

September 20, 2011

TO: Members of the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley, Chair

SUBJECT: TRANSMITTAL OF MEETING NOTICE AND TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, September 27, 2011 - 10:00 a.m.
MAG Office, Second Floor, Chaparral Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee (POPTAC) will be held at the time and place noted above.

Members of the POPTAC may attend either in person or by telephone conference. If you are attending via audioconference please contact Steve Gross at (602) 254-6300 at least one day prior to the meeting.

Visitor parking is available in the surface parking lot adjacent to the building. Refer to the enclosed map.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Scott Wilken at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please be advised that under procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership or 14 people for the MAG POPTAC. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction with Scott Wilken at (602) 254-6300.

TENTATIVE AGENDA
MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee
September 27, 2011

1. Call to Order

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the MAG POPTAC on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public will be requested to limit their comments to three minutes. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for this agenda item, unless the Chair of the POPTAC provides for an exception to this limit. Those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of June 28, 2011

4. Census Update

a. Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program

The Census Bureau established the 2010 Census Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program by which State, local and Tribal area elected officials may challenge their jurisdiction's 2010 Census counts. MAG Staff will give an update the on CQR program. The City of Chandler will briefly describe their experience with the CQR program.

2. For information.

3. For information, discussion and approval of the minutes of June 28, 2011.

4.

a. For information and discussion.

b. Census 2010 Data

This month the Census Bureau begins releasing American Community Survey (ACS) estimates that are benched to the 2010 Census counts. An overview of upcoming Census product releases will be provided. See Attachment One.

c. Delineation of 2010 Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs)

Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs) are tabulation areas for Census 2010 and American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data. PUMS contains individual records of characteristics for a sample of persons and households. The Census Bureau has offered State Data Centers an opportunity to delineate or coordinate the delineation of new PUMA boundaries. MAG and its member agencies will be responsible for the delineation boundaries in Maricopa County. These boundaries must be submitted to the State Data Center by the end of November. Information on the PUMA delineation criteria and process will be provided.

5. State Demographer's Office Update

The Council of Technical Solutions, created by Executive Order 2009-1 and staffed by the State Demographer's Office, meets every month to discuss technical issues as related to population data, methods and processes for the State of Arizona. An update on current activities will be provided.

b. For information and discussion.

c. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. Intercensal Estimates: 2000-2010

With the availability of Census 2010 data, MAG staff has been working with the State Demographers Office to develop an intercensal estimates series from 2000 to 2010. A number of data sets including births, deaths, residential completions, and vacancy rates from Phoenix Metropolitan Housing Study were explored by MAG staff. Draft numbers and methodology will be discussed.

7. Data Collection and Review

Ongoing data collection efforts include land use information such as General Plan amendments and development projects. The land use data collected are used in preparing socioeconomic projections and conducting regional analysis. A schedule for the collection of data for the next six months is included in Attachment Two. A review of MAG's Draft Existing Land Use database will be undertaken in October. More information will be provided to POPTAC members on the developments review at the next meeting. A status report will be provided.

8. Sustainable Transportation – Land Use Integration Study

MAG Staff will provide an update on the Sustainable Transportation Land Use Integration Study (ST-LUIS). The presentation will review methodology used to develop an 8 million population base scenario. Additionally, MAG Staff will discuss the steps of the study including the 'base-case' transportation network, three alternative transportation/land use scenarios, and 'place types.'

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

9. Brookings Metropolitan Business Planning Initiative Update

On May 25, 2011, the MAG Regional Council authorized submitting a proposal to Brookings for MAG to be considered to participate in the Brookings Metropolitan Business Planning Initiative. Brookings Institution announced the selection of the Phoenix region for the Metropolitan Business Planning Initiative. The official launch of the project is anticipated in October 2011. Brookings will work with MAG and its partners on an innovative, bottom-up approach to regional economic development. The result will be a comprehensive business plan that includes an overview of the region's economy, one or more lead initiatives, a prospectus, and a policy memorandum to align the plan with federal priorities and opportunities. MAG Staff will provide an update on the Metropolitan Business Planning Initiative.

10. MAG Member Agency Meetings

MAG IS Staff is currently meeting with member agencies to demonstrate the new interactive GIS mapping and reporting websites, as well as to discuss land use planning efforts and regional land use planning issues. MAG Staff will give an update on recent and upcoming meetings.

11. Chair and Vice Chair Term Appointments

On July 22, 2009, the MAG Regional Council approved the MAG Committee Operating Policies and Procedures. The document has clarified, and in some cases, modified, former MAG committee procedures. The policies and procedures note that Chairs and Vice Chairs of technical and policy committees, with the exception of the Transportation Policy Committee, will be appointed by the MAG Executive Committee and are eligible for

9. For information and discussion.

10. For information and discussion.

11. For information and discussion.

one year terms, with possible reappointment to serve up to one additional term by consent of the committee.

According to the MAG Committee Operating Policies and Procedures, the current vice chair will ascend to the chair. Those members interested in the vice chair position will submit letters of interest to the MAG Regional Council Chair. At their November 14, 2011 meeting, the MAG Executive Committee will appoint a new vice chair for the MAG POPTAC. Please refer to Attachment Three.

12. Regional Updates

MAG POPTAC members and MAG staff will have the opportunity to provide an update on development within their jurisdiction, amendments to general plans and any special projects.

13. Next Meeting of MAG POPTAC

The next meeting of the MAG POPTAC is scheduled for Tuesday, October 25, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.

12. For information and discussion.

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-Tracy Clark, ADOT
Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Vice Chair
*Bryant Powell, Apache Junction
A-Andrea Marquez, Buckeye
*DJ Stapley, Carefree
A-Luke Kautzman for Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek
*David de la Torre, Chandler
A-Mark Smith, El Mirage
*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
*Ed Boik, Peoria
Chris DePerro, Phoenix
*Dave Williams, Queen Creek
*Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian
Community
Eddie Lamperez, Scottsdale
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
Jason Howard, MAG
Jami Garrison, MAG
Anubhav Bagley, MAG

Scott Wilken, MAG
Peter Burnett, MAG
Max Enterline, Phoenix
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. 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.

Upcoming Product Releases from the U.S. Census Bureau

Product Type	Planned Release	Data Products	Lowest Level Geography
ACS	Sept. 22, 2011	1-Year Data Release on American FactFinder: Data Profiles Comparison Profiles Selected Population Profiles Ranking Tables Subject Tables Detailed Tables Geographic Comparison Tables 1-Year Summary File	Places, County Subdivisions Geographies of 65,000+ population Exception: Ranking Tables the lowest level is States
ACS	October, 2011	3-Year Data Release on American FactFinder: Data Profiles Selected Population Profiles Subject Tables Detailed Tables Geographic Comparison Tables 3-Year Summary File	Places, Minor Civil Divisions Geographies of 20,000+ population
ACS	December, 2011	5-Year Data Release on American FactFinder: Data Profiles Subject Tables Detailed Tables Geographic Comparison Tables 5-Year Summary File	Census Tracts Exceptions: Geographic Comparison Tables the lowest level is Places/County Subdivisions Census Block Groups
Census 2010	Dec 2011 to April 2012	Summary File 2 (SF 2) Population and housing characteristics iterated for many detailed race and hispanic or Latino categories, and American Indian and Alaska Native tribes single year of age data 0 to 99, (grouped over 100)	Census Tracts

Prepared September 20, 2011

DRAFT		
MAG POPTAC Timeline		
From September 2011 to March 2012		
MAG Due Date	Member Agency Due Date	Activity
	Submit when the latest Plan or update is complete.	Submit General Plans for 60 day review.
	Submit when Amendment is ready for review.	Submit Major General Plan Amendments for 60 day review.
Ongoing	Ongoing	Submit Minor General Plan Amendments, Area Plans and Development Master Plans/Community Master Plans and Amendments.
Ongoing	Ongoing	Submit Planned Area Developments/Planned Community Developments/Planned Residential Developments/Unit Planned Development/Final Plats and Reports.
Ongoing	Ongoing	Submit copy of C404 Form to MAG.
Ongoing	Ongoing	Submit Annexations to MAG as they occur.
	October, 2011	Submit Q3 residential completions to MAG.
October, 2011	November, 2011	Review of MAG 2011 Employer Database.
October, 2011	November, 2011	Review 2010 Existing Land Use database.
November/December, 2011		Review of County and Sub-county 2011 population updates dependent upon State Demographer's Office schedule.
January - February, 2012		Review MAG point databases including hotel/motels, major group quarters, RV parks/Mobile homes, and apartments.
January, 2012		Submit Q4 residential completions to MAG.



302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6430

September 20, 2011

TO: Members of the MAG POPTAC

FROM: Scott Wilken, Regional Planner III

SUBJECT: CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR APPOINTMENTS ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2011

On July 22, 2009, the MAG Regional Council approved the MAG Committee Operating Policies and Procedures. Officer positions for technical committees have one-year terms, with possible reappointment to serve up to one additional term, by consent of the respective committee. The chair and vice chair appointments of the POPTAC are due to expire on December 31, 2011.

According to the policies and procedures, the vice chair will ascend to the chair position and a new vice chair will be appointed by the Regional Council Executive Committee. Those interested in the vice chair position will be required to submit a letter of interest to the Regional Council Chair. The letters of interest are requested to be submitted by Tuesday, November 1, 2011 to Mayor Hugh Hallman, MAG Chair, at the MAG Office located at 302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 300, Phoenix, Arizona 85003. The appointments will be made at the November 14, 2011 Executive Committee meeting.

If you have any question, please contact Scott Wilken at the MAG Office at (602) 254-6300 or swilken@azmag.gov.

cc: MAG Management Committee
MAG Intergovernmental Representatives