

Minutes of the
MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options
Friday, May 2, 2003
Cholla 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
Tom Remes, MAG
Harry Wolfe, MAG
** Susan Lavin, Census Bureau, Denver
**Mark Hellfritz, Census Bureau, Denver

**Ron Dopkowski, Census Bureau,
Headquarters
**Dennis Schwanz, Census Bureau
Headquarters
** Richard Ning, Census Bureau
Headquarters
**Karen Deaver, Census Bureau
Headquarters
**Sydnee Chattin-Reynolds, Census Bureau
Headquarters
** Tim Olson, Census Bureau, Headquarters
**Janet Cummings, Census Bureau,
Headquarters

* Not present nor represented by proxy
** Participated via Videoconference

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:35 a.m. by George Pettit.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of April 4, 2003

It was moved by Jim Huling, seconded by Prisila Ferreira and unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of April 4, 2003.

3. Legislation for Alternatives to a 2005 Special Census

Harry Wolfe reported that Senate Bill 1209, which allows for an estimate and/or survey to be used for distributing state-shared revenues in lieu of a Special Census had been signed by Governor Napolitano.

4. Options for Deriving a 2005 Population Figure For Distributing State-Shared Revenues

Harry Wolfe reported that at the April Subcommittee meeting a review was undertaken of the cost of a survey for deriving a 2005 population figure for distributing state-shared revenue. He said that the Census Bureau had calculated a cost to conduct a survey at a 95 percent confidence interval +/-2%, and +/-1 percent without including the cost of counting population in Group Quarters, including the homeless, which had not yet been determined.

Mr. Wolfe stated that subsequently, the Census Bureau had estimated the cost of conducting the count of population in group quarters and homeless at \$2 million; and had also increased the cost by \$345,000 of conducting the survey under the 2 percent option for Mesa assuming two subregions sampled. He added that MAG staff had recalculated the net cost to member agencies of pursuing a survey at the different confidence intervals versus conducting a Special Census, noting that the Gross cost of the three options are: \$9.4 million for the survey with 95 percent confidence interval +/- 2 percent; \$19.2 for the survey with 95 percent confidence interval +/- 1 percent; and \$30 million for a Special Census.

Harry Wolfe said that the Subcommittee would be requested to consider a recommendation to the Management Committee on an option for deriving a 2005 population figures for distributing state-shared revenues; and that MAG staff was currently working on estimating the state-shared revenue implications of pursuing a survey for each member agency.

Jim Huling pointed out that one of the recommendations that would need to be made by the Committee is whether the survey costs should be allocated based upon each jurisdiction's share of housing units sampled, or each jurisdiction's share of population.

Harry Wolfe added that the Census Bureau had indicated that MAG would need to provide a payment of 15 percent of the project cost at the time the Memorandum of Understanding was signed in March 2004. Jim Huling asked how much would be needed in subsequent years.

Ron Dopkowski responded that another 5% of the project cost would be needed in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2004, and the 80% balance in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2005.

Tim Tilton pointed out that all the jurisdictions needed to go with a survey option to use the \$6 million in FHWA funds.

Pat Flynn said that Tempe might consider opting out and using the DES estimate.

Harry Wolfe pointed out that there were issues with the accuracy of the DES estimates which needed to be fully understood. He said that the problems involved both the derivation of the

County estimate and the allocation of the estimate to individual jurisdictions.

Jim Huling said that before a recommendation was made to the Management Committee he wanted to have a better understanding of the potential use of DES population estimates. He asked why we would not consider using an estimate when almost everyone else in the state would use one.

It was recommended that the Subcommittee meet again on May 16, 2003 to have a full discussion on the implications of using DES estimates to distribute state-shared revenues.

Charlie McClendon stated that Avondale benefits from the 2005 population figures and could make a case for going with a survey at + or -2 percent, as long as the allocation of cost procedure treated the smaller cities fairly.

Ron Dopkowski asked whether conducting a survey for deriving population in households and a full count for deriving population in Group Quarters would meet the requirements of the State law. George Pettit responded that it would.

Ron Dopkowski also noted that the State Legislation didn't define resident population and asked whether MAG would use the Census definition. Harry Wolfe replied that we would be using the Census definition.

Ron Dopkowski asked if we wanted the Home count separated from the total Group Quarter count. Harry Wolfe responded that MAG would like the homeless count disaggregated from the total Group Quarter count.

Janet Cummings pointed out that the 2005 Special Census cost estimates cited by MAG in its table comparing survey and Special Census costs was a very rough estimate; and that a more precise estimate would be generated if jurisdictions submitted a formal request for a Special Census cost estimate accompanied by a \$200 fee.

Charlie McClendon said that costs aside there are advantages to taking a survey compared to a Special Census. He said that a Census cannot count everyone, but a survey provides the opportunity to estimate the entire population based on the sample taken.

It was requested that Harry Wolfe prepare a matrix that looks at the pros and cons of each option for the May 16, 2003 meeting of the Subcommittee.

5. Other Miscellaneous Issues Associated with the Decision on Which 2005 Population Option to Pursue for the Distribution of State-Shared Revenues

No other miscellaneous issues associated with the decision on which 2005 population option to pursue for distributing state-shared revenues were raised.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.