



MEMORANDUM

Date: December 19, 2018

To: The Honorable Chairman and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "CHH", is written over the printed name "C.H. Huckelberry".

Re: **Road Repair Funding and Discussion by the Board of Supervisors at the December 18, 2018 Board Meeting**

As requested by the Board of Supervisors, I will provide detailed answers to Supervisor Steve Christy's questions he asked at the meeting of December 18, 2018 as well as those he will forward to the Transportation Advisory Committee.

In response to the Board, many of these issues and questions have been asked and answered numerous times and I will reference all of the previous transportation communications I have sent to the Board answering these questions that continue to be raised. A tab on my web page is dedicated to transportation and can be accessed by anyone.

It would be helpful to understand that the primary source of revenue for road repair is the County's state distribution of Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) and transportation earmarked Vehicle License Taxes. These are funds specifically earmarked for street and highway construction, maintenance and operation and have been used for this purpose in Pima County as well as in all other counties in Arizona since inception of HURF by the Legislature in 1974.

In constructing the County budget, it is important that specifically earmarked funds be used for their lawful, intended purposes. For example, it would be clearly unlawful to use wastewater or sewer revenues to repair roads. Likewise, using Library District, Stadium District, or Flood Control District taxes to repair roads would be unlawful and clearly misappropriate. The same is true for the County's General Fund as it is intended to support General Fund departments of the County that provide regional countywide services. The primary revenue source of the General Fund is from a Countywide property tax. To use property taxes collected on all properties, whether in a city, town or unincorporated area of Pima County, for a purpose restricted to the unincorporated area, such as street and highway construction, operation and maintenance, would be inappropriate and inequitable from a tax use perspective.

The Honorable Chairman and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Re: **Road Repair Funding and Discussion by the Board of Supervisors at the December 18,
2018 Board Meeting**
December 19, 2018
Page 2

Attached is the latest table of population by supervisorial District, jurisdiction and total incorporated versus unincorporated population by District. As you can see, four supervisorial districts have incorporated populations greater than their unincorporated population. Only one District, District 1, has an unincorporated population greater than the incorporated population of that District.

The unincorporated population of the County is 37 percent of the total County population, which means 63 percent of the County's population lives in a city or town. By assessed value, the percentages are 42 percent for the unincorporated area, 41 percent for the City of Tucson, 8 percent for the Town of Marana, 0.3 percent for South Tucson, 3 percent for the Town of Sahuarita and 6 percent for the Town of Oro Valley.

It should be obvious why it is inequitable to use taxes paid by 63 percent of the incorporated population to only benefit 37 percent of the County unincorporated population.

CHH/anc

Attachment

c: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
Ana Olivares, Director for Transportation Department

POPULATION ESTIMATES BY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT AND JURISDICTION

DISTRICT	SUPERVISOR	JURISDICTION	POPULATION ESTIMATE 2016	PERCENT TOTAL POPULATION
1	ALLY MILLER	MARANA	21,522	11%
1	ALLY MILLER	ORO VALLEY	36,132	18%
1	ALLY MILLER	TUCSON	3,338	2%
2	ALLY MILLER	TOTAL INCORPORATED	60,992	30%
1	ALLY MILLER	UNINCORPORATED PIMA COUNTY	141,015	70%
		DISTRICT TOTAL	202,007	100%
2	RAMON VALADEZ	SAHUARITA	18,416	9%
2	RAMON VALADEZ	SOUTH TUCSON	5,597	3%
2	RAMON VALADEZ	TUCSON	157,642	78%
3	RAMON VALADEZ	TOTAL INCORPORATED	181,655	90%
2	RAMON VALADEZ	UNINCORPORATED PIMA COUNTY	21,154	10%
		DISTRICT TOTAL	202,809	100%
3	SHARON BRONSON	MARANA	16,830	9%
3	SHARON BRONSON	SAHUARITA	1,840	1%
3	SHARON BRONSON	TUCSON	81,338	42%
4	SHARON BRONSON	TOTAL INCORPORATED	100,008	52%
3	SHARON BRONSON	UNINCORPORATED PIMA COUNTY	91,912	48%
		DISTRICT TOTAL	191,920	100%
4	STEVE CHRISTY	SAHUARITA	2,617	1%
4	STEVE CHRISTY	TUCSON	121,467	59%
5	STEVE CHRISTY	TOTAL INCORPORATED	124,084	60%
4	STEVE CHRISTY	UNINCORPORATED PIMA COUNTY	83,088	40%
		DISTRICT TOTAL	207,172	100%
5	RICHARD ELIAS	TUCSON	160,830	81%
5	RICHARD ELIAS	UNINCORPORATED PIMA COUNTY	38,599	19%
		DISTRICT TOTAL	199,429	100%
		COUNTY UNINCORPORATED	375,768	37%
		COUNTY TOTAL	1,003,337	