

Options to Incorporate 2010 Census Data into the 2012 RTP Forecast

DATE : February 9, 2011
TO : P&P TAC
FROM : Simon Choi / Frank Wen, SCAG Staff
Deborah Diep, Director, Center for Demographic Research, CSU, Fullerton

Option 1

Do nothing. Do not incorporate 2010 Census data into RTP/SCS or RHNA.

Highlights:

- This is a defensible process and methodology which SCAG was already pursuing.
- The 2010 Census data is being released at a time that arguably falls outside the practicable schedule to incorporate the latest and greatest data.

Pro:

- Staff can proceed with all of the many tasks already on-going, and move forward according to work plan and 2012 RTP/SCS technical approach.

Con:

- Negative public perception by not using "latest and greatest".
- Vacancy rates outdated.
- Increased likelihood of RHNA challenges through litigation.
- Difficulty in using other than the 2010 Census data to accurately depict current/base year conditions.

Option 2

Incorporate 2010 Census data into RTP/SCS and RHNA processes and use growth increments (delta) submitted/approved by jurisdictions, over 20-month review and input process, to recalculate the 2020 and 2035 target years.

Highlights:

- Jurisdictions within SCAG region have participated in the 20-month review and input process for developing the growth forecast dataset.
- Growth increments for 2008-2020 and 2020-2035, already approved by jurisdictions will not be changed.
- SCAG staff works from March to April to process census geographies and data, update 2010 data in growth forecast, “backcast” new 2010 numbers to 2008.
- 2020 and 2035 totals will be updated based on new 2010 data and the growth increments for 2008-20 and 2020-35 already reviewed/approved by jurisdictions.

Pro:

- Incorporates “latest and greatest” information.
- SCAG has already done preliminary model calibrations to address gap.
- RHNA allocations at the jurisdiction level will use 2010 Census population and housing data.
- Jurisdictions have already reviewed/approved data and growth increments.
- Staff has evaluated timeline and tasks and believes this can be completed within the required timeframe for the feds to determine conformity so as to not jeopardize funding.

Con:

- Does not allow for another full review and update process by jurisdictions.
- Schedules are tight, leaves no room for any mistakes or errors in dataset development, model calibration, and model output production.

Option 3

Incorporate 2010 Census data into RTP/SCS and RHNA processes with full revisions of growth projections, jurisdiction review to all years, and revised growth increments.

Pro:

- Incorporates “latest and greatest” information.
- Allows for another full review by jurisdictions of incremental year data and growth.
- RHNA allocations at the jurisdiction level will use 2010 Census population and housing.
- SCAG has already done preliminary model calibrations to address gap.

Con:

- Full revisions of growth projections and review by jurisdictions basically start the growth forecasting process all over again. In particular, review by local jurisdictions would necessitate packaging data, sending it out for review, fielding questions, collecting and incorporating comments, follow up with non-responders, updating full SED dataset and modeling variables again.
- These additional tasks would adversely impact the timely completion of 2012 RTP/SCS, EIR, and may postpone the approval of RTP and jeopardize funding and transportation projects.
- Still lack of key datasets (detail census data by age, gender and ethnicity—release in Summer 2011, updated national employment projections by BLS—available in November 2011) for technically sound revisions of the regional, county and city projections of both population and employment.

