



Proposal and Fee Schedule for Demographic Redistricting Services Monterey County Board of Supervisors

May 12, 2021

We are pleased to offer redistricting services to the Monterey County Board of Supervisors. We provided these services after the 1990, 2000, and 2010 Censuses, and are quite familiar with the characteristics of the County and its population and geography.

According to California law, each county's Board of Supervisors must finish redistricting by December 15, 2021,¹ and we are committed to helping meet this deadline. Delays in release of Census 2020 data caused by COVID-19 means that there is far less time to complete the redistricting work than in prior decades. We will not receive the official redistricting data until mid-to-late September, and draft plans are not permitted to be provided until three weeks after the official data are released.² This will result in a truncated redistricting process, perhaps as little as six weeks to choose among draft maps.

In the post-2000 and 2010 Census redistricting processes, the Board of Supervisors used a Redistricting Advisory Committee. We assume a committee will be used for this round of redistricting.³ Using a committee will help complete the redistricting process by December 15, since the committee can meet frequently and devote their entire meetings to redistricting.

Another difference in 2021 round of redistricting that two new laws the California Fair Maps Act (AB-849, 2019) and AB-1276 (2020) specify procedures to assure public input. These new laws describe the precise criteria to be used when evaluating draft plans. The new laws also state meeting requirements and protocols. Many actions described in this proposal follow requirements in these laws as we understand them. However, we are not attorneys, so it is extremely important that both laws be reviewed carefully by County officials, including legal counsel.

Our Services

Our districting services will result in a redistricting plan that the Board of Supervisors adopts by December 15, 2021, and then implemented by county Registrars of Voters in time for the 2022 Board elections. Note that regardless of changes in election district boundaries that result from redistricting, current elected officials will complete their terms of office.

¹ Deadlines for other types of jurisdictions have recently changed. At this time, we have no information that suggests the County Boards of Supervisors will be given more time.

² If data are released after September 16, only a one-week delay is required.

³ In the Fair Maps Act (AB 849), advisory committees are referred to as Redistricting Advisory Commissions.

The redistricting process must be public, with opportunities for input by interested residents. Counties are now required by state law to encourage public participation in the redistricting process, as Monterey County has done in the past.

Our redistricting work will comply with the requirements of the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. Sec. 10301 et seq.), and recent California statutes concerning redistricting.

Specific Tasks

The tasks we perform during redistricting include (listed chronologically):

Before the official 2020 redistricting population counts are released:

1. Prepare the redistricting database for your jurisdiction using the Census Bureau’s 2020 redistricting data, the California Statewide Database, the most recent American Community Survey estimates, and data from local sources.
2. Prepare the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping database for your jurisdiction, using GIS layers from the Census Bureau (2020 versions), County/City GIS departments, and County Elections Office/Registrar of Voters.
3. Convert the current Supervisorial district boundaries (adopted in 2011) into Census 2020 geography using GIS software.
4. Provide content for County staff members to use in the County’s redistricting website.
5. Provide one or more orientation meetings for the Redistricting Advisory Commission. These are meetings that occur before any maps are developed. At these meetings, the Commission should receive public comment on “communities of interest⁴” and discuss communities of interest among themselves to give direction to demographers.

After 2020 redistricting population counts are released:

6. Evaluate whether the current boundaries need to be adjusted. If the populations are sufficiently equal,⁵ it may be possible to have a simplified public process.⁶ If the current election districts’ total 2020 populations are unequal, the redistricting process will continue as described below.

⁴ Communities of Interest (COIs) are contiguous areas where residents share common social and economic interests and should be in a single Trustee Area or be considered when drawing Trustee Area boundaries. COIs can be cities and unincorporated places, recognized neighborhoods, school districts, and areas with similar characteristics and interests.

⁵ The rule of thumb used to determine whether the current election districts can be used for another decade is that the difference between the most and least populous election districts should not exceed 10 percent of the ideal total population (one-fifth or one-seventh of the jurisdiction’s Census 2020 total population). The percentage is called “total deviation.”

⁶ The Fair Maps Act may still require a redistricting process, even if boundaries are still balanced. Please consult your redistricting attorney for advice in this situation.

7. Meet with the Redistricting Advisory Commission to provide draft maps for consideration. Members of the public may present maps as well, which we will replicate for the Commission's consideration. Continue working with the Redistricting Advisory Commission as they review draft redistricting plans and any modifications of the plans. We will develop and modify plans as needed. We will work with the Commission until it decides upon a redistricting plan to recommend to the Board. The Commission will need to meet several times in October and November until its work concludes.
8. Meet with the Board of Supervisors and describe the Commission's recommended plan(s). The Board will need to hold at least two public hearings, the first to take public input and hear about the Commission's recommended plan(s), and the second to adopt a resolution to adjust the boundaries as described in the recommended plan. Discussions about redistricting plans must be an entirely public process. The number of plans considered will need to be limited because of tight timelines.
9. (This may be optional) Provide online redistricting services so interested members of the public can draw plans that we will evaluate for you.
10. Document the adopted plan for the Registrar of Voters and work with their staff so that precincts can be adjusted well before the filing deadline for the 2022 election.

Overview of Tasks with Timeline

Summer, 2021	Staff sets up redistricting page on website, plans any other outreach efforts, Commissioners selected
August - September, 2021	One or more meetings by the Redistricting Advisory Commission to receive orientation on the process, take public comment on "communities of interest" and discuss among themselves "communities of interest"
September 16, 2021	The U.S. Census Bureau releases unadjusted redistricting counts
mid-end Sept 2021	Official redistricting data provided by Statewide Database (adjusted for prison inmates)
early to mid October 2021	Public hearing to receive any draft maps by members of the public; demographers present information about the population imbalance in the current Supervisorial districts
mid October - end of November 2021	Commission meets and receives draft maps from demographers and the public. Continues to make modifications to maps. Ultimately makes recommendation(s) to Board of Supervisors
By December 7, 2021	Board of Supervisors reviews all plans that are to be considered for adoption
By December 15, 2021	Board of Supervisors adopts new plan

Fee Proposal for Demographic Redistricting Services – Monterey County, CA – May 2021*

Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.

Service	Description	Deliverables	Fee
Base Fee	All services detailed below, except meetings and online redistricting tool. Includes one orientation meeting (meeting should be video recorded and posted on the County's redistricting website). The meeting can be hybrid: demographers virtual, live or virtual for all others		\$95,000
Throughout project	Consult with the County's legal counsel and staff members as needed		Included
	Provide materials for the County's redistricting website	Reports, maps, and tables in pdf format	Included
	Provide an unlimited number of telephone/virtual consultations with the jurisdiction's staff members for planning purposes		Included
Meeting Charges (minimum of 4 meetings)	Meet with the County Board of Supervisors and its redistricting advisory committee.		
	Fee for each in-person meeting attended by Dr. Lapkoff or Dr. Gobalet, which includes additional districting plan development as well as meeting preparation and follow up.		\$3,900 per live meeting
	Fee for each virtual meeting (Zoom or similar) includes additional plan development as well as meeting preparation and follow up. We also will attend meetings virtually that are either live and/or virtual in the County for this fee.		\$1,000 per virtual meeting
Develop and modify redistricting scenarios	Develop and modify various scenarios (each scenario will meet demographic requirements of the Federal and State Voting Right Acts). Provide summaries of each scenario's total population, voting age population, and estimated citizen voting age population. Provide scenario and background maps.	Initial report with maps of at least two scenarios plus data tables. Modify scenarios, as needed.	Included
Plan Implementation	Document adopted plan with electronic shapefiles so that the County Registrar of Voters can implement the plan. Advise the jurisdiction if it needs to engage the services of another consultant to meet the Registrar's need to determine exact boundaries.	Provide maps of adopted plan (pdf files), and electronic files (shapefiles) that define the plan.	Included
Online Redistricting Resources for the Public (may be optional)	Provide access to Maptitude Online Redistricting or another online redistricting provider, with built-in data and map-drawing capabilities so that members of the public can submit redistricting plans electronically. The fee is fixed by the software company and depends on the jurisdiction's population size and other factors. Fee does not include web hosting, which is the County's responsibility. Fee to the online software providers could be paid separately.		\$33,000 (\$30,000 for Caliper Corporation; \$3,000 for LGDR administration)
	LGDR evaluation of redistricting plans submitted by members of the public based on legal and conventional redistricting criteria.	Report findings	\$1,000 per plan

* The prices quoted are guaranteed until May 31 30, 2021. Fees may increase after that date.

The County's responsibilities include:

1. Setting up the Redistricting Advisory Commission
2. Setting up, maintaining, and updating the County's redistricting website
3. Provide translation services for all meetings, website materials, and materials for the public
4. Facilitating meetings with the Redistricting Advisory Commission
5. Community outreach: organizing and offering opportunities for community members to participate in the redistricting process
6. Publicizing the redistricting process to the community
7. Hosting the virtual meetings with the Board of Supervisors and Redistricting Advisory Commission
8. Organizing and hosting the County's redistricting website
9. Hosting the online redistricting plan-drawing website (which may or may not be optional)

In prior decades, the County performed most of these tasks, especially to meet preclearance by the US. Department of Justice. Preclearance is no longer necessary. Now, the new redistricting laws have requirements regarding public outreach and record keeping that are somewhat similar to what was needed under preclearance.

Lapkoff & Gobalet will suggest material for the County's redistricting website.

Caveats

We will rely on data, maps, and other information supplied by various public agencies, including the Census Bureau's 2020 Public Law 94-171 data and population and citizenship estimates from the Bureau's American Community Survey and/or California Statewide Database. In addition to the state, county or city official GIS maps, we will use electronic maps of Census blocks provided by the Census Bureau, since redistricting data are available for only those geographical units (not precincts or real estate parcels). The jurisdiction or a local government agency will need to supply GIS shapefiles for the jurisdiction's outer boundaries, parcels, and precincts.

We cannot be responsible for any errors or omissions resulting from incorrect data or maps provided by the Census Bureau, County, City or any other agency. Furthermore, because election districts must be constructed by aggregating Census blocks to permit use of Census population counts, we may not be able to provide exact population counts. We will not be able to supply maps that exactly represent the jurisdiction's legal outer boundary.

We will work with the County Registrar of Voter GIS personnel to implement the adopted plan and will help to resolve any differences about the jurisdiction's legal boundary, the County's election precincts, and the Census block-based approximation used for establishing election districts.

We provide indemnification only up to the limits of our insurance.

QUALIFICATIONS

Since 1990, Lapkoff & Gobalet has provided demographic support for many districting and redistricting projects. After the 1990, 2000, and 2010 U.S. Censuses, we helped many clients redistrict as well as to change the election method to by-district pursuant to Federal Voting Rights Act requirements; recent projects have also been pursuant to California Voting Rights Act and AB 350 requirements.

Lapkoff & Gobalet's headquarters is in Saratoga, CA, with additional offices in Oakland, CA, and Reno/Sparks, NV.

Lapkoff & Gobalet have certified small business status with the State of California (Supplier #1125021). The firm is 100 percent woman owned. It is an Equal Opportunity employer.

Lapkoff & Gobalet are known for the clarity and effectiveness of their public presentations, maps, and reports. The company's principals enjoy working with members of the public and are seasoned public speakers. They became skilled users of Zoom for virtual meetings during the COVID-19 shutdown.

Lapkoff & Gobalet are skilled in explaining the redistricting process to members of the public, elected officials and staff members. They suggest content that explains the redistricting process, as well as maps and data tables for the jurisdiction's redistricting website or web page.

The personal styles of Drs. Lapkoff and Gobalet are suited to consensus-building and they have provided the basis for disparate parties to agree on a districting plan that met "one person, one vote" and Voting Rights Act criteria. Dr. Gobalet was cited in an amicus brief in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), a U.S. Supreme Court decision about Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act.

The company's two principals are committed professionals and see their role as being the impartial and non-partisan providers of information and analyses that inform choices made by elected officials.

Drs. Lapkoff and Gobalet are expert users of Census data, skilled users of GIS (Geographic Information System) mapping software (including Maptitude Redistricting), and are proficient, practiced quantitative analysts. They understand the technical, legal, and political aspects of districting. They are ably assisted by Robin Merrill, GIS Specialist.

Dr. Lapkoff earned a PhD in Demography from U.C. Berkeley and Dr. Gobalet earned a Ph.D. in Sociology from Stanford University. Each has made many presentations at professional conferences on political redistricting, the use of Census data, and other demographic subjects. Their redistricting work has included litigation support: they have served as expert witness in several voting rights cases and other litigation involving the U.S. Department of Justice. See LGDR's website at www.demographers.com for details.

Districting and redistricting clients, past and present, include:

City of Fremont
City of Hollister
City of Salinas
City of Santa Clara
ABC Unified School District
Alisal Union School District
Cerritos Community College District
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
Chualar School District
Gavilan Joint Community College District
Goleta Sanitary District
Hartnell Community College District
Kerman Unified School District
Kern High School District
Menifee Union School District
Monterey County Board of Education
Monterey County Board of Supervisors
Monterey Peninsula College District
Monterey Peninsula Unified School District
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
North Monterey County Unified School District
Perris Union High School District
Salinas City School District
Salinas Union High School District
San Benito Health Care District
San Jacinto Unified School District
San Jose Unified School District
San Jose/Evergreen Community College District
Sierra View Local Health Care District
State Center Community College District
Stockton Unified School District
Sylvan Union School District
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
West County Wastewater District
West Hills Community College District
West Valley-Mission Community College District

References:

Since 1990, LGDR has provided demographic support for districting and redistricting projects. After the 1990, 2000, and 2010 U.S. Censuses, LGDR helped many clients redistrict and to move from at-large to by-district elections pursuant to Federal Voting Rights Act requirements; recent projects have also been pursuant to California Voting Rights Act and AB 350 requirements. References include:

City of Salinas (Monterey County), 2011: Provided redistricting services for City Council election districts after Census 2010 (as well as 2000).

Contact: Patricia Barajas, CMC, Salinas City Clerk, patricib@ci.salinas.ca.us, (831) 758-7383

City of Hollister (San Benito County), 2011: Provided redistricting services for City Council election districts after Census 2010 (as well as 2000). Helped the City move from five to four Council Districts in 2015.

Contact: Christine Black, MMC, City Clerk, City of Hollister, CA, christine.black@hollister.ca.gov, 831-636-4300 x 1017

City of Fremont (Alameda County), 2017: Provided districting services for the City Council after the City received a CVRA challenge. See our work on the City's districting website:

<https://fremont.gov/districtelections>

Contact: Harvey Levine, City Attorney, HLevine@fremont.gov, (510) 284-4030

City of Santa Clara, 2011-2018: Provided various districting services to the City, supplying maps and reports for public hearings and the City's website. Provided demographic support while the City consider whether to change the Council's election method. Met with advisory committees. Helped the City implement a court-ordered districting plan that we developed.

Contact: Nadine Nader, Assistant City Manager, nnader@SantaClaraCA.gov, (408) 615-2228

Additional references will be provided upon request.

We have worked extensively with various attorneys specializing in voting rights and redistricting. One of these is:

Marguerite Mary Leoni, Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross & Leoni
MLeoni@nmgovlaw.com, (415) 389-6800

Testimonials

Our web site, www.Demographers.com, includes testimonials from many clients.

Shelley Lapkoff, Ph.D.

Demographer

Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.

Lapkoff@demographers.com

President and Principal, Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc., since 1992, and founder and owner of Lapkoff Demographic Research before that.

Lecturer, *University of California, Berkeley*, Demography Department, 1995 and 2001.

Education and Honors

Ph.D. Demography, *University of California, Berkeley*, 1988

M.A. Economics, *University of California, Berkeley*

A.B. Economics, With Honors, *University of Maryland*

Guest Lecturer, Business School, *University of California, Berkeley*

NICHHD Training Grant, *University of California, Berkeley*, 1984-86

University of California Graduate Fellowship, 1982-84

Political Redistricting Experience

Since 1990, Dr. Lapkoff has provided demographic assistance to many jurisdictions making the change from at-large to by-district election of governing board members. In connection with these projects, she has made many public presentations involving redistricting. She has provided expert testimony and litigation support in a variety of cases involving political districting and redistricting.

Attended Maptitude Redistricting training course (2011). Caliper Corporation's three-day course covering GIS redistricting and mapping.

Papers and Professional Presentations

Political Districting

"Who Must Elect by District in California? A Demographer's Perspective on Methods for Assessing Racially Polarized Voting," with Jeanne Gobalet. Chapter 18 in *Emerging Techniques in Applied Demography*, Hoque, M. Nazrul, Potter, Lloyd B. (Eds.), 2015.

"How much is enough and how much is too much? Measuring Hispanic political strength for redistricting purposes," with Jeanne Gobalet, 2012 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

"Voting Rights Act Issues in Political Redistricting," with Jeanne Gobalet, 1993 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

Invited Speaker, "Demographers and the Legal System," International Conference on Applied Demography, Bowling Green University, 1992.

"Changing from At-large to District Election of Trustees in Two California Community College Districts: A Study of Contrasts," with Jeanne G. Gobalet, *Applied Demography*, August 1991.

School and Child Demography

"Who Attends Private Schools?" with Magali Barbieri and Jeanne Gobalet, 2014 Applied Demography Conference, San Antonio, TX.

"Measuring Variations in Private School Enrollment Rates Using ACS Estimates," with Magali Barbieri and Jeanne Gobalet, 2014 American Community Survey Users Conference, Washington, DC.

"Five Trends for Schools," Educational Leadership, March 2007, Volume 64, No. 6, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (with Rose Maria Li).

“Studies in Applied Demography,” Session Organizer at the 2006 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“California’s Changing Demographics: How New Population Trends Can Affect Your District,” 2004 California School Boards Association Annual Meeting.

Panelist, “School Demography” session, 2004 Southern Demographic Association Annual Meeting.

“Where Have All the Children Gone?” Poster, 2004 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“Using Child-Adult Ratios for Estimating Census Tract Populations,” 1996 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“How to Figure Kids,” *American Demographics*, January 1994.

“Neighborhood Life Cycles,” 1994 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

"Enrollment Projections for School Districts," *Applied Demography*, Spring 1993.

"Projecting Births in a California School District," 1993 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

"School District Demography," Session Organizer and Chair, 1994 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

"School District Demography," Roundtable Luncheon Organizer, 1992 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

"National Demographic Trends," presentation to the National Association of Business Economists, 1990.

"Demographic Trends and Long-range Enrollment Forecasting," presentation at the Redwood Leadership Institute, Sonoma County, California, 1990.

"Projections of Student Enrollment in the Pleasanton Unified School District," 1989 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

General Demography

“Forecast of Emeritus Faculty/Staff Households on a University Campus,” with Jeanne Gobalet, 2000 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“Communicating Results: Practical Approaches Suited to Decision-Oriented Audiences,” Panelist. 2000 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“Fiscal Impacts of Demographic Change: Focus on California,” Session Organizer and Chair. 1995 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

Discussant for "Evaluating the Accuracy of Population Estimates and Projections," 1992 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

"Intergenerational Flows of Time and Goods: Consequences of Slowing Population Growth," with Ronald Lee, *Journal of Political Economy*, March 1988.

"A Research Note on Keyfitz' 'The Demographics of Unfunded Pension'," *European Journal of Population*, July 1991.

"Pay-as-you-go Retirement Systems in Nonstable Populations," Working Paper, U.C. Berkeley Demography Group, 1985.

"Assessing Long-run Migration Policy as a Solution to the Old Age Dependency Problem," paper presented at the 1985 Population Association of America Annual Meeting

Jeanne Gobalet, Ph.D.
Demographer and GIS Specialist
Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.
Gobalet@demographers.com

Vice President and Principal, Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc., since 1992

Social Sciences Instructor, Institutional Researcher, and Accreditation Steering Committee Chair, San Jose City College, 1967-99

Evaluation Team Member, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 1993-97

Education and Honors

Ph.D. Sociology, *Stanford University*, 1982

Specialties: Demography and Social Stratification

M.A. Sociology, *Stanford University*

M.A. Education, *Stanford University*

A.B. Sociology and History (Majors) and Geography (Minor)

Stanford University. With Distinction and Phi Beta Kappa

Postdoctoral Fellow, Demography, *University of California, Berkeley*, 1982-83

Political Redistricting Experience

Since 1989, Dr. Gobalet has provided demographic assistance to many jurisdictions making the change from at-large to by-district election of governing board members. In connection with these projects, she made many public presentations involving redistricting. She has provided expert testimony and litigation support in a variety of cases involving political districting and redistricting.

Selected Publications

“Who Must Elect by District in California? A Demographer’s Perspective on Methods for Assessing Racially Polarized Voting,” with Shelley Lapkoff. Chapter 18 in *Emerging Techniques in Applied Demography*, Hoque, M. Nazrul, Potter, Lloyd B. (Eds.), 2015.

“State and Local Government Demography,” in *Encyclopedia of Population*, Macmillan Reference USA, 2003.

“Lead Hot Zones and Childhood Lead Poisoning Cases, Santa Clara County, California, 1995,” with Su-Lin Wilkinson, Marcia Majoros, Bernie Zebrowski, and Guadalupe S. Olivas. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, 1999.

“Demographic Data and Geographic Information Systems for Decision-Making: The Case of Public Health,” with Richard K. Thomas. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 1996.

“Using Sociological Tools in a Legal Context,” *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 1995.

"Changing from At-large to District Election of Trustees in Two California Community College Districts: A Study of Contrasts," with Shelley Lapkoff. *Applied Demography*, Fall 1991.

World Mortality Trends Since 1870. New York, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1989.

Presentations at Professional Meetings

“Who Attends Private Schools?” with Magali Barbieri and Shelley Lapkoff, 2014 Applied Demography Conference, San Antonio, TX.

“Measuring Variations in Private School Enrollment Rates Using ACS Estimates,” with Magali Barbieri and Shelley Lapkoff, 2014 American Community Survey Users Conference, Washington, DC.

“Using American Community Survey Citizenship Estimates in Political Redistricting,” invited panelist, Workshop on the Benefits (and Burdens) of the American Community Survey, National Research Council of the National Academies of Science, Washington, DC, 2012.

“How much is enough and how much is too much? Measuring Hispanic political strength for redistricting purposes,” with Shelley Lapkoff, 2012 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“Who Must Elect by District? Methods for Assessing Racially Polarized Voting,” 2012 Applied Demography Conference, San Antonio, TX.

“What U.S. Census Data Tell Us About the Number of Children Per Housing Unit,” 2009 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

Organizer and Chair, School Demography Session, 2007-2011 Population Association of America Annual Meetings.

Panel Member, “Order in the Court: Demographers as Expert Witnesses in Legal Proceedings,” 2008 Population Association of American Annual Meeting.

“Did Changing the Election Method Make a Difference?” 2003 Southern Demographic Association Annual Meeting.

Panel Organizer, “Applications of GIS and Spatially-Referenced Data,” 2000 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“Forecast of Emeritus Faculty/Staff Households on a University Campus,” with Shelley Lapkoff, 2000 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

Panel Organizer and Presenter, “Spatially Referenced Data,” 1999 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

Demographics & Public Health, GIS in Public Health 3rd National Conference, 1998.

“Targeting At-Risk Children and Adolescents for Decision Makers,” 1996 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“GIS and Demography,” Discussant, 1996 Population Association of American Annual Meeting.

“Small Area Demographic Analysis with GIS,” 1994 International Conference on Applied Demography.

“What Demographers Need to Know about GIS,” 1994 International Conference on Applied Demography.

“Spatial Analysis in Sociology Using Geographic Information System Software,” 1994 American Sociological Association Annual Meeting.

“Exploring the Spatial Element in School District Demography Using GIS Software,” 1994 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.

“Use of Neighborhood Life Cycles for Improving Small Area Population Forecasts,” with Shelley Lapkoff, 1994 Population Association of America Annual Meeting.