

Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
State Capitol Complex, Suite E210
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2210
Telephone (801) 538-1027

Utah Population Estimates Committee

Minutes

Monday, November 14, 2005

2:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.

Committee Members

Present:

Robert Spendlove	Chair
Scott Festin	Wasatch Front Regional Council
Mark Knold	Utah Dept. of Workforce Services
Patty Murphy	Utah State Office of Education
Pam Perlich	University of Utah
Blake Smith	Questar Gas
Mike Toney	Utah State University
Tom Williams	Utah Tax Commission
Walt Busse	LDS Church
Ken Sizemore	Five County Association of Governments
Shawn Eliot	Mountainland Association of Governments
Jeff Gilbert	Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization
Barry Nangle	DOH, Vital Records

Staff:

Peter Donner	GOPB
Effie Johnson	GOPB
Morgan Lyon Cotti	GOPB
David Stringfellow	GOPB

Absent:

Nate Millward	Utah State Board of Regents
---------------	-----------------------------

Call to Order—Robert Spendlove, Committee Chair

I. Approve November 22, 2004 Minutes

Tom Williams proposed a change to the November 22, 2004 minutes as follows: The last two sentences in the first paragraph of the Discussion of Estimates of Methodology to “Tom said that the IRS results of growth rates were influenced by tax cuts.” Ken Sizemore made a motion to approve the minutes as amended and Blake Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Welcome and Introductions—Robert Spendlove

Robert welcomed everyone and had committee members and staff introduce themselves.

III. Discussion of Estimates Methodology—Effie Johnson, David Stringfellow, Robert Spendlove

Effie Johnson reviewed the challenges made by cities in Utah and Utah County to the 2004 round of estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau. For the 2004 round 15 cities (13 in Utah County) and Utah

County challenged the Census Bureau's estimates and 12 of the 15 have been accepted. Utah County was used as an example of how the Census Bureau's estimates differ from UPEC's estimates and how the accepted challenge estimate is much closer to the UPEC estimate. Walt Busse commented that the challenge estimate adds a degree of confidence to the UPEC method.

David Stringfellow discussed the current estimates methodology (IRS, School, LDS, and Housing) the Committee has been using in establishing the population estimates for Utah. He then introduced a new method for identifying outliers. He then explained the different ways to make the estimates

1. Trust the simple average of the four methods and do not modify
 - Pro—Simple, not influenced by bias
 - Con—highly influenced by outliers
2. Use the expertise of the committee
 - Pro—Flexibility
 - Con—introduces bias
3. Use statistics to determine outliers
 - Pro—Every County receives equal treatment
 - Con—Complicated and difficult to explain
4. Use a combination of 2 and 3

David then went on to explain the outlier method using the Dixon's Q test. He then provided visual graphs for each county with the outliers identified by the Dixon's Q test. Pam Perlich and Tom Williams expressed concern that relying solely on the Dixon's Q test is not appropriate. Robert Spendlove made a motion that the outlier method be used as a tool in combination with regular methods, Pam seconded it and the motion passed unanimously.

David continued with an overview of the population estimates (pe) file. Patty Murphy was concerned that charter school enrollment was not included in the school method. Robert explained that the reason they were left out is because charter school enrollment is not a stable cohort. The school method was review with charter schools and without. Patty made a motion to use charter school enrollment in the school method, Pam seconded the motion and it passed. David made the change to the pe file.

Robert also discussed discontinuing the "no outlier" method because of its inaccuracy. By taking the simple average of the School, LDS, and Housing methods and identifying the populations as "low" or "high" a more comprehensive count could be determined.

IV. 2005 State and County Estimates

- A. **Washington, San Juan, Grand, Garfield, and Piute Counties** – The LDS count was determined to be an outlier and was dropped and the School, IRS, and Housing average was used.
- B. **Box Elder, Uintah, Sevier, Morgan, Rich, and Daggett Counties** – The School method was determined to be an outlier and was dropped and the LDS, IRS, and Housing average was used.
- D. **Summit County** –The LDS count was determined to be a low outlier. The growth rate with the LDS method was 3.0% and without was 3.8%. The committee determined that the first rate was too low and the second rate was too high, therefore they decided to go with a method to average the UPEC method with the LDS outlier method to get a growth rate of 3.4%.
- E. **Beaver County** – The IRS count was determined to be an outlier and was dropped and the School, LDS, and Housing average was used.

A simple average was used in determining the estimates for the remaining counties. Walt Busse made a motion to accept all the county population estimates produced in the meeting as the official estimates of the Utah Population Estimates Committee. Scott Festin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Scott Festin moved to adjourn the meeting, Blake Smith seconded and the motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned.