

January 18, 2012

TO: Members of the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Chair

SUBJECT: TRANSMITTAL OF MEETING NOTICE AND TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, January 24, 2012 - 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
January 24, 2012

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 November 1, 2011.

4. Boundary and Annexation Survey

The U.S. Census Bureau conducts the annual Boundary and Annexation Survey (BAS) to collect information about the legal boundaries and names of all governmental units in the United States. The Census Bureau uses the information collected in the BAS to tabulate data for the decennial and economic censuses, and annual estimates and surveys such as the Population Estimates Program and the American Community Survey.

The Census Bureau has recently mailed an advance response letter to each MAG member agency's BAS contact (or Highest Elected Official if a BAS contact has not been identified). BAS respondents wishing to submit boundary changes, corrections, or feature updates can request BAS materials

2. For information.

3. For information, discussion and approval of the minutes of November 1, 2011.

4. For information and discussion.

from the Census Bureau or download them from:

<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/bas/bashome.html>. Participants who wish to use paper maps must notify the Census Bureau prior to February 15, 2012. The Census Bureau must receive responses to the 2012 BAS before March 1, 2012 to be included in the Population Estimates Program and the American Community Survey.

MAG will hold an informational workshop related to the 2012 BAS following the January 24 POPTAC meeting. The workshop is scheduled from 1:00pm to 3:00pm in the Cholla Room.

5. State Demographer's Office Update

The Council of Technical Solutions, authorized by Executive Order 2011-04 and staffed by the Arizona Department of Administration, 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.

a. Final July 1, 2011 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates

The final July 1, 2011 population updates were approved by Regional Council on December 7, 2011. The control total for Maricopa County was 3,843,370, which was within 1% of the total recommended by POPTAC. The final July 1, 2011 population updates are provided as Attachment One.

b. Maricopa County Intercensal Estimates

MAG staff, working with Arizona Department of Administration staff, has been developing the final 2000-2010 Intercensal Estimates. The intercensal

5. For information and discussion.

a. For information and discussion.

b. For information and discussion.

numbers are provided as Attachment Two. An update will be provided.

6. AZ-SMART and 2012 Socioeconomic Projections Preparations

MAG staff have been building and testing Arizona's Socioeconomic Modeling, Analysis, and Reporting Toolbox (AZ-SMART) in preparation for the 2012 official population projections. MAG Staff will present an overview of the AZ-SMART system, including data requirements, model processes, and model outputs. MAG Staff will also provide an approximate timeline for data and model methods for review by POPTAC.

7. MAG Demographic GIS Viewer Update

The MAG online demographic GIS viewer has been updated with American Community Survey 2006-2010 data and using Census 2010 block group geography. MAG staff will provide a brief overview.

8. Updated Foreclosure Map, December 2011

MAG creates a quarterly set of maps displaying foreclosed and distressed properties in Maricopa County. The current maps can be found here: http://www.azmag.gov/Documents/DRP_2012-01-11_Distressed-Properties_Dec-2011.pdf. MAG staff will provide an update.

9. Data Collection, Review and Presentation

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 analyses. A schedule for the collection of data for 2012 is included in Attachment Three.

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

9. For information and discussion.

The next major data review to be undertaken will be of land use documents submitted to MAG by the member agencies in 2011. MAG is requesting member agencies to send all land use documents from 2011 to MAG as soon as possible. Attachment Four includes each jurisdiction's total number of land use documents received in 2010. Following the January POPTAC meeting, a list of documents submitted along with other materials will be sent for review and comment to each member agency. Please review the list and submit any additions, corrections or deletions to MAG by February 13, 2012.

Upcoming data review activities beginning in February include the following: review of Municipal Planning Area boundaries; review of MAG point databases, including hotels/motels, major group quarters, RV parks/mobile home parks, and apartments; review of draft 2011 general plan and development databases; and a review of the draft 2011 Employer database. More information will be provided to POPTAC members on the Municipal Planning Area boundary review at the next meeting. MAG staff will provide an update.

10. 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.

11. Next Meeting of MAG POPTAC

The next meeting of the MAG POPTAC is currently scheduled for Tuesday, February 28, 2012 at 10:00 a.m.

10. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 1, 2011
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Ave, Phoenix

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

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

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

* *Not in attendance*

A - Participated via audioconference

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Eric Morgan, Avondale
Max Enterline, Phoenix
Stacey Bridge-Denzak, Avondale
Jason Howard, MAG
Jami Garrison, MAG
A-Anubhav Bagley, MAG

Scott Wilken, MAG
Scott Bridwell, MAG
Jesse Ayers, MAG
Alice Chen, MAG
Shannon Acevedo, MAG

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 am by Vice Chair Charlie McClendon.

2. Call to the Audience

There were no requests from the audience to address the MAG POPTAC.

3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes of September 27, 2011

Chris DePerro moved that the September 27, 2011 draft minutes be approved. David de la Torre seconded the motion and the Committee unanimously approved the minutes of September 27, 2011.

4. Census Update – Delineation of 2010 Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs)

Jason Howard gave an update on Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs). He said that PUMAs are the statistical areas that Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data is fed. He said that PUMS contain records for a sample of housing units with information on the characteristics of the unit and each person within the unit. He described the methodology used to create the PUMA boundaries: between 100,000 and 200,000 population, attempted to follow municipal boundaries as much as possible, and did not conform to the 2000 PUMA boundaries. He showed the draft PUMA boundaries, which had been amended based on comments from the member agencies, and then gave a timeline for the draft PUMA boundaries.

Thomas Ritz noted that PUMA 17, located north of downtown Phoenix is labeled South Central Phoenix, which seems to be a misnomer. Jason Howard said that it was meant to denote the southern part of Central Phoenix. Chris DePerro suggested simply reversing the order of words in that name to become Central South Phoenix, or changing it to North of Downtown or Uptown.

Max Enterline thanked Jason for addressing comments from Phoenix about the boundary with Glendale.

Adam Zaklikowski asked why the PUMA for Buckeye splits Verrado. Jason Howard said that it was delineated that way to meet the 100,000 population minimum threshold. Adam Zaklikowski asked what the ramification of splitting a community like that would be. Anubhav Bagley said the PUMAs are used primarily for modeling purposes. He said that ideally one would like to create homogenous areas, but in a metro area this large it's difficult to do that.

5. Draft July 1, 2011 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates and Methodology

Scott Bridwell provided an update on the July 1, 2011 Maricopa County and Municipality Resident Population Updates and Methodology. He said that the county total of 3.840 million came from the state demographer's office, using the composite method, which uses information about four different age cohorts come up with the total number. He said that in the past, the state used a combination of the composite method and the Housing Unit Method (HUM). He said that for the municipal populations, MAG staff used the HUM to derive the original estimates, which were then scaled up to match the county total from the state.

Chris DePerro said that he would like to see additional footnotes with the table to explain how the various figures were derived. Scott Bridwell said that such footnotes could be added.

Charlie McClendon said that the POPTAC Ad Hoc subcommittee had received a technical briefing from MAG staff on the methodology used for the population estimates. He said the Ad Hoc subcommittee recommended approval of this item to the MAG POPTAC provided the number is within one percent of the final control total.

Thomas Ritz moved to recommend approval to the MAG Management Committee of the Draft July 1, 2011 Maricopa County and MAG Municipality Resident Population Updates, provided the Maricopa County control total is with one percent of the final control total. Chris DePerro seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Thomas Ritz asked when the final control total will be available. Anubhav Bagley said staff should have the final numbers in the next few weeks, before taking this item to Regional Council.

6. State Demographer's Office Update

Jami Garrison gave an update on activities of the State Demographer's Office (SDO). She said that the SDO has been busy with the population estimates. She said that the SDO is also looking at buying data regarding vacancy rates, and are currently evaluating the data. She said that the Governor signed an executive order designating the Department of Administration (DOA) as the agency responsible for producing population estimates and projections. She said that the previous executive order regarding the SDO called for a commission to be formed. She said that this commission was never formed, and is eliminated by the new executive order. Chris DePerro asked, if there is no commission, if the staff in the SDO responsible for coming up with estimates. Jami Garrison said that, essentially, that is correct. She also said that there is still the Council for Technical Solutions (CTS), which has been meeting, and provides some technical information, as well. Tracy Clark added that the SDO encourages as much input as possible from CTS.

7. Intercensal Estimates: 2000-2010

Scott Bridwell gave an update on Intercensal Estimates for 2000-2010. He said that MAG is currently considering two series of Intercensal estimates: one done by the state demographer's office (SDO) and one that has a county-level control total provided by the Census Bureau and place-level estimates using a method developed by MAG. He said that the series from the SDO peaks a little earlier, in 2004, while the Census Bureau series peaks in 2005. He said that the approach MAG has looked at involves a forward-looking approach, taking Census 2000 and adding in housing completions and group quarters information, and a backward series that incorporates information from Census 2010 and goes back to 2000.

Thomas Ritz noted that staff is using a backward Das Gupta, and the results have larger adjustments at the beginning of the series, while having fewer adjustments closer to 2010. He questioned the idea that there was more population change around 2001 than 2009, and that the recent shocks may have had a larger effect at the end of the series than the trend at the beginning. Scott Bridwell said that the end result is an average of the two series, with a temporally-weighted average applied. He said that this uses more of the forward-looking data earlier in the series and more of the backward-looking data at the end of the series.

Chris DePerro said that his thought is he would like to be consistent in what we do, and because the Census Bureau has created Intercensal Estimates he would like to use those. But if that would put us at odds with the SDO, he said he wouldn't like that situation, either. He said that his thought on which series to use is more practical, rather than a methodology preference. Anubhav Bagley said this is the reason this item has been brought to POPTAC. He said that MAG staff has been working closely with the SDO. He said that, because no funding is tied to these estimates and they're only used for academic and research purposes, only one series should be used. He said that staff's internal recommendation is to use the SDO estimates. He said that staff was only taking comments at this time, and will have further discussions with the SDO.

Thomas Ritz said that he would like to see a summary of the Census Bureau's estimate methodology. He said he would like to see how they produce their estimates, but it is unfortunate that they stop at the county level and do not produce estimates for municipalities. Scott Bridwell

said that the Census Bureau applies the same Das Gupta method that the SDO applies, but the Census Bureau applies it across the series and doesn't apply break it into two different series like the SDO.

Wahid Alam said that there is value in looking at what the Census Bureau is doing compared to the state, because that is the only way to judge the quality of the estimates. Max Enterline said the line charts showing the two series are more demonstrative than just numbers. Scott Bridwell said that staff can provide those charts to the membership for future discussions.

8. Data Collection and Review

8A. Land Use Database

Jason Howard discussed the MAG POPTAC Data Collection and Review. Timeline through April 2012. He said that members should have received the draft 2010 existing land use data set to review. He said that in January staff will begin reviewing municipal planning boundaries. There were no questions on this item.

8B. Employer Database

Shannon Acevedo gave an update on the MAG Employer Database. She said that staff is currently in the collection and compilation phase. She said that, once staff has compiled the 2011 data, members will be contacted to review the dataset for their jurisdiction. She said this will happen in early 2012.

9. MAG Member Agency Meetings

9A. Recent Meetings Update

Scott Wilken gave an update on recent meetings with member agencies. He said that MAG staff is visiting member agencies to demonstrate the interactive GIS websites and to discuss planning and development issues. He said that staff has met with about half of the member agencies, and will be scheduling meetings with the rest in the near future. He said one of the topics of discussion at these meetings is regarding what topics people would be interested in hearing about at Planners Stakeholder Group meetings.

9B. Planners Stakeholder Group

Scott Wilken discussed the reconstituted Planners Stakeholder Group meetings. He said that initially, POPTAC members will be the primary contact for these meetings. The first meeting, he said, will be held in early December, and the primary topic will be the Regulatory Bill of Rights (SB 1598). He said the new law raises a lot of questions, and goal of the meeting is to hold a workshop to allow people from different jurisdictions to share what they are doing to come into compliance with the new law.

Wahid Alam thanked MAG staff for coming to them to ask what they would want, rather than simply handing out numbers through POPTAC.

10. Avondale General Plan 2030

Stacey Bridge-Denzak gave a presentation on Avondale's General Plan update. She said that the plan is currently in the 60-day review period. She said that the entire planning staff has worked on the update, and it was done entirely in-house. She said that Avondale is trying to achieve a healthy and sustainable community through the goals and objectives of the general plan. She said the plan focuses on transit-oriented development (TOD).

She highlighted the themes of the general plan. The first theme is Land Use and Community Mobility. She said that the plan includes some new land use categories related to transit and TOD, such as high-intensity office, urban commercial, urban residential, and mixed-use. She said that the land use tables have been updated, and that the city's build out population will be large enough to support the idea of transit. She showed the draft land use map and highlighted the transit corridors, urban development areas, and low density residential areas.

The second theme she discussed was the Open Space and Sustainable Development theme. She said that creating a trail system uniting the open space areas in the city is an important goal to provide places for residents to walk and ride throughout the community. The third theme was Community Facilities and Quality of Life. She said that this includes planning for adequate public services and public safety facilities, as well as creating walkable environments. The fourth theme is Neighborhoods and Economic Vitality. She said this theme focuses on creating livable communities with housing close to jobs and services, as well as revitalization of Old Town Avondale and the creation of a new large lot residential area in southern Avondale. This theme also focuses on economic development, maintaining a strong tax base, and ensuring that development pays its fair share.

She discussed the extensive public participation process. She said that the Avondale staff has tried every avenue possible to inform the public about the general plan. She said that they also made sure to keep the City Council updated throughout the process. She said that, following the 60-day review period, there will be a community meeting at the end of January, followed by two Planning Commission meetings in February and March. She said that the City Council adoption hearing is planned for April 2, 2012, and the citywide vote is planned to take place August 28, 2012.

Thomas Ritz said that Avondale planners had presented to POPTAC an expansion plan for Phoenix International Raceway (PIR). He asked, with the proposed new freeway in that area, why the area around PIR isn't designated as more of a high-intensity node in the draft general plan. Charlie McClendon said that the PIR development is shown on the land use map, but wasn't highlighted in the presentation. He said that it is called the Sports and Entertainment District. Stacey Bridge-Denzak added that one of the greatest challenges in the planning process has been working with the contrast of the rural lifestyle and the expansion and intensification plans of PIR. She said that there will be buffers and clustering in that area to maintain the balance.

11. Designing Transit Accessible Communities

Alice Chen gave a presentation on Designing Transit Accessible Communities. She said that the goals of the study are to identify the challenges faced by transit users when accessing transit; to recommend improvements, policies, and guidelines for the region; and to provide a cost analysis and framework for funding options and prioritization. She said that the consultant separated different transit challenges into different levels of usability. She showed examples of bus stops with varying degrees of amenities, such as sidewalks, direct neighborhood access, weather shelter, and seating area. She outlined the project scope and the process. The process, she said,

starts with stakeholder interviews, a light survey, and interviews with transit users. She said a technical working group will be formed, which will divide all bus stops into five different categories. She said that the end goal of the study is to provide a toolkit to improve bus and transit stops, as well look at policy and funding availability.

She discussed the technical working group for the study. She said that she wants someone from POPTAC to be a part of the working group to get land use planners involved throughout the process.

Wahid Alam said that municipal planners already know about the bad bus stops. He said that he hopes to look outside this study to do more than identify the bad bus stops. If there was a standardized bus stop development type, it would help future development. Alice Chen said that feedback from planners like this will be useful for this study.

Charlie McClendon said that the model for handing out funding at a regional level is an additional challenge. Alice Chen said that she is part of the high capacity transit study. She said that studies have shown that the shorter distance a user has to walk, the more likely they are to use transit.

12. Regional Updates

There were no regional updates from the membership.

13. Next Meeting of the MAG POPTAC

Vice Chair McClendon said that the next meeting of the MAG POPTAC is scheduled for Tuesday, January 24, 2012 at 10:00 am. The meeting adjourned at 11:26 am.

Jurisdiction Population Update Census 2010 and July 1, 2011

| Jurisdiction | Total Population | | | Percent Change | | Share | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | April 1, 2010 (Census 2010) | July 1, 2011 | Change | Overall | Annual | Share of Growth | Share of County |
| Apache Junction* | 294 | 294 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Avondale | 76,238 | 76,392 | 154 | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.6% | 2.0% |
| Buckeye | 50,876 | 52,334 | 1,458 | 2.9% | 2.1% | 5.6% | 1.4% |
| Carefree | 3,363 | 3,367 | 4 | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.1% |
| Cave Creek | 5,015 | 5,055 | 40 | 0.8% | 0.6% | 0.2% | 0.1% |
| Chandler | 236,123 | 238,381 | 2,258 | 1.0% | 0.7% | 8.6% | 6.2% |
| El Mirage | 31,797 | 31,862 | 65 | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.8% |
| Fort McDowell | 971 | 971 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Fountain Hills | 22,489 | 22,554 | 65 | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.6% |
| Gila Bend | 1,922 | 1,922 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.1% |
| Gila River* | 2,994 | 2,994 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.1% |
| Gilbert | 208,453 | 213,519 | 5,066 | 2.4% | 1.8% | 19.3% | 5.6% |
| Glendale | 226,721 | 227,446 | 725 | 0.3% | 0.2% | 2.8% | 5.9% |
| Goodyear | 65,275 | 67,337 | 2,062 | 3.2% | 2.4% | 7.9% | 1.8% |
| Guadalupe | 5,523 | 5,895 | 372 | 6.7% | 5.0% | 1.4% | 0.2% |
| Litchfield Park | 5,476 | 5,523 | 47 | 0.9% | 0.6% | 0.2% | 0.1% |
| Mesa | 439,041 | 441,160 | 2,119 | 0.5% | 0.4% | 8.1% | 11.5% |
| Paradise Valley | 12,820 | 12,972 | 152 | 1.2% | 0.9% | 0.6% | 0.3% |
| Peoria* | 154,058 | 155,754 | 1,696 | 1.1% | 0.8% | 6.5% | 4.1% |
| Phoenix | 1,445,632 | 1,451,966 | 6,334 | 0.4% | 0.3% | 24.1% | 37.8% |
| Queen Creek* | 25,912 | 26,764 | 852 | 3.3% | 2.5% | 3.2% | 0.7% |
| Salt River | 6,289 | 6,342 | 53 | 0.8% | 0.6% | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| Scottsdale | 217,385 | 217,965 | 580 | 0.3% | 0.2% | 2.2% | 5.7% |
| Surprise | 117,517 | 118,349 | 832 | 0.7% | 0.5% | 3.2% | 3.1% |
| Tempe | 161,719 | 162,503 | 784 | 0.5% | 0.4% | 3.0% | 4.2% |
| Tolleson | 6,545 | 6,541 | -4 | -0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.2% |
| Wickenburg | 6,363 | 6,379 | 16 | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Youngtown | 6,156 | 6,156 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.2% |
| Balance of County | 274,150 | 274,673 | 523 | 0.2% | 0.1% | 2.0% | 7.1% |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total | 3,817,117 | 3,843,370 | 26,253 | 0.7% | 0.5% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding

* Maricopa County portion only

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Arizona State Demographer's Office, Maricopa Association of Governments
Approved by the Maricopa Association of Governments Regional Council, December 7, 2011
See attached document for methodology

Municipality Population and Housing Unit Update

April 1, 2010 and July 1, 2011
Maricopa Association of Governments

| Jurisdiction | Census 2010 (April 1 2010) | | | | | | | April 1 2010 - June 30 2011 | | | | | July 1, 2011 Update | | | | Jurisdiction |
|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | Population | | | Housing Units | | Occupancy Rate | Persons per Occupied Units | Residential Completions | Residential Demolitions | Annexed Housing Units | Annexed Household Population | Change in Group Quarters | Total Housing Units | Population | | | |
| | Total | Household | Group Quarter | Total | Occupied | | | | | | | | | Household | Group Quarter | Total | |
| Apache Junction* | 294 | 294 | 0 | 293 | 210 | 71.67% | 1.40000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 293 | 294 | 0 | 294 | Apache Junction* |
| Avondale | 76,238 | 76,078 | 160 | 27,001 | 23,386 | 86.61% | 3.25314 | 44 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27,041 | 76,232 | 160 | 76,392 | Avondale |
| Buckeye | 50,876 | 45,782 | 5,094 | 18,207 | 14,424 | 79.22% | 3.17402 | 461 | 0 | 1 | 3 | -131 | 18,669 | 47,371 | 4,963 | 52,334 | Buckeye |
| Carefree | 3,363 | 3,316 | 47 | 2,251 | 1,654 | 73.48% | 2.00484 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,253 | 3,320 | 47 | 3,367 | Carefree |
| Cave Creek | 5,015 | 5,015 | 0 | 2,579 | 2,150 | 83.37% | 2.33256 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,594 | 5,055 | 0 | 5,055 | Cave Creek |
| Chandler | 236,123 | 235,577 | 546 | 94,404 | 86,924 | 92.08% | 2.71015 | 670 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 95,066 | 237,835 | 546 | 238,381 | Chandler |
| El Mirage | 31,797 | 31,784 | 13 | 11,326 | 9,416 | 83.14% | 3.37553 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,343 | 31,849 | 13 | 31,862 | El Mirage |
| Fort McDowell | 971 | 971 | 0 | 308 | 283 | 91.88% | 3.43110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 308 | 971 | 0 | 971 | Fort McDowell |
| Fountain Hills | 22,489 | 22,307 | 182 | 13,167 | 10,339 | 78.52% | 2.15756 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13,195 | 22,372 | 182 | 22,554 | Fountain Hills |
| Gila Bend | 1,922 | 1,922 | 0 | 943 | 664 | 70.41% | 2.89458 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 943 | 1,922 | 0 | 1,922 | Gila Bend |
| Gila River* | 2,994 | 2,984 | 10 | 835 | 748 | 89.58% | 3.98930 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 835 | 2,984 | 10 | 2,994 | Gila River* |
| Gilbert | 208,453 | 208,149 | 304 | 74,907 | 69,372 | 92.61% | 3.00048 | 1,339 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76,240 | 213,215 | 304 | 213,519 | Gilbert |
| Glendale | 226,721 | 223,464 | 3,257 | 90,505 | 79,114 | 87.41% | 2.82458 | 128 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 306 | 90,629 | 223,883 | 3,563 | 227,446 | Glendale |
| Goodyear | 65,275 | 61,447 | 3,828 | 25,027 | 21,491 | 85.87% | 2.85920 | 614 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 25,640 | 63,505 | 3,832 | 67,337 | Goodyear |
| Guadalupe | 5,523 | 5,508 | 15 | 1,376 | 1,292 | 93.90% | 4.26316 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,444 | 5,880 | 15 | 5,895 | Guadalupe |
| Litchfield Park | 5,476 | 5,439 | 37 | 2,716 | 2,263 | 83.32% | 2.40345 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,733 | 5,486 | 37 | 5,523 | Litchfield Park |
| Mesa | 439,041 | 435,503 | 3,538 | 201,173 | 165,374 | 82.20% | 2.63344 | 609 | 6 | 191 | 244 | 0 | 201,967 | 437,622 | 3,538 | 441,160 | Mesa |
| Paradise Valley | 12,820 | 12,789 | 31 | 5,643 | 4,860 | 86.12% | 2.63148 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,692 | 12,941 | 31 | 12,972 | Paradise Valley |
| Peoria* | 154,058 | 152,831 | 1,227 | 64,814 | 57,454 | 88.64% | 2.66006 | 530 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65,340 | 154,527 | 1,227 | 155,754 | Peoria* |
| Phoenix | 1,445,632 | 1,423,894 | 21,738 | 590,149 | 514,806 | 87.23% | 2.76588 | 2,124 | 147 | 1 | 3 | -194 | 592,127 | 1,430,422 | 21,544 | 1,451,966 | Phoenix |
| Queen Creek* | 25,912 | 25,896 | 16 | 8,394 | 7,569 | 90.17% | 3.42132 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,596 | 26,748 | 16 | 26,764 | Queen Creek* |
| Salt River | 6,289 | 6,284 | 5 | 2,607 | 2,198 | 84.31% | 2.85896 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,623 | 6,337 | 5 | 6,342 | Salt River |
| Scottsdale | 217,385 | 216,226 | 1,159 | 124,001 | 101,273 | 81.67% | 2.13508 | 261 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124,244 | 216,806 | 1,159 | 217,965 | Scottsdale |
| Surprise | 117,517 | 117,243 | 274 | 52,586 | 43,272 | 82.29% | 2.70944 | 289 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52,859 | 118,075 | 274 | 118,349 | Surprise |
| Tempe | 161,719 | 151,531 | 10,188 | 73,462 | 66,000 | 89.84% | 2.29592 | 289 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73,740 | 152,315 | 10,188 | 162,503 | Tempe |
| Tolleson | 6,545 | 6,545 | 0 | 2,169 | 1,959 | 90.32% | 3.34099 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,168 | 6,541 | 0 | 6,541 | Tolleson |
| Wickenburg | 6,363 | 6,174 | 189 | 3,617 | 2,909 | 80.43% | 2.12238 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,624 | 6,190 | 189 | 6,379 | Wickenburg |
| Youngtown | 6,156 | 5,953 | 203 | 2,831 | 2,470 | 87.25% | 2.41012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,831 | 5,953 | 203 | 6,156 | Youngtown |
| Balance of County | 274,150 | 273,034 | 1,116 | 141,988 | 117,709 | 82.90% | 2.31957 | 333 | 2 | -195 | -254 | 0 | 142,124 | 273,557 | 1,116 | 274,673 | Balance of County |
| Total | 3,817,117 | 3,763,940 | 53,177 | 1,639,279 | 1,411,583 | 86.11% | 2.66647 | 8,113 | 231 | 0 | 0 | -15 | 1,647,161 | 3,790,208 | 53,162 | 3,843,370 | Total |

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding

* Maricopa County portion only

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Arizona State Demographer's Office, Maricopa Association of Governments

Approved by the Maricopa Association of Governments Regional Council, December 7, 2011

See attached document for methodology

Methodology for Preparing July 1, 2011 Municipality Population Updates

1. Prepare Census Data

Using the Census 2010 as the Base, determine the April 1, 2010 household population, group quarter population, total housing units, occupied housing units, occupancy rates and population per occupied unit for total units for each jurisdiction.

2. Collect New Data

Obtain the residential housing unit completions and demolitions for the time period from April 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 from the MAG member agencies.

Obtain annexed and de-annexed housing unit data from member agencies. Determine population change from annexations/de-annexations using persons per household and occupancy rates from the Census 2010 blocks intersecting each annexed/de-annexed area.

Obtain July 1, 2011 group quarters population from survey of MAG member agencies.

3. Calculate July 1, 2011 Housing Units

Calculate the July 1, 2011 housing stock by municipality by adding the net housing units (completions minus demolitions) and the net housing units annexed from step 2 above to the Census base.

4. Calculate July 1, Resident Population

Calculate household population using the Housing Unit Method (HUM) by multiplying the housing stock of non-annexed units from step 3 times the respective occupancy rates and persons per occupied unit by municipality and adding this to the annexed population for each municipality.

The occupancy rate and persons per occupied unit by municipality were taken from Census 2010 to calculate the new household population.

Bench the residential population in households to the county control total for population in households from Arizona State Demographer's Office (SDO) to obtain July 1, 2011 population in households. Benching is necessary when the MAG derived total population does not match the control total obtained from SDO. MAG benches its numbers by municipality by proportionately distributing the difference based on the change from the base Census population.

Calculate the total resident population for July 1, 2011 by adding the July 1, 2011 group quarter population from step 2 to the July 1 2011 household population.

Municipality Intercensal Population Estimates

April 1, 2000 to April 1, 2010

| | April 2000 | July 2000 | July 2001 | July 2002 | July 2003 | July 2004 | July 2005 | July 2006 | July 2007 | July 2008 | July 2009 | April 2010 |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Apache Junction* | 273 | 275 | 277 | 279 | 280 | 282 | 285 | 286 | 289 | 291 | 293 | 294 |
| Avondale | 35,883 | 36,400 | 40,465 | 47,638 | 54,225 | 60,480 | 66,373 | 69,382 | 71,797 | 72,613 | 72,360 | 76,238 |
| Buckeye | 6,537 | 6,697 | 10,982 | 12,630 | 14,139 | 16,110 | 23,685 | 31,290 | 39,767 | 49,131 | 51,560 | 50,876 |
| Carefree | 2,927 | 2,959 | 3,063 | 3,090 | 3,140 | 3,202 | 3,355 | 3,415 | 3,433 | 3,442 | 3,393 | 3,363 |
| Cave Creek | 3,728 | 3,766 | 3,905 | 4,034 | 4,172 | 4,398 | 4,651 | 4,746 | 4,882 | 4,960 | 5,012 | 5,015 |
| Chandler | 176,581 | 178,398 | 185,511 | 191,785 | 205,026 | 215,705 | 225,187 | 230,029 | 234,607 | 236,658 | 236,371 | 236,123 |
| El Mirage | 7,609 | 8,405 | 12,053 | 21,070 | 26,303 | 29,498 | 31,154 | 31,629 | 32,396 | 32,280 | 32,076 | 31,797 |
| Fountain Hills | 20,235 | 20,465 | 21,058 | 21,489 | 21,784 | 22,048 | 22,547 | 22,788 | 22,932 | 22,984 | 22,736 | 22,489 |
| Gila Bend | 1,980 | 1,979 | 1,945 | 1,915 | 1,881 | 1,847 | 1,826 | 1,838 | 1,918 | 1,929 | 1,933 | 1,922 |
| Gilbert | 109,697 | 111,250 | 120,447 | 129,864 | 145,758 | 156,412 | 166,919 | 179,602 | 196,602 | 206,264 | 207,783 | 208,453 |
| Glendale | 218,812 | 219,392 | 223,748 | 225,206 | 227,712 | 229,501 | 231,126 | 230,455 | 230,643 | 230,658 | 229,241 | 226,721 |
| Goodyear | 18,911 | 19,700 | 23,373 | 27,881 | 32,370 | 38,906 | 45,664 | 49,894 | 56,141 | 59,631 | 62,129 | 65,275 |
| Guadalupe | 5,228 | 5,226 | 5,209 | 5,286 | 5,281 | 5,318 | 5,346 | 5,316 | 5,307 | 5,625 | 5,592 | 5,523 |
| Litchfield Park | 3,810 | 3,832 | 3,906 | 3,959 | 4,038 | 4,142 | 4,563 | 5,102 | 5,307 | 5,380 | 5,445 | 5,476 |
| Mesa | 396,375 | 400,491 | 410,487 | 420,776 | 425,293 | 434,952 | 436,945 | 438,232 | 440,670 | 441,523 | 440,627 | 439,041 |
| Paradise Valley | 13,664 | 13,643 | 13,504 | 13,346 | 13,167 | 13,040 | 12,863 | 12,830 | 12,838 | 12,856 | 12,885 | 12,820 |
| Peoria* | 108,363 | 109,923 | 116,693 | 121,663 | 125,289 | 130,618 | 135,060 | 142,495 | 148,255 | 151,644 | 154,204 | 154,058 |
| Phoenix | 1,321,045 | 1,324,016 | 1,334,195 | 1,345,980 | 1,361,441 | 1,381,217 | 1,408,069 | 1,428,315 | 1,446,686 | 1,455,028 | 1,455,175 | 1,445,632 |
| Queen Creek* | 4,197 | 4,300 | 4,820 | 5,433 | 7,398 | 11,262 | 15,425 | 18,459 | 21,742 | 23,789 | 25,471 | 25,912 |
| Scottsdale | 202,705 | 204,060 | 209,237 | 212,699 | 215,969 | 218,984 | 221,030 | 220,907 | 221,031 | 220,410 | 218,888 | 217,385 |
| Surprise | 30,848 | 32,667 | 39,628 | 47,739 | 56,259 | 71,328 | 89,488 | 102,901 | 110,741 | 115,626 | 117,230 | 117,517 |
| Tempe | 158,625 | 158,671 | 158,645 | 157,956 | 157,722 | 158,421 | 157,711 | 156,271 | 156,522 | 159,336 | 159,762 | 161,719 |
| Tolleson | 4,974 | 5,030 | 5,219 | 5,375 | 5,939 | 6,140 | 6,332 | 6,325 | 6,444 | 6,556 | 6,608 | 6,545 |
| Wickenburg | 5,082 | 5,068 | 5,128 | 5,244 | 5,318 | 5,467 | 5,911 | 6,243 | 6,325 | 6,376 | 6,375 | 6,363 |
| Youngtown | 3,010 | 3,064 | 3,444 | 3,857 | 4,618 | 5,360 | 5,872 | 6,142 | 6,121 | 6,272 | 6,232 | 6,156 |
| Balance of County | 211,050 | 213,250 | 216,276 | 225,010 | 229,352 | 241,955 | 249,690 | 259,023 | 270,015 | 277,568 | 281,756 | 284,404 |
| Maricopa County | 3,072,149 | 3,092,927 | 3,173,219 | 3,261,203 | 3,353,875 | 3,466,592 | 3,577,074 | 3,663,915 | 3,753,413 | 3,808,829 | 3,821,136 | 3,817,117 |

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding

* Maricopa County portion only

Prepared by Arizona State Demographers's Office, Maricopa Association of Governments, December 2011

See attached document for methodology

Methodology for Preparing July 1, 2000 to July 1, 2009 Municipality Intercensal Population Estimates

Developed by the Arizona State Demographers Office, reviewed by the Maricopa Association of Governments

1) Prepare postcensal series

Collect the published jurisdiction-level annual population updates from July 2000 to July 2010 into a single series; this will hereafter be referred to as the *postcensal* estimates series.

2) Initial adjustment: 2000 - 2004

For each jurisdiction, adjust the postcensal estimates for July 2000 to July 2004 to conform to the Census 2000 and Special Census Survey 2005 population counts. Perform the adjustment using the *Das Gupta* method:

$$P_t = Q_t * (P_{3652} / Q_{3652})^{t/3652}$$

where:

t = time (number of days) since previous census

P_t = intercensal estimate at time t

Q_t = postcensal estimate at time t

P₃₆₅₂ = population count from most recent Census (e.g. 2010)

Q₃₆₅₂ = postcensal estimate for time of most current Census

The Das Gupta method performs the adjustment by multiplying the postcensal estimate for each year by a ratio of the postcensal estimate in the final estimate period and the population count for that period; this ratio is weighted over time so that there are larger adjustments as time increases.

3) Secondary adjustment: 2000 - 2010

Create a new series by combining the adjusted estimates for July 2000 – July 2005 from Step 2 with the postcensal estimates for July 2005 to April 2010. Adjust the entire series to conform to Census 2000 and Census 2010 population counts using the Das Gupta method.

4) Apply controls

Bench the jurisdiction-level estimates so their sum matches Maricopa County intercensal total. The Maricopa County total is in turn benched to State intercensal estimates.

| DRAFT MAG POPTAC Timeline From January 2012 to August 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. |
| January - February, 2012 | 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. |
| January, 2012 | February, 2012 | MAG sends jurisdictions list of all land use documents received for calendar year 2011 for their review. |
| January, 2012 | February, 2012 | Review Municipal Planning Area boundaries. |
| January - March 2012 | January - April 2012 | Review of 2012 Socioeconomic Projection input data, buildout/capacity, and methods |
| February, 2012 | March, 2012 | MAG sends jurisdictions the draft 2010 General Plan and developments database for review. |
| March, 2012 | April, 2012 | MAG sends jurisdictions the 2011 draft Employer database for review. |
| | April, 2012 | Submit Q1 residential completions to MAG. |
| April, 2012 | April, 2012 | MAG sends jurisdictions draft annexations between July 1, 2011 and March 31, 2012 for July 1 Arizona Department of Administration population estimates. Jurisdictions verify and provide number of units. |
| | April, 2012 | Submit Q1 residential completions to MAG. |
| June, 2012 | July, 2012 | Review 2011 Existing Land Use database. |
| July, 2012 | | MAG begins collection of 2012 Employer data. |
| | July, 2012 | Submit public employment data for MAG Employer Database 2012. |
| | July, 2012 | Submit Q2 residential completions to MAG. |
| July, 2012 | July, 2012 | MAG sends jurisdictions draft annexations between April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 for July 1 Estimates. Jurisdictions verify and provide number of units. |
| August, 2012 | | MAG submits annexations that take place from April 1, 2012 thru June 30, 2012 to ADOA for July 1 Estimates. |

**DRAFT - MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM MAG MEMBER AGENCIES
BETWEEN 1/1/2011 and 12/31/2011**

| Agency | Documents/Data Received | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| | Total # of Documents Received by MAG | General Plans / Amendments | Developments / Zoning | Reports |
| Apache Junction | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Avondale | 17 | 4 | 13 | 0 |
| Buckeye | 18 | 1 | 9 | 8 |
| Carefree | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Cave Creek | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Chandler | 25 | 2 | *23 | 0 |
| El Mirage | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fountain Hills | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Gila Bend | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Gila River Indian Community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gilbert | 31 | 4 | 26 | 1 |
| Glendale | 6 | 1 | *5 | 0 |
| Goodyear | 30 | 5 | *25 | 0 |
| Guadalupe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Litchfield Park | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Maricopa County | 26 | 12 | *14 | 0 |
| Mesa | 6 | 1 | *5 | 0 |
| Paradise Valley | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Peoria | 3 | 1 | *2 | 0 |
| Phoenix | 36 | 5 | *31 | 0 |
| Queen Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Scottsdale | 77 | 7 | 70 | 0 |
| Surprise | 35 | 1 | 34 | 0 |
| Tempe | 41 | 3 | 38 | 0 |
| Tolleson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wickenburg | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Youngtown | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 379 | 52 | 318 | 9 |

* Multiple projects submitted together as a single dataset may be represented as only one document in this report.

Note: This list does not include minor changes, like improvements to an existing structure that do not change square footage or number of units.