

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

August 10, 2004
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman	*Horatio Skeete, Litchfield Park
Bryant Powell, Apache Junction	Wahid Alam, Mesa
Adrian Williamson, Avondale	Matt Holm, Maricopa County
*Phil Garthright, Buckeye	Prisila Ferreira, Peoria
* Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	Tim Tilton, Phoenix
David de la Torre, Chandler	**Shawney Ekadis, Queen Creek
* Mark Smith, El Mirage	Peggy Carpenter for Harry Higgins, Scottsdale
**Dana Burkhardt, Fountain Hills	Stephanie Wilson, Surprise
*Terry Yergan, Gila River Indian Community	Hector Tapia, Tempe
Kate Langford, Glendale	Mark Fooks, Youngtown
Janeen Gaskin, Goodyear	Anne MacCracken, Valley Metro
Gary Smith, Guadalupe	

* Not in attendance

** Participated via audioconference

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Gary Neiss, Carefree	Anubhav Bagley, MAG
Sam Andreas, Chandler	Michelle Green, MAG
John Lynch, McDOT	Heidi Pahl, MAG
Lori Brannick, Peoria	Tom Remes, MAG
Karen Flores, Peoria	Jack Tomasik, MAG
Norris Nordvold, Phoenix	Elaine Trammell, MAG
Max Enterline, Phoenix	Don Worley, MAG
	Harry Wolfe, MAG

The meeting was called to order by Chairman George Pettit at 10:05 a.m.

2. Call to the Audience

There were no requests to address the MAG POPTAC.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of May 18, 2004

It was moved by Mark Fooks, seconded by Priscilla Ferreira and unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of May 18, 2004.

4. Regional Annual Report

Jack Tomasik provided an update on the status of the Regional Annual Report. He indicated that most of the tables and maps for the report had been completed and that MAG staff would send out to members information from the report to review. Mr. Tomasik said that additional information is being developed. He also noted that the MAG Executive Committee recommended producing a report that had a positive tone.

5. Preparations for 2005 Census Survey

Heidi Pahl gave a presentation on the 2005 census survey. Ms. Pahl explained that new construction, office space, group quarters addresses and annexations would be needed from the member agencies. She noted that MAG and the Census Bureau are hosting a workshop October 7, 2004 in the MAG Saguaro room to brief member agencies on how the 2005 census survey will be carried out. She added that the workshop will offer member agencies an opportunity to ask questions and ensure that they understand their role in the process. Ms. Pahl asked for input from POPTAC on the workshop and reviewed the milestones in the time line. She discussed the next steps in preparing for the 2005 Survey and count of population in Group Quarters, including: planning the workshop, establishing the oversight committee and collecting address lists of Group Quarters.

Mark Fooks asked who would be invited to the workshop. Heidi Pahl said that POPTAC, intergovernmental coordinators, public information officers and any other interested staff will be invited to attend the workshop.

Heidi Pahl explained that in September, MAG staff will ask the Management Committee to recommend the composition of an Oversight Committee. approval of the oversight committee and ask for input on its membership.

George Pettit stated that POPTAC can be the oversight committee for the 2005 census survey since the POPTAC did a good job overseeing the 2000 census. He added that staff from member agencies can be added to the POPTAC to accommodate the different facets such as adding Public Information Officers for discussing the marketing of the census survey. Mr. Pettit asked for input from POPTAC on the oversight committee.

Tim Tilton asked if the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires MAG to put transportation related questions on the census questionnaire since FHWA is paying for a portion of the survey. Harry Wolfe responded no, adding that the Census Bureau does require that age and sex be added to the questionnaire.

David de la Torre asked if member agencies can use the Department of Health Services (DHS) list for group quarters. Harry Wolfe responded that DHS supplied lists of group quarters for the 2000 census but that each member agency was to destroy the list after the 2000 census. He added that he would check with DHS on the feasibility of obtaining group quarter address lists for the 2005 census survey.

George Pettit asked if the BAS can be submitted electronically. Heidi Pahl said she would follow-up with the Census Bureau on that question.

Mark Fooks asked if elected officials can work on the 2005 census survey. Harry Wolfe responded that he does not see why not unless there is a stipulation in their ordinances that they cannot. Heidi Pahl said she would check with the Census Bureau to determine if they have rules on who they can and cannot hire for the 2005 census survey.

Janeen Gaskin indicated that she would like to forward Goodyear's list of group quarter addresses electronically to the Census Bureau with a copy to MAG.

Prisilla Ferreira asked when the office spaces were needed and for how long. Heidi Pahl responded that the command central office is needed from January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005; the testing/recruiting offices are needed from approximately February 1, 2005 to November 30, 2005; crew leader office space dates are estimated to be needed from May 1, 2005 through August 15 and again from October 1 through November 2005.

George Pettit asked if the office space would be needed exclusively for Census Bureau. Heidi Pahl responded that the command central office space is needed 24x7 by the Census Bureau but that the other offices will be shared between the Census Bureau and the member agency.

Mark Fooks asked if local jurisdictions would incur the cost of providing office space for the effort. Heidi Pahl replied that MAG is looking for temporary donations of office space for this effort and in-kind contributions from the member agencies.

David de la Torre asked what subcommittees would be formed. Heidi Pahl responded that for the 1995 special census several subcommittees were formed, such as a minority subcommittee, Hispanic subcommittee, seniors, new growth, etc. She added that the oversight committee provided a leader for the various subcommittees and the subcommittees worked on marketing the census to their particular audience. Ms. Pahl noted that the subcommittees can aid in the success of the survey by targeting marketing to specific populations and increasing their likelihood of responding to the survey.

Heidi Pahl reviewed the changes that had been made to the time line in the agenda packet which were reflected in the time line handed out in the meeting.

6. Residential Completion Status Report

Harry Wolfe thanked MAG member agencies for submitting their residential completions in a timely fashion. He said that only a few jurisdictions still had to supply data. Mr. Wolfe mentioned that all data needs to be supplied to DES by August 19, 2004.

7. Preparation of July 1, 2004 Resident Population Updates

Harry Wolfe noted that a number of issues had arisen regarding the process for supplying DES with information on annexations and population in Group Quarters. He requested suggestions on streamlining the data collection process.

Wahid Alam recommended that DES confirm receipt of e-mails forwarded by member agencies so that the staff would have verification that the information had been received.

Kate Langford asked whether DES compared the annexation information that was supplied for the population updates, with other annexation data that were collected by DES. Harry Wolfe said he would look into the matter.

David de la Torre said that he had notified DES the past two years that he was the Chandler contact for supplying data, but that he was told he had to have a letter from the City Manager designating him. He added that requests for data have been sent to a person who no longer works for the City.

David de la Torre questioned why DES required some data request forms to be filled out in hard copy and must be used to submit the data. He said he would like to forward the data in electronic format.

David de la Torre mentioned that it is difficult to review the spreadsheet of population in group quarters as of July 1, 2004 because there is no breakout and population in group quarters in 2003, additions to population in group quarters, and then total population in Group Quarters.

Mr. David de la Torre said that he surveys the Group Quarters in Chandler each year and provides updated population figures to DES.

Tim Tilton noted that Phoenix has 465 Group Quarters and that no one has the time to survey them annually.

George Pettit said that it would be helpful to meet with Peter Kozy to discuss these issues.

Hector Tapia said that DES memos transmitting the request for data did not always make it clear what we had to provide and why we had to provide it.

Mark Fooks asked whether data collection issues experienced by MAG were also being experienced by other Councils of Government. Harry Wolfe said that they were.

Janeen Gaskin said that she was informed that if there weren't any population in newly annexed areas, that jurisdictions did not have to submit the data.

Janeen Gaskin urged MAG to work to resolve the data submission issues that have arisen.

Karen Flores said that Peoria was also experiencing some inefficiencies in providing data to DES and that she was happy that MAG was discussing the matter along with methods to enhance the data collection process.

Max Enterline said that the Department of Health Services Social Services Guide provides a reference for updating some new Group Quarters

8. Best Practices of Member Agencies and Suggestions on Agenda Items for Future MAG POPTAC Meetings

A number of suggestions were offered by member agencies on future agenda items for POPTAC meetings.

Kate Langford suggested an agenda item related to land use absorption. Harry Wolfe said MAG staff could probably provide some information, but that we would be interested to learn what other jurisdictions have done on this issue.

Hector Tapia said he would like an agenda item on the use of GIS in the Metropolitan Area. He was concerned about compatibility among GIS systems.

David de la Torre asked for an agenda item explaining how agencies provide data to the public.

Max Enterline said that he would be willing to discuss the DHS social services guide and how it can be used to assist in updating population in Group Quarters.

9. New Aerial Photography

Harry Wolfe reported that MAG would be purchasing aerial photography flown in July of 2004 from Aerials Express. He said that as in the past, MAG has a license agreement which allows for the distribution of the aerials to our member agencies. He noted that the latest aerials that were distributed to member agencies were in October 2003. Don Worley also mentioned that the Aerials would probably be available by the end of August, and that the resolution of the aerials was 2 foot pixels.

10. Next Meeting of the MAG POPTAC

Harry Wolfe stated that the next meeting of the MAG POPTAC is scheduled for Tuesday, September 21, 2004 at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 21, 2004
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman	*Horatio Skeete, Litchfield Park
*Bryant Powell, Apache Junction	Wahid Alam, Mesa
Connie Randal for Adrian Williamson, Avondale	*Matt Holm, Maricopa County
*Phil Garthright, Buckeye	#Prisila Ferreira, Peoria
*Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	Tim Tilton, Phoenix
David de la Torre, Chandler	*Shawney Ekadis, Queen Creek
Mark Smith, El Mirage	*Harry Higgins, Scottsdale
Dana Burkhardt, Fountain Hills	Stephanie Wilson, Surprise
*Terry Yergan, Gila River Indian Community	Hector Tapia, Tempe
*Kate Langford, Glendale	Cecilia Casillas for Mark Fooks, Youngtown
Janeen Gaskin, Goodyear	*Anne MacCracken, Valley Metro
* Gary Smith, Guadalupe	

*Not in attendance
#Participated via audioconference
+Participated via videoconference

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Sam Andreas, Chandler	#Mark Hellfritz, Census Bureau, Denver
Max Enterline, Phoenix	#Dennis Johnson, Census Bureau, Denver
+Mike Stump, Census Bureau, Headquarters	Anubhav Bagley, MAG
+Ron Dopkowski, Census Bureau, Headquarters	Heidi Pahl, MAG
+Barbara Vandervate, Census Bureau, Headquarters	Elaine Trammell, MAG
	Rita Walton, MAG
	Harry Wolfe, MAG

The meeting was called to order by Chairman George Pettit at 10:05 a.m.

2. Call to the Audience

There were no requests to address the MAG POPTAC.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of August 10, 2004

Because of a lack of a quorum, approval of the August 10, 2004 minutes was deferred to the October MAG POPTAC meeting.

4. Preparation of July 1, 2004 Resident Population Updates

Harry Wolfe stated that DES was in the process of preparing July 1, 2004 resident population estimates by County and that MAG needed the county estimates to develop Municipality estimates. He explained that DES uses two methods to produce the estimate – the Housing Unit Method and the Composite Method – and that the weighted average of the two was used to produce the estimate. He added that a more detailed discussion of the methodology would be provided at the next meeting of the MAG POPTAC Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

Janeen Gaskin asked about efforts to facilitate and coordinate supplying DES with the data needed for preparing the annual population estimates. Harry Wolfe responded that the issue would be covered at a subsequent meeting of the MAG POPTAC.

5. Preparations for 2005 Census Survey

Heidi Pahl provided an overview of preparations for the 2005 census survey of population in households and full count of population in group quarters and outdoor locations. She distributed a time line listing only member agency tasks for the census effort, the Census Bureau Workshop flyer and agenda, and a seven page document titled, “Group Quarters Definitions used for Special Censuses Conducted during the 2000 Decade.” She discussed POPTAC tasks listed on the time line, the formation of an oversight subcommittee to provide guidance, make decisions and implement strategies for the census, and the agenda for the Census Bureau Workshop. Ms. Pahl informed that a letter requesting donated office space for census testing/training and crew leaders would be sent from MAG to each city/town manager in the near future. She also provided answers to questions raised at the August POPTAC meeting.

She noted that:

- a. Elected officials, while in office, are not authorized to be employed by the Census Bureau for the 2005 Census Survey effort.

- b. Changes to the Census Bureau's Boundary and Annexation Survey cannot be submitted electronically because the Census Bureau does not currently have the capability to handle electronic files.
- c. The Department of Health Services Web site does contain a list of Group Homes and the URL for it will be distributed to MAG POPTAC members.

Tim Tilton asked if member agencies would have access to the address file. Ron Dopkowski replied that staff of member agencies could look at the address files by obtaining Special Sworn Status and following Census Bureau guidelines. He added that review has to be in the Census Bureau's office under the supervision of a Census Bureau employee.

6. Population in Group Quarters

Mike Stump provided a definition of Group Quarters and referred the MAG POPTAC to the seven page explanation of group quarters on the Census Bureau's website. Dave de la Torre said that it would be helpful if member agencies could have the full definition of group quarters. Heidi Pahl said she would e-mail the definition to member agencies.

Mike Stump explained that the output of the Census Survey and count of population in group quarters would be population in households, population in Group Quarters (including outdoor locations) and number of occupied housing units. Harry Wolfe asked if the total number of housing units would also be included in the output and Mike Stump responded that it would.

Mike Stump said that the first step in preparing for the full count of population in group quarters was to compile an address list. He said it is the Census Bureau's preference is to have the following information for each Group Quarters:

- a. Name
- b. Physical address
- c. Nearest cross streets
- d. Contact person
- e. Phone number
- f. Special notes

He added that all the information did not have to be provided, but that if it were, it would assist the Census Bureau in carrying out the count.

Mr. Stump said that the preliminary list needed to be submitted by March 2005 with the final list by July 2005. He also mentioned that during the listing operation, any Group Quarters that are identified and are not on the Census Bureau's mailing list will be added.

The Group Quarters enumeration will take place in the middle of September 2005. An attempt will be made first to conduct the enumeration by telephone and, if unsuccessful, then to make a visit to the Group Quarter facility.

Harry Wolfe asked if the Census Bureau could notify our member agencies of Group Quarters information that was submitted, but which the Census Bureau did not classify as a Group Quarters. Mike Stump said that he would look into the matter.

Max Enterline asked for a list of categories within the definition of group quarters. Heidi Pahl said they were available through the Census Bureau Website. David de la Torre said that he would like to have a copy of the seven page group quarter definition and urged that it be circulated. Heidi Pahl said she would distribute the definition.

Mike Stump said that a one person facility, by definition, could not be considered a group quarter.

Anubhav Bagley asked whether two people who share an apartment are classified as group quarters. Mike Stump responded that it did not meet the definition of group quarters and pointed out that the structure of the facility is also a factor in labeling a facility a group quarter. Barbara Vandervate added that people who reside in a group quarter, reside there for a specific purpose. She provided the following examples: People in prisons are there because they committed a crime; people in college dormitories are there because they are enrolled in school; and people in nursing homes are there because they are unable to live independently.

Harry Wolfe asked if an assisted living facility met the definition of group quarters. Barbara Vandervate responded that determining whether an assisted living facility was classified as group quarters depended in part upon the level of custodial care. She acknowledged that a certain amount of judgement is involved. She mentioned that in a nursing home the resident is under strictly custodial control and cannot leave without permission. That situation, however, may not be case with an assisted living facility. As a result, an assisted living facility may not be considered in the definition of group quarters.

Mike Stump stated if a housing unit is owned by a University and is rented out to several students, it is considered group quarters. However, if the same housing unit were privately owned and rented out to those same students it would not be considered group quarters.

Tim Tilton provided an example of a University that didn't own a housing unit, but through an official housing department on campus arranged for students to live there. He asked if that qualified as group quarters.

Mike Stump conceded that there was a certain amount of interpretation involved in classifying facilities as group quarters, but said he would look into the example provided by Mr. Tilton. He also indicated that he wanted to work with MAG member agencies to try to resolve issues relating to definitions of group quarters prior to the actual enumeration.

Mark Smith asked why the derivation of population in households and population in group quarters could not be done jointly. George Pettit explained that the 2005 figure for population in households was a survey, while the derivation of population in group quarters would be based on a full count. Max Enterline added that knowing the population in group quarters is helpful to cities for determining the funding needed to support the group quarter facilities.

Max Enterline explained how he updates the list of Group Quarters for the city of Phoenix. He explained that he uses the Department of Health Services Web site to identify licensed group homes. But he said that the annual Directory of Human Services, which is available both in hard copy and on-line, is an invaluable resource for updating group quarters. He said that one of the biggest problems in his update process was making corrections to the contact person since those people often have a short tenure in their jobs. He said that he would be willing to provide to member agencies the URL for the Directory. Harry Wolfe asked Mr. Enterline to send the URL to either Heidi Pahl or Harry Wolfe and that one of them would distribute it to MAG POPTAC members.

Max Enterline explained that for some group quarters an address is not available. For example, women's shelters do not have an address listed for their own protection.

Hector Tapia asked whether a day care center was considered group quarters. Harry Wolfe responded that he didn't think it was because the children were there only a part of the day and subsequently resided in a home with their families. The Census Bureau staff concurred with Mr. Wolfe's comment.

7. Outdoor Location Count of Population

Amy St. Peter provided a general overview of the outdoor location count that has been conducted by MAG for the past three years. Ms. St. Peter explained that HUD mandates that every Continuum applying for McGivney funds to support homeless assistance programs must conduct a street count and a shelter count. DES does the shelter count, MAG does the street count. The results are combined to provide a gaps analysis that determines how many more beds are needed. Without the street count, this Continuum would be ineligible to apply for funds. This year, we applied for nearly \$20 million.

Ms. St. Peter said that while in 2003 only 11 jurisdictions participated in the outdoor location count, that in 2004 participation increased to 24 jurisdictions. She explained that each participating jurisdiction has a coordinator who develops a counting program attuned to that jurisdiction's unique characteristics. In communities that have shelters, a count at night works best because anyone who is staying in the shelter will be inside. That leaves unsheltered people on the street. In communities that don't have shelters, a street count in the morning may work well as the homeless people will still be in their camps. In those communities, you don't have to worry about double counting homeless people that have shelter but are simply outside at the time of the count.

Ms. St. Peter stated that the next count of population in outdoor locations would be conducted on January 25, 2005. She said that HUD requires that the enumerations be conducted during the last week of January and that the local jurisdictions chose January 25th because it was the most convenient day during that week.

Ms. St. Peter said that having people without homes participate in the count was very helpful in obtaining support.

Mike Stump asked whether the street locations were identified before the enumeration was conducted. Ms. St. Peter responded that some locations were identified in advance of the enumeration, while others were identified during the enumeration.

Harry Wolfe noted that the cost of the count of population in outdoor locations was based upon 300 locations, but that if MAG member agencies wanted more than that, they could request it.

Mike Stump urged MAG to get the information about number of locations to the Census Bureau as quickly as possible.

Harry Wolfe noted that in the process for reviewing and updating the list of outdoor locations, MAG would be using contacts established in jurisdictions responsible for conducting the count, but the process would be coordinated with POPTAC representatives.

Prisila Ferreira asked if the October 7, 2004 Census workshop required attendance for the full day. Heidi Pahl responded that it did not. She reviewed the agenda for the Workshop and explained that people could chose which part or parts of the workshop they wanted to attend based upon their area of interest.

8. Residential Completion Status Report

Harry Wolfe thanked member agencies for supplying the residential completions in a timely manner.

9. Preparation of July 1, 2004 Resident Population Updates

Harry Wolfe explained the general process that DES uses to produce the population estimates for Arizona counties. He noted that it involved using the weighted average of two methods: the housing unit method and the composite method. He explained that the housing unit methods uses new construction undertaken together with occupancy rates and persons per household to derive population in Households. The composite method on the other hand uses secondary data for three age cohorts to estimate the population in each of those cohorts. Added to each of the population estimates in households is an estimate of population in Group quarters.

Harry Wolfe said that he would provide more detail on the method at the next meeting of the MAG POPTAC Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

10. Practices of Member Agencies and Suggestions of Agenda Items for Future MAG POPTAC Meetings

Harry Wolfe said that a number of items were added to the agenda based on input from the MAG POPTAC. He noted that those items not included would be deferred to other meetings of the MAG POPTAC. Many MAG member agencies have developed their own procedures for collecting, displaying, organizing or analyzing data associated with socioeconomic data. We would like MAG POPTAC members to present these best practices at future meetings and will be soliciting input from members at the meeting. We would also like MAG POPTAC members to identify other items to be included in future agendas that would be of interest or use to them.

11. Next Meeting of MAG POPTAC

George Pettit stated that the next meeting of the MAG POPTAC is scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 2004 at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

TOTAL HOUSING UNITS AND HOUSEHOLD SURVEY SAMPLE SIZES

Jurisdiction	Total Housing Units						Year 2005 Survey	
	Year 2000 Census April 1, 2000	July 1, 2001	July 1, 2002	July 1, 2003	July 1, 2004	Projected September 1, 2005 Housing Units	Sample Size (Housing Units)	% of Total Housing Units in Sample
Avondale	11,419	12,877	15,127	17,711	19,326	21,300	3,230	15%
Buckeye	2,344	2,490	2,865	3,075	3,524	4,000	2,130	53%
Carefree	1,769	1,872	1,924	1,963	2,007	2,100	1,540	73%
Cave Creek	1,753	1,834	1,898	1,966	2,060	2,200	1,470	67%
Chandler	66,592	70,463	73,751	79,993	83,771	88,100	4,640	5%
El Mirage	3,162	4,951	7,127	8,760	9,327	10,600	4,860	46%
Fountain Hills	10,491	10,966	11,216	11,378	11,505	11,700	3,510	30%
Gila Bend	766	773	779	783	784	800	700	88%
Gilbert	37,007	41,282	45,411	52,006	55,616	57,100	3,350	6%
Glendale	79,667	81,939	83,104	84,505	85,206	86,200	4,650	5%
Goodyear	6,771	8,372	10,002	11,555	13,564	15,800	3,155	20%
Guadalupe	1,184	1,184	1,208	1,210	1,219	1,300	900	69%
Litchfield Park	1,633	1,649	1,651	1,661	1,681	1,700	1,170	69%
Mesa	175,701	183,626	188,388	191,403	194,729	197,800	13,770	7%
Paradise Valley	5,499	5,600	5,680	5,742	5,814	5,900	2,265	38%
Peoria	42,570	46,090	48,414	50,134	52,213	54,400	4,665	9%
Phoenix	495,832	505,005	513,880	522,909	531,450	541,900	27,250	5%
Queen Creek *	1,290	1,473	1,654	2,299	3,507	4,600	1,775	39%
Scottsdale	104,974	108,763	111,356	113,143	114,881	116,900	5,965	5%
Surprise	16,260	20,257	23,312	27,018	32,489	38,100	6,250	16%
Tempe	67,068	67,406	67,445	67,530	67,910	68,200	4,710	7%
Tolleson	1,485	1,505	1,506	1,736	1,737	1,900	1,220	64%
Wickenburg	2,691	2,734	2,777	2,869	2,940	3,000	1,945	65%
Youngtown	1,783	1,873	1,936	1,933	2,094	2,600		
Balance	110,581	114,042	117,869	120,055	125,525	135,300	7,555	6%
Total	1,250,292	1,299,026	1,340,280	1,383,337	1,424,879	1,473,500		

* Includes Pinal County portion of Queen Creek

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2000 Census, Arizona Department of Economic Security, Maricopa Association of Governments Residential Completion database.
Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, September 2004.

July 1, 2004 Municipality Resident Population and Housing Unit Update

Methodology

1. Census Data

Using the Year 2000 Census as the base, determine the April 1, 2000 household population, group quarter population, total housing units, occupied housing units, occupancy rates and population per occupied unit by unit type for each jurisdiction.

2. New Data

Obtain residential housing unit completions and demolitions for the time period of April 1, 2000 through June 30, 2004. This data is received quarterly by MAG from MAG member agencies. Subtract residential demolitions from residential completions by Municipality by unit type to determine net new housing units.

Obtain annexed and de-annexed housing unit data from DES. Determine population change from annexations/de-annexations using persons per occupied housing units and occupancy rates.

Obtain July 1, 2004 group quarter population from DES annual survey.

3. Housing Unit Calculations

Calculate the July 1, 2004 housing stock by unit type by municipality by adding the net new housing units and the net annexed housing units from step 2 to the Census base.

4. Population Calculations

Calculate household population by multiplying the housing stock from step 3 times the respective occupancy rates and persons per occupied unit (by unit type by municipality).

Bench the residential population in households to the county control total from DES to obtain July 1, 2004 population in households.

Calculate the Total Resident Population for July 1, 2004 by adding the July 1, 2004 group quarter population from step 2 to the July 1, 2004 household population.

Round the county resident population total to the nearest 25 persons and each municipality population to the nearest 5 persons.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
POPULATION BY JURISDICTION
2000 CENSUS AND JULY 1, 2004

DRAFT

DRAFT

Jurisdiction	Total Population			Percent Growth		Share	
	April 1, 2000 (Census)	July 1, 2004 (Draft)	Change	Overall	Annual	Share of Growth	Share of County
Apache Junction *	273	275	2	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Avondale	35,883	58,930	23,047	64.2%	12.4%	5.4%	1.7%
Buckeye **	8,497	14,325	5,828	68.6%	13.1%	1.4%	0.4%
Carefree	2,927	3,290	363	12.4%	2.8%	0.1%	0.1%
Cave Creek	3,728	4,335	607	16.3%	3.6%	0.1%	0.1%
Chandler	176,581	218,330	41,749	23.6%	5.1%	9.8%	6.2%
El Mirage	7,609	27,180	19,571	257.2%	34.9%	4.6%	0.8%
Fountain Hills	20,235	22,365	2,130	10.5%	2.4%	0.5%	0.6%
Gila Bend	1,980	2,025	45	2.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%
Gila River *	2,699	2,740	41	1.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%
Gilbert	109,697	161,690	51,993	47.4%	9.6%	12.2%	4.6%
Glendale	218,812	232,545	13,733	6.3%	1.4%	3.2%	6.6%
Goodyear	18,911	34,910	15,999	84.6%	15.5%	3.7%	1.0%
Guadalupe	5,228	5,370	142	2.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Litchfield Park	3,810	3,915	105	2.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%
Mesa	396,375	444,420	48,045	12.1%	2.7%	11.2%	12.7%
Paradise Valley	13,664	14,365	701	5.1%	1.2%	0.2%	0.4%
Peoria *	108,363	130,995	22,632	20.9%	4.6%	5.3%	3.7%
Phoenix	1,321,045	1,410,995	89,950	6.8%	1.6%	21.0%	40.3%
Queen Creek *	4,197	10,865	6,668	158.9%	25.1%	1.6%	0.3%
Salt River	6,405	6,760	355	5.5%	1.3%	0.1%	0.2%
Scottsdale	202,705	220,130	17,425	8.6%	2.0%	4.1%	6.3%
Surprise	30,848	62,155	31,307	101.5%	17.9%	7.3%	1.8%
Tempe	158,625	160,715	2,090	1.3%	0.3%	0.5%	4.6%
Tolleson	4,974	5,420	446	9.0%	2.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Wickenburg	5,082	5,930	848	16.7%	3.7%	0.2%	0.2%
Youngtown	3,010	3,945	935	31.1%	6.6%	0.2%	0.1%
Unin-New River	10,740	11,005	265	2.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%
Unin-Rio Verde	1,419	1,570	151	10.6%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Unin-Sun City	38,309	38,640	331	0.9%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%
Unin-Sun City West	26,344	26,480	136	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%
Unin-Sun Lakes	11,936	13,375	1,439	12.1%	2.7%	0.3%	0.4%
Unin-Other	111,238	140,010	28,772	25.9%	5.6%	6.7%	4.0%
Total	3,072,149	3,500,000	427,851	13.9%	3.1%	100.0%	100.0%

* Maricopa County portion only

** Buckeye's growth rate from 2000 to 2004 resulted in part from the transfer of the Lewis Prison population. The Census Bureau had incorrectly assigned the prison population to the unincorporated area in the 2000 Census.

MAG is required to round the county resident population total to the nearest 25 persons and the municipality population to the nearest 5 persons.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2000 Census, MAG Residential Completion database.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, October 2004.

JULY 1, 2004 MUNICIPALITY POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT UPDATE

TABLE 1
DRAFT

DRAFT

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Jurisdiction	Year 2000 Census (April 1, 2000)					Net Units 4/01/2000 - 6/30/2003	Population from new Units	Annexations		July 1, 2004 Effective		July 1, 2004 Update			
	Population			Housing Units				Population	Housing Units	Pop. Per Occupied Unit	Occupancy Rate	Population		Total (Round to 5)	Total Housing Units
	Total	Household	Group Quarter	Total	Occupied							Household	Group Quarter		
Apache Junction *	273	273	0	328	163	0	0	0	0	1.67	0.50	273	0	275	328
Avondale	35,883	35,737	146	11,419	10,640	7,905	22,992	23	7	3.25	0.93	58,752	176	58,930	19,331
Buckeye	8,497	6,528	1,969	2,344	2,158	1,166	3,015	44	14	2.94	0.93	9,586	4,741	14,325	3,524
Carefree	2,927	2,927	0	1,769	1,389	238	362	0	0	2.09	0.78	3,289	0	3,290	2,007
Cave Creek	3,728	3,728	0	1,753	1,571	307	607	0	0	2.35	0.90	4,335	0	4,335	2,060
Chandler	176,581	175,799	782	66,592	62,377	16,991	40,571	567	200	2.77	0.94	216,937	1,394	218,330	83,783
El Mirage	7,609	7,608	1	3,162	2,121	6,155	19,549	5	5	3.52	0.83	27,162	18	27,180	9,327
Fountain Hills	20,235	20,228	7	10,491	8,653	1,014	1,954	0	0	2.33	0.83	22,182	182	22,365	11,505
Gila Bend	1,980	1,980	0	766	659	18	45	0	0	3.00	0.86	2,025	0	2,025	784
Gila River *	2,699	2,654	45	685	629	10	40	0	0	4.22	0.92	2,694	45	2,740	695
Gilbert	109,697	109,631	66	37,007	35,405	15,751	43,139	8,777	2,868	3.03	0.96	161,547	142	161,690	55,626
Glendale	218,812	215,955	2,857	79,667	75,700	5,534	13,634	18	6	2.84	0.95	229,607	2,937	232,545	85,207
Goodyear	18,911	16,541	2,370	6,771	6,179	6,793	15,564	0	0	2.59	0.91	32,105	2,805	34,910	13,564
Guadalupe	5,228	5,220	8	1,184	1,110	35	149	0	0	4.70	0.94	5,369	0	5,370	1,219
Litchfield Park	3,810	3,780	30	1,633	1,508	48	104	0	0	2.50	0.92	3,884	30	3,915	1,681
Mesa	396,375	392,426	3,949	175,701	146,643	18,596	43,936	2,976	1,052	2.67	0.84	439,338	5,083	444,420	195,349
Paradise Valley	13,664	13,652	12	5,499	5,034	315	715	0	0	2.70	0.92	14,367	0	14,365	5,814
Peoria *	108,363	106,849	1,514	42,570	39,183	9,643	22,580	0	0	2.69	0.92	129,429	1,568	130,995	52,213
Phoenix	1,321,045	1,298,577	22,468	495,832	465,834	35,597	87,714	152	52	2.78	0.94	1,386,443	24,552	1,410,995	531,481
Queen Creek *	4,197	4,197	0	1,229	1,172	2,155	6,569	0	0	3.35	0.95	10,766	98	10,865	3,384
Salt River	6,405	6,355	50	2,526	1,959	105	356	0	0	3.27	0.78	6,711	50	6,760	2,631
Scottsdale	202,705	201,028	1,677	104,974	90,669	9,905	17,302	4	2	2.20	0.86	218,334	1,798	220,130	114,881
Surprise	30,848	30,724	124	16,260	12,484	16,229	31,291	0	0	2.39	0.80	62,015	140	62,155	32,489
Tempe	158,625	153,383	5,242	67,068	63,602	842	1,760	0	0	2.41	0.95	155,143	5,573	160,715	67,910
Tolleson	4,974	4,974	0	1,485	1,432	252	446	0	0	3.30	0.94	5,420	0	5,420	1,737
Wickenburg	5,082	5,039	43	2,691	2,341	184	348	274	120	2.16	0.87	5,661	271	5,930	2,995
Youngtown	3,010	2,857	153	1,783	1,641	311	463	0	0	1.72	0.92	3,320	625	3,945	2,094
Unin-New River	10,740	10,695	45	4,514	3,921	124	267	0	0	2.72	0.87	10,962	45	11,005	4,638
Unin-Rio Verde	1,419	1,419	0	1,168	761	136	153	0	0	1.85	0.65	1,572	0	1,570	1,304
Unin-Sun City	38,309	37,641	668	27,731	23,490	261	333	0	0	1.60	0.85	37,974	668	38,640	27,992
Unin-Sun City West	26,344	26,083	261	17,359	14,997	95	135	0	0	1.74	0.86	26,218	261	26,480	17,454
Unin-Sun Lakes	11,936	11,936	0	7,746	6,683	1,005	1,440	0	0	1.77	0.86	13,376	0	13,375	8,751
Unin-Other	111,238	110,942	296	48,524	40,778	16,805	41,362	-12,841	-4,326	2.70	0.85	139,463	550	140,010	60,998
Total	3,072,149	3,027,366	44,783	1,250,231	1,132,886	174,525	418,882	0	0	2.67	0.91	3,446,248	53,752	3,500,000	1,424,756

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

* Maricopa County portion only.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2000 Census, Arizona Department of Economic Security, Maricopa Association of Governments Residential Completion database.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, October 2004.

YEAR 2000 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING
Resident Housing Unit and Population Information by Municipality
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

TABLE 2

Jurisdiction	Total Resident Housing Units (April 1, 2000)				Occupied Resident Housing Units (April 1, 2000)				Population (April 1, 2000)					
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Pop. In Households	Pop. in Grp. Qrts.	TOTAL
Apache Junction *	0	185	143	328	0	89	74	163	0	155	118	273	0	273
Avondale	8,599	1,581	1,239	11,419	8,255	1,234	1,151	10,640	28,582	3,149	4,006	35,737	146	35,883
Buckeye	1,284	451	609	2,344	1,212	418	528	2,158	4,182	942	1,404	6,528	1,969	8,497
Carefree	1,604	163	2	1,769	1,269	118	2	1,389	2,751	171	5	2,927	0	2,927
Cave Creek	1,449	181	123	1,753	1,332	155	84	1,571	3,193	360	175	3,728	0	3,728
Chandler	50,762	13,669	2,161	66,592	48,788	11,754	1,835	62,377	144,270	26,514	5,015	175,799	782	176,581
El Mirage	1,627	322	1,213	3,162	1,498	273	350	2,121	5,664	960	984	7,608	1	7,609
Fountain Hills	8,102	2,389	0	10,491	7,202	1,451	0	8,653	17,694	2,534	0	20,228	7	20,235
Gila Bend	428	100	238	766	368	88	203	659	1,023	254	703	1,980	0	1,980
Gila River *	527	39	119	685	511	33	85	629	2,268	119	267	2,654	45	2,699
Gilbert	33,304	3,569	134	37,007	31,986	3,292	127	35,405	101,821	7,405	405	109,631	66	109,697
Glendale	51,924	22,775	4,968	79,667	50,527	20,675	4,498	75,700	156,874	48,142	10,939	215,955	2,857	218,812
Goodyear	5,879	575	317	6,771	5,340	522	317	6,179	14,415	1,319	807	16,541	2,370	18,911
Guadalupe	971	93	120	1,184	909	90	111	1,110	4,472	238	510	5,220	8	5,228
Litchfield Park	1,529	104	0	1,633	1,425	83	0	1,508	3,566	214	0	3,780	30	3,810
Mesa	95,457	47,196	33,048	175,701	89,210	40,806	16,627	146,643	269,215	91,328	31,883	392,426	3,949	396,375
Paradise Valley	5,477	15	7	5,499	5,012	15	7	5,034	13,599	30	23	13,652	12	13,664
Peoria *	33,392	5,047	4,131	42,570	31,793	4,199	3,191	39,183	92,511	7,574	6,764	106,849	1,514	108,363
Phoenix	311,575	162,461	21,796	495,832	301,382	145,394	19,058	465,834	911,008	337,737	49,832	1,298,577	22,468	1,321,045
Queen Creek *	986	0	243	1,229	944	0	228	1,172	3,349	0	848	4,197	0	4,197
Salt River	1,033	15	1,478	2,526	1,022	15	922	1,959	4,496	43	1,816	6,355	50	6,405
Scottsdale	71,301	32,656	1,017	104,974	63,411	26,429	829	90,669	153,139	46,194	1,695	201,028	1,677	202,705
Surprise	12,056	1,378	2,826	16,260	10,185	829	1,470	12,484	25,713	1,724	3,287	30,724	124	30,848
Tempe	36,722	27,620	2,726	67,068	35,734	25,390	2,478	63,602	95,836	51,673	5,874	153,383	5,242	158,625
Tolleson	1,165	280	40	1,485	1,165	227	40	1,432	4,402	485	87	4,974	0	4,974
Wickenburg	1,501	594	596	2,691	1,367	507	467	2,341	3,362	950	727	5,039	43	5,082
Youngtown	1,236	537	10	1,783	1,145	496	0	1,641	2,121	736	0	2,857	153	3,010
Unin-New River	3,969	17	528	4,514	3,421	12	488	3,921	9,593	41	1,061	10,695	45	10,740
Unin-Rio Verde	1,168	0	0	1,168	761	0	0	761	1,419	0	0	1,419	0	1,419
Unin-Sun City	23,397	4,248	86	27,731	19,524	3,883	83	23,490	32,180	5,345	116	37,641	668	38,309
Unin-Sun City West	16,264	1,085	10	17,359	14,118	869	10	14,997	24,872	1,192	19	26,083	261	26,344
Unin-Sun Lakes	6,685	73	988	7,746	5,718	73	892	6,683	10,451	96	1,389	11,936	0	11,936
Unin-Other	29,825	2,643	16,056	48,524	27,588	2,280	10,910	40,778	78,935	4,435	27,572	110,942	296	111,238
Total	821,198	332,061	96,972	1,250,231	774,122	291,699	67,065	1,132,886	2,226,976	642,059	158,331	3,027,366	44,783	3,072,149

* Maricopa County portion only.

Note: Total Housing Units and Population consistent with full Census count.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, October 2004.

YEAR 2000 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING
Occupancy Rates and Population per Occupied Housing Unit by Municipality
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

TABLE 3

Jurisdiction	Occupancy Rates (April 1, 2000)				Population per Occupied Unit (April 1, 2000)			
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total
Apache Junction *	0.00	0.48	0.52	0.50	0.00	1.74	1.59	1.67
Avondale	0.96	0.78	0.93	0.93	3.46	2.55	3.48	3.36
Buckeye	0.94	0.93	0.87	0.92	3.39	2.25	2.66	3.03
Carefree	0.79	0.72	1.00	0.79	2.15	1.45	2.50	2.11
Cave Creek	0.92	0.86	0.68	0.90	2.43	2.32	2.08	2.37
Chandler	0.96	0.86	0.85	0.94	2.96	2.26	2.73	2.82
El Mirage	0.92	0.85	0.29	0.67	3.83	3.52	2.81	3.59
Fountain Hills	0.89	0.61	0.00	0.82	2.46	1.75	0.00	2.34
Gila Bend	0.86	0.88	0.85	0.86	2.83	2.89	3.46	3.00
Gila River *	0.97	0.85	0.71	0.92	4.46	3.61	3.14	4.22
Gilbert	0.96	0.92	0.95	0.96	3.18	2.25	3.19	3.10
Glendale	0.97	0.91	0.91	0.95	3.11	2.33	2.43	2.85
Goodyear	0.91	0.91	1.00	0.91	2.73	2.53	2.55	2.68
Guadalupe	0.94	0.97	0.93	0.94	4.92	2.64	4.59	4.70
Litchfield Park	0.93	0.80	0.00	0.92	2.50	2.58	0.00	2.51
Mesa	0.93	0.86	0.50	0.83	3.01	2.24	1.92	2.68
Paradise Valley	0.92	1.00	1.00	0.92	2.69	2.00	3.29	2.71
Peoria *	0.95	0.83	0.77	0.92	2.90	1.80	2.12	2.73
Phoenix	0.97	0.89	0.87	0.94	3.02	2.32	2.61	2.79
Queen Creek *	0.96	0.00	0.94	0.95	3.49	0.00	3.72	3.58
Salt River	0.99	1.00	0.62	0.78	4.39	2.87	1.97	3.24
Scottsdale	0.89	0.81	0.82	0.86	2.42	1.75	2.04	2.22
Surprise	0.84	0.60	0.52	0.77	2.52	2.08	2.24	2.46
Tempe	0.97	0.92	0.91	0.95	2.69	2.04	2.37	2.41
Tolleson	1.00	0.81	1.00	0.96	3.79	2.14	2.18	3.47
Wickenburg	0.91	0.85	0.78	0.87	2.51	1.87	1.56	2.15
Youngtown	0.93	0.92	0.00	0.92	1.87	1.48	0.00	1.74
Unin-New River	0.86	0.71	0.92	0.87	2.80	3.42	2.17	2.73
Unin-Rio Verde	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.65	1.81	0.00	0.00	1.86
Unin-Sun City	0.83	0.91	0.97	0.85	1.65	1.38	1.40	1.60
Unin-Sun City West	0.87	0.80	1.00	0.86	1.77	1.37	1.90	1.74
Unin-Sun Lakes	0.86	1.00	0.90	0.86	1.82	1.32	1.56	1.79
Unin-Other	0.92	0.84	0.68	0.84	2.86	1.94	2.52	2.72
Total	0.94	0.88	0.69	0.91	2.88	2.20	2.36	2.67

* Maricopa County portion only.

Note: An Occupancy Rate or Population per Occupied Unit of 0.00 signifies that there were no units for this unit type.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census Year 2000 Census.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, October 2004.

JULY 1, 2004 MUNICIPALITY POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT UPDATE
Net Housing Unit Completion and Annexation Information by Municipality (April 1, 2000 - June 30, 2004)

TABLE 4

DRAFT

DRAFT

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Jurisdiction	Net Housing Units (Completions - Demolitions)				Annexed Housing Units			
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total
Apache Junction *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Avondale	6,869	1,036	0	7,905	7	0	0	7
Buckeye	789	316	61	1,166	14	0	0	14
Carefree	238	0	0	238	0	0	0	0
Cave Creek	302	4	1	307	0	0	0	0
Chandler	12,209	4,782	0	16,991	200	0	0	200
El Mirage	6,102	7	46	6,155	0	0	5	5
Fountain Hills	928	86	0	1,014	0	0	0	0
Gila Bend	11	0	7	18	0	0	0	0
Gila River *	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	0
Gilbert	14,858	893	0	15,751	2,868	0	0	2,868
Glendale	3,358	2,176	0	5,534	6	0	0	6
Goodyear	6,785	8	0	6,793	0	0	0	0
Guadalupe	35	0	0	35	0	0	0	0
Litchfield Park	48	0	0	48	0	0	0	0
Mesa	13,939	3,892	765	18,596	1,052	0	0	1,052
Paradise Valley	315	0	0	315	0	0	0	0
Peoria *	7,825	1,729	89	9,643	0	0	0	0
Phoenix	24,568	11,012	17	35,597	52	0	0	52
Queen Creek *	2,155	0	0	2,155	0	0	0	0
Salt River	82	0	23	105	0	0	0	0
Scottsdale	6,379	3,526	0	9,905	2	0	0	2
Surprise	15,409	744	76	16,229	0	0	0	0
Tempe	444	398	0	842	0	0	0	0
Tolleson	22	228	2	252	0	0	0	0
Wickenburg	151	32	1	184	120	0	0	120
Youngtown	158	153	0	311	0	0	0	0
Unin-New River	87	0	37	124	0	0	0	0
Unin-Rio Verde	136	0	0	136	0	0	0	0
Unin-Sun City	261	0	0	261	0	0	0	0
Unin-Sun City West	95	0	0	95	0	0	0	0
Unin-Sun Lakes	999	0	6	1,005	0	0	0	0
Unin-Other	14,248	5	2,552	16,805	-4,321	0	-5	-4,326
Total	139,815	31,027	3,683	174,525	0	0	0	0

* Maricopa County portion only.

Sources: Maricopa Association of Governments Residential Completion database.
 Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, October 2004.

JULY 1, 2004 MUNICIPALITY POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT UPDATE

TABLE 5
DRAFT

DRAFT

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Jurisdiction	Total Resident Housing Units (July 1, 2004)				Occupied Resident Housing Units (July 1, 2004)				Population (July 1, 2004)					
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Pop. In Households	Pop. in Grp. Qrts.	TOTAL
Apache Junction *	0	185	143	328	0	89	74	163	0	155	118	273	0	273
Avondale	15,475	2,617	1,239	19,331	14,857	2,043	1,151	18,051	49,776	4,969	4,006	58,752	176	58,928
Buckeye	2,087	767	670	3,524	1,971	711	580	3,262	6,515	1,535	1,536	9,586	4,741	14,327
Carefree	1,842	163	2	2,007	1,451	118	2	1,571	3,113	171	5	3,289	0	3,289
Cave Creek	1,751	185	124	2,060	1,601	158	85	1,844	3,790	367	178	4,335	0	4,335
Chandler	63,171	18,451	2,161	83,783	60,700	15,866	1,835	78,401	177,066	34,857	5,015	216,937	1,394	218,331
El Mirage	7,729	329	1,269	9,327	7,079	279	366	7,724	25,158	979	1,025	27,162	18	27,180
Fountain Hills	9,030	2,475	0	11,505	8,026	1,503	0	9,529	19,571	2,612	0	22,182	182	22,364
Gila Bend	439	100	245	784	378	88	209	675	1,048	254	723	2,025	0	2,025
Gila River *	537	39	119	695	521	33	85	639	2,308	119	267	2,694	45	2,739
Gilbert	51,030	4,462	134	55,626	49,003	4,116	127	53,246	152,122	9,021	405	161,547	142	161,689
Glendale	55,288	24,951	4,968	85,207	53,800	22,650	4,498	80,948	166,359	52,309	10,939	229,607	2,937	232,544
Goodyear	12,664	583	317	13,564	11,551	529	317	12,398	29,962	1,336	807	32,105	2,805	34,910
Guadalupe	1,006	93	120	1,219	942	90	111	1,143	4,621	238	510	5,369	0	5,369
Litchfield Park	1,577	104	0	1,681	1,470	83	0	1,553	3,670	214	0	3,884	30	3,914
Mesa	110,448	51,088	33,813	195,349	103,233	44,171	17,021	164,425	308,785	98,068	32,485	439,338	5,083	444,421
Paradise Valley	5,792	15	7	5,814	5,301	15	7	5,323	14,314	30	23	14,367	0	14,367
Peoria *	41,217	6,776	4,220	52,213	39,236	5,637	3,269	48,142	112,672	9,842	6,914	129,429	1,568	130,997
Phoenix	336,195	173,473	21,813	531,481	325,202	155,249	19,073	499,524	978,124	358,439	49,868	1,386,431	24,552	1,410,983
Queen Creek *	3,141	0	243	3,384	2,990	0	228	3,218	9,918	0	848	10,766	98	10,864
Salt River	1,115	15	1,501	2,631	1,103	15	936	2,055	4,830	43	1,838	6,711	50	6,761
Scottsdale	77,682	36,182	1,017	114,881	69,086	29,283	829	99,197	165,954	50,685	1,695	218,334	1,798	220,132
Surprise	27,465	2,122	2,902	32,489	23,175	1,277	1,512	25,963	56,103	2,539	3,372	62,015	140	62,155
Tempe	37,166	28,018	2,726	67,910	36,166	25,756	2,478	64,400	96,919	52,351	5,874	155,143	5,573	160,716
Tolleson	1,187	508	42	1,737	1,187	412	42	1,641	4,482	847	91	5,420	0	5,420
Wickenburg	1,772	626	597	2,995	1,616	534	468	2,619	3,941	992	728	5,661	271	5,932
Youngtown	1,394	690	10	2,094	1,292	637	0	1,929	2,376	927	17	3,320	625	3,945
Unin-New River	4,056	17	565	4,638	3,497	12	523	4,031	9,790	41	1,131	10,962	45	11,007
Unin-Rio Verde	1,304	0	0	1,304	849	0	0	849	1,572	0	0	1,572	0	1,572
Unin-Sun City	23,658	4,248	86	27,992	19,743	3,883	83	23,709	32,513	5,345	116	37,974	668	38,642
Unin-Sun City West	16,359	1,085	10	17,454	14,200	869	10	15,079	25,007	1,192	19	26,218	261	26,479
Unin-Sun Lakes	7,684	73	994	8,751	6,569	73	897	7,540	11,884	96	1,397	13,376	0	13,376
Unin-Other	39,752	2,648	18,598	60,998	36,757	2,284	12,681	51,722	103,269	4,442	31,751	139,463	550	140,013
Total	961,013	363,088	100,655	1,424,756	904,550	318,464	69,497	1,292,511	2,587,529	695,017	163,702	3,446,248	53,752	3,500,000

* Maricopa County portion only.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, October 2004.

JULY 1, 2004 MUNICIPALITY POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT UPDATE
Occupancy Rates and Population per Occupied Housing Unit by Municipality

TABLE 6

DRAFT

DRAFT

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Jurisdiction	Occupancy Rates (July 1, 2004)					Population per Occupied Unit (July 1, 2004)			
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total		Single Family	Multi-Family	Other	Total
Apache Junction *	0.00	0.48	0.52	0.50		0.00	1.74	1.59	1.67
Avondale	0.96	0.78	0.93	0.93		3.35	2.43	3.48	3.25
Buckeye	0.94	0.93	0.87	0.93		3.30	2.16	2.65	2.94
Carefree	0.79	0.72	1.00	0.78		2.15	1.45	2.50	2.09
Cave Creek	0.91	0.86	0.68	0.90		2.37	2.32	2.10	2.35
Chandler	0.96	0.86	0.85	0.94		2.92	2.20	2.73	2.77
El Mirage	0.92	0.85	0.29	0.83		3.55	3.51	2.80	3.52
Fountain Hills	0.89	0.61	0.00	0.83		2.44	1.74	0.00	2.33
Gila Bend	0.86	0.88	0.85	0.86		2.77	2.89	3.46	3.00
Gila River *	0.97	0.85	0.71	0.92		4.43	3.61	3.14	4.22
Gilbert	0.96	0.92	0.95	0.96		3.10	2.19	3.19	3.03
Glendale	0.97	0.91	0.91	0.95		3.09	2.31	2.43	2.84
Goodyear	0.91	0.91	1.00	0.91		2.59	2.52	2.55	2.59
Guadalupe	0.94	0.97	0.93	0.94		4.91	2.64	4.59	4.70
Litchfield Park	0.93	0.80	0.00	0.92		2.50	2.58	0.00	2.50
Mesa	0.93	0.86	0.50	0.84		2.99	2.22	1.91	2.67
Paradise Valley	0.92	1.00	1.00	0.92		2.70	2.00	3.29	2.70
Peoria *	0.95	0.83	0.77	0.92		2.87	1.75	2.12	2.69
Phoenix	0.97	0.89	0.87	0.94		3.01	2.31	2.61	2.78
Queen Creek *	0.95	0.00	0.94	0.95		3.32	0.00	3.72	3.35
Salt River	0.99	1.00	0.62	0.78		4.38	2.87	1.96	3.27
Scottsdale	0.89	0.81	0.82	0.86		2.40	1.73	2.04	2.20
Surprise	0.84	0.60	0.52	0.80		2.42	1.99	2.23	2.39
Tempe	0.97	0.92	0.91	0.95		2.68	2.03	2.37	2.41
Tolleson	1.00	0.81	1.00	0.94		3.78	2.06	2.17	3.30
Wickenburg	0.91	0.85	0.78	0.87		2.44	1.86	1.56	2.16
Youngtown	0.93	0.92	0.00	0.92		1.84	1.46	0.00	1.72
Unin-New River	0.86	0.71	0.93	0.87		2.80	3.42	2.16	2.72
Unin-Rio Verde	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.65		1.85	0.00	0.00	1.85
Unin-Sun City	0.83	0.91	0.97	0.85		1.65	1.38	1.40	1.60
Unin-Sun City West	0.87	0.80	1.00	0.86		1.76	1.37	1.90	1.74
Unin-Sun Lakes	0.85	1.00	0.90	0.86		1.81	1.32	1.56	1.77
Unin-Other	0.92	0.86	0.68	0.85		2.81	1.94	2.50	2.70
Total	0.94	0.88	0.69	0.91		2.86	2.18	2.36	2.67

* Maricopa County portion only.

Note: An Occupancy Rate or Population per Occupied Unit of 0.00 signifies that there were no units for this unit type.

Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments, October 2004.