

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 24, 2011
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Ave, Phoenix

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

*Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley, Chair
A-Tracy Clark, ADOT
Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Vice Chair
*Bryant Powell, Apache Junction
A-Andrea Marquez, Buckeye
DJ Stapley, Carefree
A-Ian Cordwell for Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek
David de la Torre, Chandler
A-Mark Smith, El Mirage
*Ken Valverde for Eugene Slechta, Fountain Hills
Thomas Ritz, Glendale
A-Katie Wilken, Goodyear
*Gino Turrubiarres, Guadalupe
*Rick Buss, Town of Gila Bend

A-Linda Edwards for Kyle Mieras, Gilbert
Sonny Culbreth, Litchfield Park
John Verdugo for Matt Holm, Maricopa County
*Wahid Alam, Mesa
A-Ed Boik, Peoria
Chris DePerro, Phoenix
Dave Williams, Queen Creek
*Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian
Community
Eddie Lamperez, Scottsdale
A-Lloyd Abrams, Surprise
A-Arlene Palisoc for Lisa Collins, Tempe
*Anne McCracken, Valley Metro
*Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown

* *Not in attendance*

A - Participated via audioconference

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Eric Morgan, Avondale
Ken Galica, Avondale
Jason Howard, MAG
Jami Garrison, MAG
Anubhav Bagley, MAG

Don Thorstenson, MAG
Peter Burnett, MAG
Max Enterline, Phoenix
Jesse Ayers, MAG
Carolyn Oberholtzer, Phoenix
International Raceway (PIR)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:02am by Vice Chair Charlie McClendon.

2. Call to the Audience

There were no comments from the audience.

3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes of March 22, 2011

Dave Williams moved, Thomas Ritz seconded and it was unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of March 22, 2011.

4. Census Update

Jami Garrison provided an update on products released from the 2010 Census data. She said that on May 12, 2011 the Census Bureau released the *Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010*, which is more commonly referred to as the *Demographic Profiles*. She said that a demographic profile summary report for Maricopa County is provided as a handout at today's meeting. MAG staff have also prepared a report for each MAG member agency and those are also available on the MAG website. Ms. Garrison said that the *Demographic Profiles* are available only to the "place" level of geography and higher, including Indian reservations.

Ms. Garrison said that the next data to be released from 2010 Census data will be the Summary File 1 data (or SF-1). The SF-1 data includes more detailed age, race, household characteristics and housing information down to the block level which is the lowest level of Census geography. She said that the data will be released on a flow basis by the State beginning in June and continuing through August 2011.

5. 2015 Population Update Options

Anubhav Bagley distributed a handout entitled *Population Share of State Comparison*. He said that on an annual basis about one billion dollars is distributed based on the share of the State's population that is within each city and town. These include income tax, sales tax, gasoline tax, and vehicle license tax. Currently, by State law, these are distributed based on either the decennial census numbers or a mid-decade special census number. In 2005 MAG spearheaded the effort for a special census survey, and that was overseen through a subcommittee of the MAG Management Committee. At the same time there was a State law passed that allowed for use of either a special census or a census survey for the revenue sharing population number. MAG also spearheaded efforts for a full special census in both 1985 and 1995.

Mr. Bagley continued, saying that in 2005 the Special Census Survey cost the region about \$8 million. If a full Census had been conducted instead of a survey, the cost would have been about \$31 million. He said that at this stage MAG staff is soliciting input from committee members on how MAG should be thinking about options for 2015. He then referenced the handout showing the comparison of the population share of state for 2000, 2005 and 2010. Mr. Bagley pointed out that the county generally has maintained about 60% of the state's share of population since 2000. From 2000 to 2010 there were ten MAG member agencies that declined in their share of the state's population, the largest one being Phoenix which declined by about 3 percent. Some agencies also gained, like Gilbert which increased its share by just over 1 percent.

Mr. Bagley asked the committee members for input on what other types of analysis they would like to see conducted and what other options could be investigated. He said that this was discussed at the MAG Intergovernmental Representatives meeting and the major concern expressed was with regard to the large cost involved, especially given the current economic conditions. He said the big reason for conducting a mid-decade census or census survey would be if growth rates are higher than the rest of the state, which was the situation in the past (e.g. 1985, 1995, and 2005). One of the options would be for MAG to collect data from member agencies on projected housing, if this is a data item currently being kept based on any development planned for the next few years. Mr. Bagley said that in addition, vacancy rates across the region are abnormally high. Rates are about double what they were in 2000. He said that in 2000 the vacancy rate was around 5.64% after adjusting for seasonal housing. In 2010, the rate was 10.4%, with 227,000 vacant housing units. About 60,000 of those units may

be seasonal but it is still a sizeable number of vacancies. When the economy recovers one would expect these vacancy rates to come back down. Another interesting analysis could be to compare this to the other Arizona counties and the state as a whole.

Charlie McClendon asked what would happen if we don't do anything for 2015. Anubhav Bagley responded that for the state shared revenue portion, if nothing is done then we would continue using the population shares from the 2010 Census for distribution of State shared revenues. The State population estimates (also known as "DES estimates") will keep getting produced annually and would be used for distribution of lottery funds, but those funds have been swept by the legislature and are no longer distributed. The population estimates are primarily used now for setting expenditure limits. Cities that are using "home rule" are not tied to those estimates anyway. Mr. Bagley said that in the MAG region there are not very many cities tied to the state estimates for expenditure limitations.

Anubhav Bagley said that if the MAG region decides not to do anything in 2015 it would raise the question of what the other jurisdictions around the state will do. He said that he will be asking the Arizona League of Cities and Towns for input on what jurisdictions around the state are planning for mid-decade.

Katie Wilken asked if there is any way to do an analysis on what would be the break-even point. In other words, she clarified, what percentage of growth would we have to show in order to get back the amount of money spent on doing a Special Census or Census Survey? Mr. Bagley responded that even if we could estimate that number using data and information mentioned earlier, such as projected housing, it would also have to be done for the rest of the state because the basis is a percentage share of the state population. However, he said that is a good option and MAG staff will begin looking into ways to do this analysis.

Eddie Lamperez asked that if we did decide to do a Special Census or Census Survey in 2015, when would a decision need to be made and money allocated/paid to the Census Bureau? Anubhav responded that the last time, for the 2005 Special Census Survey the subcommittee was formed in 2002 and the money began being collected in late 2002, early 2003.

Mr. Lamperez said that while we are still in the economic downturn, paying for something like this may not seem reasonable or doable for the cities, but this time next year things could turn around and it may be a different story. Because of this, he said that he would be reluctant to say no right now when there are unknowns about the future conditions.

Mr. Bagley said that another option would be to look at the differences in the Census Bureau's estimate process. As a region, we could begin looking at improving our inputs to the Census Bureau's annual estimates and working with the Bureau on these estimates. It could be looked into using the Census Bureau's estimates in place of a Special Census or Census Survey. A similar option would be to look at improving the State Demographer's Office annual estimates.

Dave Williams asked if there is any estimate of a per-head dollar amount for the State Shared Revenue. He said that if Queen Creek shows a growth of 10% for the next five years then it could make a significant difference in their budget.

Mr. Bagley said he would evaluate what was done in 2005 with regards to this. He said that in 2005 the evaluations on cost and revenue sharing were done by the oversight subcommittee. POPTAC was tasked with looking at the technical aspects such as: what are the pros and cons of using different methodologies? However, he added that this was a good idea and MAG staff will evaluate this.

Charlie McClendon added that he served on the subcommittee in 2002 and 2003 in determining what to do for 2005. It was then a forgone conclusion that something would be done because the region was still in a period of high growth. He said that the debate then was whether to do a full census or a survey. This time the dynamic is a bit different and it is not a forgone conclusion. In fact, some cities may be better off staying with the 2010 numbers. There is a lot to be considered and certainly nothing needs to be decided right now. He continued saying that committee members need to talk about this within their own organization in order to determine what would make the most sense for their jurisdiction. He said you could determine the per-person revenue by taking the amount you get currently for state shared revenue and dividing that by the current population.

Anubhav Bagley asked if any members have ideas on other types of data that could be collected that would be helpful in the analysis to let him know. He also said that currently MAG requests that member agencies provide MAG a copy of the C-404 form that they turn in to the Census Bureau which reports housing permits. MAG compares this data and the final report that comes back from the Census Bureau with the MAG Residential Completions dataset. Generally the Census Bureau accepts input based on the completion data but there are often issues with demolitions and mobile home data. These areas, demolitions and mobile home data, could be improved on.

Katie Wilken asked if the amount paid for the 2005 Census Survey was recovered based on the updated data. Anubhav Bagley said that he believed that it did but he would go back and check the data. The percentages did go up for 2005 and it is only later that the shares started to go down, particularly for the larger cities.

Thomas Ritz said that the Census Bureau did not adjust their estimates based on the 2005 Census Survey. He asked if, had the region conducted one, the Census Bureau would have adjusted their numbers based on a full census count. Mr. Bagley replied that he would need to check with the Census Bureau on that question. He said the American Community Survey (ACS) is benched to the full Census counts, but he would check with the Census Bureau regarding a census survey.

Mr. Ritz then asked if there is any way to check if there is a specific cutoff in terms of growth or expected growth that a jurisdiction could use to determine if they will indeed conduct a mid-decade census or census survey. Anubhav Bagley responded that Maricopa County is the only region that has done a full mid-decade census. In 1995 Pima County did a Census Survey but no other county has done a full mid-decade census. Thomas Ritz then asked if a jurisdiction with high growth does a mid-decade Special Census but the rest of the jurisdictions do not, would the new higher percent share that comes about from the Special Census count affect the jurisdictions that do not do a Census by reducing their share. Mr. Bagley responded yes, the state shared revenue numbers would be realigned. He explained that is how the state law is right now but there could always be a new bill introduced in the future.

Chris DePerro commented that the City of Phoenix is not interested in participating in a 2015 Special Census. Charlie McClendon remarked that it would be interesting to learn the positions of the various agencies with regards to mid-decade census activities and he recommended that the committee continue to look into this.

Anubhav Bagley asked about working with member agencies with regards to getting input on how they see their jurisdiction growing as well as additional input on permit data sent to the

Census Bureau on C-404 forms. Charlie McClendon said that would be a good idea and that he will assume MAG staff will move forward in gathering and analyzing this data.

6. State Demographer's Office update

Anubhav Bagley reported that the State Demographer's Office has been moved from the State Department of Commerce to the State Department of Administration. He said that originally, as the Department of Commerce transitioned to the Arizona Commerce Authority, the State Demographer's Office was to be moved to the Governor's Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting. However, due to some legislative issues and potential conflicts, it needed to be part of a State Agency, so it is now part of the State Department of Administration.

Mr. Bagley reported that the State Demographer's Office staff are currently working on updating the July 1, 2010 population estimates. State staff prepared an initial draft using birth and death data for the counties, but the place-level data only just became available. They are now using the newly available place data to prepare updated place-level July 1, 2010 population estimates.

Mr. Bagley continued his update by noting that intercensal estimates are also being prepared by the State. The State looked at three methods for these estimates. One method is looking at just the 2000 and the 2010 Census numbers and using those to estimate the in-between years. The second method is to do the same thing except they would also include the population estimate that came from the 2005 Maricopa County Special Census Survey. The third method is to use the estimates that are produced by the Census Bureau under their methodology, which differs from the one the State uses. MAG staff recommendation is to use the first method and not add in the data from the 2005 Maricopa County Special Census Survey.

Anubhav Bagley then reported that the State Demographer's Office is also working on producing the next set of long range population projections. These projections are due by the end of December 2012, according to State law. The word is that they are targeting late summer for completion of these projections so MAG is hoping to see them in August or September of 2012. They are required by State law to go out every 25 years for transportation planning purposes, MAG staff is requesting that they produce numbers out to at least the year 2040 to match our planning horizon.

Mr. Bagley concluded his report discussing the July 1, 2011 population estimates effort. MAG continues to collect annexation and group quarter data from the member agencies. The State is evaluating different methodologies for the 2011 estimates and MAG staff will report back to the POPTAC membership and/or the POPTAC Ad Hoc committee as new information is received from the State.

7. MAG 2010 Employer Database

Don Thorstenson reported that the 2010 MAG Employer database has been completed and is ready for distribution. He thanked the members for their assistance in providing and reviewing the data. He then gave an overview of the Employer database. He said that as a whole the database represents about 47,000 employers with 1.4 million employees. Mr. Thorstenson emphasized that the published data is only for businesses with 5 or more employees as the smaller employers are not tracked in this database. The data for the employer database comes from various data sources: the Maricopa County Trip Reduction Program, MAG member agencies for the public employment data, Dun & Brandstreet commercial database and various other sources where staff find information such as the Phoenix Business Journal. Mr. Thorstenson added that MAG is currently in the process of reviewing third-party data sources.

Every 5 years MAG performs a data source review to ensure that the third party data being used is the best available. He said that MAG has received sample data for Phoenix, Chandler and Avondale from the potential data providers. He said that representatives from those three member agencies are assisting MAG staff with review of the data.

Mr. Thorstenson presented a map of the concentration of employment throughout the region based on the 2010 Employer database. He then shared a chart showing the breakdown of total employment by industry. He noted that the largest sectors include trade, transportation and utilities as well as education and health services. Mr. Thorstenson provided a comparative analysis chart of employment by industry from 2006 to 2010. He noted that copies of his charts and presentation are available on the MAG website on the May 2011 meeting webpage.

8. Data Collection and Review

8A. Timeline

Jason Howard thanked the POPTAC members for their review of various data sets in March. He added that MAG has received several updates on General Plan Amendments and Development plans from members. He said that MAG staff have been inputting these data into the databases. Mr. Howard said that the next data set to be distributed for review will be the General Plan dataset. The review documents have already been sent out to several member agencies and will continue to be sent out as the data are prepared.

Jason Howard directed the members to Attachment One in their agenda packet, which is the data review timeline covering the period May through November 2011. He noted that following the General Plan review comes the Major Developments review. Jason indicated that this is going to be an important review because of the many changes in the region as a result of the economic downturn. He said that some of the important attribute fields on the Developments file that will need to be reviewed are the “status” and “start year” fields. The “start year” in particular is traditionally difficult to pin down due to stalls in construction. Likewise, he added, the “status” field goes with the start year and MAG staff will need to determine what phase these developments are in and when or if they will be completed or built.

Jason Howard then said that another Existing Land Use database review will be coming up later this summer. A consultant is working on the public lands portion of the database and in-house MAG staff are working on the land use codes at the parcel level.

The last data item Mr. Howard reported on was imagery. He said that we are finally going to be getting the 2010 imagery. There were some delays with getting the imagery from the County as a result of delays by the contractor. MAG provided a 3 terabyte hard drive to the County for transferring the images. Once MAG has the imagery an email will be sent out to all members alerting them that the imagery is available. Mr. Howard reminded the members that this imagery was flown in October 2010 and is 1 foot natural color.

8B. Apartment, Mobile Home/RV Park, and Major Group Quarters Review

Peter Burnett thanked the POPTAC members for helping with the review. MAG staff finished the update and review of these datasets. He said that POPTAC members provided important information during the update, such as apartment names as well as identifying several areas classified as town homes that are actually apartments. Mr. Burnett said that the review added 230 additional apartment buildings to the database and 1,777 apartment units. For mobile homes, with the help of member agency staff, several mobile home/rv parks that were in the

database were identified as having closed, but updates to the space counts for mobile home parks added 136 more spaces than previously had been in the database. For the major group quarters, Mr. Burnett said that there were many that had been removed based on feedback that indicated they had been closed or moved but there were also several new major group quarters identified and added to the database. Due to these updates overall the total count of group quarters did not change but capacity within these showed an increase of 544. Mr. Burnett once again thanked the members for their efforts in helping to review these datasets and asked that the members pass on his thanks to any of their staff who assisted in these reviews.

9. MAG Online Mapping Site

Jason Howard reported that the map viewer that was demonstrated at the last POPTAC meeting is moving forward. He said that input from members on useability and suggestions for improvements were greatly appreciated. He indicated that some suggestions had been used to update the application while some suggestions that were beyond the scope of the first release have been added to a list for future enhancements. Mr. Howard said that MAG staff have been working diligently to get the site to a point where it will be ready to go live and expect that to happen within the next month. He added that along with the demographic viewer an employment data viewer is also being created that will have the geocoded MAG employer database as the base data. Separating these by subject area, a general demographic viewer and a separate employment/employer viewer, makes things less cluttered and simplifies the user experience.

Mr. Howard said that URLs for each of these online mapping viewers will be shared with the POPTAC members once they are final and are rolled-out live. He asked that members or agency staffs interested in a training session or workshop on how to use the viewers to contact him directly.

10. Regional Updates

The City of Avondale gave a presentation on a Major General Plan Amendment that includes Phoenix International Raceway (PIR). Carolyn Oberholtzer, with Rose Law Group and representing PIR, presented the conceptual site plan proposed amendment. Ken Galica with the City of Avondale then provided an overview of the City of Avondale's Major Sports and Entertainment Zoning District. Copies of the presentations are available on the MAG website in the resource section for the May 2011 meeting.

Thomas Ritz asked if they were anticipating keeping the same amount of parking at PIR based on the new development plan. Ken Galica responded that the current parking is adequate, but as mixed use development begins to be built it may squeeze some of the parking and thus it would possibly require parking decks. He added that there are some undeveloped areas around the location now which could potentially be converted to surface parking or decks as well but that would not be known until some of the anticipated future development begins to actually occur.

11. MAG POPTAC Alternate Meeting Location

Jami Garrison reported that the MAG building will be under renovation for the months of June, July and August and the entire second floor of the building will be unavailable for any meetings. She said that MAG has acquired meeting space at the Maricopa County offices at 28th Avenue and Durango. Directions and a map will be provided in future meeting announcements.

12. Next Meeting of the MAG POPTAC

Charlie McClendon said that the next meeting of the MAG POPTAC is scheduled for Tuesday, June 28, 2011 at 10:00 am at the Maricopa County Flood Control District Offices. The meeting adjourned at 11:02 am.