

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 30, 2012  
MAG Offices, Chaparral Room  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Ave, Phoenix

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Charlie McClendon, Avondale  
A-Tracy Clark, ADOT  
\*Brad Steinke for Bryant Powell, Apache Junction  
A-Andrea Marquez, Buckeye  
\*DJ Stapley, Carefree  
A-Ian Cordwell for Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek  
A-David de la Torre, Chandler  
A-Mark Smith, El Mirage  
A-Ken Valverde, Fountain Hills  
\*Rick Buss, Gila Bend  
Patrick Banger, Gilbert  
Thomas Ritz, Glendale  
A-Katie Wilken, Goodyear  
\*Gino Turrubiarres, Guadalupe

\*Sonny Culbreth, Litchfield Park  
A-John Verdugo for Matt Holm, Maricopa County  
Wahid Alam, Mesa  
\*Molly Hood, Paradise Valley  
A-Ed Boik, Peoria  
Chris DePerro, Phoenix  
Dave Williams, Queen Creek  
\*Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian  
Community  
A-Adam Yaron, Scottsdale  
\*Lloyd Abrams, Surprise  
A-Arlene Palisoc for Lisa Collins, Tempe  
Stuart Boggs for Ratna Korepella, Valley Metro  
\*Diane Cordova, Youngtown

*\* Not in attendance*

*A - Participated via audioconference*

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Eric Morgan, Avondale  
Max Enterline, Phoenix  
Mohammed Al-Sabbry, ADWR  
David Johnson, Buckeye  
Chip Young, AZ Game and Fish Dept  
Scott Sprague, AZ Game and Fish Dept  
Kelly Wolff-Krauter, AZ Game and Fish Dept  
Ray Schweinsburg, AZ Game and Fish Dept  
Tim Cole, Phoenix

Scott Wilken, MAG  
Steve Gross, MAG  
Jami Garrison, MAG  
Anubhav Bagley, MAG  
Scott Bridwell, MAG  
Jason Howard, MAG  
Jesse Ayers, MAG  
Lora Mwaniki-Lyman, MAG  
Brandee Mead, MAG

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:12 am by Chair Charlie McClendon.

2. Call to the Audience

3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes of August 28, 2012

Dave Williams made a motion to approve the August 28, 2012 minutes as written. Chris DePerro seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Draft July 1, 2012 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates and Methodology

Scott Bridwell presented the draft July 1, 2012 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates and Methodology. He said a two-stage methodology was applied. First, he said, the State Demographer's Office (SDO) performs a county estimate using the composite method. He said the composite method uses a series of indicators that map to certain age cohorts: births and deaths for 0-4, school enrollment for 5-17, driver's licenses for 18-64, and Social Security and Medicare enrollment for 65 and up. He said from there, MAG staff distributes the county-level estimates to the sub-county jurisdictions using the housing unit method (HUM), which uses housing units, changes in housing units, group quarters, and annexations. He outlined changes in the HUM methodology from the previous year and highlighted changes in counts for the various cohorts used by the SDO for the composite method. He showed the changes in distressed properties from the previous year. He said MAG staff is exploring ways to improve the methodology, including providing better updates to the occupancy rates over time rather than using the previous census rates.

Patrick Banger said that the POPTAC Ad Hoc subcommittee forwarded a recommendation of approval of the draft July 1, 2012, Maricopa County and MAG Municipality Residential Population Update, provided the Maricopa County control total is within one percent of the final control total. Wahid Alam seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

5. MAG Socioeconomic Projections

5a. Maricopa County Resident Population and Employment Projections

Anubhav Bagley discussed the Maricopa County Resident Population and Employment Projections. He said the last set of projections was done in 2007. He said that the State Demographer's Office (SDO) has produced the county-level population control totals, which are required to be used for all long-range state and federal planning purposes, such as transportation modeling and air quality modeling. He discussed the county's historical population growth, saying that the county had a population of about 3.8 million in 2010. He said the SDO projects the county to have a population of about 4.5 million in 2020, 5.3 million in 2030, 6.2 million in 2040, and 6.9 million in 2050. He said that Maricopa County makes up about 60% of the population of the state, and, until the decade of 2000-2010 grew at a faster rate than the state. He said that in the last decade, Maricopa County grew at about the same rate as the state, and is projected to continue that trend. He said that the SDO uses a cohort survival model, adding in migration factors exogenously. He said that the SDO does not produce long-range employment projections, which are required for the MAG models. He said staff is using employment projections created from a combination of projections from Moody's economy.com and the University of Arizona. He said the employment numbers were broken down into Covered, Military and Uncovered employment. He said the employment projections had 1.7 million jobs in 2010 and about 3.1 million in 2040. He then showed the population and employment control totals through 2040 for Maricopa County and for the entire metropolitan area, which includes Pinal County.

Patrick Banger said that the POPTAC Ad Hoc subcommittee recommended approval of the draft ADOA 2010 to 2040 population projections for Maricopa County and the draft 2010 to 2040 employment projections based on a revised methodology provided the Maricopa County control total is within three percent of the final control total. Thomas Ritz seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

#### 5b. Preparation of MAG Socioeconomic Projections

Anubhav Bagley talked about the preparations for the upcoming MAG Socioeconomic Projections series. He said the first draft of base and build-out projections were reviewed with member agencies in March 2012. He said that when the final control totals are available, the first draft of the projections will be released for review, followed by a second draft then final projections for approval by MAG Regional Council.

#### 6. Census Update

Jami Garrison gave a census update. She said that the Census Bureau has released the one-year and three-year American Community Survey estimates. She said the one-year estimates are for places with a population of 65,000 or more and the three-year estimates are for places with a population of 20,000 or more. She said the five-year estimates are scheduled for release on December 6. She said there are new tables in the one-year and three-year, including worker population by work place geography. She said that the 2011 detailed tables from the American Housing Survey were recently released for the national, as well. She said that metro-level data will be released in the near future. Wahid Alam asked if the household survey data will be available at the city level. Jami Garrison said that the data is only at the national level, and the next release will be at the metro level.

#### 7. 2015 Mid-Decade Census Options

Jami Garrison discussed options for a mid-decade census. She said that some analysis needs to be done to decide if a mid-decade census in 2015 is needed. She said that state law specifies that state-shared revenue is distributed based on population counted at the most recent decennial census or special census. She said in the past state law was amended to allow special options for state-shared revenue, which became the use of the 2005 special census survey.

Patrick Banger asked if a municipality commissions a special census of their own, could they see an increase in state-shared revenue. Jami Garrison said that they could. Patrick Banger asked if that were the case, could other municipalities that did not commission a special census see a slight reduction in state-shared revenue. Anubhav Bagley said that that could potentially be the situation. He said that smaller communities typically see a faster growth rate than larger communities. Patrick Banger asked if there had been discussion of doing something at a county level. Anubhav Bagley said that in 1985 and 1995 full censuses were conducted, and in 2005 a survey was done. He said that the cost in 2005 was around \$8 million. He said a full census in 2015 would cost around \$70 million. He said a key question is if the region is growing at a much faster rate than the state, which could affect regional state-shared revenue. He said the other question is which communities within the region would get adjusted themselves.

Chris DePerro asked how the costs were paid in past special censuses. Anubhav Bagley said in 2005 the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) paid half of the cost and the rest was paid by member dues. Charlie McClendon said that in 2005 there was a debate on if the proportional cost would be based on the population before the survey or after. He said that in 1995 it made more

sense for the region to do a full census because communities in Maricopa County would get more in increased funds than the census cost.

Jami Garrison compared growth of Maricopa County to the growth of the entire state, both historically and future projections. Anubhav Bagley pointed out that for the first time the Maricopa County growth rate is now lower than the state growth rate. He said the region may lose state-shared revenue if a new count were done today. He said that in 2015 it might be different, however. Jami Garrison said that between the 2010 census and the July 1, 2012 population estimate the county's growth rate was under 1% annually, and more than half of the jurisdictions in the county had a growth rate lower than that. She said that MAG staff has done some analysis to help member agencies decide if a 2015 census is needed or desired, and will do more if requested.

Chris DePerro asked how and by whom the decision would be made. Charlie McClendon said it would go to MAG Management Committee and MAG Regional Council for an ultimate decision. He asked when the decision has to be made. Anubhav Bagley said that the decision needs to be made within 6 months to a year. Charlie McClendon said that within the next year there won't be a big shift in population, and that he doubts a special census would pay for itself. Chris DePerro asked for clarification on the cost. Jami Garrison said that a full count would cost between \$60 million \$70 million. She said that in the past FHWA paid half the cost, but it is not known at this time if they would pay for half the cost again. Chris DePerro said that a rough estimate, with FHWA paying for half, would have Phoenix paying around \$11 million, and he said he doesn't think the city would be interested in spending that much on a census count. Jami Garrison said that those figures are for a full count, while a survey would be significantly less.

Anubhav Bagley said that the first question that needs to be answered is if it makes sense regionally to do a special census. He said there are options, including full census, census survey, or enhancing the estimates made by the SDO and using those. Charlie McClendon said that based on the recent growth rates for more than half of the county, it would be politically unlikely that those communities would vote to spend their money to lose state-shared revenue. Wahid Alam said that historically the state changed dramatically between decennial censuses, and the lack of updated data caused problems. He said that now the American Community Survey is released every year and provides updated data, so a special census might not be as important as it used to be. Thomas Ritz suggested that if this state statute needs to be adjusted long term, it might be something that the League of Arizona Cities and Towns should take on. Anubhav Bagley said that the distribution of state-shared revenue is in the state constitution, and was amended specifically for each mid-decade special census in the past. He said that MAG will be talking to the League and other councils of government to see if something should be done on a more long-term basis. Charlie McClendon said that it would still be difficult politically to get support to make a change to the law.

Anubhav Bagley said that one reason to do a special survey is to get a good up-to-date dataset, but that the amount of money involved doesn't seem worth it just for data. He said that the 2005 survey produced three numbers for each jurisdiction: population, households, and housing units, and that the same data can be taken from the annual ACS now. He said that from a monetary and regional perspective, at this time it would not make sense. Chris DePerro said that, even if there was a potential for a positive financial long-term result, most cities have cut so much budget, they may not be able to pay for a special census. Anubhav Bagley said that this is the question that will be discussed. He asked for any other ideas for studies or analysis that MAG staff should do to help with this issue.

Katie Wilken said that this might be worth discussing with the League because the 2010 vacancy rates were extremely high and need to be updated, and asked if there are other methods that could be used to update them. Anubhav Bagley said that this might be possible with improvements at the state and county levels to the estimates methodology.

Max Enterline asked if the ACS data can be aggregated to the county level. Anubhav Bagley said that there is too much variability in the ACS over time to do that. He said that trends could be drawn out from ACS, however.

Charlie McClendon said that he thinks it would be difficult to see the League leading a change in state law when over half of its members would be financially damaged. Chris DePerro said it might make sense to see what the League hears from its members before deciding to pursue any kind of change.

Thomas Ritz pointed out that the ACS data explicitly warns against using the data as population totals or estimates. He said that it might be possible to get vacancy rates from the data, but as you look at smaller samples, the margin of error gets larger. Charlie McClendon said that he agrees with staff that improving vacancy rates would be the biggest improvement.

#### 8. 2013 MAG Homeless Street Count Methodology

Brande Mead gave an update on the 2013 MAG Homeless Street Count methodology. She said that she staffs the MAG Continuum of Care Committee, and one of their responsibilities is to submit an application on behalf of the region to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for homeless assistance funding. She said that one of the requirements for the HUD funding is to conduct a point-in-time (PIT) count of homeless individuals and families, both sheltered and unsheltered. She said the unsheltered count is the street count, which is currently conducted annually. She said the PIT street count is required to be conducted during the last 10 days of January. She said the data collected is used to measure benchmarks and goals toward ending homelessness across the region. She said in the past, the count was done as a visual count, with volunteers using tally sheets to count the number of homeless people they see on the street. She said that last year the requirements changed to include finding out if the homeless people were military veterans, which meant that a visual count was no longer viable. She said there was a 36% decrease in the street count in 2011, which may have been due to the change in methodology. She said that over the last six months the committee created a workgroup to reexamine the methodology to produce a more accurate count. She said that in the past many cities in the region conducted their street count differently, so the workgroup examined best practices from around the county. She said the City of Phoenix method is a best practice and is being used across the country, as well. She said that the workgroup, as well as a study by Arizona State University, recommended adopting a universal count method that mirrors the methodology used by Phoenix. She said that the group recommended allowing small municipalities that have small homeless populations to opt out of the Phoenix methodology and conduct their own count.

Tim Cole described the City of Phoenix methodology. He said the city uses a statistically valid sampling. He said the city has to report for an area of about 540 square miles. He said there is an area of about 48 square miles that the city will always count, because they know there are homeless individuals in those areas. He said those areas are considered high density areas, defined as a square mile with at least 5 homeless individuals. He said those areas are counted 100%. He said there are another 140 square miles considered low density, which have between 0 and 4 homeless individuals. He said a randomizer is used to determine which of those areas will be counted. He said that HUD now requires the count to be conducted between the hours of 3am

and 7am. He said that teams of three will go out and conduct surveys of the homeless individuals they find in their areas. He said the HUD requirements necessitate about 20 questions on the survey.

Dave Williams asked about the first question on the survey, which asks if the individual is sleeping in a shelter or is sleeping unsheltered. He said that the majority of the homeless population in Queen Creek is sleeping in tool sheds, and asked if that would be considered sheltered or unsheltered. He said the last count showed zero homeless in Queen Creek, but that the number is actually higher than that. Tim Cole advised talking to the coordinator for Queen Creek to make sure that situation is covered by their count, regardless of the method the town uses.

Wahid Alam asked what the number is for the county. Brande Mead said that the 2011 count had 1,749 individuals on the streets, and roughly 5,000 in emergency and transitional shelters. Wahid Alam said that it seems unreasonable to wake up so many homeless individuals and have them respond to a survey in the middle of the night. Tim Cole said that there was a program called H3 that did a similar late night/early morning count in various areas and ran into no problems and got very good information. He said that the city does a really good job of getting the word out to the homeless community about the count to help get higher participation. Patrick Banger said that it's more about human dignity, and that waking someone up for this doesn't seem like the best idea. He asked how many times this method has been done before. Tim Cole said that this will be the first year in this area, but that the City of Los Angeles has been doing this for a number of years.

Chris DePerro asked what HUD does with the data. Brande Mead said that it is used to allocate federal funding, and it is used as part of the federal strategic plan to end homelessness. Chris DePerro asked how the federal funds are awarded. Brande Mead said that funds are awarded regionally, but the amount of money is not based on the number of people counted.

Wahid Alam said that the Census Bureau does a homeless count, and asked how that interacts with the PIT. Brande Mead said one piece of data that she is interested in getting from the Census Bureau is the number of families that have lost their housing and are living with other families in traditional housing. She said that the committee has not been collecting that information, but has heard that those numbers are growing.

Katie Wilken asked if shelter count data gets counted as group quarters data. She said that many transitional shelters are included in group quarters. Brande Mead said she could provide that data to MAG staff. She said that emergency shelters are for up to 100 days, and transitional shelters are for up to 2 years. Anubhav Bagley said that not all transitional shelters would be included, that it is only the institutional shelters that would be group quarters.

#### 9. Data Collection, Review, and Presentation

Charlie McClendon said that in the interest of time, the committee would skip over Item 9, and directed members to Attachment 8 for information on that item.

#### 10. Arizona Game and Fish Department Wildlife Linkages Database

Kelly Wolff-Krauter gave a presentation on the Arizona Game and Fish Department's (AGFD) Wildlife Linkages Database. She said that fish and wildlife resources generate about \$515 million a year in Arizona. She outlined the importance of habitat connectivity and some of the ways connectivity can be disrupted.

Scott Sprague talked about some of the projects AGFD has done using the Wildlife Linkages Database. He discussed a 17 mile stretch of State Route 260 east of Payson that will include bridges and wildlife underpasses to maintain habitat connectivity in that area, as well as fencing to funnel the animals to the designated crossings. He said improvements already completed have reduced the number of elk-vehicle collisions. He also talked about the addition of three bighorn sheep crossings at the realigned US Highway 93 near the Hoover Dam. He gave an example of some data acquired by tracking mountain lions north of Tucson to see where their primary habitats are and where they go to connect the habitats. He showed pictures of new fencing that will help guide desert tortoises between habitats and keep them off of State Route 87.

Kelly Wolff-Krauter talked about the approach AGFD is taking with the linkages assessment and database, which started in 2002. She said the first product that was released was Arizona's Wildlife Linkages Assessment, which was released in 2006. She said this was a broad, state-wide assessment. She said the next product was the County Wildlife Corridor Assessments, which looked at a finer scale than the state-wide effort. She said from there, more detailed, local assessments and corridor designs are being produced. She then gave details of the Maricopa County assessment. She then talked about the evolution of a local linkage, using as an example a project near the Vulture and White Tanks Mountains. She talked about the need to work with local jurisdictions and developers at an early stage to incorporate wildlife corridors into long-range plans and development plans when necessary.

#### 11. Regional Updates

There were no regional updates.

#### 12. Next Meeting of MAG POPTAC

Chair Charlie McClendon said that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 22, 2013 at 10:00 am. Scott Wilken announced that there will be a luncheon for POPTAC members following the January meeting. Anubhav Bagley announced that Steve Gross will be retiring from MAG as of January 4<sup>th</sup>, and this will be his last POPTAC meeting. The meeting adjourned at 11:56 am.