

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 22, 2011
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Ave, Phoenix

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

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

* Not in attendance

A - Participated via audioconference

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Sam Andrea, Chandler	Angela Gotto, CAAG
Eric Morgan, Avondale	Peter Burnett, MAG
Jason Howard, MAG	Don Thorstenson, MAG
Jami Garrison, MAG	Nathan Pryor, MAG
Jason Howard, MAG	Kelly Taft, MAG
Anubhav Bagley, MAG	Max Enterline, Phoenix
Scott Bridwell, MAG	Jesse Ayers, MAG

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:07am by the Chair, Jim Bacon.

2. Call to the Audience

Anubhav Bagley (MAG) announced that Heidi Pahl-Bickart, a longtime MAG employee who staffed the POPTAC has resigned from MAG in order to spend more time with her infant daughter. He added praise for her commitment to the POPTAC and MAG stating that she will be missed.

There were no other comments from the audience.

3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes of January 25, 2011

Wahid Alam moved, Dave Williams seconded and it was unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of January 25, 2011.

4. Census Update

A) Census 2010 Results

Jami Garrison provided an overview of the recently released Census 2010 numbers for Maricopa County. She reported that the Census Bureau released the first Census 2010 local-level population and housing counts for Arizona on March 10, 2011. According to the 2010 Census, Maricopa County had a 24.2% growth since Census 2000 with an April 1, 2010 population of 3,817,117. Jami gave a brief presentation showing maps and charts of the distribution of the population across the region. She also provided a brief overview of the vacancy rate data as reported in the recently released Census 2010 data. Jami reported that MAG has several Census 2010 data reports available on the MAG Census website at www.magcensus.com and will be adding additional reports there as they become available.

Anubhav Bagley asked the Committee for any suggestions for future reports, graphs or charts using the Census data. Thomas Ritz said that given the difficulties with the Census Bureau's FactFinder2 website and the interest by members for Census block-level housing data, if MAG could provide guidance or assistance with this it would be a great help. Anubhav Bagley responded that MAG has a new online mapping application and demographic viewer that will be demonstrated later in the meeting under item number 7.

Charlie McClendon asked about how to explain information on race and ethnic origin to news reporters. He indicated that for Avondale there was a high percentage of population who considered themselves Hispanic but did not know what to put for the race question as they considered Hispanic/Latino for their race so they marked "other" as their race. Jami Garrison explained that the data is available to tabulate Hispanic/Latino origin as a component of race. Anubhav Bagley said that the way the questions are asked on the Census Questionnaire allows the Census Bureau to tabulate the data this way and they do not make any assumptions on race or ethnicity, but rather it is a full reporting of the tabulated results. He said that MAG has prepared detailed reports on this that are available on the MAGcensus.com website and directed the members to this resource.

Wahid Alam asked for any kind of assistance that MAG could provide on creating customized boundary tabulations would be extremely helpful. He said there is always a demand for these custom boundaries such as the population within five miles of a local retailer. Anubhav Bagley responded that this will be addressed in item number 7 with the Demographic Data Viewer demonstration.

B) Census Data Timeline

Jami Garrison reported on the upcoming 2010 Census data products. She explained that the next products to be released will be the National summary files which includes the American Indian areas, the demographic profiles and the Summary File 1. She said that the demographic profiles are nice reporting tools that provide a summary of selected population and housing characteristics

by place. Jami said that the next major data release will be the Summary File 1 product which provides additional detailed data, such as detailed age and race characteristics, down the Census Block level. The Summary file 1 data will be released on a State by State flow bases from June 2011 to August 2011.

C) 2010 Census Data Review Activities

Peter Burnett reported on the Census Bureau's Count Question Resolution (CQR) program and how MAG can assist member agencies with this program. He explained that the CQR program is the process by which to challenge the Census Housing and Group Quarters counts. He said that it will be important to submit the proper documentation and MAG will assist with this if needed. Peter explained that the timeline for the CQR program begins in June 2011 and continues through June 2013. It is important to note that the incorporated place boundaries are based on the boundaries effective as of January 1, 2010 while the population and housing unit counts are as of April 1, 2010.

Peter Burnett said that there are three (3) types of challenges that will be accepted as part of the CQR program: Boundary Challenges, Geocoding Challenges and Coverage Challenges. He then explained each type:

- 1) Boundary challenges: to correct inaccurate reporting or recording of boundaries in effect on or before January 1, 2010
- 2) Geocoding challenges: to correct the placement of living quarters and associated population within governmental unit boundaries and 2010 Census blocks
- 3) Coverage challenges: to add or delete specific living quarters and people associated with them, identified during the census process, but erroneously included as duplicates or excluded due to processing errors

Peter stated that MAG will be conducting data analysis to assist the member agencies with reviewing their Census 2010 data. MAG staff will aggregate data such as residential completions, apartments, mobile home parks, RV parks and major group quarters into Census 2010 geography and compare it to the Census counts to look for any discrepancies. Staff will also use data from the County Assessor's parcel database as well as aerial imagery to further review the data. Staff will work with member agencies on any discrepancies found.

Jason Howard reported on a high-level analysis that MAG staff performed and referred members to agenda packet attachment two entitled "MAG Housing Unit Estimates based on the 2000 Census and Residential Completions Compared to Census 2010 Results." He explained that the document serves as a high-level analysis to compare the expected housing unit counts based on residential completion and demolition documents against the reported actual Census 2010 housing unit count. Jason explained the various data items in the document and commented that some of the differences may be attributed to missing demolition reports. Additionally information on Group Quarters will help to clarify some of the differences. The information on group quarters will be available this summer when the Census Bureau releases the 2010 Census Summary File 1 (SF1). He reminded the members that the report is an initial look at the data and additional data analysis will help to determine whether or not a member agency wishes to submit a challenge under the CQR program.

Jason Howard asked if member agencies had any comments or suggestions for further analysis to let him know.

Anubhav Bagley said that the report showed two specific member agencies where more analysis would need to be done - Mesa and Paradise Valley. He indicated that the differences could be from a number of factors including missing demolitions and apartment data. Anubhav said that the good thing is that there is enough time to look into these types of data concerns as the CQR program does not officially begin until June.

Katie Wilken, City of Goodyear, asked about the Census Bureau's methodology for determining a housing unit. She asked if it had to have a separate address and gave an example of a property with a main housing unit with a casita, or separate living quarters, in the back of the property.

Anubhav Bagley responded and said that MAG staff will contact the Census Bureau to get a response to this question and report back to the POPTAC.

Katie Wilken added that she would also like clarification on how the Census Bureau treats a model home. In the City of Goodyear, for example, completion data is not provided to MAG until the model home is closed out, reinspected and ready for sale/occupancy. This could add to the vacant unit numbers.

Peter Burnett added thanks to the member agencies for providing their residential completion and demolition data which has helped to improve our data. He also specified that it is important to review the quarterly email that he sends out with the total number of units recorded in the MAG residential completion database.

Anubhav Bagley added that for anyone who is on audio and due to the current audio system issues, if they have questions, to email or call Jami Garrison or anyone of the MAG Information Services staff with your question or concern.

Eddie Lamperez, City of Scottsdale, asked what can be done with the data that is out right now from the Census. In other words, until more detailed data is out this summer from the SF1, how much can be done with what is available now?

Anubhav Bagley said that the housing unit data is available by block. Although it is not split out by type, total housing units along with the number of vacant and occupied units provides a good place to start reviewing the data. He said that other databases that MAG has, such as the residential completions and assessor parcel data, along with databases that member agencies may have at their disposal, such as utility connections, provide a good starting point for analysis.

D) Census Workshop

Jami Garrison reported that the Census Bureau partnered with MAG and held a Census Data Workshop on February 22, 2011. The workshop was very successful with approximately 135 people in attendance. A follow-up hands-on computer lab will be conducted by the Census Bureau on Wednesday, April 6, 2011 at the Chicanos Por La Causa computer lab. There is a flyer in the agenda packet. Jami advised anyone wanting to attend the workshop to register now as the morning session has already filled and an afternoon session has been added which is half-full already.

5. July 1, 2010 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates and Methodology

Anubhav Bagley reported that the POPTAC Ad Hoc committee had discussed the July 1, 2010 estimates and referred members to attachment four in the agenda packet. He summarized the

update saying that the Arizona Department of Commerce developed the estimates in coordination with the Council for Technical Solutions (CTS), of which MAG is a member. The July 1, 2010 estimates are place holder estimates for the 2010 numbers. Anubhav said that the methodology used was to take the Census 2010 numbers for April 1, 2010 then add in births for the time from April 1, 2010 to June 30, 2010 and subtract out deaths for the same time period. So the methodology assumes there is zero net migration or no people moving in or out of the State, counties and places. For Maricopa county that is an increase of 7,026 and for the entire state of Arizona the population increase is 9,741. He reported that MAG staff was comfortable with this methodology as no other detailed datasets on migration are available. The methodology that MAG staff and the Ad Hoc subcommittee are not comfortable with is the way the 7,026 increase for the county is distributed to the place level. The method uses the ratio of the births and deaths as it was in 2009 for one city to the county and holds that ratio constant. MAG staff recommended to CTS that this number be a place holder number only for 2010 and given to the Economic Estimates Commissions. New data for the births and deaths by city of residence will be available in May.

Thomas Ritz asked if MAG staff still recommends using the persons per household and vacancy rate data from 2005 for estimating population, although the 2010 vacancy rate is available, the persons per household from 2010 is not yet released. Anubhav Bagley said that, as discussed in the Ad Hoc Committee, he did not feel comfortable using the Housing Unit Method (HUM) given the current economic conditions and how things have changed. In addition to the anecdotal evidence that persons per household has changed quite a bit since 2005 due to such things as people moving in with friends or other family members. The births and deaths methodology to get a July 1, 2010 method is okay to use given that it is only for one quarter worth of data. Anubhav added that the July 1, 2010 method will be the base year data for population estimates over the next 5 to 10 years it is best to be as accurate as possible. In addition there is no urgent need for the July 1, 2010 numbers right now so waiting for updated numbers on births and deaths in May would allow for a revised July 1, 2010 population estimate that uses more accurate data.

Chris Deperro asked if MAG staff would be evaluating the estimates methodology for the subsequent years. Anubhav responded that the timeline is short as the July 1, 2011 estimates are due on December 31, 2011. MAG Staff is working with the State CTS looking at various methodologies for what would be an ideal estimates methodology to use moving forward. He said that the estimates for 2010 for the State were higher by about 5% than the Census 2010 number and for Maricopa County the estimates were almost 6%, or 5.9%, higher than the Census 2010 count. Some of the cities were quite a bit off indicating that the current methodology is not working. He stated that one of the biggest concerns is in holding some data/ratios constant. With the HUM method the vacancy rate and persons per household is held constant and with the composite method the ratios have been held constant from the 2000 Census. Anubhav said that MAG staff, working with CTS, will be evaluating data coming from the Census American Community Survey (ACS) because annual data will be coming in for some of the cities and 3 or 5 year data for the rest of the cities. Anubhav said that he will provide more detail on this at the next POPTAC Ad Hoc meeting.

6. Data Collection Timeline

Don Thorstenson thanked the member agencies for the input and updates provided for the 2010 employer database. He said that because of the great response, 3,000 new business locations were added to the dataset, 329 locations were identified as being closed, and 57 locations were noted as having moved their location. Overall, he said, over 4,000 records were updated and revised in the database and he again thanked the member agencies for their support in reviewing the data.

Peter Burnett reported that he sent out an email last week requesting review of the apartments, major group quarters, mobile homes and RV parks. If you are a POPTAC member and did not receive the email that means that none of these locations were identified within your jurisdiction. If you believe that you do have some of these locations and did not receive the email, he asked that you contact him and let him know. He then reviewed the datasets and summarized the review process. Peter said that there are 2,750 apartment complexes, with 294,000 units. In the past this dataset was purchased from a third party company which has since gone out of business. MAG has taken over the update to this dataset and has done a lot of review work up to this point on the data. Peter said that for the apartment data the items needing review include the name, the address and the number of units. For mobile home and RV parks, there are 595 locations in the dataset with 920,00 spaces. Peter said that for this dataset the items needing review are the name, the address, total spaces and total RV spaces. For the major group quarters data set there are 373 records for a total of 71,000 capacity and 47,000 occupancy. He said that members should review the data for accuracy and completeness. Peter added that for all the datasets if there are any omissions or records that should be removed, to note that in the review as well. He asked that the reviews be completed by Friday April 1, 2011.

Wahid Alam asked about small group quarters like group homes and how would these be accounted for as many of them are situations where the location cannot be made public, such as for battered women. Peter replied that Don had spent a lot of time calling all the major group quarters to get the most recent data and that some data is just not available. As for the smaller group homes, Peter said that this dataset is only for the larger group quarters so the smaller group homes would not be part of this dataset. In the current dataset there are some smaller group quarters in there because the data was readily available so it was kept in. Peter indicated that if there is data available, include it in the review, but for situations like the example given where the location cannot be made public, those will not be included.

Anubhav Bagley added that the dataset is geared to the large group quarters so that a comparison can be made with the Census data when that comes out. He said that if any member agency has additional group quarter data available, especially if there are annual updates made to the capacity MAG would be happy to take that data and integrate it into the database for use in the modeling process. He said that any other suggestions on improving these datasets is welcome and that a more detailed discussion of this will occur at a future meeting.

Chris Deperro asked about the time frame. The City of Phoenix has a large majority, of the apartments in the database and he was concerned about being able to review this data given a lack of resources to check the data against and a limited staff. Anubhav Bagley responded that MAG staff will work with them with whatever input they could provide. Peter Burnett added that staff will provide them with assistance for the review as well as work with them on timelines as well. Anubhav said that there may be other sources that are internal to the city which MAG does not access to such as fire department records. He indicated that if the members had access to this type of data or other potential sources that they could look into using this as a way to review the data sent to them by MAG.

Chris Deperro added that the turn around time was too short for them. Peter Burnett responded that considering the large amount of data to be review by the City of Phoenix that he would work with him to give him additional time for reviewing the data.

7. MAG Online Mapping Site

Jason Howard introduced Scott Bridwell who has developed a beta version of the new online mapping viewer. This site will be a replacement for the exiting online mapping site. Jason said that MAG staff would like comments on functionality, data content, look and feel or any other input. Scott Bridwell then gave a demonstration of the demographic mapping viewer.

8. Regional Updates

No updates were given.

9. Next Meeting of the MAG POPTAC

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