

Minutes of the  
MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options  
Friday, June 13, 2003  
Ocotillo Room

Members

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman  
Charlie McClendon, Avondale  
Prisila Ferreira, Peoria

Tim Tilton for Norris Nordvold, Phoenix  
Jim Huling, Mesa  
Patrick Flynn, Tempe

Others in Attendance

Brian Townsend, Gilbert  
Peggy Carpenter, Scottsdale

Amber Wakeman, Tempe  
Harry Wolfe, MAG

\* Not present nor represented by proxy

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:40 a.m. by George Pettit.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of May 16, 2003

It was moved by Charlie McClendon, seconded by Pat Flynn and unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of May 16, 2003.

3. Option for Deriving a 2005 Population Figure for Distributing State-Shared Revenue

Harry Wolfe noted that at the May 16, 2003 meeting of the Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options the cost of the different alternatives for deriving a 2005 population figure for distributing state-shared revenue was reviewed. He said that at the close of the meeting the consensus expressed was that MAG pursue a Census Survey at a 95 percent confidence interval plus/minus 2 percent (jurisdictions could opt for a higher accuracy level and if they incurred the additional cost); and that the cost be distributed based on population size. No official vote or action, however, was taken.

George Pettit indicated that it had been assumed that population would be used to distribute the cost of the Census Survey but that additional discussion on the matter was requested.

Charlie McClendon said that the problem with using the share of the housing unit sample is that it hurts the thirteen smallest cities. For them it is up to five times more expensive to conduct the survey and so they might as well conduct a full Special Census. He said that for Avondale the cost allocation was not that crucial.

Prisila said that she shared Mr. McClendon's concerns about the impact on small cities. She said if there were no difference in cost between a Census Survey and a Special Census, the smaller cities might pursue a Special Census and FHWA funding would be lost.

George Pettit said he would like the Subcommittee to have a unified position prior to going to the Management Committee with a recommendation.

Tim Tilton said the allocation of costs based on population was not a major issue with Phoenix. Jim Huling responded that in conversations he had held with Phoenix staff, that Phoenix was opposed to the distribution of costs based on population. Mr. Tilton said he would check back with his management.

Prisila Ferreira said that she agreed with the rationale for using a housing unit sample, but was concerned it would jeopardize the \$6 million in FHWA funds for the survey.

Jim Huling said that some of the larger cities like Phoenix and Glendale will lose the greatest amount of state-shared revenue.

Charlie McClendon pointed out that some smaller cities, like Litchfield Park, Tolleson and Gila Bend, will also lose state-shared revenues.

Jim Huling reiterated that Phoenix would take the biggest hit in state-shared revenue. He said that he could not support the use of population for allocating costs, and would abstain on a motion to that effect.

George Pettit commented that the option of pursuing a DES estimate creates a new dynamic to the process.

Charlie McClendon asked the Subcommittee should wait or delay any more. He said the issues were clearly stated.

Jim Huling said that a compromise could address the smaller cities that weren't growing like Gila Bend and Litchfield Park.

George Pettit stated that there would be a benefit to a regional approach to developing 2005 population figures for distributing state-shared revenues. He added that the remaining unresolved issue was the cost allocation. Mr. Pettit suggested that those who have a larger sample should pay more, but that such an option would negatively impact some of the smaller jurisdictions. He said that he thought that the compromise was to distribute the cost based on population, but that there was not unanimous support for that option. He also commented that the Subcommittee had fulfilled its obligation in coming up with a recommendation.

Patrick Flynn said that using population to allocate costs would be most fair to get everyone in agreement to pursue a Census Survey.

Prisila Ferreira suggested than another subcommittee meeting be held to see if the disagreement over cost allocation could be resolved.

Jim Huling said that Mesa is open to change but that the City believes that using the housing

sample to allocate costs is the way to go.

George Pettit said he would call Frank Fairbanks to discuss the cost allocation issue; and that if another meeting were needed one would be held.

4. Financing the Cost of the Census Survey

Harry Wolfe reported that at the May 16, 2003 Subcommittee meeting an issue raised was about using FHWA matching funds to provide the up-front funding to the Census Bureau to cover initial costs associated with the Census Survey. Mr. Wolfe said that MAG would need to provide a payment equivalent to about 15 percent of the Census survey cost at the time of signing a contract with the Census Bureau. He also mentioned that the contract would need to be signed by March 2004; in Fiscal Year 2005 5 percent of the survey cost would be paid to the Census Bureau; and in Fiscal Year 2006 the remaining 80 percent of the cost would be paid. Mr. Wolfe added that a means of securing a commitment from MAG member agencies to cover their share of the cost of a survey in 2006 was needed.

Jim Huling suggested that the commitment be secured through an Intergovernmental Agreement. George Pettit requested that MAG work with its attorney regarding such an agreement.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.