

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 28, 2011  
Maricopa County Flood Control District  
2801 W Durango, Phoenix

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley, Chair	A-Linda Edwards for Kyle Mieras, Gilbert
A-Tracy Clark, ADOT	*Sonny Culbreth, Litchfield Park
Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Vice Chair	John Verdugo for Matt Holm, Maricopa County
*Bryant Powell, Apache Junction	*Wahid Alam, Mesa
A-Andrea Marquez, Buckeye	*Ed Boik, Peoria
*DJ Stapley, Carefree	Chris DePerro, Phoenix
A-Luke Kautzman for Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	*Dave Williams, Queen Creek
*David de la Torre, Chandler	*Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
A-Mark Smith, El Mirage	Eddie Lamperez, Scottsdale
*Eugene Slechta, Fountain Hills	Lloyd Abrams, Surprise
Thomas Ritz, Glendale	A-Arlene Palisoc for Lisa Collins, Tempe
A-Katie Wilken, Goodyear	*Anne McCracken, Valley Metro
*Gino Turrubiarres, Guadalupe	*Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown
*Rick Buss, Town of Gila Bend	

\* *Not in attendance*

*A - Participated via audioconference*

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Eric Morgan, Avondale	Scott Wilken, MAG
Jason Howard, MAG	Peter Burnett, MAG
Jami Garrison, MAG	Max Enterline, Phoenix
Anubhav Bagley, MAG	Scott Bridwell, MAG
	Aaron Golub, ASU

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:08am by Chair Jim Bacon.

2. Call to the Audience

Anubhav Bagley introduced Scott Wilken as the newest member of MAG.

3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes of May 24, 2011

John Verdugo moved, Thomas Ritz seconded and it was unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of May 24, 2011.

#### 4. Census Update

##### 4A. Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program

Jami Garrison provided an update on the Count Question Resolution Program for the 2010 Census. She said that most of the information on the CQR Program is available on the Census Bureau website at [census2010.gov/about/cqr](http://census2010.gov/about/cqr). She said that the Census Bureau started accepting Count Question challenges June 1 and will continue accepting challenges through June 1, 2013, and that challenges are processed as soon as the Bureau receives them in the order they're received. Ms Garrison said that the Census Bureau website also contains a 32 page booklet regarding guidelines on the count question process, and that if a member agency is considering submitting a challenge they should obtain a copy of the booklet. Ms Garrison stated that the division of the Census Bureau handling CQR challenges is the Geography Division, meaning that the Bureau will not do any new counts, but will only take challenges due to an inaccurately reported boundary as of January 1, 2010; any geocoding challenges; or any coverage challenges. She also said that MAG staff has done some analysis and may be able to give assistance to member agencies that would like assistance with a challenge. She reminded the committee that if they are doing a challenge, that challenge has to come from the highest elected official, then introduced Peter Burnett to give a brief overview of the analysis staff has done to date.

Peter Burnett said that staff would like to hear from member agencies on what types of analysis they would like to see done, then gave an overview of what staff has already done. One piece of analysis is that staff has taken the 2000 census and added the residential completion data provided by the member agencies to compare the sums with the 2010 census numbers. Mr. Burnett said that staff has found some differences, but that much of the differences may have come from not getting complete demolition data, particularly regarding mobile homes, and that there may be issues with correct numbers of residential completions, as well. He said that staff is also looking at taking the County Assessor's data and the units that staff has been able to improve in that data and comparing that to the 2010 Census, comparing by blocks and block groups. He said that staff is also looking at comparing group quarters data to blocks and block groups, and that staff has already found some instances of group quarters being counted as group quarters in the 2000 Census but not counted as group quarters in the 2010 Census.

Jami Garrison asked if there were any questions or comments. Chair Bacon asked if staff knows whether or not any jurisdictions are planning to submit a challenge to the CQR Program. Eddie Lamperez stated that Scottsdale intends to submit a challenge. Jami Garrison added that Chandler and Fountain Hills had contacted her with some questions, but she did not know whether or not either of them plans to submit a challenge.

Andrea Marquez asked if there were any red flags when staff compared the numbers for permits that were submitted to MAG. Peter Burnett responded by saying that the member agencies have been very good about sending in residential completion data and helping staff catch up if they find any mistakes. He said that the biggest red flags related to residential completions came when the submitted completion numbers were added to the 2000 Census and the sums were higher than the 2010 Census. The primary reason for that appears to be that staff does not have complete demolition data for some areas. Chair Bacon added that in the case of Paradise Valley, the demolition data was the issue, and that finding that out helped them to correct problems that they had.

##### 4B. Census 2010 Data

Jami Garrison provided an update on Census 2010 Data. She said that the data that has been released so far is demographic data. The next data is Summary File 1, and the Census Bureau is releasing this data on a state-by-state flow basis. So far data for seven states has been released, but Arizona is not one of them. She said that this data for all states will be released by August 2011. Ms Garrison explained that this data is more detailed, all the way down to the block level, including information on age, family status, households, seasonal use of homes. She also explained that the Census Bureau is still finalizing the criteria for what the boundaries of the urbanized areas will be. The Census Bureau has created a draft of the criteria, and while the final criteria is still pending, the Bureau Geography Division is making assumptions that the criteria will be approved as shown in the draft, but if the final criteria has any changes, those changes can be incorporated at a later date. She said that the Census Bureau hopes to have the criteria final by the end of summer 2011, but the data by urbanized area is not scheduled to be released until October 2012.

##### 5. July 1, 2010 Population Estimates

Anubhav Bagley gave an update on the July 1, 2010 Population Estimates. He said that staff has developed population estimates for July 1, 2010 based on the Census 2010 numbers (April 1, 2010) and 2010 County-level births and deaths numbers. He said that births and deaths numbers are geocoded to the place of residence, so they can be used to aggregate municipal-level estimates. He said that the biggest assumption for the three month period between the Census 2010 and July 1, 2010 is that there was no net migration, because there is no migration data available for that time period. He said that staff hopes to be able to capture any migration data by the time the July 1, 2011 population estimates are completed. He said that the downside to this method is that certain communities that don't see a large number of births do not see any population increase during that time period. He said that this was discussed at the POPTAC Ad Hoc meeting, and asked Ad Hoc Chair Charlie McClendon if he had anything to add on the topic. Mr. McClendon stated that the Ad Hoc Committee voted to recommend acceptance of these estimates, and that at the appropriate time he will move that POPTAC vote to accept the estimates.

Max Enterline asked if, when the new data come out for the age cohort for 2010, staff could double check the median age to see if there's a correlation between communities that have higher death rates to see if the ages are higher. Mr. Bagley responded that staff plans to look at that when the data is available. He said that there is some age level data at the place level available already, and that staff has looked at that and has seen a similar correlation.

Katie Wilken asked if, between now and when we work on the July 1, 2011 estimates, staff will be working on how exactly residential completions will play into population estimates from now on. Mr. Bagley said that, yes, staff is evaluating the population estimates methodology down to the place level, and that for the three month period between April 1, 2010 and July 1, 2010 staff decided to use the births and deaths and not housing unit completions. He said that the housing unit method is still a good method and staff plans to continue using it, while figuring out how to incorporate foreclosure data and changes in occupancy rates.

Chair Bacon asked Mr. Bagley to clarify that, with this three month adjustment there's never a look-back where we try to correct past estimates. Mr. Bagley confirmed that there is never a look-back for the net migration number, but for the July 1, 2011 number, we should be able to catch on to that using housing units and the Census 2010 number as a base.

Chair Bacon noted that Mr. McClendon had previously moved that POPTAC recommend approval of the updated estimates to the MAG Management Committee. Eddie Lamperez seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### 6. State Demographer's Office Update

Jami Garrison gave an update on the State Demographer's Office. She said that the State Demographer's Office is now officially part of the Arizona Department of Administration, and believes that their new name will be Employment and Population Statistics (EPS). She said that EPS is working on population projections, with an expected release date of July or August 2012. She said that those projections will include projections by race or ethnicity, five year age groups, and multiple scenarios. She also said that data collection is underway for population estimates for 2011, EPS is continuing to evaluate methods, and are working on the intercensal estimates. Ms Garrison gave the floor to Anubhav Bagley to further discuss the intercensal estimates.

Mr. Bagley started by saying that EPS is reviewing their projection and estimate methods, and that MAG staff is working closely with them to be able to update MAG's methods as EPS's methods change. For the intercensal estimates, staff has the Census 2000 and 2010 numbers, and is working with EPS to revisit and revise the annual estimates using the 2000 and 2010 numbers as benchmarks. He said that staff will bring the methodology and draft numbers to POPTAC hopefully at the next meeting. He said that, as discussed at the last meeting, staff will not use the 2005 Special Census number as a middle, but will adjust 2005 based on the two benchmarks.

Eddie Lamperez asked if those numbers should, in some way, reflect a bell curve because the foreclosure crisis and national economic recession have to play into the calculation. He said that population at some point reached a bell curve around mid-decade and the foreclosure crisis caused population to go down. Because of this, he said, we can't simply use the 2000 and 2010 numbers without reflecting a bell curve. He said that we know the population was inflated, but that still needs to be reflected. Mr. Bagley responded that taking the 2005 Special Census number out removes the inflation, but the bell curve comes from using the housing completions themselves, because as the housing market crashed, our housing completions went down, as well. He said that there is a formula that takes this into account. Mr. Bagley added that the Census Bureau is planning to produce an intercensal estimate, but theirs will be released a year from now, while MAG is getting these questions right now. He said that the formula the Census Bureau will use is the formula that MAG will use. He said that staff tried a version of the intercensal estimates using the 2005 number, but what they found is that the population rose and then dropped dramatically, and this did not reflect a realistic scenario.

Thomas Ritz stated that the vacancy rates were somewhat consistent from 2000 to 2005 and much higher by 2010, and the challenge is to determine when the vacancy rate accelerated. He said that it would be very rare for a community to have more demolitions than completions, and that because of this the graph would show population going up and then coming to a plateau. He said that perhaps what actually happened is more like a bell curve, with a low vacancy rate until after 2005. He said that residential completions alone won't catch this situation. Mr. Bagley said that this is true, and one of the things staff has is access to foreclosure data by month for the past two years. He said that staff is trying to get foreclosure data back to 2005. With that information, he said, staff could see how the rise in foreclosures coincided with the drop in residential completions.

Charlie McClendon said that Avondale has found good vacancy rate data in the City's active water account information. He said that starting in 2007 the number of active water accounts started dropping and started recovering in 2009, but is still not as high as it was previously. Mr.

Bagley said that this is a great idea and staff had been thinking about approaching member agencies to get this information. He said that staff approached SRP and APS about getting similar data for active electric accounts. He said that, looking at the SRP and APS data, there were no good correlations, and that, while both record low use accounts, the threshold for low use accounts is different between the two entities. He said that staff has hopes to get good information from that data. He went on to say that the issue with active water accounts is that water accounts may not be getting shut off for seasonal residents, while electric usage goes significantly down when seasonal residents are away. He said that water account data from member agencies may be something that could be of use, however.

## 7. Data Collection and Review

Jason Howard gave an update on data collection and review. He said that staff has heard back from just over half of member agencies whether or not there are changes to the general plan data. Staff has also received a lot of feedback on the land use codes, and any updates will be included in the final county-wide dataset that will be distributed to the member agencies.

Mr. Howard went on to say that later in July, staff will be requesting information on developments and existing land use, and reminded the members that staff is looking for significant input on the start year and construction status of developments.

Mr. Howard also said that staff has begun distributing imagery from October 2010. He told members that if they have not heard from him yet and would like to receive the imagery to email him or talk to him after the meeting.

## 8. MAG Online Mapping Site

Scott Bridwell gave a presentation on the new MAG Online Mapping Site. Currently MAG has some online map viewers, and staff has updated them with additional datasets. Staff is trying to standardize the map viewers across all datasets, and has produced two pilot maps as demonstrations. The first pilot map is the demographics map, incorporating data from Census 2010 and the American Community Survey (ACS) from 2005 to 2010. The second pilot map is an employment viewer with data from MAG's employment database. He then demonstrated how the maps are used and highlighted changes made since the last time POPTAC had seen the map viewers, including the simplification and streamlining of the maps and the addition of a dynamic legend that changes as the data being viewed changes. He also demonstrated the reporting capabilities of the map viewers, which can produce three levels of reports: county-level data, jurisdictional reports, and definable custom reports to the tract level. He showed that the map viewer can also export a pdf of a map. He also showed that the map viewer now includes extensive Help features and some step-by-step guides for accomplishing certain tasks. He concluded the presentation by providing the URLs for the two demonstration maps.

Eddie Lamperez stated that the map viewers have save him time already by allowing his staff to find answers they need by using the map viewers rather than having him find the information.

Anubhav Bagley said that staff has endeavored to make these map viewers as simple to use as possible, but if any members have questions or would like staff to set up a demonstration or workshop, staff would be happy to do that. He then asked the members to give staff ideas for what other kinds of viewers and information would they would be interested in seeing.

Thomas Ritz asked what boundaries are included in the map viewers. Mr. Bagley responded that the map viewers include incorporated places, but, in order to keep the viewers as simples as

possible, they do not include census-designated places. He also said that the staff has municipal planning area (MPA) boundaries for projection data, but have not included any projection data in the map viewers yet. Mr. Bridwell added that there is a base map that provides contextual information, and that includes MPA boundaries, jurisdictional boundaries, and transportation elements, and that the information that dynamically changes is at the tract level. Mr. Bagley also added that he envisions being able to put population projections, draft and final, on viewers like these to make it easier for members to review.

Chair Bacon said that he can see some application of land use designations in viewers like this. He also said that he agrees with the comment that staff has been responsive to the feedback POPTAC gave staff to make these map viewers as user-friendly as possible, and thanked staff for those efforts. He also said that he sees these map viewers at a point now that they have applicability beyond just POPTAC.

#### 9. Light Rail Economic Impact Study (EIS)

Jami Garrison introduced Aaron Golub, Senior Scientist at the Global Institute of Sustainability at Arizona State University (ASU). She said that in 2009, MAG contracted with ASU to do a light rail economic impact study (EIS) to document land use and property value impacts along the light rail. Mr. Golub explained that the goal of the study was to understand the impacts of the light rail on real estate markets during different phases of the light rail. He said that the group used statistical regression to tease out the effects of the light rail itself. The findings were that there were significant price impacts of the light rail on the four markets examined: single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial, and vacant properties. There were also impacts from being close to the light rail and there were impacts throughout out planning process, construction, and operation of the light rail.

Mr. Golub said that the group used a hedonic regression method, which allowed them to control for different characteristics of the properties and tease out what the specific effects of being close to the light rail had. He said the group used a number of different datasets, but the core of the data was the actual sales prices of the properties. He said the group looked at five time periods: prior to the announcement that the alignment would be looked at (pre-1999); the NEPA review period (1999-2003); design period (2003-2005); construction (2005-2008); and after the light rail was open (since December 2008). Additionally, the group looked at the proximity to the rail line itself, stops along the light rail, and other locational variables.

Mr. Golub said that, compared to the pre-announcement period, the group saw a clear accrual of value in each of the subsequent phases. He said they also saw a correlation of distance from the light rail, with properties closer to the light rail having higher values. He then showed graphs demonstrating the value of the properties by distance from the light rail.

Scott Bridwell asked if the results vary by city, if the distance impact was different among the three cities (Phoenix, Mesa, and Tempe). Mr. Golub responded that the group did not specifically examine that, but that they did use different market price indexes for the different cities.

Max Enterline asked Mr. Golub to explain the vacant property graph further. Mr. Golub explained that vacant properties lost value after the completion of the light rail, but that this time period coincided with the economic recession. Mr. Golub also confirmed that there was a nuisance for the commercial properties during construction near the arterial streets.

Chair Bacon commented that he is struck by the notion of what many people in this market think is too far to walk to the light rail, especially compared to other markets like San Francisco or Seattle, and that it is reflected in the data.

10. Regional Updates

Chair Bacon said that Paradise Valley will be doing its general plan update after coming back from vacation in the fall, and expects to have the updated general plan on the ballot in the spring. Eddie Lamperez said that is the same for Scottsdale.

11. Next Meeting of the MAG POPTAC

Chair Bacon said that the next meeting of the MAG POPTAC is scheduled for Tuesday, July 26, 2011 at 10:00 am. The meeting adjourned at 11:03 am.