,747 | 25,661 | 29,726 | 32,892 | 34,916 |
| Natural Increase | x | 4,273 | 1925 | -2511 | -7508 | -11426 | -13411 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | x | 13,671 | 12,090 | 12515 | 12819 | 12975 | 13,020 |
| Female Population | 212,368 | 220,927 | 227,825 | 232,888 | 235,771 | 236,862 | 236,984 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 93,119 | 95,196 | 96,808 | 97,276 | 97,558 | 96,598 | 96,427 |

Table 13: Merrimack County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 153,808 | 159,385 | 164,072 | 167,214 | 168,609 | 168,770 | 168,475 |
| Population Change | X | 5,577 | 4,687 | 3,142 | 1,395 | 161 | -295 |
| Total 5-year Births | X | 7,675 | 7,712 | 7,572 | 7,349 | 7,206 | 7,293 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | x | 8,359 | 9,540 | 11,162 | 12,821 | 13,979 | 14,529 |
| Natural Increase | x | -684 | -1828 | -3590 | -5472 | -6773 | -7236 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | X | 6,261 | 6,515 | 6732 | 6867 | 6934 | 6,941 |
| Female Population | 78,095 | 80,734 | 83,066 | 84,674 | 85,399 | 85,470 | 85,287 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 32,419 | 32,719 | 33,184 | 33,170 | 33,311 | 33,284 | 33,363 |

Table 14: Rockingham County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | 314,176 | 327,586 | 339,248 | 347,444 | 350,560 | 350,316 | 348,082 |
| Population Change | X | 13,410 | 11,662 | 8,196 | 3,116 | -244 | $-2,234$ |
| Total 5-year Births | X | 12,525 | 12,839 | 12,465 | 11,712 | 11,099 | 11,081 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | X | 11,152 | 13,753 | 17,317 | 21,103 | 23,969 | 25,929 |
| Natural Increase | X | 1,373 | -914 | -4852 | -9391 | -12870 | -14848 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | X | 12,037 | 12,576 | 13048 | 12507 | 12626 | 12,614 |
| Female Population | 158,602 | 165,220 | 171,069 | 175,259 | 176,943 | 176,899 | 175,767 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 63,898 | 64,216 | 65,479 | 65,585 | 65,770 | 65,025 | 64,383 |

Table 15: Strafford County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population | 130,889 | 136,162 | 140,565 | 144,214 | 146,813 | 148,384 | 149,435 |
| Population Change | x | 5,273 | 4,403 | 3,649 | 2,599 | 1,571 | 1,051 |
| Total 5-year Births | x | 6,811 | 7,160 | 7,293 | 7,158 | 6,852 | 6,773 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | x | 6,208 | 6,954 | 7,999 | 9,040 | 9,852 | 10,347 |
| Natural Increase | x | 603 | 206 | -706 | -1882 | -3000 | -3574 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | x | 4,670 | 4,197 | 4355 | 4481 | 4571 | 4,625 |
| Female Population | 66,578 | 69,132 | 71,304 | 73,132 | 74,455 | 75,267 | 75,833 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 32,402 | 33,365 | 34,102 | 34,372 | 34,929 | 35,183 | 35,725 |

Table 16: Sullivan County Projected Components of Change

|  | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 43,063 | 43,943 | 44,429 | 44,429 | 43,950 | 43,131 | 42,141 |
| Population Change | X | 880 | 486 | 0 | -479 | -819 | -990 |
| Total 5-year Births | X | 1,953 | 1,880 | 1,789 | 1,704 | 1,641 | 1,617 |
| Total 5-year Deaths | X | 1,624 | 1,960 | 2,363 | 2,755 | 3,029 | 3,160 |
| Natural Increase | X | 329 | -80 | -574 | -1051 | -1388 | -1543 |
| Net Migration (5-year) | X | 551 | 566 | 574 | 572 | 569 | 553 |
| Female Population | 21,696 | 22,097 | 22,318 | 22,308 | 22,063 | 21,652 | 21,150 |
| Females Age 15 to 49 | 8,235 | 8,039 | 7,937 | 7,718 | 7,517 | 7,218 | 7,091 |

## Minor Civil Division Projections

New Hampshire's towns and cities, known in Census terms as Minor Civil Divisions (MCDs), are primary governmental units and make up 100 percent of all land area, and their boundaries are consistent with county boundaries. That means the total population projected for counties can be used as a "control" total for the sum of all of the MCDs in each county. This characteristic is important for the method used to project the future populations of towns, cities and related sub-county areas.

Much of the demographic data required by the county projections model is not available at the sub-county level. Total population, age, race, Hispanic or Latino origin and housing unit data will become available from the Decennial Census but is not currently available. Many of these MCD's are too small in population size to allow for individual projection and certainly not for age and sex characteristics. The Census Bureau also prepares annual estimates of the total population for all MCD's, but here also there are no demographic characteristics available.

The Office of Planning and Development requires projections of only the total population for each MCD. The projections to 2050 are based on a "shift-share" methodology which is a common method used in local and regional projections and analysis. In this application, the method computes the share of population that each MCD comprises of the county total population and applies that ratio to projected county growth. Table 17 presents an example of the share development for Belknap County. Here it is seen that the share of county population in the city of Laconia, for example, declined between 2000 and 2010 from 29.14 percent to 26.55 percent and then remained very stable in 2020 at 26.48 percent. These share trends form the basis for the projection of each MCD through 2050.

Table 17: Shift-Share Method Results for Belknap County

|  | 2000 |  | 2010 |  | 2020 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Population | Share | Population | Share | Population | Share |
| Belknap County | 56,325 | $100.00 \%$ | 60,088 | $100.00 \%$ | 63,705 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Alton town | 4,502 | $7.99 \%$ | 5,250 | $8.74 \%$ | 5,894 | $9.25 \%$ |
| Barnstead town | 3,886 | $6.90 \%$ | 4,593 | $7.64 \%$ | 4,915 | $7.72 \%$ |
| Belmont town | 6,716 | $11.92 \%$ | 7,356 | $12.24 \%$ | 7,314 | $11.48 \%$ |
| Center Harbor town | 996 | $1.77 \%$ | 1,096 | $1.82 \%$ | 1,040 | $1.63 \%$ |
| Gilford town | 6,803 | $12.08 \%$ | 7,126 | $11.86 \%$ | 7,699 | $12.09 \%$ |
| Gilmanton town | 3,060 | $5.43 \%$ | 3,777 | $6.29 \%$ | 3,945 | $6.19 \%$ |
| Laconia city | 16,411 | $29.14 \%$ | 15,951 | $26.55 \%$ | 16,871 | $26.48 \%$ |
| Meredith town | 5,943 | $10.55 \%$ | 6,241 | $10.39 \%$ | 6,662 | $10.46 \%$ |
| New Hampton town | 1,950 | $3.46 \%$ | 2,165 | $3.60 \%$ | 2,377 | $3.73 \%$ |
| Sanbornton town | 2,581 | $4.58 \%$ | 2,966 | $4.94 \%$ | 3,026 | $4.75 \%$ |
| Tilton town | 3,477 | $6.17 \%$ | 3,567 | $5.94 \%$ | 3,962 | $6.22 \%$ |

The shift aspect of the method allows for the shares to be adjusted based on other exogenous factors like housing construction, transportation networks and changes in employment centers. It is common practice to make this type of adjustment when factors affecting growth are known, as in the case of new housing development that is approved and/or under construction, new transportation infrastructure or new commercial development that has the potential to change employment patterns. It is not reasonable, or good practice, to alter projections on the basis of speculative change unless that is a potential scenario that the analyst simply wants to investigate. That is not the case in the development of this set of projections.

For this project, the team consulted with the state's nine regional planning commission (RPC) directors and identified areas of significant upcoming housing development, including approved permits for construction and development that was actually under construction, for areas in Carroll, Cheshire, Hillsborough, Merrimack, Rockingham and Strafford counties. For these counties, the shares were adjusted to account for future growth in the 2020 to 2025 period and then held constant at the adjusted level for the remainder of the projection intervals. For other counties where such data was not available, the 2020 population shares were held constant throughout the projection interval.

The New Hampshire county population projections for 2020 to 2050 by municipality are located in Appendix B.

New Hampshire's RPCs are not always made up of entire counties and have boundaries that follow MCD boundaries. In order to provide the RPCs with total population projections, the MCD projections have been aggregated to regional boundaries as shown in Table 18.

Table 18: Population Projections by Regional Planning Commission (RPC)

| New Hampshire RPCs | 2020 <br> Census | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central New Hampshire Regional <br> Planning Commission | 120,515 | 124,920 | 128,598 | 131,074 | 132,189 | 132,335 | 132,112 |
| Lakes Region Planning Commission | 125,258 | 130,448 | 134,739 | 137,093 | 137,797 | 137,310 | 136,302 |
| Nashua Regional Planning Commission | 217,543 | 226,575 | 233,630 | 238,666 | 241,339 | 242,119 | 241,922 |
| North Country Council | 83,107 | 85,340 | 86,866 | 87,171 | 86,379 | 84,799 | 82,887 |
| Rockingham Planning Commission | 198,870 | 207,357 | 214,738 | 219,925 | 221,897 | 221,743 | 220,329 |
| Southern New Hampshire Planning <br> Commission | 285,230 | 297,529 | 307,538 | 314,622 | 317,976 | 318,575 | 317,693 |
| Southwest Region Planning <br> Commission | 100,307 | 102,551 | 103,931 | 104,209 | 103,415 | 101,931 | 100,248 |
| Strafford Regional Planning <br> Commission | 156,145 | 162,479 | 167,784 | 172,031 | 174,816 | 176,294 | 177,095 |
| Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional <br> Planning Commission | 90,554 | 93,408 | 95,467 | 96,258 | 95,967 | 94,854 | 93,326 |

## Race and Hispanic Origin Projections

The Census Bureau collects race and ethnicity data in accordance with the 1997 Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity directed by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget ${ }^{3}$. This requirement has maintained consistency in the collection of data for the 2000, 2010 and 2020 censuses, as well as Census Bureau current surveys such as the ACS. These definitions have been followed in the development of projections for New Hampshire's counties by race and Hispanic Origin.

The Census derives these data from the responses to two separate questions:

1) Is this person of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin? This includes a "Yes"/"No" response and if "Yes" selections for the type of origin and a write-in space.
2) What is this person's race? This allows for multiple selections of racial identification and also write-in space for further identification.

This construct allows for multiple cross classifications of race and Hispanic Origin and data reported from each census includes many tables and permutations of the various selections.

A common tabulation of these questions results in a smaller set of mutually exclusive categories which present racial identification for the Hispanic and Non-Hispanic population. This form of tabulation is used for the projections and includes the following categories:

[^2]1) White alone, Non-Hispanic
2) Black or African American alone, Non-Hispanic
3) American Indian or Alaska Native alone, Non-Hispanic
4) Asian alone, Non-Hispanic
5) Some other race alone, Non-Hispanic
6) Two or more races, Non-Hispanic
7) Hispanic

Attitudes toward race and ethnic identification have changed over time with a general willingness to be more specific when reporting an individual's race and ethnic identity. For the 2020 Census, there were also changes in the way the Census Bureau tabulated the responses which affect the data for those reporting "Some other race" and "Two or more races". These changes are described in an August 2021 Census Bureau blog found at: https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2021/08/improvements-to-2020-census-race-hispanic-origin-question-designs.html

The Census Bureau last produced national projections of the population by race and Hispanic Origin in 2017. Those projections provided population counts in 5-year projection intervals to the year 2060. An initial attempt to develop New Hampshire projections was made by using the percent change by racial/Hispanic Origin category in each period. However, the Census Bureau projections used a modified racial classification that eliminated the "Some other race" category and distributed that population to the various racial groups. This difference made it impossible to use the Census projections for the race/ethnic categories required.

The alternative method, which has been used here, is to apply the percent distribution, starting with the 2020 Census distribution, to the projected New Hampshire county level total populations. This method maintains the mutually exclusive categories and allows the state's total projection to be consistent with the individual county projections. Table 19 presents the New Hampshire race and Hispanic Origin projections which is the sum of the individual counties.

Table 19: New Hampshire Population Projections by Race and Hispanic Origin

|  | April 1, 2020 |  | Sum of Counties |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| Total | 1,377,529 | 100.0\% | 1,430,601 | 1,473,285 | 1,501,045 | 1,511,770 | 1,509,955 | 1,501,908 |
| Not Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Alone | 1,200,649 | 87.2\% | 1,212,812 | 1,227,467 | 1,233,906 | 1,229,092 | 1,219,133 | 1,206,087 |
| Black or African American Alone | 18,655 | 1.4\% | 21,512 | 24,359 | 26,549 | 28,385 | 29,150 | 29,722 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Alone | 2,299 | 0.2\% | 2,422 | 2,465 | 2,508 | 2,523 | 2,518 | 2,503 |
| Asian Alone | 35,604 | 2.6\% | 39,970 | 43,773 | 46,940 | 48,798 | 50,034 | 50,752 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone | 388 | 0.0\% | 2,626 | 2,708 | 2,765 | 2,791 | 2,794 | 2,785 |
| Some Other Race | 5,916 | 0.4\% | 8,934 | 11,460 | 12,676 | 14,723 | 15,079 | 16,366 |
| Two or More Races | 54,564 | 4.0\% | 72,138 | 83,067 | 91,528 | 97,286 | 100,555 | 101,899 |
| Hispanic | 59,454 | 4.3\% | 70,187 | 77,986 | 84,173 | 88,171 | 90,693 | 91,795 |

## Sources of Data

- New Hampshire Department of State, Division of Vital Records Administration, NHVRINweb query service
- U.S. Census Bureau
- 2000 Census of Population, Summary File 1, Population by Sex and Age
- 2010 Census of Population, Summary File 1, Population by Sex and Age
- 2020 Census of Population, Public Law 94-171 Redistricting data file
- Intercensal Estimates of the Resident Population by 5-year Age Groups, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019
- 2020 Census Bureau, Demographic Analysis estimates by county, age and sex
- 2019 American Community Survey, Table B01001
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Health Statistics
- U.S. Social Security Administration, "Life Tables for the United States Social Security Area, 1900-2100", Actuarial Study No. 120.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 National Population Projections Tables: Main Series, https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2017/demo/popproj/2017-summary-tables.html
- Vespa, Jonathan, Lauren Medina, and David M. Armstrong, "Demographic Turning Points for the United States: Population Projections for 2020 to 2060," Current Population Reports, P25-1144, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC, 2020.


## Glossary

Age-Specific Fertility Rate - The Age-Specific Fertility Rate is calculated as the number of births by age of mother divided by the number of women of the same age. For example, births to women age 25 to 29 divided by the number of women age 25 to 29 . It is a more accurate representation of fertility than crude measures based on the total population or the population of all women. The Age-Specific Fertility Rate can be thought of as the "probability" of women of a certain age giving birth.

Age-Specific Migration Rate - The Age-Specific Migration Rate is calculated as the number of net migrants during the migration period for a specific age category divided by the number of persons in that age category at the beginning of the migration period. For example, between 2010 and 2015, the number of net migrants age 30 to 34 is divided by the number of 30 to 34 year-old persons in 2010.

Crude Migration Rate - The Crude Migration Rate is the total number of net migrations (the balance between in-migrants and out-migrants) divided by the total population at the beginning of the migration period. For example, when measuring migration between 2010 and 2015, the Crude Migration Rate is the number of net migrants during the period divided by the total population in 2010.

Grade Progression Ratio - The ratio of students in a current grade and school year to the students in the previous grade one year earlier. For example, 500 students enrolled in grade 3 in the Fall of 2019 divided by 450 students enrolled in grade 2 in the Fall of 2018 equals a grade progression ratio of 1.111.

Sex Ratio - The sex ratio is typically calculated as the ratio of males to females. Typically the sex ratio at birth is greater than 1.0 slightly favoring more male births than female births. By age 65 , the sex ratio greatly favors women due to their greater longevity.

Total Fertility Rate - The Total Fertility Rate is the sum of age-specific fertility rates and represents the average completed fertility of women across all ages. A Total Fertility Rate of 2.1 represents the "replacement" level of fertility - that level which accounts for a woman replacing herself, her partner and accounting for childless women.

Survivorship Ratio - The survivorship ratio at any given age represents the probability that an individual age " $x$ " will survive to age " $x+n$ " where " $n$ " is the number of years in the interval. For example, the probability that an individual at age 30 on the exact day of their birthday will survive five years to be age 35 on the exact day of their birthday.

## Appendix A

New Hampshire County Population Projections 2020 to 2050: Demographic Components of Change Report

## Introduction

This report presents analysis of the demographic components of change for the ten counties of New Hampshire. The historical components of change analysis is the first step in development of transition rates for the Cohort Component Projection model. Figure 1 illustrates the link between analysis of the historical population change and the inputs to the model projecting future populations. The projection model requires age-sex specific rates of mortality and migration, and fertility rates by age of mother and their county of residence. These are developed from the historical analysis presented in this report and are necessary for understanding the demographic factors accounting for change in the population. Further analysis helps to understand population change by age and sex cohort.

Figure 1: Projection Process Phases


Each component is applied separately in the projections model while also being sensitive to the interactive effects of the components. For example, the projected number of births in a future period is a function of the fertility rates applied to women of childbearing age but is also a
function of the interaction with migration. If the number of women is increasing due to inmigration, births will increase even when fertility rates are stable.

The Components of Change Module and analysis utilizes the following data sources:

- Historical birth and death data by age and sex from the New Hampshire Department of State through the Division of Vital Records Administration web query system,
- Current and historical census results and population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau Decennial Census, Population Estimates Program and American Community Survey,
- College enrollment by age and sex for selected colleges from the U.S. Department of Education, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS),
- Prison populations by age and sex (when available) through various county corrections departments,
- Nursing home residents by facility provided by the New Hampshire Office of Planning and Development,
- Estimates of total net migration and migration by age and sex prepared by RLS Demographics using Census Bureau estimates and the Life Table Survival Rate methodology.


## Demographic Components of Change - Process Overview

Demographic components of change (fertility, mortality and migration) are analyzed to capture total population change and change by age and sex. This is particularly important for projecting births which are dependent on fertility rates and the number of women of childbearing age. Changes in household composition and housing unit type are also factors to be considered when analyzing population change. Household composition relates to our living arrangements: single person households, delayed marriage, reduced household sizes. Housing construction relates to the type of unit: single family versus multi-unit structures. This has particular impacts on household size and the number of children.

The age structure of the population is particularly important in measuring changes in the fertility level. The simple Crude Birth Rate (total births divided by the total population) does not capture the "population at risk" of having children, namely, women of childbearing age. Fertility rates are not consistent across all ages, requiring the calculation of age-specific fertility. Migration is a critically important component and must also be specific to age and sex populations. Each of these component factors is discussed in more detail below.

The measurement of population change over a given period of time is defined by a simple identity known as the demographic balancing equation. In its simplest form, the equation is stated as:
$P_{1}=P_{0}+B_{(t, t+n)}-D_{(t, t+n)}+M_{(t, t+n)}$

Where: $\mathrm{P}_{0}=$ population at the base period
$P_{1}=$ population at the end of period $n$
$B=$ births between time $t$ and $t+n$
$D=$ deaths between time $t$ and $t+n$
$M=$ net migrants between time $t$ and $t+n$

The Population Estimates Program of the U.S. Census Bureau utilizes a nationwide methodology for estimating total population and age, race, sex characteristics at the county level which follows this basic balancing equation concept. Table 1 presents these historical estimates and components of change for the State of New Hampshire and for each county.

Population change in New Hampshire and individual counties has varied over the last three decades. Total growth in New Hampshire from 1990 to 2020 exceeded 260,000 and a rate of 24.6 percent. Not all counties grew during that time period, and the range of population change shows a loss of more than 3,500 (-10.2 percent) in Coos to a high of 87,000 in Hillsborough. While Hillsborough had the largest numeric increase, the rate of change was 25.9 percent. The rate of growth in five other counties (Belknap, Grafton, Merrimack, Rockingham and Strafford) were all in the range of 20 to 30 percent. Carroll County had the fastest rate of increase at 41.5 percent.

These overall populations and rates of change mask the variation occurring within the threedecade span. Growth or decline is not consistent. Coos County shows a fairly consistent decline in each 5-year period but even here there was some growth between 2005 and 2010. Carroll County with the most rapid rate of growth is estimated to have lost population between 2010 and 2015. Each county exhibits different patterns of change in reviewing the 5 -year periods.

Population change is a function of only three demographic processes: fertility, mortality and migration. As noted earlier, this report analyzes the effects of each of these components. Two factors stand out as being consistent across all counties: a decline in the number of births and an increase in the number of deaths. This difference is referred to as "natural change". Declining births reflect national trends of reduced fertility levels, and increasing deaths reflects, again following national trends, the aging of the Baby Boom cohort into high mortality ages. These trends are so pronounced that Belknap, Carroll, Coos, Grafton and Merrimack counties all show natural decline - an excess of deaths over births - in the 2015 to 2020 period. Cheshire, Strafford and Sullivan counties are very near that level.

Table 1: New Hampshire Historical Components of Change, 1990 to 2020

| New Hampshire State | April 1, 1990 | July 1, 1995 | $\begin{gathered} \text { April 1, } \\ 2000 \end{gathered}$ | July 1, 2005 | $\begin{gathered} \text { April 1, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | July 1, 2015 | $\begin{gathered} \text { April 1, } \\ 2020 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 1,109,252 | 1,157,561 | 1,235,786 | 1,298,492 | 1,316,470 | 1,336,350 | 1,377,529 |
| Population Change | X | 48,309 | 78,225 | 62,706 | 17,978 | 19,880 | 41,179 |
| Percent Change | X | 4.4\% | 6.8\% | 5.1\% | 1.4\% | 1.5\% | 3.1\% |
| Cumulative Births | X | 78,913 | 71,940 | 72,571 | 69,253 | 62,555 | 72,337 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | 43,463 | 47,310 | 49,433 | 50,929 | 55,059 | 49,804 |
| Natural Increase | x | 35,450 | 24,630 | 23,138 | 18,325 | 7,496 | 22,534 |
| Net Migration | X | 12,859 | 53,595 | 39,568 | -347 | 12,384 | -4,716 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | 1.2\% | 4.6\% | 3.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.9\% | -0.4\% |
| Belknap County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Population | 49,216 | 50,780 | 56,268 | 60,928 | 60,075 | 60,408 | 63,705 |
| Population Change | X | 1,564 | 5,488 | 4,660 | -853 | 333 | 3,297 |
| Percent Change | x | 3.2\% | 10.8\% | 8.3\% | -1.4\% | 0.6\% | 5.4\% |
| Cumulative Births | X | x | 2,671 | 3,040 | 3,403 | 2,841 | 2,338 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 2,287 | 2,722 | 2,635 | 3,015 | 3,064 |
| Natural Increase | x | x | 384 | 319 | 768 | -174 | -726 |
| Net Migration | X | X | 5,104 | 4,341 | -1,621 | 507 | 4,023 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | X | 10.1\% | 7.7\% | -2.7\% | 0.8\% | 6.7\% |
| Carroll County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Population | 35,410 | 37,543 | 43,697 | 46,707 | 47,823 | 47,442 | 50,107 |
| Population Change | x | 2,133 | 6,154 | 3,010 | 1,116 | -381 | 2,665 |
| Percent Change | x | 6.0\% | 16.4\% | 6.9\% | 2.4\% | -0.8\% | 5.5\% |
| Cumulative Births | X | X | 1,891 | 2,093 | 2,249 | 1,903 | 1,541 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | X | 1,666 | 1,860 | 1,848 | 2,011 | 2,039 |
| Natural Increase | X | x | 226 | 233 | 402 | -109 | -498 |
| Net Migration | X | x | 5,929 | 2,777 | 715 | -273 | 3,163 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | X | x | 15.8\% | 6.4\% | 1.5\% | -0.6\% | 6.7\% |

Table 1: New Hampshire Historical Components of Change, 1990 to 2020 (cont'd)

| Cheshire County | April 1, 1990 | July 1, <br> 1995 | April 1, 2000 | July 1, $2005$ | April 1, <br> 2010 | July 1, $2015$ | July 1, $2019$ | April 1, <br> 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 70,121 | 70,850 | 73,811 | 76,832 | 77,123 | 76,390 | 75,880 | 76,458 |
| Population Change | x | 729 | 2,961 | 3,021 | 291 | -733 | -510 | 68 |
| Percent Change | X | 1.0\% | 4.2\% | 4.1\% | 0.4\% | -1.0\% | -0.7\% | 0.1\% |
| Cumulative Births | X | x | 3,504 | 3,939 | 4,276 | 3,597 | 2,610 | 3,085 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 2,481 | 2,855 | 2,559 | 2,993 | 2,526 | 3,005 |
| Natural Increase | x | x | 1,023 | 1,083 | 1,717 | 604 | 84 | 80 |
| Net Migration | x | x | 1,938 | 1,938 | -1,426 | -1,337 | -594 | -12 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | x | 2.7\% | 2.6\% | -1.9\% | -1.7\% | -0.8\% | 0.0\% |

Coos County

| Total Population | 34,828 | 33,578 | 33,089 | 32,779 | 33,052 | 32,351 | 31,421 | 31,268 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Population Change | x | $-1,250$ | -489 | -310 | 273 | -701 | -930 | $-1,083$ |
| Percent Change | x | $-3.6 \%$ | $-1.5 \%$ | $-0.9 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $-2.1 \%$ | $-2.9 \%$ | $-3.4 \%$ |
| Cumulative Births | x | x | 1,501 | 1,567 | 1,669 | 1,377 | 947 | 1,123 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 1,704 | 1,883 | 1,558 | 1,845 | 1,558 | 1,844 |
| Natural Increase | x | x | -204 | -316 | 111 | -468 | -611 | -721 |
| Net Migration | x | x | -286 | 6 | 163 | -233 | -319 | -362 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | x | $-0.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $-0.7 \%$ | $-1.0 \%$ | $-1.1 \%$ |

Grafton County

| Total Population | 74,929 | 77,545 | 81,764 | 84,743 | 89,135 | 89,566 | 90,369 | 91,118 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Population Change | x | 2,616 | 4,219 | 2,979 | 4,392 | 431 | 803 | 1,552 |
| Percent Change | x | $3.5 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Cumulative Births | x | x | 3,864 | 4,227 | 4,697 | 3,992 | 2,803 | 3,303 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 3,747 | 4,213 | 3,979 | 4,801 | 4,008 | 4,813 |
| Natural Increase | x | x | 117 | 15 | 718 | -810 | $-1,205$ | $-1,511$ |
| Net Migration | x | x | 4,103 | 2,965 | 3,674 | 1,241 | 2,008 | 3,063 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | x | $5.3 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |

Hillsborough County

| Total Population | 335,838 | 349,027 | 380,856 | 398,784 | 400,706 | 409,229 | 417,738 | 422,937 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Population Change | x | 13,189 | 31,829 | 17,928 | 1,922 | 8,523 | 8,509 | 13,708 |
| Percent Change | x | $3.9 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Cumulative Births | x | x | 23,430 | 26,150 | 27,816 | 22,665 | 16,706 | 19,791 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 12,692 | 14,245 | 13,292 | 15,605 | 13,381 | 16,003 |
| Natural Increase | x | x | 10,738 | 11,906 | 14,524 | 7,060 | 3,325 | 3,788 |
| Net Migration | x | x | 21,091 | 6,023 | $-12,602$ | 1,463 | 5,184 | 9,920 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | x | $6.0 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $-3.2 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |

Table 1: New Hampshire Historical Components of Change, 1990 to 2020 (cont'd)

| Merrimack County | April 1, 1990 | July 1, <br> 1995 | April 1, <br> 2000 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { July 1, } \\ 2005 \end{gathered}$ | April 1, $2010$ | July 1, <br> 2015 | July 1, $2019$ | April 1, <br> 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 120,240 | 123,596 | 136,264 | 146,353 | 146,452 | 148,770 | 151,606 | 153,808 |
| Population Change | x | 3,356 | 12,668 | 10,089 | 99 | 2,318 | 2,836 | 5,038 |
| Percent Change | x | 2.8\% | 10.2\% | 7.4\% | 0.1\% | 1.6\% | 1.9\% | 3.3\% |
| Cumulative Births | x | x | 7,039 | 8,063 | 8,695 | 7,111 | 5,219 | 6,144 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 5,341 | 6,608 | 6,028 | 6,966 | 5,964 | 7,106 |
| Natural Increase | x | x | 1,698 | 1,455 | 2,667 | 145 | -745 | -962 |
| Net Migration | x | x | 10,970 | 8,634 | -2,568 | 2,173 | 3,581 | 6,000 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | x | 8.9\% | 6.3\% | -1.8\% | 1.5\% | 2.4\% | 4.0\% |
| Rockingham County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Population | 245,845 | 257,715 | 277,388 | 292,634 | 295,207 | 302,975 | 309,647 | 314,176 |
| Population Change | x | 11,870 | 19,673 | 15,246 | 2,573 | 7,768 | 6,672 | 11,201 |
| Percent Change | x | 4.8\% | 7.6\% | 5.5\% | 0.9\% | 2.6\% | 2.2\% | 3.6\% |
| Cumulative Births | X | x | 16,090 | 17,344 | 16,959 | 13,610 | 10,618 | 12,603 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 6,269 | 7,407 | 6,795 | 8,549 | 7,531 | 9,063 |
| Natural Increase | x | x | 9,821 | 9,938 | 10,164 | 5,061 | 3,088 | 3,540 |
| Net Migration | x | x | 9,852 | 5,309 | -7,591 | 2,707 | 3,585 | 7,661 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | X | 3.8\% | 1.9\% | -2.6\% | 0.9\% | 1.2\% | 2.5\% |
| Strafford County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Population | 104,233 | 105,907 | 112,235 | 119,006 | 123,146 | 127,174 | 130,716 | 130,889 |
| Population Change | x | 1,674 | 6,328 | 6,771 | 4,140 | 4,028 | 3,542 | 3,715 |
| Percent Change | x | 1.6\% | 6.0\% | 6.0\% | 3.5\% | 3.3\% | 2.8\% | 2.8\% |
| Cumulative Births | x | x | 6,134 | 7,288 | 7,881 | 6,539 | 4,715 | 5,578 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 3,437 | 4,069 | 4,043 | 4,943 | 4,571 | 5,456 |
| Natural Increase | x | x | 2,697 | 3,219 | 3,838 | 1,597 | 144 | 122 |
| Net Migration | x | x | 3,631 | 3,552 | 302 | 2,432 | 3,399 | 3,593 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | x | 3.4\% | 3.2\% | 0.3\% | 2.0\% | 2.7\% | 2.8\% |
| Sullivan County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Population | 38,592 | 39,138 | 40,435 | 42,284 | 43,738 | 43,175 | 43,263 | 43,063 |
| Population Change | x | 546 | 1,297 | 1,849 | 1,454 | -563 | 88 | -112 |
| Percent Change | x | 1.4\% | 3.3\% | 4.6\% | 3.4\% | -1.3\% | 0.2\% | -0.3\% |
| Cumulative Births | x | x | 2,084 | 2,461 | 2,623 | 2,108 | 1,549 | 1,814 |
| Cumulative Deaths | x | x | 1,212 | 1,288 | 1,226 | 1,450 | 1,272 | 1,515 |
| Natural Increase | X | x | 871 | 1,173 | 1,397 | 658 | 278 | 299 |
| Net Migration | x | X | 426 | 676 | 57 | -1,221 | -190 | -411 |
| Crude Net Migration Rate | x | x | 1.1\% | 1.7\% | 0.1\% | -2.8\% | -0.4\% | -1.0\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Intercensal Estimates of Population, 2000 to 2019. New Hampshire Department of State, Annual Vital Statistics, 1990 to 2020

Migration is the most volatile of the three demographic components of change and is responsive to many economic, housing and social changes. New Hampshire counties reflect this with varying levels of both in- and out-migration over the three decades and differences between the counties. Grafton and Strafford counties are the only counties that show net inmigration in each 5 -year period. Some of the largest levels of net out-migration (Belknap,

Cheshire, Hillsborough, Merrimack and Rockingham) occur in the 2005 to 2010 period and are likely a result of the Great Recession.

An important caveat: To date, results from the 2020 Census only include data required under Public Law 94-171 for states to use in Congressional and state redistricting. This data file provides results for all levels of geography from the state total to all individual census blocks. However, the characteristics provided are limited to include population by race, Hispanic/Latino origin, voting age (18 and over), housing occupancy and group quarters population.

## Analysis of Age-Sex Specific Components of Change

While these trends in total population are informative, it's necessary to understand the underlying age-sex distribution of the population and its impact on the components of change. In the context of producing 30-year population projections, fertility and migration become the most important components.

## Fertility Analysis

The absolute number of births projected by the Cohort-Component Projections model for each area, in each 5-year time interval, is calculated by applying age-specific fertility rates to the number of women in the childbearing ages (women age 15 through 49). The number of male and female births is determined by applying the sex ratio at birth based on historical data.

Individual county fertility patterns are based on two decades of analysis using the Decennial Census as the benchmark for each decade. Births by age of mother are averaged over a threeyear period centered on the Census data. The analysis for 2010 uses birth data for 2009, 2010 and 2011 and the 2010 Census population as the base. As noted earlier, 2020 Census data at this level is not available, while State vital statistics data on births by age of mother is available through calendar year 2021. The analysis is based on the three-year average of 2019, 2020 and 2021 births. The base population utilizes estimates for 2020 from the Census Bureau's Demographic Analysis program for evaluation of the 2020 Census results. This process is fully described.

## Estimating the 2020 Age-Sex Distribution

An important factor that can affect the results is having to estimate the 2020 age-sex distribution. In the absence of the actual 2020 Census results, the age-sex distribution has been estimated using the Census Bureau's county level Demographic Analysis estimates for April 1, 2020. These estimates use a methodology similar to the demographic balancing equation whereby the 2010 population is "aged" to 2020 incorporating birth, death and estimated migration data. The age-sex structure will closely reflect the structure of the 2010 Census but doesn't account for changes other than the natural aging process.

The estimates are subject to what is called "error of closure" which is the measurable error between the estimated population and the actual Census result. The estimates can over or understate the Census enumerated population and that difference represents error in the estimates process. Lacking the age-sex data from the 2020 Census, the Demographic Analysis estimates have been made to equal the 2020 Census total population count for each county. This is accomplished by uniformly applying the percent difference between the estimate total and the 2020 Census total to each age-sex group.

A second issue of importance is special populations. Special populations reside in group quarters and include populations like college students, prisoners, military, and nursing home residents. These populations impact the calculations for age-specific fertility and migration rates because they do not reflect actions of the general population. In the case of fertility, college age women are not prone to having children at the same rates as their counterparts who are not in college. In the case of migration, college students do not "age in place" as the general population. Graduating seniors often do not stay in the location of the college and are replaced each year by incoming freshmen. If these populations are not removed from the total resident population by age and sex, they will distort the resulting fertility and migration rates and create an artificial "bulge" in the age distribution as they age.

New Hampshire is home to a number of colleges and universities with large enrollments. They are primarily located in Cheshire, Grafton, Hillsborough, Merrimack and Strafford counties. The data used here is based on full-time undergraduate and graduate enrollment by age and sex from the National Center for Education Statistics. Prison populations are defined in Cheshire, Coos, Hillsborough, Merrimack, Rockingham and Strafford counties though the populations are relatively small in all but Coos, Hillsborough and Merrimack. Current data by age and sex for 2020 was not available for all facilities and was estimated based on the total inmate counts. Nursing home populations reside in each county. Only the total resident population is available and the age-sex detail was estimated based on the age-sex distribution in the Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates of nursing home residents for the 2015-2019 period.

The age-specific fertility patterns establish women's relative propensity for giving birth at each age. The patterns are often remarkably stable and it's the pattern by age that illustrates how recent generations have delayed childbearing. This is seen in the following Figures 2 through 11 where fertility of teenage women 15 to 19 and women age 20 to 30 have continued to decline while fertility of women age 30 to 34 and older has increased. This shift reflects nationwide trends. Two factors affecting the future projection are unknown: the results of the 2020 Census and the impact of the COVID pandemic on long-term fertility.

Figure 2: Belknap County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 4: Cheshire County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 6: Grafton County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 8: Merrimack County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 3: Carroll County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 5: Coos County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 7: Hillsborough County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 9: Rockingham County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 10: Strafford County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


Figure 11: Sullivan County Age-Specific Fertility Rates


The last piece of the fertility analysis is the actual level of fertility as described by the Total Fertility Rate (TFR). A well-known number is the replacement level of fertility, which is a TFR of 2.1 children per woman. This reflects the average number of children per woman necessary in a population to replace herself, a male partner and account for women unable to bear children. It is the combination of the age pattern of fertility and the Total Fertility Rate that controls the number of births generated in the Cohort-Component Projection model.

The delay of marriage and childbearing is a recognized trend of the last two decades, and there is little to indicate that women will again begin to have children at younger ages, particularly for the very young teen population. Assuming the age pattern of fertility remains constant, the TFR can be used in the model to affect the absolute number of births generated by women of childbearing years. The absolute number of births will be a function of the number of women (impacted by the age distribution and migration) and the TFR. If the TFR and age-specific rates remain constant, an increase in the number of women due to migration will increase the number of births and vice versa. If the age distribution (number of women by age) remains constant, then increasing the TFR will increase the number of births and vice versa. Both of these parameters are used in the projection model to vary assumptions about future events.

Figure 12: Total Fertility Rates in 2010 and 2020 for New Hampshire Counties


Even in 2010, the Total Fertility Rate for each of New Hampshire's counties, as well as the nation, was below the replacement level of fertility. It has continued to decline and the 2020 rates are reaching historically low levels.

As noted earlier, the lack of final 2020 Census data on the age-sex distribution of population and the recent impact of the COVID-19 pandemic are limitations that present challenges for projecting future changes in fertility. However, given the nationwide declines in fertility and continued delay of childbearing, there seems to be little justification for making large changes in the fertility patterns or the TFR in the projections model. This will allow future births to primarily be a function of the natural cohort aging of women of childbearing age and migration. This analysis of the current fertility rates establishes the starting point for the projection of future fertility.

## Migration Analysis

Similar to the modeling of fertility, net migrants by age and sex for each county are based on the age pattern of migration and a specified total absolute level of migration, the Crude Migration Rate (CMR). The age pattern typically reflects life-cycle changes. Oftentimes, lifecycle factors are most important in the decision to migrate or not. Because of this, age patterns of migration can show stability over time, even though economic conditions result in a higher or lower overall level of total migration. At the county level, some counties exhibit absolute stability of the age pattern while others show very mixed patterns. In cases of stability, the age patterns define the level of migration in each age group relative to other ages and the whole pattern shifts up or down depending on the total net migration or CMR.

The age pattern specifies the age distribution of net migrants and is sex specific. As with fertility, this can be thought of as the propensity to migrate, one age category relative to another, in any given area or time period. The absolute level of net migration is controlled by the specification of the CMR. The CMR used in the projection model is analogous to the 5 -year Crude Net Migration Rate shown in Table 1 above. As with the fertility module, the model has the flexibility to alter assumptions regarding changes in the age pattern of migration and the Crude Migration Rate in each time period.

These age-specific patterns are calculated using the Life Table Residual Migration method. It uses the decennial census populations for 2010 and the estimated age-sex distribution for 2020 as the actual populations. This process measures the difference between the "expected" population after accounting for cohort aging and the "observed" population actually enumerated in the census.

For example, the 2010 Census population by age and gender is "aged" to be 10 years older at the time of the 2020 Census. This aging is accomplished by applying survival rates from the life table mortality analysis to each age-sex cohort and estimates the expected number of people alive at the end of the decade who are 10 years older. Applying the life table survival ratio to the population age 35-39 in 2010 yields the number of expected 45-49 year olds as of the 2020

Census. The difference between the expected number and the actual enumerated population is, by definition, migration. If the observed population is higher than the expected population, then in-migration must have occurred and vice versa.

This calculation is carried out for the decade in two 5-year intervals: aging the 2010 population to 2015 and comparing it to the Census Bureau's current estimates and aging the 2015 population to 2020 and comparing it to the 2020 estimated Census count. Annual births are also included to measure migration of the youngest age groups. Actual reported births between 2010 and 2015 become the 0 to 4 population in 2015 and births between 2015 and 2020 become the 0 to 4 population in 2020. This calculation is shown in Table 2 for the total population in Belknap County for the 2010 to 2020 period.

There is a lot of data in Table 2 so the resulting migration pattern for males and females in New Hampshire is more easily seen in Figures 13 and 14. It's important to remember the economic picture for the decade. Migration slowed dramatically during the Great Recession of 2007 to 2009. However, recovery was slow and had different effects in different areas of the country. The second half of the decade was a period of more normal economic growth, though many areas still experienced high unemployment and mobility. The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on migration weren't yet felt during this time period but likely have a great impact on the migration of population for 2020 and 2021. The continued effects are unknown.

Figures 13 and 14 illustrate some important points. First, there is some volatility between the first and second half of the decade affecting some ages, especially for males in the 30 to 60 age range. This likely reflects the economic impacts of the Great Recession. However, overall there is a very consistent shape to the age pattern which follows traditional lifecycle changes. Second, ages over 25 experience net in-migration though that positive rate stabilizes around age 50 at just over the zero line. Again, that represents stability that once you come to New Hampshire you tend to stay but it's most attractive for in-migrants in their late 20's to 40's. Third, there is high out-migration in the oldest ages. The stability of most ages lends support to the assumption for the projections that the age pattern of migration can be held constant - even though allowance can still be made for positive or negative shifts in total migration.

Table 2: Life Table Residual Migration, Belknap County Total

| Age in 2010 | 2010 |  |  | 5-gr Survival | 2015 |  | 2010-2015 |  |  | 5-gr Survival | 2020 |  | $2015-2020$ <br> Net Migration |  | Age in 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Popul | Special Popul | HHold <br> Popul |  |  |  | ------ | Migran | ------ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Expected | Actual | Age | Number | Rate |  | Expected | -Actual- | Number | Rate |  |
| Births 15-20 | 1,172 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.99538 | 1,167 | 1,277 | 110 | 0.094209 | Under 5 |
| Births 10-15 | 1,312 |  | 1,312 | 0.99538 | 1,305 | 1,357 | Under 5 | 52 | 0.03931 | 0.99888 | 1,355 | 1,520 | 165 | 0.121239 | 5-9 |
| Under 5 | 1,548 | 0 | 1,548 | 0.99888 | 1,546 | 1,617 | 5-9 | 71 | 0.04569 | 0.99968 | 1,616 | 1,748 | 132 | 0.081331 | 10-14 |
| 5-9 | 1,618 | 0 | 1,618 | 0.99968 | 1,617 | 1,648 | 10-14 | 31 | 0.01886 | 0.99310 | 1,647 | 1,590 | -57 | -0.034289 | 15-19 |
| 10-14 | 1,791 | 0 | 1,791 | 0.99910 | 1,789 | 1,624 | 15-19 | -165 | -0.09234 | 0.99826 | 1,621 | 1,499 | -122 | -0.075232 | 20-24 |
| 15-19 | 1,783 | 0 | 1,783 | 0.99826 | 1,780 | 1,516 | 20-24 | -264 | -0.14801 | 0.99803 | 1,513 | 1,658 | 145 | 0.095634 | 25-29 |
| 20-24 | 1,317 | 0 | 1,317 | 0.99803 | 1,314 | 1,459 | 25-29 | 145 | 0.10979 | 0.99769 | 1,456 | 1,654 | 198 | 0.135962 | 30-34 |
| 25-29 | 1,623 | 0 | 1,623 | 0.99769 | 1,619 | 1,689 | 30-34 | 70 | 0.04297 | 0.99678 | 1,684 | 1,886 | 202 | 0.119862 | 35-39 |
| 30-34 | 1,561 | 0 | 1,561 | 0.99678 | 1,556 | 1,638 | 35-39 | 82 | 0.05255 | 0.99520 | 1,630 | 1,758 | 128 | 0.078057 | 40-44 |
| 35-39 | 1,836 | 0 | 1,836 | 0.99520 | 1,827 | 1,802 | 40-44 | -25 | -0.01372 | 0.99255 | 1,789 | 1,886 | 97 | 0.05406 | 45-49 |
| 40-44 | 2,093 | 0 | 2,093 | 0.99255 | 2,077 | 2,060 | 45-49 | -17 | -0.00832 | 0.98772 | 2,035 | 2,242 | 207 | 0.100625 | 50-54 |
| 45-49 | 2,508 | 0 | 2,508 | 0.98772 | 2,477 | 2,532 | 50-54 | 55 | 0.02184 | 0.98005 | 2,481 | 2,730 | 249 | 0.098146 | 55-59 |
| 50-54 | 2,692 | 0 | 2,692 | 0.98005 | 2,638 | 2,667 | 55-59 | 29 | 0.01066 | 0.96720 | 2,580 | 2,935 | 355 | 0.133252 | 60-64 |
| 55-59 | 2,486 | 0 | 2,486 | 0.96720 | 2,404 | 2,530 | 60-64 | 126 | 0.05062 | 0.94615 | 2,394 | 2,544 | 150 | 0.05917 | 65-69 |
| 60-64 | 2,362 | 10 | 2,352 | 0.94615 | 2,225 | 2,234 | 65-69 | 9 | 0.00389 | 0.91464 | 2,044 | 2,108 | 65 | 0.028877 | 70-74 |
| 65-69 | 1,607 | 43 | 1,564 | 0.91464 | 1,431 | 1,442 | 70-74 | 11 | 0.00709 | 0.86751 | 1,251 | 1,260 | 9 | 0.00625 | 75-79 |
| 70-74 | 1,125 | 39 | 1,086 | 0.86751 | 942 | 935 | 75-79 | -7 | -0.00617 | 0.78940 | 738 | 769 | 31 | 0.033444 | 80-84 |
| 75-79 | 907 | 64 | 843 | 0.78940 | 665 | 679 | 80-84 | 13 | 0.01582 | 0.66503 | 451 | 380 | . 72 | -0.105844 | 85-89 |
| 80-84 | 815 | 62 | 753 | 0.66503 | 500 | 744 | 85-89 | 244 | 0.32369 | 0.40417 | 301 | 126 | -175 | -0.234625 | 90. |
| 85. | 936 | 236 | 700 | 0.40417 | 283 | 991 | 90* | 708 | 1.01205 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 30,608 | 455 | 31,464 |  | 29,999 | 31,164 |  | 1,165 | 0.03703 |  | 29,751 | 31,570 | 1,818 | 0.05834 |  |

Figure 13: New Hampshire Residual Net Migration Rate for Males 2010-2020


Figure 14: New Hampshire Residual Net Migration Rate for Females 2010-2020


Of course, this pattern is not consistent for every county and there is much more variability by age and gender at the county level. Figures 15 through 24 present the county level patterns for the total population, though the projection model uses the age-sex specific migration patterns and they show more variability than for the total population.

Figure 15: Belknap County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 17: Cheshire County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 19: Grafton County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 21: Merrimack County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 16: Carroll County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 18: Coos County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 20: Hillsborough County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 22: Rockingham County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 23: Strafford County Residual Net Migration Rate


Figure 24: Sullivan County Residual Net Migration Rate


As with the fertility assumption, the Crude Migration Rates, shown in Table 3, reflect the net migration estimated using the Life Table Residual Migration methodology. These figures represent the starting point input to the Cohort-Component Projection model.

Table 3: Summary Crude Migration Rates

|  | Total |  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 |
| Belknap | $1.14 \%$ | $6.94 \%$ | $1.87 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 . 0 3 \%}$ | $0.55 \%$ | $6.03 \%$ |
| Carroll | $2.00 \%$ | $9.43 \%$ | $2.77 \%$ | $10.41 \%$ | $1.43 \%$ | $8.72 \%$ |
| Cheshire | $0.37 \%$ | $3.51 \%$ | $0.89 \%$ | $4.08 \%$ | $-0.06 \%$ | $3.07 \%$ |
| Coos | $-3.23 \%$ | $2.39 \%$ | $-2.34 \%$ | $5.40 \%$ | $-3.98 \%$ | $-0.46 \%$ |
| Grafton | $1.48 \%$ | $4.05 \%$ | $1.74 \%$ | $5.15 \%$ | $1.35 \%$ | $3.14 \%$ |
| Hillsborough | $0.81 \%$ | $3.84 \%$ | $0.41 \%$ | $4.83 \%$ | $1.26 \%$ | $2.93 \%$ |
| Merrimack | $1.69 \%$ | $4.23 \%$ | $2.67 \%$ | $3.62 \%$ | $0.77 \%$ | $4.89 \%$ |
| Rockingham | $3.20 \%$ | $5.25 \%$ | $3.74 \%$ | $5.73 \%$ | $2.72 \%$ | $4.87 \%$ |
| Strafford | $1.72 \%$ | $3.92 \%$ | $1.94 \%$ | $5.04 \%$ | $1.55 \%$ | $2.88 \%$ |
| Sullivan | $-0.57 \%$ | $1.33 \%$ | $-0.28 \%$ | $2.57 \%$ | $-0.78 \%$ | $0.24 \%$ |

## Mortality Analysis

Mortality is the least volatile of the three components of change. In the projections model, the population is aged by applying age- and sex-specific survivorship ratios for a five-year period to the base population by five-year age group. The model allows for area-specific assumptions regarding the change in survivorship. However, there is little variation in survivorship in the younger ages, with larger impacts among the elderly. Because of its population size, computation of the life table and survivorship ratios by sex are possible for Hillsborough County but no other New Hampshire counties. For this reason, regional life tables were prepared by creating county groups based on similar characteristics and geography. Groupings included: Belknap and Merrimack; Rockingham and Strafford; Carroll, Coos and Grafton; Cheshire and Sullivan.

The life table analysis requires a more detailed distribution of deaths by age than the fertility or migration analysis. Infant mortality is relatively high in the first year of life, requiring a breakdown of the 0 to 5 ages into the under 1 and 1 to 4 years. Data for 5 -year age groups is sufficient for the other ages but also needs to account for deaths beyond the age of 85 and over. This requires detail for the 85 to 89,90 to 94 and 95 and over population. Current data for these more detailed age group data are not available from the Department of State. As a result, life tables were prepared using a 3-year average of deaths for 2009, 2010 and 2011 centered on the 2010 Census population. Life expectancy has increased since 2010 and while this is not ideal, most of the increase is due to greater longevity of the senior population - age groups which have a declining impact on the overall projections.

Figures 25 and 26 illustrate the age-specific survival rate distribution for New Hampshire's male and female population. They clearly show the high level of survivorship in the younger ages those most critical for the projection of women of childbearing age - and only slight differences in the older ages.

Figure 25: New Hampshire Survival Rate Distribution for Males Figure 26: New Hampshire Survival Rate Distribution for Females


The most common measure resulting from life table analysis is the expectation of life at birth. The age-specific death rates used in the calculation area are based on the 2009 to 2011 mortality experience of New Hampshire residents. If these rates were to continue into the future, newborn males could expect to live 81.1 years while newborn females could expect to live to 84.6 years. The increased life expectancy of females over males is typical and is reflected in the positive ratios of females to males in the older ages.
Table 4:Life Expectancy at Birth for New Hampshire Counties

|  | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Hillsborough | 83.0 | 81.2 | 84.7 |
| Belknap/Merrimack | 82.0 | 80.4 | 83.6 |
| Rockingham/Strafford | 83.9 | 82.2 | 85.5 |
| Carroll/Coos/Grafton | 82.0 | 80.0 | 84.1 |
| Cheshire/Sullivan | 81.5 | 79.5 | 83.3 |

## Model Calibration

The fertility, migration and mortality rates developed in the Components of Change module utilize the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program estimates for July 1, 2015, and the Demographic Analysis estimates for April 1, 2020. As estimates, there is always some unmeasurable error because there is no actual census count that can be used to evaluate the estimates. As a result of this potential error, the calculated Total Fertility Rates, the Crude Migration Rates and survival rates approach, but will not exactly duplicate actual data.

The 2020 Census provides the best total population and actual reported births and deaths from the New Hampshire Department of State provide the most accurate totals for the model to replicate. This is done through a calibration process whereby the projections model is run for the 2010 to 2020 period making adjustments to the fertility, migration and mortality rates to most closely represent the actual reported data.

This is an iterative process where fertility and mortality rates are adjusted to reflect the actual reported births and deaths. There is no corresponding migration total, so migration rates are adjusted to reflect the final 2020 Census population. The following steps are repeated many times because of the interaction of the demographic processes. For example, changing fertility rates to generate more or fewer births will change the number of migrants and survivors. Changing the migration rates will change the number of women of childbearing age and hence the number of births. Tables 5 and 6 present the initial TFR and CMR rates that were output from the Components of Change module and the resulting rates required to calibrate the 2010 to 2020 projections model to meet the reported number of births, deaths, migrants and 2020 Census populations.

| Table 5: Total Fertility Rate |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  2015-2020 <br> Components <br> of Change 2015-2020 <br> Calibration <br> Belknap 1.399 1.600 <br> Carroll 1.259 1.520 <br> Cheshire 1.278 1.470 <br> Coos 1.567 1.670 <br> Grafton 1.292 1.663 <br> Hillsborough 1.392 1.610 <br> Merrimack 1.499 1.865 <br> Rockingham 1.125 1.252 <br> Strafford 1.333 1.620 <br> Sullivan 1.493 1.650 |  |  |


| Table 6: Crude Migration Rate |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2015-2020 <br> Components <br> of Change | 2015-2020 <br> Calibration |
| Belknap | 5.83 | 7.00 |
| Carroll | 8.72 | 6.95 |
| Cheshire | 3.07 | 0.71 |
| Coos | -0.46 | -0.40 |
| Grafton | 3.14 | 3.90 |
| Hillsborough | 2.93 | 2.86 |
| Merrimack | 4.89 | 4.35 |
| Rockingham | 4.87 | 3.48 |
| Strafford | 2.88 | 3.27 |
| Sullivan | 0.24 | -0.50 |

## Summary and Recommendations

The Components of Change analysis provides the baseline data for input to the CohortComponent Projections model. This includes:

- Age-specific fertility patterns by age of mother and the summary Total Fertility Rate which will generate future births,
- Age-sex specific migration patterns and the summary Crude Migration Rate which will impact the future number of women of childbearing age and future births,
- Age-sex specific survivorship ratios used to age each age-sex cohort to future projection dates, and
- College enrollment, prison and nursing home residents used to calculate the nonspecial (household) population to which the fertility, mortality and migration rates will be applied.

This analysis also points to a couple of issues/concerns to be addressed in the projections model:

- In the absence of the age distribution results from the 2020 Census, the Census Bureau's 2020 Demographic Analysis estimates provide the best data on the population. However, these estimates needed to be adjusted to the final 2020 Census count of total county population. Potential differences between the estimated and actual 2020 age distribution is a concern. Final age data is not expected to be released until 2023, at which time it would be useful to update the analysis and future projections.
- Current data on college enrollment was obtained from the U.S. Department of Education IPEDS system. This system does not provide any data on projected enrollments. In the absence of such a source, the assumption will be made that enrollment is stable throughout the projections period. The same assumption will be made for prison and nursing home populations.
- The age-specific fertility rates and age-sex specific migration rates establish an appropriate starting point for the projections. These patterns will be maintained throughout the projection periods, and changes in the TFR and CMR will be the primary drivers of future population change.


## Projected Summary Populations and Components of Change Tables

Table 1: 5-Year Projected Births for New Hampshire and Counties

| State/County | 5-year Projected Births |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $2020-25$ | $2025-30$ | $2030-35$ | $2035-40$ | $2040-45$ | $2045-50$ |
| New Hampshire | 64,992 | 65,816 | $\mathbf{6 4 , 4 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 , 9 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 , 7 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 , 6 1 8}$ |
| Belknap | 2,818 | 2,863 | 2,863 | 2,817 | 2,755 | 2,741 |
| Carroll | 1,799 | 1,781 | 1,700 | 1,618 | 1,594 | 1,624 |
| Cheshire | 3,134 | 2,985 | 2,802 | 2,676 | 2,621 | 2,625 |
| Coos | 1,220 | 1,174 | 1,110 | 1,050 | 1,012 | 996 |
| Grafton | 3,830 | 3,750 | 3,676 | 3,606 | 3,469 | 3,363 |
| Hillsborough | 23,227 | 23,672 | 23,150 | 22,218 | 21,466 | 21,505 |
| Merrimack | 7,675 | 7,712 | 7,572 | 7,349 | 7,206 | 7,293 |
| Rockingham | 12,525 | 12,839 | 12,465 | 11,712 | 11,099 | 11,081 |
| Strafford | 6,811 | 7,160 | 7,293 | 7,158 | 6,852 | 6,773 |
| Sullivan | 1,953 | 1,880 | 1,789 | 1,704 | 1,641 | 1,617 |

Table 2: 5-Year Projected Deaths for New Hampshire and Counties

| State/County | 5-year Projected Deaths |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 - 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 5 - 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 5 - 5 0}$ |
| New Hampshire | $\mathbf{6 3 , 5 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 , 0 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 , 5 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 , 2 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 4 , 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0 , 0 7 4}$ |
| Belknap | 3,744 | 4,345 | 5,172 | 5,936 | 6,421 | 6,615 |
| Carroll | 2,519 | 3,087 | 3,923 | 4,817 | 5,453 | 5,763 |
| Cheshire | 3,528 | 4,065 | 4,769 | 5,453 | 5,852 | 5,914 |
| Coos | 2,006 | 2,197 | 2,455 | 2,702 | 2,830 | 2,812 |
| Grafton | 5,456 | 6,445 | 7,697 | 8,896 | 9,736 | 10,089 |
| Hillsborough | 18,954 | 21,747 | 25,661 | 29,726 | 32,892 | 34,916 |
| Merrimack | 8,359 | 9,540 | 11,162 | 12,821 | 13,979 | 14,529 |
| Rockingham | 11,152 | 13,753 | 17,317 | 21,103 | 23,969 | 25,929 |
| Strafford | 6,208 | 6,954 | 7,999 | 9,040 | 9,852 | 10,347 |
| Sullivan | 1,624 | 1,960 | 2,363 | 2,755 | 3,029 | 3,160 |


| State/County | 5-year Projected Net-Migrants |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | $2020-25$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 - 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 5 - 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 5 - 5 0}$ |  |
| New Hampshire | 51,626 | 50,970 | 51,844 | 52,061 | 52,471 | 52,416 |  |
| Belknap | 3,588 | 3,752 | 3,543 | 3,612 | 3,638 | 3,639 |  |
| Carroll | 2,904 | 3,038 | 3,139 | 3,196 | 3,194 | 3,155 |  |
| Cheshire | 1,660 | 1,693 | 1,709 | 1,701 | 1,674 | 1,638 |  |
| Coos | 793 | 791 | 789 | 768 | 741 | 711 |  |
| Grafton | 5,490 | 5,745 | 5,452 | 5,538 | 5,553 | 5,510 |  |
| Hillsborough | 13,667 | 12,093 | 12,513 | 12,816 | 12,973 | 13,023 |  |
| Merrimack | 6,263 | 6,518 | 6,729 | 6,869 | 6,935 | 6,941 |  |
| Rockingham | 12,039 | 12,575 | 13,044 | 12,506 | 12,626 | 12,618 |  |
| Strafford | 4,669 | 4,201 | 4,354 | 4,483 | 4,573 | 4,629 |  |
| Sullivan | 553 | 564 | 572 | 572 | 564 | 552 |  |

Table 4: Projected Total Fertility Rate for New Hampshire Counties

| County | Projected Total Fertility Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 5}$ | $2025-30$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 3 5}$ | $2035-40$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}-45$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 5 - 5 0}$ |
| Belknap | 1.680 | 1.680 | 1.680 | 1.680 | 1.680 | 1.680 |
| Carroll | 1.596 | 1.596 | 1.596 | 1.596 | 1.596 | 1.596 |
| Cheshire | 1.544 | 1.544 | 1.544 | 1.544 | 1.544 | 1.544 |
| Coos | 1.754 | 1.754 | 1.754 | 1.754 | 1.754 | 1.754 |
| Grafton | 1.746 | 1.746 | 1.746 | 1.746 | 1.746 | 1.746 |
| Hillsborough | 1.691 | 1.691 | 1.691 | 1.691 | 1.691 | 1.691 |
| Merrimack | 1.958 | 1.958 | 1.958 | 1.958 | 1.958 | 1.958 |
| Rockingham | 1.315 | 1.315 | 1.315 | 1.315 | 1.315 | 1.315 |
| Strafford | 1.701 | 1.701 | 1.701 | 1.701 | 1.701 | 1.701 |
| Sullivan | 1.733 | 1.733 | 1.733 | 1.733 | 1.733 | 1.733 |


| County | Projected Crude Net-Migration Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | $2020-25$ | $2025-30$ | $2030-35$ | $2035-40$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 4 5}$ | $2045-50$ |
| Belknap | Male | 6.00 | 6.00 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 |
|  | Female | 6.00 | 6.00 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 | 5.50 |
| Carroll | Male | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
|  | Female | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| Cheshire | Male | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
|  | Female | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Coos | Male | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
|  | Female | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Grafton | Male | 6.50 | 6.50 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
|  | Female | 6.50 | 6.50 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| Hillsborough | Male | 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
|  | Female | 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Merrimack | Male | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
|  | Female | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| Rockingham | Male | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 |
|  | Female | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 |
| Strafford | Male | 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 |
|  | Female | 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 |
| Sullivan | Male | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
|  | Female | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 |

Table 6: Projected Populations for New Hampshire by Age Groups and Sex

| State of | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hampshire Totals | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 32,392 | 31,214 | 63,606 | 37,904 | 36,039 | 73,943 | 38,408 | 36,512 | 74,920 | 37,564 | 35,707 | 73,271 |
| 5-9 | 35,557 | 33,599 | 69,156 | 33,580 | 32,758 | 66,338 | 39,177 | 37,707 | 76,884 | 39,682 | 38,237 | 77,919 |
| 10-14 | 37,985 | 36,312 | 74,297 | 36,260 | 34,443 | 70,703 | 34,155 | 33,475 | 67,630 | 39,838 | 38,575 | 78,413 |
| 15-19 | 42,330 | 41,350 | 83,680 | 39,451 | 38,611 | 78,062 | 37,782 | 36,916 | 74,698 | 36,001 | 36,147 | 72,148 |
| 20-24 | 44,889 | 42,721 | 87,610 | 43,007 | 42,682 | 85,689 | 40,184 | 39,941 | 80,125 | 38,624 | 38,278 | 76,902 |
| 25-29 | 46,217 | 42,329 | 88,546 | 44,853 | 40,618 | 85,471 | 42,684 | 40,493 | 83,177 | 39,414 | 37,314 | 76,728 |
| 30-34 | 45,541 | 42,807 | 88,348 | 48,954 | 46,234 | 95,188 | 47,266 | 44,172 | 91,438 | 44,935 | 44,089 | 89,024 |
| 35-39 | 42,417 | 41,354 | 83,771 | 48,062 | 45,334 | 93,396 | 51,441 | 48,829 | 100,270 | 49,681 | 46,686 | 96,367 |
| 40-44 | 38,284 | 38,660 | 76,944 | 43,044 | 42,439 | 85,483 | 48,676 | 46,422 | 95,098 | 51,971 | 50,057 | 102,028 |
| 45-49 | 41,192 | 42,048 | 83,240 | 38,179 | 38,871 | 77,050 | 42,821 | 42,538 | 85,359 | 48,430 | 46,578 | 95,008 |
| 50-54 | 47,409 | 48,495 | 95,904 | 40,233 | 41,745 | 81,978 | 37,163 | 38,483 | 75,646 | 41,686 | 42,163 | 83,849 |
| 55-59 | 53,814 | 56,053 | 109,867 | 46,227 | 48,458 | 94,685 | 39,107 | 41,598 | 80,705 | 36,102 | 38,389 | 74,491 |
| 60-64 | 52,508 | 54,643 | 107,151 | 52,746 | 55,795 | 108,541 | 45,177 | 48,083 | 93,260 | 38,236 | 41,343 | 79,579 |
| 65-69 | 43,041 | 45,766 | 88,807 | 51,130 | 54,088 | 105,218 | 51,172 | 55,042 | 106,214 | 43,836 | 47,514 | 91,350 |
| 70-74 | 34,251 | 37,254 | 71,505 | 41,701 | 44,834 | 86,535 | 49,430 | 52,889 | 102,319 | 49,426 | 53,863 | 103,289 |
| 75-79 | 21,474 | 24,741 | 46,215 | 32,291 | 35,230 | 67,521 | 39,277 | 42,242 | 81,519 | 46,544 | 49,826 | 96,370 |
| 80-84 | 12264 | 15780 | 28044 | 18,281 | 22,218 | 40,499 | 27,256 | 31,538 | 58,794 | 33,073 | 37,834 | 70,907 |
| 85 and over | 11,013 | 19,829 | 30,842 | 13,847 | 20,454 | 34,301 | 19,649 | 25,581 | 45,230 | 28,880 | 34,522 | 63,402 |
| 65 and over | 122,043 | 143,370 | 265,413 | 157,250 | 176,824 | 334,074 | 186,784 | 207,292 | 394,076 | 201,759 | 223,559 | 425,318 |
| Total | 682,578 | 694,955 | 1,377,533 | 709,750 | 720,851 | 1,430,601 | 730,825 | 742,461 | 1,473,286 | 743,923 | 757,122 | 1,501,045 |
|  | 2040 |  |  | 2045 |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 36,045 | 34,271 | 70,316 | 34,734 | 33,030 | 67,764 | 34,686 | 32,987 | 67,673 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 38,905 | 37,518 | 76,423 | 37,443 | 36,109 | 73,552 | 36,132 | 34,844 | 70,976 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 40,463 | 39,253 | 79,716 | 39,805 | 38,628 | 78,433 | 38,360 | 37,223 | 75,583 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 41,139 | 40,664 | 81,803 | 41,831 | 41,366 | 83,197 | 41,276 | 40,853 | 82,129 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 36,977 | 37,608 | 74,585 | 41,895 | 42,101 | 83,996 | 42,658 | 42,899 | 85,557 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 37,725 | 35,437 | 73,162 | 35,846 | 34,752 | 70,598 | 41,572 | 40,078 | 81,650 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 41,455 | 40,623 | 82,078 | 39,749 | 38,618 | 78,367 | 37,709 | 37,880 | 75,589 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 47,265 | 46,699 | 93,964 | 43,639 | 43,092 | 86,731 | 41,862 | 41,020 | 82,882 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 50,398 | 48,001 | 98,399 | 48,036 | 48,142 | 96,178 | 44,362 | 44,431 | 88,793 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 51,859 | 50,395 | 102,254 | 50,483 | 48,463 | 98,946 | 48,138 | 48,685 | 96,823 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 47,287 | 46,308 | 93,595 | 50,789 | 50,242 | 101,031 | 49,515 | 48,371 | 97,886 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 40,623 | 42,227 | 82,850 | 46,250 | 46,494 | 92,744 | 49,750 | 50,498 | 100,248 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 35,392 | 38,306 | 73,698 | 39,957 | 42,282 | 82,239 | 45,512 | 46,552 | 92,064 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 37,265 | 41,070 | 78,335 | 34,613 | 38,210 | 72,823 | 39,111 | 42,206 | 81,317 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 42,448 | 46,650 | 89,098 | 36,197 | 40,445 | 76,642 | 33,655 | 37,673 | 71,328 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 46,665 | 50,921 | 97,586 | 40,201 | 44,306 | 84,507 | 34,322 | 38,524 | 72,846 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 39,263 | 44,823 | 84,086 | 39,538 | 45,976 | 85,514 | 34,173 | 40,091 | 74,264 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 37,043 | 42,779 | 79,822 | 45,250 | 51,443 | 96,693 | 48,617 | 55,684 | 104,301 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 202,684 | 226,243 | 428,927 | 195,799 | 220,380 | 416,179 | 189,878 | 214,178 | 404,056 |  |  |  |
| Total | 748,217 | 763,553 | 1,511,770 | 746,256 | 763,699 | 1,509,955 | 741,410 | 760,499 | 1,501,909 |  |  |  |

Table 7: Projected Populations for Belknap County by Age Groups and Sex


Table 8: Projected Populations for Carroll County by Age Groups and Sex

| Carroll County | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 912 | 853 | 1,765 | 1,043 | 1,015 | 2,058 | 1,032 | 1,006 | 2,038 | 985 | 960 | 1,945 |
| 5-9 | 1,071 | 1,053 | 2,124 | 996 | 923 | 1,919 | 1,141 | 1,104 | 2,245 | 1,134 | 1,101 | 2,235 |
| 10-14 | 1,221 | 1,043 | 2,264 | 1,115 | 1,105 | 2,220 | 1,039 | 974 | 2,013 | 1,196 | 1,173 | 2,369 |
| 15-19 | 1,143 | 1,058 | 2,201 | 1,119 | 929 | 2,048 | 1,024 | 990 | 2,014 | 959 | 880 | 1,839 |
| 20-24 | 1,152 | 1,008 | 2,160 | 964 | 925 | 1,889 | 947 | 817 | 1,764 | 871 | 878 | 1,749 |
| 25-29 | 1,205 | 1,119 | 2,324 | 1,192 | 1,048 | 2,240 | 1,001 | 966 | 1,967 | 987 | 859 | 1,846 |
| 30-34 | 1,132 | 1,118 | 2,250 | 1,277 | 1,278 | 2,555 | 1,267 | 1,202 | 2,469 | 1,068 | 1,116 | 2,184 |
| 35-39 | 1,204 | 1,235 | 2,439 | 1,236 | 1,234 | 2,470 | 1,397 | 1,418 | 2,815 | 1,391 | 1,342 | 2,733 |
| 40-44 | 1,067 | 1,186 | 2,253 | 1,232 | 1,329 | 2,561 | 1,268 | 1,334 | 2,602 | 1,440 | 1,543 | 2,983 |
| 45-49 | 1,316 | 1,343 | 2,659 | 1,075 | 1,199 | 2,274 | 1,246 | 1,347 | 2,593 | 1,288 | 1,362 | 2,650 |
| 50-54 | 1,635 | 1,654 | 3,289 | 1,341 | 1,381 | 2,722 | 1,100 | 1,242 | 2,342 | 1,280 | 1,406 | 2,686 |
| 55-59 | 2,062 | 2,324 | 4,386 | 1,704 | 1,834 | 3,538 | 1,403 | 1,543 | 2,946 | 1,156 | 1,397 | 2,553 |
| 60-64 | 2,482 | 2,664 | 5,146 | 2,326 | 2,607 | 4,933 | 1,930 | 2,075 | 4,005 | 1,597 | 1,757 | 3,354 |
| 65-69 | 2,414 | 2,540 | 4,954 | 2,745 | 2,964 | 5,709 | 2,584 | 2,924 | 5,508 | 2,155 | 2,345 | 4,500 |
| 70-74 | 2,173 | 2,117 | 4,290 | 2,528 | 2,598 | 5,126 | 2,888 | 3,059 | 5,947 | 2,730 | 3,038 | 5,768 |
| 75-79 | 1,343 | 1,281 | 2,624 | 2,089 | 1,966 | 4,055 | 2,443 | 2,433 | 4,876 | 2,804 | 2,884 | 5,688 |
| 80-84 | 683 | 783 | 1466 | 1,097 | 1,088 | 2,185 | 1,709 | 1,685 | 3,394 | 2,008 | 2,101 | 4,109 |
| 85 and over | 626 | 891 | 1,517 | 788 | 1,003 | 1,791 | 1,183 | 1,302 | 2,485 | 1,835 | 1,913 | 3,748 |
| 65 and over | 7,239 | 7,612 | 14,851 | 9,247 | 9,619 | 18,866 | 10,807 | 11,403 | 22,210 | 11,532 | 12,281 | 23,813 |
| Total | 24,841 | 25,270 | 50,111 | 25,867 | 26,426 | 52,293 | 26,602 | 27,421 | 54,023 | 26,884 | 28,055 | 54,939 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Carroll } \\ & \text { County } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2040 |  |  |  |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total |   <br> Male 2045 |  | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 939 | 914 | 1,853 | 924 | 900 | 1,824 | 942 | 917 | 1,859 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 1,089 | 1,058 | 2,147 | 1,041 | 1,012 | 2,053 | 1,026 | 997 | 2,023 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 1,196 | 1,178 | 2,374 | 1,153 | 1,136 | 2,289 | 1,103 | 1,087 | 2,190 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 1,113 | 1,068 | 2,181 | 1,118 | 1,077 | 2,195 | 1,077 | 1,040 | 2,117 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 823 | 787 | 1,610 | 958 | 959 | 1,917 | 963 | 969 | 1,932 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 914 | 930 | 1,844 | 866 | 837 | 1,703 | 1,010 | 1,021 | 2,031 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 1,060 | 998 | 2,058 | 986 | 1,085 | 2,071 | 934 | 977 | 1,911 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 1,181 | 1,254 | 2,435 | 1,176 | 1,126 | 2,302 | 1,094 | 1,225 | 2,319 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 1,444 | 1,470 | 2,914 | 1,230 | 1,379 | 2,609 | 1,225 | 1,239 | 2,464 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 1,473 | 1,587 | 3,060 | 1,483 | 1,519 | 3,002 | 1,263 | 1,425 | 2,688 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 1,333 | 1,431 | 2,764 | 1,529 | 1,674 | 3,203 | 1,540 | 1,604 | 3,144 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 1,354 | 1,591 | 2,945 | 1,415 | 1,627 | 3,042 | 1,624 | 1,904 | 3,528 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 1,325 | 1,602 | 2,927 | 1,556 | 1,831 | 3,387 | 1,626 | 1,872 | 3,498 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 1,796 | 2,001 | 3,797 | 1,497 | 1,833 | 3,330 | 1,758 | 2,094 | 3,852 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 2,291 | 2,453 | 4,744 | 1,916 | 2,101 | 4,017 | 1,597 | 1,926 | 3,523 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 2,669 | 2,887 | 5,556 | 2,248 | 2,344 | 4,592 | 1,880 | 2,012 | 3,892 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 2,322 | 2,511 | 4,833 | 2,221 | 2,526 | 4,747 | 1,874 | 2,054 | 3,928 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 2,373 | 2,520 | 4,893 | 2,871 | 3,119 | 5,990 | 3,012 | 3,382 | 6,394 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 11,451 | 12,372 | 23,823 | 10,753 | 11,923 | 22,676 | 10,121 | 11,468 | 21,589 |  |  |  |
| Total | 26,695 | 28,240 | 54,935 | 26,188 | 28,085 | 54,273 | 25,548 | 27,745 | 53,293 |  |  |  |

Table 9: Projected Populations for Cheshire County by Age Groups and Sex

| Cheshire County | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 1,726 | 1,726 | 3,452 | 1,894 | 1,838 | 3,732 | 1,805 | 1,752 | 3,557 | 1,694 | 1,643 | 3,337 |
| 5-9 | 1,924 | 1,863 | 3,787 | 1,789 | 1,815 | 3,604 | 1,964 | 1,936 | 3,900 | 1,875 | 1,853 | 3,728 |
| 10-14 | 1,980 | 1,902 | 3,882 | 1,912 | 1,851 | 3,763 | 1,779 | 1,807 | 3,586 | 1,957 | 1,936 | 3,893 |
| 15-19 | 2,569 | 2,660 | 5,229 | 2,438 | 2,581 | 5,019 | 2,384 | 2,546 | 4,930 | 2,281 | 2,520 | 4,801 |
| 20-24 | 2,550 | 2,628 | 5,178 | 2,548 | 2,527 | 5,075 | 2,439 | 2,466 | 4,905 | 2,397 | 2,443 | 4,840 |
| 25-29 | 2,269 | 2,224 | 4,493 | 1,890 | 1,997 | 3,887 | 1,887 | 1,858 | 3,745 | 1,752 | 1,776 | 3,528 |
| 30-34 | 2,488 | 2,387 | 4,875 | 2,333 | 2,334 | 4,667 | 1,935 | 2,094 | 4,029 | 1,936 | 1,952 | 3,888 |
| 35-39 | 2,280 | 2,188 | 4,468 | 2,604 | 2,481 | 5,085 | 2,441 | 2,431 | 4,872 | 2,025 | 2,188 | 4,213 |
| 40-44 | 1,895 | 1,961 | 3,856 | 2,280 | 2,225 | 4,505 | 2,606 | 2,531 | 5,137 | 2,447 | 2,490 | 4,937 |
| 45-49 | 1,968 | 2,119 | 4,087 | 1,835 | 1,955 | 3,790 | 2,211 | 2,225 | 4,436 | 2,532 | 2,542 | 5,074 |
| 50-54 | 2,466 | 2,453 | 4,919 | 1,980 | 2,106 | 4,086 | 1,847 | 1,948 | 3,795 | 2,230 | 2,225 | 4,455 |
| 55-59 | 2,787 | 3,008 | 5,795 | 2,430 | 2,478 | 4,908 | 1,953 | 2,132 | 4,085 | 1,825 | 1,981 | 3,806 |
| 60-64 | 2,942 | 3,120 | 6,062 | 2,772 | 3,000 | 5,772 | 2,421 | 2,479 | 4,900 | 1,951 | 2,144 | 4,095 |
| 65-69 | 2,692 | 2,815 | 5,507 | 2,907 | 3,091 | 5,998 | 2,743 | 2,981 | 5,724 | 2,404 | 2,480 | 4,884 |
| 70-74 | 2,157 | 2,315 | 4,472 | 2,612 | 2,765 | 5,377 | 2,825 | 3,044 | 5,869 | 2,671 | 2,948 | 5,619 |
| 75-79 | 1,279 | 1,530 | 2,809 | 1,992 | 2,163 | 4,155 | 2,417 | 2,586 | 5,003 | 2,619 | 2,857 | 5,476 |
| 80-84 | 783 | 1004 | 1787 | 1,055 | 1,329 | 2,384 | 1,632 | 1,882 | 3,514 | 1,979 | 2,260 | 4,239 |
| 85 and over | 665 | 1,135 | 1,800 | 793 | 1,122 | 1,915 | 1,035 | 1,318 | 2,353 | 1,535 | 1,732 | 3,267 |
| 65 and over | 7,576 | 8,799 | 16,375 | 9,359 | 10,470 | 19,829 | 10,652 | 11,811 | 22,463 | 11,208 | 12,277 | 23,485 |
| Total | 37,420 | 39,038 | 76,458 | 38,064 | 39,658 | 77,722 | 38,324 | 40,016 | 78,340 | 38,110 | 39,970 | 78,080 |
| Cheshire County | 2040 |  |  | 2045 |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 1,617 | 1,570 | 3,187 | 1,584 | 1,537 | 3,121 | 1,587 | 1,540 | 3,127 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 1,765 | 1,746 | 3,511 | 1,690 | 1,673 | 3,363 | 1,656 | 1,638 | 3,294 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 1,874 | 1,862 | 3,736 | 1,770 | 1,760 | 3,530 | 1,694 | 1,686 | 3,380 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 2,430 | 2,630 | 5,060 | 2,369 | 2,578 | 4,947 | 2,285 | 2,497 | 4,782 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 2,316 | 2,429 | 4,745 | 2,445 | 2,525 | 4,970 | 2,394 | 2,480 | 4,874 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 1,703 | 1,750 | 3,453 | 1,603 | 1,733 | 3,336 | 1,768 | 1,869 | 3,637 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 1,799 | 1,872 | 3,671 | 1,753 | 1,849 | 3,602 | 1,647 | 1,829 | 3,476 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 2,033 | 2,049 | 4,082 | 1,893 | 1,971 | 3,864 | 1,843 | 1,944 | 3,787 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 2,036 | 2,251 | 4,287 | 2,050 | 2,113 | 4,163 | 1,908 | 2,030 | 3,938 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 2,385 | 2,512 | 4,897 | 1,990 | 2,278 | 4,268 | 2,003 | 2,137 | 4,140 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 2,564 | 2,555 | 5,119 | 2,422 | 2,533 | 4,955 | 2,019 | 2,296 | 4,315 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 2,211 | 2,274 | 4,485 | 2,550 | 2,619 | 5,169 | 2,409 | 2,596 | 5,005 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 1,830 | 2,002 | 3,832 | 2,222 | 2,304 | 4,526 | 2,560 | 2,651 | 5,211 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 1,949 | 2,159 | 4,108 | 1,835 | 2,025 | 3,860 | 2,222 | 2,324 | 4,546 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 2,348 | 2,465 | 4,813 | 1,908 | 2,152 | 4,060 | 1,797 | 2,017 | 3,814 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 2,485 | 2,783 | 5,268 | 2,190 | 2,339 | 4,529 | 1,780 | 2,044 | 3,824 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 2,151 | 2,510 | 4,661 | 2,050 | 2,454 | 4,504 | 1,810 | 2,062 | 3,872 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 1,961 | 2,131 | 4,092 | 2,237 | 2,448 | 4,685 | 2,252 | 2,531 | 4,783 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 10,894 | 12,048 | 22,942 | 10,220 | 11,418 | 21,638 | 9,861 | 10,978 | 20,839 |  |  |  |
| Total | 37,457 | 39,550 | 77,007 | 36,561 | 38,891 | 75,452 | 35,634 | 38,171 | 73,805 |  |  |  |

Table 10: Projected Populations for Coos County by Age Groups and Sex

| CoosCounty | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 663 | 591 | 1,254 | 632 | 602 | 1,234 | 608 | 579 | 1,187 | 576 | 548 | 1,124 |
| 5-9 | 680 | 644 | 1,324 | 677 | 637 | 1,314 | 647 | 650 | 1,297 | 622 | 626 | 1,248 |
| 10-14 | 801 | 714 | 1,515 | 685 | 659 | 1,344 | 684 | 653 | 1,337 | 653 | 668 | 1,321 |
| 15-19 | 777 | 723 | 1,500 | 751 | 663 | 1,414 | 644 | 613 | 1,257 | 643 | 609 | 1,252 |
| 20-24 | 918 | 653 | 1,571 | 744 | 622 | 1,366 | 722 | 571 | 1,293 | 622 | 530 | 1,152 |
| 25-29 | 1,052 | 710 | 1,762 | 1,075 | 668 | 1,743 | 887 | 637 | 1,524 | 862 | 586 | 1,448 |
| 30-34 | 933 | 715 | 1,648 | 1,040 | 738 | 1,778 | 1,064 | 695 | 1,759 | 890 | 664 | 1,554 |
| 35-39 | 941 | 763 | 1,704 | 943 | 760 | 1,703 | 1,057 | 785 | 1,842 | 1,082 | 741 | 1,823 |
| 40-44 | 928 | 797 | 1,725 | 998 | 790 | 1,788 | 1,003 | 788 | 1,791 | 1,124 | 816 | 1,940 |
| 45-49 | 1,038 | 872 | 1,910 | 893 | 813 | 1,706 | 966 | 808 | 1,774 | 971 | 807 | 1,778 |
| 50-54 | 1,177 | 1,001 | 2,178 | 1,017 | 875 | 1,892 | 870 | 817 | 1,687 | 945 | 814 | 1,759 |
| 55-59 | 1,281 | 1,289 | 2,570 | 1,091 | 1,019 | 2,110 | 942 | 892 | 1,834 | 802 | 835 | 1,637 |
| 60-64 | 1,426 | 1,331 | 2,757 | 1,293 | 1,337 | 2,630 | 1,104 | 1,060 | 2,164 | 953 | 931 | 1,884 |
| 65-69 | 1,300 | 1,300 | 2,600 | 1,437 | 1,326 | 2,763 | 1,308 | 1,334 | 2,642 | 1,118 | 1,063 | 2,181 |
| 70-74 | 1,087 | 974 | 2,061 | 1,212 | 1,251 | 2,463 | 1,345 | 1,279 | 2,624 | 1,223 | 1,289 | 2,512 |
| 75-79 | 659 | 685 | 1,344 | 985 | 898 | 1,883 | 1,103 | 1,152 | 2,255 | 1,224 | 1,179 | 2,403 |
| 80-84 | 404 | 469 | 873 | 532 | 586 | 1,118 | 791 | 769 | 1,560 | 884 | 988 | 1,872 |
| 85 and over | 330 | 642 | 972 | 400 | 625 | 1,025 | 518 | 702 | 1,220 | 742 | 860 | 1,602 |
| 65 and over | 3,780 | 4,070 | 7,850 | 4,566 | 4,686 | 9,252 | 5,065 | 5,236 | 10,301 | 5,191 | 5,379 | 10,570 |
| Total | 16,395 | 14,873 | 31,268 | 16,405 | 14,869 | 31,274 | 16,263 | 14,784 | 31,047 | 15,936 | 14,554 | 30,490 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Coos } \\ & \text { County } \end{aligned}$ | 2040 |  |  | 2045 |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 545 | 519 | 1,064 | 524 | 499 | 1,023 | 516 | 492 | 1,008 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 591 | 594 | 1,185 | 560 | 564 | 1,124 | 540 | 544 | 1,084 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 631 | 645 | 1,276 | 600 | 614 | 1,214 | 569 | 583 | 1,152 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 617 | 624 | 1,241 | 596 | 605 | 1,201 | 568 | 576 | 1,144 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 623 | 528 | 1,151 | 600 | 543 | 1,143 | 582 | 527 | 1,109 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 756 | 545 | 1,301 | 758 | 545 | 1,303 | 733 | 561 | 1,294 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 871 | 613 | 1,484 | 773 | 572 | 1,345 | 776 | 572 | 1,348 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 904 | 710 | 1,614 | 884 | 657 | 1,541 | 783 | 614 | 1,397 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 1,154 | 773 | 1,927 | 963 | 743 | 1,706 | 944 | 688 | 1,632 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 1,099 | 838 | 1,937 | 1,131 | 796 | 1,927 | 936 | 765 | 1,701 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 953 | 815 | 1,768 | 1,087 | 849 | 1,936 | 1,122 | 807 | 1,929 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 877 | 834 | 1,711 | 886 | 838 | 1,724 | 1,016 | 873 | 1,889 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 814 | 874 | 1,688 | 891 | 875 | 1,766 | 902 | 880 | 1,782 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 969 | 939 | 1,908 | 829 | 885 | 1,714 | 909 | 887 | 1,796 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 1,049 | 1,031 | 2,080 | 910 | 913 | 1,823 | 780 | 861 | 1,641 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 1,118 | 1,193 | 2,311 | 960 | 960 | 1,920 | 834 | 853 | 1,687 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 984 | 1,015 | 1,999 | 901 | 1,030 | 1,931 | 777 | 830 | 1,607 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 885 | 1,078 | 1,963 | 1,004 | 1,188 | 2,192 | 984 | 1,244 | 2,228 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 5,005 | 5,256 | 10,261 | 4,604 | 4,976 | 9,580 | 4,284 | 4,675 | 8,959 |  |  |  |
| Total | 15,440 | 14,168 | 29,608 | 14,857 | 13,676 | 28,533 | 14,271 | 13,157 | 27,428 |  |  |  |

Table 11: Projected Populations for Grafton County by Age Groups and Sex


Table 12: Projected Populations for Hillsborough County by Age Groups and Sex

| ough | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 11,105 | 10,720 | 21,825 | 12,871 | 12,438 | 25,309 | 13,121 | 12,678 | 25,799 | 12,831 | 12,398 | 25,229 |
| 5-9 | 11,712 | 10,919 | 22,631 | 11,234 | 10,866 | 22,100 | 12,943 | 12,523 | 25,466 | 13,187 | 12,778 | 25,965 |
| 10-14 | 12,390 | 11,808 | 24,198 | 11,827 | 10,980 | 22,807 | 11,276 | 10,853 | 22,129 | 12,984 | 12,522 | 25,506 |
| 15-19 | 12,726 | 12,127 | 24,853 | 12,070 | 11,435 | 23,505 | 11,476 | 10,629 | 22,105 | 10,962 | 10,529 | 21,491 |
| 20-24 | 13,375 | 12,533 | 25,908 | 12,563 | 12,430 | 24,993 | 11,876 | 11,693 | 23,569 | 11,316 | 10,931 | 22,247 |
| 25-29 | 15,832 | 14,512 | 30,344 | 15,397 | 14,004 | 29,401 | 14,339 | 13,802 | 28,141 | 13,502 | 12,885 | 26,387 |
| 30-34 | 15,452 | 14,537 | 29,989 | 17,311 | 16,011 | 33,322 | 16,745 | 15,356 | 32,101 | 15,584 | 15,147 | 30,731 |
| 35-39 | 13,917 | 13,410 | 27,327 | 15,968 | 15,105 | 31,073 | 17,802 | 16,540 | 34,342 | 17,208 | 15,875 | 33,083 |
| 40-44 | 12,499 | 12,582 | 25,081 | 13,713 | 13,610 | 27,323 | 15,664 | 15,243 | 30,907 | 17,471 | 16,717 | 34,188 |
| 45-49 | 13,190 | 13,418 | 26,608 | 12,492 | 12,601 | 25,093 | 13,637 | 13,545 | 27,182 | 15,584 | 15,192 | 30,776 |
| 50-54 | 15,045 | 15,085 | 30,130 | 12,784 | 13,175 | 25,959 | 12,033 | 12,290 | 24,323 | 13,134 | 13,225 | 26,359 |
| 55-59 | 16,588 | 16,717 | 33,305 | 14,532 | 14,823 | 29,355 | 12,272 | 12,860 | 25,132 | 11,543 | 12,009 | 23,552 |
| 60-64 | 14,871 | 15,256 | 30,127 | 15,750 | 16,108 | 31,858 | 13,725 | 14,193 | 27,918 | 11,591 | 12,330 | 23,921 |
| 65-69 | 11,392 | 12,093 | 23,485 | 13,951 | 14,603 | 28,554 | 14,690 | 15,311 | 30,001 | 12,804 | 13,522 | 26,326 |
| 70-74 | 8,752 | 9,777 | 18,529 | 10,881 | 11,721 | 22,602 | 13,258 | 14,070 | 27,328 | 13,953 | 14,768 | 28,721 |
| 75-79 | 5,438 | 6,800 | 12,238 | 8,138 | 9,237 | 17,375 | 10,072 | 10,982 | 21,054 | 12,272 | 13,173 | 25,445 |
| 80-84 | 3250 | 4367 | 7617 | 4,715 | 6,228 | 10,943 | 6,961 | 8,403 | 15,364 | 8,583 | 9,997 | 18,580 |
| 85 and over | 3,035 | 5,707 | 8,742 | 3,757 | 5,552 | 9,309 | 5,181 | 6,854 | 12,035 | 7,503 | 8,890 | 16,393 |
| 65 and over | 31,867 | 38,744 | 70,611 | 41,442 | 47,341 | 88,783 | 50,162 | 55,620 | 105,782 | 55,115 | 60,350 | 115,465 |
| Total | 210,569 | 212,368 | 422,937 | 219,954 | 220,927 | 440,881 | 227,071 | 227,825 | 454,896 | 232,012 | 232,888 | 464,900 |
| Hillsborough County | 2040 |  |  | 2045 |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 12,315 | 11,899 | 24,214 | 11,898 | 11,496 | 23,394 | 11,920 | 11,517 | 23,437 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 12,917 | 12,537 | 25,454 | 12,425 | 12,065 | 24,490 | 12,016 | 11,666 | 23,682 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 13,251 | 12,819 | 26,070 | 13,010 | 12,611 | 25,621 | 12,526 | 12,148 | 24,674 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 12,556 | 12,036 | 24,592 | 12,833 | 12,333 | 25,166 | 12,622 | 12,161 | 24,783 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 10,854 | 10,867 | 21,721 | 12,372 | 12,347 | 24,719 | 12,642 | 12,644 | 25,286 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 12,840 | 11,957 | 24,797 | 12,302 | 11,901 | 24,203 | 14,157 | 13,782 | 27,939 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 14,692 | 14,177 | 28,869 | 13,998 | 13,180 | 27,178 | 13,420 | 13,128 | 26,548 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 16,032 | 15,708 | 31,740 | 15,141 | 14,734 | 29,875 | 14,433 | 13,705 | 28,138 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 16,910 | 16,093 | 33,003 | 15,781 | 15,965 | 31,746 | 14,910 | 14,983 | 29,893 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 17,422 | 16,720 | 34,142 | 16,898 | 16,138 | 33,036 | 15,777 | 16,024 | 31,801 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 15,043 | 14,884 | 29,927 | 16,865 | 16,427 | 33,292 | 16,372 | 15,870 | 32,242 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 12,624 | 12,967 | 25,591 | 14,497 | 14,634 | 29,131 | 16,272 | 16,167 | 32,439 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 10,925 | 11,556 | 22,481 | 11,972 | 12,510 | 24,482 | 13,755 | 14,129 | 27,884 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 10,845 | 11,807 | 22,652 | 10,251 | 11,106 | 21,357 | 11,237 | 12,023 | 23,260 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 12,180 | 13,085 | 25,265 | 10,340 | 11,455 | 21,795 | 9,782 | 10,784 | 20,566 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 12,939 | 13,869 | 26,808 | 11,320 | 12,337 | 23,657 | 9,614 | 10,826 | 20,440 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 10,453 | 12,031 | 22,484 | 11,045 | 12,703 | 23,748 | 9,688 | 11,313 | 21,001 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 9,642 | 10,759 | 20,401 | 11,950 | 12,920 | 24,870 | 13,242 | 14,114 | 27,356 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 56,059 | 61,551 | 117,610 | 54,906 | 60,521 | 115,427 | 53,563 | 59,060 | 112,623 |  |  |  |
| Total | 234,440 | 235,771 | 470,211 | 234,898 | 236,862 | 471,760 | 234,385 | 236,984 | 471,369 |  |  |  |

Table 13: Projected Populations for Merrimack County by Age Groups and Sex

| Merrimack County | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 3,496 | 3,553 | 7,049 | 4,165 | 4,029 | 8,194 | 4,187 | 4,049 | 8,236 | 4,110 | 3,976 | 8,086 |
| 5-9 | 3,936 | 3,896 | 7,832 | 3,641 | 3,800 | 7,441 | 4,330 | 4,298 | 8,628 | 4,349 | 4,322 | 8,671 |
| 10-14 | 4,284 | 4,067 | 8,351 | 4,081 | 4,036 | 8,117 | 3,768 | 3,926 | 7,694 | 4,478 | 4,443 | 8,921 |
| 15-19 | 4,779 | 4,740 | 9,519 | 4,511 | 4,395 | 8,906 | 4,315 | 4,356 | 8,671 | 4,023 | 4,259 | 8,282 |
| 20-24 | 4,923 | 4,581 | 9,504 | 4,711 | 4,611 | 9,322 | 4,481 | 4,326 | 8,807 | 4,316 | 4,297 | 8,613 |
| 25-29 | 5,069 | 4,666 | 9,735 | 5,492 | 4,581 | 10,073 | 5,274 | 4,606 | 9,880 | 5,042 | 4,291 | 9,333 |
| 30-34 | 5,080 | 4,698 | 9,778 | 4,450 | 4,825 | 9,275 | 4,889 | 4,716 | 9,605 | 4,657 | 4,748 | 9,405 |
| 35-39 | 4,935 | 4,693 | 9,628 | 5,373 | 5,033 | 10,406 | 4,620 | 5,167 | 9,787 | 5,137 | 5,046 | 10,183 |
| 40-44 | 4,475 | 4,430 | 8,905 | 5,257 | 4,817 | 10,074 | 5,750 | 5,177 | 10,927 | 4,888 | 5,326 | 10,214 |
| 45-49 | 4,696 | 4,611 | 9,307 | 4,525 | 4,457 | 8,982 | 5,317 | 4,836 | 10,153 | 5,814 | 5,203 | 11,017 |
| 50-54 | 5,156 | 5,349 | 10,505 | 4,617 | 4,658 | 9,275 | 4,441 | 4,491 | 8,932 | 5,221 | 4,876 | 10,097 |
| 55-59 | 5,764 | 6,311 | 12,075 | 4,980 | 5,301 | 10,281 | 4,452 | 4,605 | 9,057 | 4,278 | 4,443 | 8,721 |
| 60-64 | 5,778 | 6,138 | 11,916 | 5,662 | 6,231 | 11,893 | 4,886 | 5,223 | 10,109 | 4,365 | 4,540 | 8,905 |
| 65-69 | 4,755 | 5,255 | 10,010 | 5,600 | 6,086 | 11,686 | 5,483 | 6,164 | 11,647 | 4,731 | 5,180 | 9,911 |
| 70-74 | 3,736 | 4,212 | 7,948 | 4,607 | 5,185 | 9,792 | 5,428 | 5,995 | 11,423 | 5,309 | 6,077 | 11,386 |
| 75-79 | 2,311 | 2,713 | 5,024 | 3,535 | 3,990 | 7,525 | 4,360 | 4,891 | 9,251 | 5,135 | 5,651 | 10,786 |
| 80-84 | 1327 | 1780 | 3107 | 1,937 | 2,406 | 4,343 | 2,934 | 3,527 | 6,461 | 3,602 | 4,323 | 7,925 |
| 85 and over | 1,213 | 2,402 | 3,615 | 1,507 | 2,293 | 3,800 | 2,092 | 2,713 | 4,805 | 3,085 | 3,673 | 6,758 |
| 65 and over | 13,342 | 16,362 | 29,704 | 17,186 | 19,960 | 37,146 | 20,297 | 23,290 | 43,587 | 21,862 | 24,904 | 46,766 |
| Total | 75,713 | 78,095 | 153,808 | 78,651 | 80,734 | 159,385 | 81,006 | 83,066 | 164,072 | 82,540 | 84,674 | 167,214 |
| Merrimack County | 2040 |  |  | 2045 |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 3,989 | 3,859 | 7,848 | 3,911 | 3,783 | 7,694 | 3,959 | 3,829 | 7,788 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 4,278 | 4,257 | 8,535 | 4,170 | 4,148 | 8,318 | 4,101 | 4,076 | 8,177 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 4,506 | 4,483 | 8,989 | 4,452 | 4,434 | 8,886 | 4,352 | 4,330 | 8,682 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 4,687 | 4,742 | 9,429 | 4,734 | 4,797 | 9,531 | 4,698 | 4,763 | 9,461 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 4,082 | 4,232 | 8,314 | 4,651 | 4,635 | 9,286 | 4,703 | 4,689 | 9,392 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 4,883 | 4,269 | 9,152 | 4,662 | 4,209 | 8,871 | 5,245 | 4,667 | 9,912 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 4,420 | 4,392 | 8,812 | 4,267 | 4,379 | 8,646 | 4,042 | 4,316 | 8,358 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 4,870 | 5,096 | 9,966 | 4,604 | 4,705 | 9,309 | 4,433 | 4,700 | 9,133 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 5,486 | 5,209 | 10,695 | 5,201 | 5,284 | 10,485 | 4,909 | 4,865 | 9,774 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 4,945 | 5,371 | 10,316 | 5,580 | 5,275 | 10,855 | 5,303 | 5,363 | 10,666 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 5,726 | 5,264 | 10,990 | 4,885 | 5,456 | 10,341 | 5,535 | 5,371 | 10,906 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 5,042 | 4,840 | 9,882 | 5,556 | 5,247 | 10,803 | 4,753 | 5,452 | 10,205 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 4,202 | 4,395 | 8,597 | 4,976 | 4,809 | 9,785 | 5,500 | 5,225 | 10,725 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 4,237 | 4,526 | 8,763 | 4,099 | 4,402 | 8,501 | 4,865 | 4,821 | 9,686 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 4,585 | 5,121 | 9,706 | 4,122 | 4,492 | 8,614 | 3,999 | 4,379 | 8,378 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 5,033 | 5,747 | 10,780 | 4,365 | 4,873 | 9,238 | 3,935 | 4,291 | 8,226 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 4,243 | 5,011 | 9,254 | 4,183 | 5,120 | 9,303 | 3,648 | 4,354 | 8,002 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 3,996 | 4,585 | 8,581 | 4,882 | 5,422 | 10,304 | 5,208 | 5,796 | 11,004 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 22,094 | 24,990 | 47,084 | 21,651 | 24,309 | 45,960 | 21,655 | 23,641 | 45,296 |  |  |  |
| Total | 83,210 | 85,399 | 168,609 | 83,300 | 85,470 | 168,770 | 83,188 | 85,287 | 168,475 |  |  |  |

Table 14: Projected Populations for Rockingham County by Age Groups and Sex

| Rockingham | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 7,394 | 6,979 | 14,373 | 9,021 | 8,342 | 17,363 | 9,250 | 8,552 | 17,802 | 8,980 | 8,302 | 17,282 |
| 5-9 | 8,111 | 7,695 | 15,806 | 8,050 | 7,669 | 15,719 | 9,801 | 9,154 | 18,955 | 10,053 | 9,393 | 19,446 |
| 10-14 | 8,785 | 8,542 | 17,327 | 8,415 | 8,073 | 16,488 | 8,333 | 8,034 | 16,367 | 10,149 | 9,598 | 19,747 |
| 15-19 | 9,111 | 8,577 | 17,688 | 8,021 | 7,662 | 15,683 | 7,664 | 7,228 | 14,892 | 7,592 | 7,201 | 14,793 |
| 20-24 | 8,725 | 7,954 | 16,679 | 7,990 | 7,521 | 15,511 | 7,017 | 6,707 | 13,724 | 6,708 | 6,334 | 13,042 |
| 25-29 | 9,858 | 9,060 | 18,918 | 9,467 | 8,886 | 18,353 | 8,640 | 8,380 | 17,020 | 7,592 | 7,480 | 15,072 |
| 30-34 | 9,972 | 9,563 | 19,535 | 10,945 | 10,469 | 21,414 | 10,476 | 10,242 | 20,718 | 9,564 | 9,666 | 19,230 |
| 35-39 | 9,762 | 9,565 | 19,327 | 11,276 | 10,717 | 21,993 | 12,336 | 11,702 | 24,038 | 11,812 | 11,457 | 23,269 |
| 40-44 | 8,808 | 8,930 | 17,738 | 10,227 | 10,043 | 20,270 | 11,774 | 11,221 | 22,995 | 12,886 | 12,264 | 25,150 |
| 45-49 | 9,878 | 10,249 | 20,127 | 8,852 | 8,918 | 17,770 | 10,243 | 9,999 | 20,242 | 11,798 | 11,183 | 22,981 |
| 50-54 | 11,704 | 12,136 | 23,840 | 9,529 | 10,008 | 19,537 | 8,508 | 8,682 | 17,190 | 9,849 | 9,745 | 19,594 |
| 55-59 | 13,252 | 13,716 | 26,968 | 11,362 | 12,002 | 23,364 | 9,219 | 9,871 | 19,090 | 8,234 | 8,572 | 16,806 |
| 60-64 | 12,617 | 13,103 | 25,720 | 12,863 | 13,529 | 26,392 | 10,996 | 11,808 | 22,804 | 8,930 | 9,724 | 18,654 |
| 65-69 | 9,822 | 10,516 | 20,338 | 12,114 | 12,910 | 25,024 | 12,311 | 13,293 | 25,604 | 10,537 | 11,624 | 22,161 |
| 70-74 | 7,847 | 8,639 | 16,486 | 9,523 | 10,332 | 19,855 | 11,712 | 12,655 | 24,367 | 11,908 | 13,044 | 24,952 |
| 75-79 | 4,856 | 5,637 | 10,493 | 7,435 | 8,190 | 15,625 | 9,001 | 9,760 | 18,761 | 11,078 | 11,953 | 23,031 |
| 80-84 | 2740 | 3526 | 6266 | 4,206 | 5,134 | 9,340 | 6,390 | 7,438 | 13,828 | 7,726 | 8,872 | 16,598 |
| 85 and over | 2,332 | 4,215 | 6,547 | 3,070 | 4,815 | 7,885 | 4,508 | 6,343 | 10,851 | 6,789 | 8,847 | 15,636 |
| 65 and over | 27,597 | 32,533 | 60,130 | 36,348 | 41,381 | 77,729 | 43,922 | 49,489 | 93,411 | 48,038 | 54,340 | 102,378 |
| Total | 155,574 | 158,602 | 314,176 | 162,366 | 165,220 | 327,586 | 168,179 | 171,069 | 339,248 | 172,185 | 175,259 | 347,444 |
| Rockingham County | 2040 |  |  | 2045 |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 8,438 | 7,801 | 16,239 | 7,996 | 7,393 | 15,389 | 7,982 | 7,380 | 15,362 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 9,779 | 9,134 | 18,913 | 9,232 | 8,618 | 17,850 | 8,769 | 8,182 | 16,951 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 10,431 | 9,867 | 20,298 | 10,197 | 9,635 | 19,832 | 9,650 | 9,108 | 18,758 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 9,268 | 8,621 | 17,889 | 9,580 | 8,907 | 18,487 | 9,391 | 8,717 | 18,108 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 6,662 | 6,324 | 12,986 | 8,178 | 7,610 | 15,788 | 8,476 | 7,879 | 16,355 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 7,272 | 7,076 | 14,348 | 7,256 | 7,093 | 14,349 | 8,926 | 8,550 | 17,476 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 8,421 | 8,642 | 17,063 | 8,103 | 8,208 | 16,311 | 8,104 | 8,241 | 16,345 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 10,804 | 10,832 | 21,636 | 9,556 | 9,722 | 19,278 | 9,216 | 9,250 | 18,466 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 12,363 | 12,029 | 24,392 | 11,363 | 11,420 | 22,783 | 10,073 | 10,269 | 20,342 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 12,942 | 12,246 | 25,188 | 12,479 | 12,065 | 24,544 | 11,497 | 11,477 | 22,974 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 11,370 | 10,921 | 22,291 | 12,538 | 12,012 | 24,550 | 12,122 | 11,859 | 23,981 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 9,553 | 9,639 | 19,192 | 11,087 | 10,850 | 21,937 | 12,258 | 11,958 | 24,216 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 7,996 | 8,463 | 16,459 | 9,322 | 9,558 | 18,880 | 10,843 | 10,778 | 21,621 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 8,588 | 9,604 | 18,192 | 7,737 | 8,406 | 16,143 | 9,033 | 9,503 | 18,536 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 10,214 | 11,427 | 21,641 | 8,366 | 9,482 | 17,848 | 7,556 | 8,315 | 15,871 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 11,289 | 12,342 | 23,631 | 9,732 | 10,870 | 20,602 | 7,990 | 9,050 | 17,040 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 9,519 | 10,886 | 20,405 | 9,756 | 11,294 | 21,050 | 8,444 | 9,970 | 18,414 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 8,708 | 11,089 | 19,797 | 10,939 | 13,756 | 24,695 | 11,986 | 15,281 | 27,267 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 48,318 | 55,348 | 103,666 | 46,530 | 53,808 | 100,338 | 45,009 | 52,119 | 97,128 |  |  |  |
| Total | 173,617 | 176,943 | 350,560 | 173,417 | 176,899 | 350,316 | 172,316 | 175,767 | 348,083 |  |  |  |

Table 15: Projected Populations for Strafford County by Age Groups and Sex

| Strafford County | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 2,994 | 2,862 | 5,856 | 3,688 | 3,449 | 7,137 | 3,876 | 3,626 | 7,502 | 3,949 | 3,694 | 7,643 |
| 5-9 | 3,380 | 3,077 | 6,457 | 2,883 | 2,901 | 5,784 | 3,534 | 3,480 | 7,014 | 3,720 | 3,668 | 7,388 |
| 10-14 | 3,472 | 3,304 | 6,776 | 3,321 | 3,055 | 6,376 | 2,819 | 2,867 | 5,686 | 3,460 | 3,448 | 6,908 |
| 15-19 | 4,861 | 5,451 | 10,312 | 4,503 | 5,185 | 9,688 | 4,380 | 5,005 | 9,385 | 4,029 | 4,887 | 8,916 |
| 20-24 | 6,587 | 7,270 | 13,857 | 6,922 | 7,667 | 14,589 | 6,413 | 7,221 | 13,634 | 6,246 | 6,931 | 13,177 |
| 25-29 | 4,989 | 4,414 | 9,403 | 4,829 | 4,336 | 9,165 | 5,230 | 4,757 | 9,987 | 4,600 | 4,273 | 8,873 |
| 30-34 | 4,532 | 4,129 | 8,661 | 5,311 | 4,774 | 10,085 | 5,114 | 4,666 | 9,780 | 5,558 | 5,150 | 10,708 |
| 35-39 | 4,007 | 3,932 | 7,939 | 4,503 | 4,090 | 8,593 | 5,273 | 4,715 | 9,988 | 5,080 | 4,619 | 9,699 |
| 40-44 | 3,538 | 3,510 | 7,048 | 3,878 | 3,817 | 7,695 | 4,345 | 3,954 | 8,299 | 5,103 | 4,581 | 9,684 |
| 45-49 | 3,674 | 3,696 | 7,370 | 3,396 | 3,496 | 6,892 | 3,708 | 3,784 | 7,492 | 4,164 | 3,931 | 8,095 |
| 50-54 | 3,992 | 4,214 | 8,206 | 3,527 | 3,612 | 7,139 | 3,245 | 3,401 | 6,646 | 3,547 | 3,691 | 7,238 |
| 55-59 | 4,501 | 4,737 | 9,238 | 3,808 | 4,097 | 7,905 | 3,348 | 3,495 | 6,843 | 3,083 | 3,299 | 6,382 |
| 60-64 | 4,353 | 4,447 | 8,800 | 4,324 | 4,632 | 8,956 | 3,645 | 3,990 | 7,635 | 3,211 | 3,415 | 6,626 |
| 65-69 | 3,341 | 3,710 | 7,051 | 4,191 | 4,392 | 8,583 | 4,147 | 4,553 | 8,700 | 3,506 | 3,938 | 7,444 |
| 70-74 | 2,606 | 2,956 | 5,562 | 3,144 | 3,550 | 6,694 | 3,930 | 4,185 | 8,115 | 3,893 | 4,351 | 8,244 |
| 75-79 | 1,721 | 1,995 | 3,716 | 2,440 | 2,762 | 5,202 | 2,934 | 3,296 | 6,230 | 3,674 | 3,889 | 7,563 |
| 80-84 | 901 | 1271 | 2172 | 1,397 | 1,761 | 3,158 | 1,957 | 2,424 | 4,381 | 2,349 | 2,899 | 5,248 |
| 85 and over | 862 | 1,603 | 2,465 | 965 | 1,556 | 2,521 | 1,363 | 1,885 | 3,248 | 1,910 | 2,468 | 4,378 |
| 65 and over | 9,431 | 11,535 | 20,966 | 12,137 | 14,021 | 26,158 | 14,331 | 16,343 | 30,674 | 15,332 | 17,545 | 32,877 |
| Total | 64,311 | 66,578 | 130,889 | 67,030 | 69,132 | 136,162 | 69,261 | 71,304 | 140,565 | 71,082 | 73,132 | 144,214 |
| Strafford County | 2040 |  |  | 2045 |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 3,875 | 3,625 | 7,500 | 3,710 | 3,470 | 7,180 | 3,668 | 3,431 | 7,099 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 3,824 | 3,766 | 7,590 | 3,762 | 3,698 | 7,460 | 3,600 | 3,542 | 7,142 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 3,674 | 3,663 | 7,337 | 3,786 | 3,763 | 7,549 | 3,723 | 3,697 | 7,420 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 4,512 | 5,300 | 9,812 | 4,674 | 5,447 | 10,121 | 4,753 | 5,517 | 10,270 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 5,778 | 6,755 | 12,533 | 6,457 | 7,435 | 13,892 | 6,681 | 7,677 | 14,358 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 4,419 | 3,979 | 8,398 | 3,838 | 3,784 | 7,622 | 4,691 | 4,545 | 9,236 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 4,906 | 4,638 | 9,544 | 4,717 | 4,306 | 9,023 | 4,074 | 4,088 | 8,162 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 5,577 | 5,144 | 10,721 | 4,921 | 4,629 | 9,550 | 4,725 | 4,297 | 9,022 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 4,957 | 4,522 | 9,479 | 5,461 | 5,047 | 10,508 | 4,810 | 4,537 | 9,347 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 4,941 | 4,591 | 9,532 | 4,810 | 4,535 | 9,345 | 5,301 | 5,064 | 10,365 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 4,019 | 3,865 | 7,884 | 4,781 | 4,516 | 9,297 | 4,653 | 4,464 | 9,117 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 3,402 | 3,610 | 7,012 | 3,866 | 3,782 | 7,648 | 4,599 | 4,423 | 9,022 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 2,985 | 3,251 | 6,236 | 3,300 | 3,557 | 6,857 | 3,747 | 3,729 | 7,476 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 3,120 | 3,404 | 6,524 | 2,910 | 3,244 | 6,154 | 3,213 | 3,548 | 6,761 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 3,321 | 3,794 | 7,115 | 2,962 | 3,281 | 6,243 | 2,761 | 3,128 | 5,889 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 3,673 | 4,075 | 7,748 | 3,140 | 3,560 | 6,700 | 2,799 | 3,086 | 5,885 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 2,964 | 3,450 | 6,414 | 2,972 | 3,617 | 6,589 | 2,544 | 3,163 | 5,707 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 2,411 | 3,023 | 5,434 | 3,050 | 3,596 | 6,646 | 3,260 | 3,897 | 7,157 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 15,489 | 17,746 | 33,235 | 15,034 | 17,298 | 32,332 | 14,577 | 16,822 | 31,399 |  |  |  |
| Total | 72,358 | 74,455 | 146,813 | 73,117 | 75,267 | 148,384 | 73,602 | 75,833 | 149,435 |  |  |  |

Table 16: Projected Populations for Sullivan County by Age Groups and Sex

| Sullivan County | 2020 |  |  | 2025 |  |  | 2030 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 0-4 | 985 | 927 | 1,912 | 1,138 | 1,037 | 2,175 | 1,095 | 999 | 2,094 | 1,043 | 950 | 1,993 |
| 5-9 | 1,059 | 1,060 | 2,119 | 1,004 | 960 | 1,964 | 1,162 | 1,074 | 2,236 | 1,121 | 1,036 | 2,157 |
| 10-14 | 1,212 | 1,113 | 2,325 | 1,062 | 1,092 | 2,154 | 1,008 | 990 | 1,998 | 1,170 | 1,109 | 2,279 |
| 15-19 | 1,146 | 1,130 | 2,276 | 1,099 | 998 | 2,097 | 965 | 980 | 1,945 | 919 | 890 | 1,809 |
| 20-24 | 1,099 | 920 | 2,019 | 995 | 980 | 1,975 | 956 | 867 | 1,823 | 841 | 852 | 1,693 |
| 25-29 | 1,231 | 1,182 | 2,413 | 1,195 | 995 | 2,190 | 1,083 | 1,061 | 2,144 | 1,043 | 939 | 1,982 |
| 30-34 | 1,345 | 1,239 | 2,584 | 1,347 | 1,278 | 2,625 | 1,310 | 1,077 | 2,387 | 1,190 | 1,150 | 2,340 |
| 35-39 | 1,202 | 1,217 | 2,419 | 1,371 | 1,313 | 2,684 | 1,376 | 1,355 | 2,731 | 1,341 | 1,143 | 2,484 |
| 40-44 | 1,119 | 1,221 | 2,340 | 1,197 | 1,244 | 2,441 | 1,368 | 1,342 | 2,710 | 1,376 | 1,388 | 2,764 |
| 45-49 | 1,328 | 1,326 | 2,654 | 1,109 | 1,231 | 2,340 | 1,188 | 1,255 | 2,443 | 1,361 | 1,356 | 2,717 |
| 50-54 | 1,558 | 1,474 | 3,032 | 1,309 | 1,324 | 2,633 | 1,095 | 1,230 | 2,325 | 1,176 | 1,256 | 2,432 |
| 55-59 | 1,712 | 1,787 | 3,499 | 1,530 | 1,525 | 3,055 | 1,288 | 1,371 | 2,659 | 1,080 | 1,275 | 2,355 |
| 60-64 | 1,795 | 1,811 | 3,606 | 1,699 | 1,770 | 3,469 | 1,522 | 1,512 | 3,034 | 1,285 | 1,362 | 2,647 |
| 65-69 | 1,618 | 1,663 | 3,281 | 1,793 | 1,806 | 3,599 | 1,701 | 1,766 | 3,467 | 1,529 | 1,514 | 3,043 |
| 70-74 | 1,323 | 1,386 | 2,709 | 1,563 | 1,583 | 3,146 | 1,735 | 1,720 | 3,455 | 1,650 | 1,685 | 3,335 |
| 75-79 | 833 | 901 | 1,734 | 1,242 | 1,266 | 2,508 | 1,471 | 1,445 | 2,916 | 1,637 | 1,571 | 3,208 |
| 80-84 | 434 | 555 | 989 | 691 | 797 | 1,488 | 1,025 | 1,120 | 2,145 | 1,215 | 1,280 | 2,495 |
| 85 and over | 368 | 784 | 1,152 | 502 | 898 | 1,400 | 763 | 1,154 | 1,917 | 1,144 | 1,552 | 2,696 |
| 65 and over | 4,576 | 5,289 | 9,865 | 5,791 | 6,350 | 12,141 | 6,695 | 7,205 | 13,900 | 7,175 | 7,602 | 14,777 |
| Total | 21,367 | 21,696 | 43,063 | 21,846 | 22,097 | 43,943 | 22,111 | 22,318 | 44,429 | 22,121 | 22,308 | 44,429 |
| Sullivan County | 2040 |  |  | 2045 |  |  | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 993 | 906 | 1,899 | 956 | 872 | 1,828 | 943 | 859 | 1,802 |  |  |  |
| 5-9 | 1,072 | 987 | 2,059 | 1,025 | 943 | 1,968 | 988 | 908 | 1,896 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 1,134 | 1,071 | 2,205 | 1,089 | 1,022 | 2,111 | 1,042 | 977 | 2,019 |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 1,071 | 999 | 2,070 | 1,043 | 967 | 2,010 | 1,002 | 923 | 1,925 |  |  |  |
| 20-24 | 806 | 775 | 1,581 | 944 | 872 | 1,816 | 920 | 844 | 1,764 |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 922 | 925 | 1,847 | 886 | 843 | 1,729 | 1,039 | 948 | 1,987 |  |  |  |
| 30-34 | 1,151 | 1,019 | 2,170 | 1,021 | 1,006 | 2,027 | 982 | 916 | 1,898 |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 1,224 | 1,222 | 2,446 | 1,189 | 1,085 | 2,274 | 1,055 | 1,071 | 2,126 |  |  |  |
| 40-44 | 1,348 | 1,173 | 2,521 | 1,235 | 1,256 | 2,491 | 1,200 | 1,115 | 2,315 |  |  |  |
| 45-49 | 1,376 | 1,404 | 2,780 | 1,353 | 1,189 | 2,542 | 1,241 | 1,274 | 2,515 |  |  |  |
| 50-54 | 1,354 | 1,360 | 2,714 | 1,374 | 1,410 | 2,784 | 1,352 | 1,194 | 2,546 |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 1,166 | 1,304 | 2,470 | 1,347 | 1,414 | 2,761 | 1,368 | 1,467 | 2,835 |  |  |  |
| 60-64 | 1,084 | 1,269 | 2,353 | 1,174 | 1,300 | 2,474 | 1,357 | 1,410 | 2,767 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | 1,299 | 1,367 | 2,666 | 1,102 | 1,278 | 2,380 | 1,194 | 1,309 | 2,503 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 | 1,490 | 1,446 | 2,936 | 1,271 | 1,309 | 2,580 | 1,079 | 1,224 | 2,303 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 | 1,565 | 1,542 | 3,107 | 1,418 | 1,328 | 2,746 | 1,211 | 1,204 | 2,415 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 | 1,358 | 1,394 | 2,752 | 1,305 | 1,371 | 2,676 | 1,185 | 1,181 | 2,366 |  |  |  |
| 85 and over | 1,474 | 1,900 | 3,374 | 1,747 | 2,187 | 3,934 | 1,833 | 2,326 | 4,159 |  |  |  |
| 65 and over | 7,186 | 7,649 | 14,835 | 6,843 | 7,473 | 14,316 | 6,502 | 7,244 | 13,746 |  |  |  |
| Total | 21,887 | 22,063 | 43,950 | 21,479 | 21,652 | 43,131 | 20,991 | 21,150 | 42,141 |  |  |  |

Appendix B
New Hampshire County Population Projections 2020 to 2050 by Municipality

Table 1: Belknap County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | Census | 2025 | 2030 |  | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Belknap County | $\mathbf{6 3 , 7 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 , 3 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 , 6 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 , 8 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 , 3 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 , 3 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 , 1 0 3}$ |
| Alton town | 5,894 | 6,141 | 6,350 | 6,465 | 6,510 | 6,508 | 6,486 |
| Barnstead town | 4,915 | 5,121 | 5,295 | 5,391 | 5,429 | 5,427 | 5,409 |
| Belmont town | 7,314 | 7,620 | 7,880 | 8,022 | 8,079 | 8,076 | 8,049 |
| Center Harbor town | 1,040 | 1,084 | 1,120 | 1,141 | 1,149 | 1,148 | 1,144 |
| Gilford town | 7,699 | 8,021 | 8,295 | 8,444 | 8,504 | 8,501 | 8,472 |
| Gilmanton town | 3,945 | 4,110 | 4,250 | 4,327 | 4,357 | 4,356 | 4,341 |
| Laconia city | 16,871 | 17,577 | 18,177 | 18,504 | 18,635 | 18,628 | 18,565 |
| Meredith town | 6,662 | 6,941 | 7,178 | 7,307 | 7,359 | 7,356 | 7,331 |
| New Hampton town | 2,377 | 2,476 | 2,561 | 2,607 | 2,626 | 2,624 | 2,616 |
| Sanbornton town | 3,026 | 3,153 | 3,260 | 3,319 | 3,342 | 3,341 | 3,330 |
| Tilton town | 3,962 | 4,128 | 4,269 | 4,346 | 4,376 | 4,375 | 4,360 |

Table 2: Carroll County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | 2020 <br> Census | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Carroll County | $\mathbf{5 0 , 1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 , 2 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 , 0 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 , 9 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 , 9 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 , 2 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 , 2 9 3}$ |
| Albany town | 759 | 792 | 818 | 832 | 832 | 822 | 807 |
| Bartlett town | 3,200 | 3,340 | 3,450 | 3,509 | 3,508 | 3,466 | 3,403 |
| Brookfield town | 755 | 788 | 814 | 828 | 828 | 818 | 803 |
| Chatham town | 341 | 356 | 368 | 374 | 374 | 369 | 363 |
| Conway town | 9,822 | 10,256 | 10,595 | 10,775 | 10,774 | 10,644 | 10,452 |
| Eaton town | 405 | 423 | 437 | 444 | 444 | 439 | 431 |
| Effingham town | 1,691 | 1,765 | 1,823 | 1,854 | 1,854 | 1,832 | 1,799 |
| Freedom town | 1,689 | 1,763 | 1,821 | 1,852 | 1,852 | 1,829 | 1,796 |
| Hale's Location | 132 | 138 | 142 | 145 | 145 | 143 | 140 |
| Hart's Location town | 68 | 71 | 73 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 72 |
| Jackson town | 1,028 | 1,073 | 1,108 | 1,127 | 1,127 | 1,113 | 1,093 |
| Madison town | 2,565 | 2,677 | 2,765 | 2,812 | 2,812 | 2,778 | 2,728 |
| Moultonborough town | 4,918 | 5,133 | 5,302 | 5,392 | 5,392 | 5,327 | 5,231 |
| Ossipee town | 4,372 | 4,563 | 4,714 | 4,794 | 4,793 | 4,735 | 4,650 |
| Sandwich town | 1,466 | 1,530 | 1,581 | 1,607 | 1,607 | 1,588 | 1,559 |
| Tamworth town | 2,812 | 2,935 | 3,032 | 3,083 | 3,083 | 3,046 | 2,991 |
| Tuftonboro town | 2,467 | 2,575 | 2,660 | 2,705 | 2,705 | 2,672 | 2,624 |
| Wakefield town | 5,201 | 5,428 | 5,607 | 5,703 | 5,702 | 5,633 | 5,532 |
| Wolfeboro town | 6,416 | 6,696 | 6,917 | 7,035 | 7,034 | 6,949 | 6,824 |

Table 3: Cheshire County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | $2020$ Census | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cheshire County | 76,458 | 77,722 | 78,340 | 78,080 | 77,007 | 75,452 | 73,805 |
| Alstead town | 1,864 | 1,892 | 1,905 | 1,899 | 1,876 | 1,842 | 1,806 |
| Chesterfield town | 3,552 | 3,609 | 3,638 | 3,626 | 3,577 | 3,506 | 3,431 |
| Dublin town | 1,532 | 1,557 | 1,570 | 1,565 | 1,543 | 1,512 | 1,479 |
| Fitzwilliam town | 2,351 | 2,390 | 2,409 | 2,401 | 2,368 | 2,320 | 2,269 |
| Gilsum town | 752 | 764 | 771 | 768 | 757 | 742 | 726 |
| Harrisville town | 984 | 999 | 1,006 | 1,003 | 991 | 972 | 953 |
| Hinsdale town | 3,948 | 4,009 | 4,039 | 4,026 | 3,974 | 3,900 | 3,820 |
| Jaffrey town | 5,320 | 5,404 | 5,444 | 5,427 | 5,356 | 5,254 | 5,145 |
| Keene city | 23,047 | 23,424 | 23,608 | 23,530 | 23,211 | 22,747 | 22,257 |
| Marlborough town | 2,096 | 2,131 | 2,148 | 2,140 | 2,111 | 2,068 | 2,023 |
| Marlow town | 749 | 761 | 767 | 765 | 754 | 739 | 723 |
| Nelson town | 629 | 639 | 644 | 642 | 634 | 621 | 607 |
| Richmond town | 1,197 | 1,217 | 1,226 | 1,222 | 1,206 | 1,181 | 1,155 |
| Rindge town | 6,476 | 6,589 | 6,645 | 6,621 | 6,525 | 6,386 | 6,238 |
| Roxbury town | 220 | 224 | 225 | 225 | 222 | 217 | 212 |
| Stoddard town | 1,374 | 1,397 | 1,408 | 1,403 | 1,384 | 1,356 | 1,326 |
| Sullivan town | 658 | 668 | 672 | 670 | 662 | 650 | 638 |
| Surry town | 820 | 834 | 840 | 837 | 826 | 809 | 792 |
| Swanzey town | 7,270 | 7,409 | 7,477 | 7,449 | 7,330 | 7,159 | 6,978 |
| Troy town | 2,130 | 2,165 | 2,182 | 2,175 | 2,145 | 2,102 | 2,056 |
| Walpole town | 3,633 | 3,692 | 3,721 | 3,708 | 3,659 | 3,586 | 3,510 |
| Westmoreland town | 1,706 | 1,732 | 1,745 | 1,740 | 1,717 | 1,685 | 1,651 |
| Winchester town | 4,150 | 4,217 | 4,249 | 4,236 | 4,179 | 4,097 | 4,010 |

Table 4: Coos County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | $2020$ <br> Census | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coos County | 31,268 | 31,274 | 31,047 | 30,490 | 29,608 | 28,533 | 27,428 |
| Atkinson and Gilmanton Academy grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Beans grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Beans purchase | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Berlin city | 9,425 | 9,427 | 9,358 | 9,190 | 8,925 | 8,601 | 8,268 |
| Cambridge township | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 14 |
| Carroll town | 820 | 820 | 814 | 800 | 776 | 748 | 719 |
| Chandlers purchase | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clarksville town | 294 | 294 | 292 | 287 | 278 | 268 | 258 |
| Colebrook town | 2,084 | 2,084 | 2,069 | 2,032 | 1,973 | 1,902 | 1,828 |
| Columbia town | 659 | 659 | 654 | 643 | 624 | 601 | 578 |
| Crawfords purchase | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  | $2020$ <br> Census | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cutts grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dalton town | 933 | 933 | 926 | 910 | 883 | 851 | 818 |
| Dixs grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixville township | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Dummer town | 306 | 306 | 304 | 298 | 290 | 279 | 268 |
| Errol town | 298 | 298 | 296 | 291 | 282 | 272 | 261 |
| Ervings location | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gorham town | 2,698 | 2,699 | 2,679 | 2,631 | 2,555 | 2,462 | 2,367 |
| Greens grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hadleys purchase | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jefferson town | 1,043 | 1,043 | 1,036 | 1,017 | 988 | 952 | 915 |
| Kilkenny township | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lancaster town | 3,218 | 3,219 | 3,195 | 3,138 | 3,047 | 2,937 | 2,823 |
| Low and Burbanks grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Martins location | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Milan town | 1,358 | 1,358 | 1,348 | 1,324 | 1,286 | 1,239 | 1,191 |
| Millsfield township | 25 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 22 |
| Northumberland town | 2,126 | 2,126 | 2,111 | 2,073 | 2,013 | 1,940 | 1,865 |
| Odell township | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Pinkhams grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pittsburg town | 800 | 800 | 794 | 780 | 758 | 730 | 702 |
| Randolph town | 328 | 328 | 326 | 320 | 311 | 299 | 288 |
| Sargents purchase | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Second College grant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Shelburne town | 353 | 353 | 351 | 344 | 334 | 322 | 310 |
| Stark town | 478 | 478 | 475 | 466 | 453 | 436 | 419 |
| Stewartstown town | 813 | 813 | 807 | 793 | 770 | 742 | 713 |
| Stratford town | 662 | 662 | 657 | 646 | 627 | 604 | 581 |
| Success township | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Thompson and Meserves purchase | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Wentworth location | 28 | 28 | 28 | 27 | 27 | 26 | 25 |
| Whitefield town | 2,490 | 2,490 | 2,472 | 2,428 | 2,358 | 2,272 | 2,184 |

Table 5: Grafton County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grafton County | 91,118 | 94,984 | 98,030 | 99,463 | 99,711 | 98,998 | 97,777 |
| Alexandria town | 1,776 | 1,851 | 1,911 | 1,939 | 1,943 | 1,930 | 1,906 |
| Ashland town | 1,938 | 2,020 | 2,085 | 2,115 | 2,121 | 2,106 | 2,080 |
| Bath town | 1,077 | 1,123 | 1,159 | 1,176 | 1,179 | 1,170 | 1,156 |
| Benton town | 374 | 390 | 402 | 408 | 409 | 406 | 401 |
| Bethlehem town | 2,484 | 2,589 | 2,672 | 2,711 | 2,718 | 2,699 | 2,666 |
| Bridgewater town | 1,160 | 1,209 | 1,248 | 1,266 | 1,269 | 1,260 | 1,245 |
| Bristol town | 3,244 | 3,382 | 3,490 | 3,541 | 3,550 | 3,525 | 3,481 |
| Campton town | 3,343 | 3,485 | 3,597 | 3,649 | 3,658 | 3,632 | 3,587 |
| Canaan town | 3,794 | 3,955 | 4,082 | 4,141 | 4,152 | 4,122 | 4,071 |
| Dorchester town | 339 | 353 | 365 | 370 | 371 | 368 | 364 |
| Easton town | 292 | 304 | 314 | 319 | 320 | 317 | 313 |
| Ellsworth town | 93 | 97 | 100 | 102 | 102 | 101 | 100 |
| Enfield town | 4,465 | 4,654 | 4,804 | 4,874 | 4,886 | 4,851 | 4,791 |
| Franconia town | 1,083 | 1,129 | 1,165 | 1,182 | 1,185 | 1,177 | 1,162 |
| Grafton town | 1,385 | 1,444 | 1,490 | 1,512 | 1,516 | 1,505 | 1,486 |
| Groton town | 569 | 593 | 612 | 621 | 623 | 618 | 611 |
| Hanover town | 11,870 | 12,374 | 12,770 | 12,957 | 12,989 | 12,897 | 12,737 |
| Haverhill town | 4,585 | 4,780 | 4,933 | 5,005 | 5,017 | 4,982 | 4,920 |
| Hebron town | 632 | 659 | 680 | 690 | 692 | 687 | 678 |
| Holderness town | 2,004 | 2,089 | 2,156 | 2,188 | 2,193 | 2,177 | 2,150 |
| Landaff town | 446 | 465 | 480 | 487 | 488 | 485 | 479 |
| Lebanon city | 14,282 | 14,888 | 15,365 | 15,590 | 15,629 | 15,517 | 15,326 |
| Lincoln town | 1,631 | 1,700 | 1,755 | 1,780 | 1,785 | 1,772 | 1,750 |
| Lisbon town | 1,621 | 1,690 | 1,744 | 1,769 | 1,774 | 1,761 | 1,739 |
| Littleton town | 6,005 | 6,260 | 6,461 | 6,555 | 6,571 | 6,524 | 6,444 |
| Livermore town | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Lyman town | 585 | 610 | 629 | 639 | 640 | 636 | 628 |
| Lyme town | 1,745 | 1,819 | 1,877 | 1,905 | 1,910 | 1,896 | 1,873 |
| Monroe town | 864 | 901 | 930 | 943 | 945 | 939 | 927 |
| Orange town | 277 | 289 | 298 | 302 | 303 | 301 | 297 |
| Orford town | 1,237 | 1,289 | 1,331 | 1,350 | 1,354 | 1,344 | 1,327 |
| Piermont town | 769 | 802 | 827 | 839 | 842 | 836 | 825 |
| Plymouth town | 6,682 | 6,966 | 7,189 | 7,294 | 7,312 | 7,260 | 7,170 |
| Rumney town | 1,498 | 1,562 | 1,612 | 1,635 | 1,639 | 1,628 | 1,607 |
| Sugar Hill town | 647 | 674 | 696 | 706 | 708 | 703 | 694 |
| Thornton town | 2,708 | 2,823 | 2,913 | 2,956 | 2,963 | 2,942 | 2,906 |
| Warren town | 825 | 860 | 888 | 901 | 903 | 896 | 885 |
| Waterville Valley town | 508 | 530 | 547 | 555 | 556 | 552 | 545 |
| Wentworth town | 845 | 881 | 909 | 922 | 925 | 918 | 907 |
| Woodstock town | 1,434 | 1,495 | 1,543 | 1,565 | 1,569 | 1,558 | 1,539 |

Table 6: Hillsborough County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { Census } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hillsborough County | 422,937 | 440,881 | 454,896 | 464,900 | 470,211 | 471,760 | 471,369 |
| Amherst town | 11,753 | 12,243 | 12,625 | 12,898 | 13,043 | 13,085 | 13,075 |
| Antrim town | 2,651 | 2,763 | 2,851 | 2,914 | 2,947 | 2,957 | 2,955 |
| Bedford town | 23,322 | 24,347 | 25,152 | 25,726 | 26,031 | 26,120 | 26,097 |
| Bennington town | 1,501 | 1,565 | 1,614 | 1,650 | 1,669 | 1,674 | 1,673 |
| Brookline town | 5,639 | 5,851 | 6,017 | 6,136 | 6,198 | 6,217 | 6,212 |
| Deering town | 1,904 | 1,985 | 2,048 | 2,093 | 2,117 | 2,124 | 2,122 |
| Francestown town | 1,610 | 1,678 | 1,732 | 1,770 | 1,790 | 1,796 | 1,794 |
| Goffstown town | 18,577 | 19,406 | 20,055 | 20,519 | 20,764 | 20,836 | 20,818 |
| Greenfield town | 1,716 | 1,789 | 1,846 | 1,886 | 1,908 | 1,914 | 1,913 |
| Greenville town | 1,974 | 2,040 | 2,091 | 2,128 | 2,147 | 2,153 | 2,152 |
| Hancock town | 1,731 | 1,795 | 1,846 | 1,882 | 1,901 | 1,906 | 1,905 |
| Hillsborough town | 5,939 | 6,186 | 6,373 | 6,507 | 6,579 | 6,599 | 6,594 |
| Hollis town | 8,342 | 8,678 | 8,940 | 9,128 | 9,227 | 9,256 | 9,249 |
| Hudson town | 25,394 | 26,471 | 27,313 | 27,914 | 28,232 | 28,325 | 28,302 |
| Litchfield town | 8,478 | 8,838 | 9,119 | 9,319 | 9,426 | 9,457 | 9,449 |
| Lyndeborough town | 1,702 | 1,774 | 1,831 | 1,871 | 1,892 | 1,898 | 1,897 |
| Manchester city | 115,644 | 120,730 | 124,702 | 127,538 | 129,043 | 129,482 | 129,371 |
| Mason town | 1,448 | 1,509 | 1,557 | 1,592 | 1,610 | 1,615 | 1,614 |
| Merrimack town | 26,632 | 27,726 | 28,581 | 29,190 | 29,514 | 29,609 | 29,585 |
| Milford town | 16,131 | 16,780 | 17,286 | 17,648 | 17,840 | 17,895 | 17,881 |
| Mont Vernon town | 2,584 | 2,694 | 2,779 | 2,840 | 2,873 | 2,882 | 2,880 |
| Nashua city | 91,322 | 95,161 | 98,159 | 100,299 | 101,435 | 101,766 | 101,683 |
| New Boston town | 6,108 | 6,349 | 6,538 | 6,672 | 6,743 | 6,764 | 6,759 |
| New Ipswich town | 5,204 | 5,434 | 5,613 | 5,741 | 5,809 | 5,829 | 5,824 |
| Pelham town | 14,222 | 14,790 | 15,233 | 15,549 | 15,717 | 15,766 | 15,754 |
| Peterborough town | 6,418 | 6,690 | 6,903 | 7,055 | 7,135 | 7,159 | 7,153 |
| Sharon town | 359 | 374 | 386 | 395 | 399 | 400 | 400 |
| Temple town | 1,382 | 1,441 | 1,486 | 1,519 | 1,536 | 1,542 | 1,540 |
| Weare town | 9,092 | 9,460 | 9,747 | 9,952 | 10,061 | 10,093 | 10,085 |
| Wilton town | 3,896 | 4,061 | 4,190 | 4,283 | 4,331 | 4,346 | 4,342 |
| Windsor town | 262 | 273 | 282 | 288 | 291 | 292 | 292 |

Table 7: Merrimack County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Merrimack County | 153,808 | 159,385 | 164,072 | 167,214 | 168,609 | 168,770 | 168,475 |
| Allenstown town | 4,707 | 4,883 | 5,031 | 5,131 | 5,175 | 5,180 | 5,171 |
| Andover town | 2,406 | 2,493 | 2,567 | 2,616 | 2,638 | 2,640 | 2,635 |
| Boscawen town | 3,998 | 4,143 | 4,265 | 4,346 | 4,383 | 4,387 | 4,379 |
| Bow town | 8,229 | 8,530 | 8,783 | 8,953 | 9,028 | 9,037 | 9,021 |
| Bradford town | 1,662 | 1,722 | 1,773 | 1,807 | 1,822 | 1,824 | 1,820 |
| Canterbury town | 2,389 | 2,473 | 2,543 | 2,591 | 2,611 | 2,614 | 2,609 |
| Chichester town | 2,665 | 2,759 | 2,838 | 2,891 | 2,914 | 2,917 | 2,912 |
| Concord city | 43,976 | 45,611 | 46,986 | 47,907 | 48,316 | 48,363 | 48,277 |
| Danbury town | 1,250 | 1,293 | 1,328 | 1,352 | 1,363 | 1,364 | 1,362 |
| Dunbarton town | 3,005 | 3,108 | 3,195 | 3,254 | 3,279 | 3,282 | 3,277 |
| Epsom town | 4,834 | 5,006 | 5,151 | 5,249 | 5,292 | 5,297 | 5,288 |
| Franklin city | 8,741 | 9,055 | 9,319 | 9,496 | 9,575 | 9,584 | 9,567 |
| Henniker town | 6,185 | 6,393 | 6,567 | 6,684 | 6,736 | 6,742 | 6,731 |
| Hill town | 1,017 | 1,054 | 1,085 | 1,106 | 1,115 | 1,116 | 1,114 |
| Hooksett town | 14,871 | 15,430 | 15,899 | 16,214 | 16,354 | 16,370 | 16,340 |
| Hopkinton town | 5,914 | 6,128 | 6,309 | 6,429 | 6,483 | 6,489 | 6,478 |
| Loudon town | 5,576 | 5,767 | 5,928 | 6,035 | 6,083 | 6,088 | 6,078 |
| Newbury town | 2,172 | 2,253 | 2,321 | 2,367 | 2,387 | 2,389 | 2,385 |
| New London town | 4,400 | 4,554 | 4,683 | 4,770 | 4,809 | 4,813 | 4,805 |
| Northfield town | 4,872 | 5,049 | 5,197 | 5,297 | 5,341 | 5,346 | 5,337 |
| Pembroke town | 7,207 | 7,463 | 7,678 | 7,822 | 7,886 | 7,893 | 7,880 |
| Pittsfield town | 4,075 | 4,220 | 4,342 | 4,423 | 4,460 | 4,464 | 4,456 |
| Salisbury town | 1,422 | 1,472 | 1,515 | 1,543 | 1,556 | 1,557 | 1,555 |
| Sutton town | 1,978 | 2,047 | 2,105 | 2,144 | 2,161 | 2,163 | 2,159 |
| Warner town | 2,937 | 3,043 | 3,133 | 3,193 | 3,220 | 3,223 | 3,217 |
| Webster town | 1,913 | 1,980 | 2,036 | 2,073 | 2,090 | 2,092 | 2,088 |
| Wilmot town | 1,407 | 1,455 | 1,496 | 1,523 | 1,535 | 1,536 | 1,534 |

Table 8: Rockingham County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rockingham County | 314,176 | 327,586 | 339,248 | 347,444 | 350,560 | 350,316 | 348,082 |
| Atkinson town | 7,087 | 7,389 | 7,653 | 7,837 | 7,908 | 7,902 | 7,852 |
| Auburn town | 5,946 | 6,190 | 6,403 | 6,552 | 6,609 | 6,605 | 6,564 |
| Brentwood town | 4,490 | 4,668 | 4,823 | 4,932 | 4,974 | 4,970 | 4,941 |
| Candia town | 4,013 | 4,184 | 4,333 | 4,438 | 4,478 | 4,475 | 4,446 |
| Chester town | 5,232 | 5,442 | 5,624 | 5,753 | 5,802 | 5,798 | 5,763 |
| Danville town | 4,408 | 4,596 | 4,760 | 4,875 | 4,918 | 4,915 | 4,884 |
| Deerfield town | 4,855 | 5,056 | 5,230 | 5,352 | 5,399 | 5,395 | 5,362 |
| Derry town | 34,317 | 35,876 | 37,231 | 38,184 | 38,546 | 38,518 | 38,258 |
| East Kingston town | 2,441 | 2,538 | 2,623 | 2,683 | 2,705 | 2,704 | 2,687 |
| Epping town | 7,125 | 7,420 | 7,676 | 7,856 | 7,925 | 7,919 | 7,870 |
| Exeter town | 16,049 | 16,734 | 17,330 | 17,748 | 17,908 | 17,895 | 17,781 |
| Fremont town | 4,739 | 4,932 | 5,100 | 5,218 | 5,262 | 5,259 | 5,227 |
| Greenland town | 4,067 | 4,231 | 4,374 | 4,474 | 4,513 | 4,510 | 4,482 |
| Hampstead town | 8,998 | 9,382 | 9,716 | 9,951 | 10,040 | 10,033 | 9,969 |
| Hampton town | 16,214 | 16,906 | 17,508 | 17,931 | 18,092 | 18,079 | 17,964 |
| Hampton Falls town | 2,403 | 2,499 | 2,582 | 2,641 | 2,663 | 2,661 | 2,645 |
| Kensington town | 2,095 | 2,184 | 2,262 | 2,317 | 2,338 | 2,336 | 2,321 |
| Kingston town | 6,202 | 6,467 | 6,697 | 6,859 | 6,920 | 6,915 | 6,871 |
| Londonderry town | 25,826 | 26,955 | 27,937 | 28,627 | 28,890 | 28,869 | 28,681 |
| New Castle town | 1,000 | 1,043 | 1,080 | 1,106 | 1,116 | 1,115 | 1,108 |
| Newfields town | 1,769 | 1,845 | 1,910 | 1,956 | 1,974 | 1,972 | 1,960 |
| Newington town | 811 | 846 | 876 | 897 | 905 | 904 | 899 |
| Newmarket town | 9,430 | 9,833 | 10,183 | 10,429 | 10,522 | 10,515 | 10,448 |
| Newton town | 4,820 | 5,026 | 5,205 | 5,330 | 5,378 | 5,374 | 5,340 |
| North Hampton town | 4,538 | 4,732 | 4,900 | 5,019 | 5,064 | 5,060 | 5,028 |
| Northwood town | 4,641 | 4,830 | 4,994 | 5,109 | 5,153 | 5,150 | 5,118 |
| Nottingham town | 5,229 | 5,439 | 5,621 | 5,749 | 5,798 | 5,794 | 5,759 |
| Plaistow town | 7,830 | 8,164 | 8,455 | 8,659 | 8,737 | 8,731 | 8,675 |
| Portsmouth city | 21,956 | 22,893 | 23,708 | 24,281 | 24,499 | 24,482 | 24,326 |
| Raymond town | 10,684 | 11,133 | 11,524 | 11,799 | 11,903 | 11,895 | 11,820 |
| Rye town | 5,543 | 5,780 | 5,985 | 6,130 | 6,185 | 6,181 | 6,141 |
| Salem town | 30,089 | 31,460 | 32,653 | 33,491 | 33,810 | 33,785 | 33,557 |
| Sandown town | 6,548 | 6,814 | 7,045 | 7,208 | 7,270 | 7,265 | 7,221 |
| Seabrook town | 8,401 | 8,753 | 9,059 | 9,274 | 9,356 | 9,349 | 9,291 |
| South Hampton town | 894 | 932 | 965 | 989 | 998 | 997 | 990 |
| Stratham town | 7,669 | 7,990 | 8,268 | 8,464 | 8,539 | 8,533 | 8,480 |
| Windham town | 15,817 | 16,425 | 16,954 | 17,326 | 17,467 | 17,456 | 17,354 |

Table 9: Strafford County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | Census | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Strafford County | $\mathbf{1 3 0 , 8 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 6 , 1 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 0 , 5 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 4 , 2 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 6 , 8 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8 , 3 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9 , 4 3 5}$ |
| Barrington town | 9,326 | 9,702 | 10,015 | 10,275 | 10,461 | 10,573 | 10,647 |
| Dover city | 32,741 | 34,076 | 35,190 | 36,114 | 36,772 | 37,170 | 37,436 |
| Durham town | 15,490 | 16,114 | 16,635 | 17,067 | 17,375 | 17,560 | 17,685 |
| Farmington town | 6,722 | 6,988 | 7,209 | 7,393 | 7,524 | 7,603 | 7,656 |
| Lee town | 4,520 | 4,697 | 4,844 | 4,967 | 5,054 | 5,107 | 5,142 |
| Madbury town | 1,918 | 1,995 | 2,060 | 2,113 | 2,151 | 2,174 | 2,190 |
| Middleton town | 1,823 | 1,891 | 1,948 | 1,995 | 2,029 | 2,049 | 2,063 |
| Milton town | 4,482 | 4,657 | 4,804 | 4,925 | 5,011 | 5,064 | 5,099 |
| New Durham town | 2,693 | 2,796 | 2,882 | 2,954 | 3,005 | 3,035 | 3,056 |
| Rochester city | 32,492 | 33,801 | 34,894 | 35,800 | 36,445 | 36,835 | 37,096 |
| Rollinsford town | 2,597 | 2,696 | 2,779 | 2,848 | 2,897 | 2,927 | 2,946 |
| Somersworth city | 11,855 | 12,348 | 12,760 | 13,102 | 13,345 | 13,492 | 13,590 |
| Strafford town | 4,230 | 4,400 | 4,543 | 4,661 | 4,745 | 4,795 | 4,829 |

Table 10: Sullivan County Population Projections by Municipality

|  | Census | 2020 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | 2050 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sullivan County | $\mathbf{4 3 , 0 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 , 9 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 , 4 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 , 4 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 , 9 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 , 1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 , 1 4 1}$ |
| Acworth town | 853 | 870 | 880 | 880 | 871 | 854 | 835 |
| Charlestown town | 4,806 | 4,904 | 4,958 | 4,958 | 4,905 | 4,814 | 4,703 |
| Claremont city | 12,949 | 13,214 | 13,360 | 13,360 | 13,216 | 12,969 | 12,672 |
| Cornish town | 1,616 | 1,649 | 1,667 | 1,667 | 1,649 | 1,619 | 1,581 |
| Croydon town | 801 | 817 | 826 | 826 | 817 | 802 | 784 |
| Goshen town | 796 | 812 | 821 | 821 | 812 | 797 | 779 |
| Grantham town | 3,404 | 3,474 | 3,512 | 3,512 | 3,474 | 3,409 | 3,331 |
| Langdon town | 651 | 664 | 672 | 672 | 664 | 652 | 637 |
| Lempster town | 1,118 | 1,141 | 1,153 | 1,153 | 1,141 | 1,120 | 1,094 |
| Newport town | 6,299 | 6,428 | 6,499 | 6,499 | 6,429 | 6,309 | 6,164 |
| Plainfield town | 2,459 | 2,509 | 2,537 | 2,537 | 2,510 | 2,463 | 2,406 |
| Springfield town | 1,259 | 1,285 | 1,299 | 1,299 | 1,285 | 1,261 | 1,232 |
| Sunapee town | 3,342 | 3,410 | 3,448 | 3,448 | 3,411 | 3,347 | 3,270 |
| Unity town | 1,518 | 1,549 | 1,566 | 1,566 | 1,549 | 1,520 | 1,485 |
| Washington town | 1,192 | 1,216 | 1,230 | 1,230 | 1,217 | 1,194 | 1,166 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ U.S. Census Bureau, "Methodology for the Subcounty Total Resident Population Estimates (Vintage 2019): April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019", https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/technical-documentation/methodology/2010-2019/2019-su-meth.pdf

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ U.S. Social Security Administration, Office of the Actuary, Actuarial Study No. 12. https://www.ssa.gov/oact/NOTES/as120/LifeTables Body.html\#wp1169453

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-1997-10-30/pdf/97-28653.pdf

