MEMORANDUM

Date: December 6, 2017

To: Members
   Sales Tax Advisory Committee

From: Wendell Long
       Committee Chairman

Re: Forming and Confirming Assumptions December 14, 2018 Agenda Item

This item was continued from the last meeting at the request of Committee Member Dan Eckstrom, who asked that it be placed on the agenda for reconsideration of the vote taken at that meeting. My intent on placing the list of assumptions before the Committee at the last meeting was to begin a discussion about them and see if the Committee was moving towards general agreement on any items. That initial list is attached to refresh your memory. I did not intend for action to be taken on the list; however the Committee did take action approving a motion to acknowledge the assumptions. Since Mr. Eckstrom was the maker of the motion, it was appropriate procedurally for Mr. Eckstrom to make a request for reconsideration.

I did ask that members continue to think about the list. Since the meeting, Committee Member Dennis Minano provided an alternative list for the Committee to continue discussing – not for action at this time. This list is also attached and is intended to record items for consideration by the Committee as it transitions from receiving input to formulating recommendations. I would suggest we refer to Mr. Minano’s list as “Sign Posts”. At the next meeting, I would ask that the Committee discuss this list of Sign Posts and consider adding to it as our meetings continue. This list will be a “work in progress” until we start the deliberation phase.

CHH/dr

Attachments
Forming and Confirming Assumptions

Do we all agree that:

1. The majority of the roads in Pima County are in poor shape?
2. Fixing the roads in Pima County is a priority?
3. Fixing the roads (although a priority) may not be the #1 priority in Pima County?
4. Poor roads are hurting the economy?
5. We are concerned with the impact an increase sales tax would have on low-income and elderly residents?
6. It is essential to our process to seek as much input from diverse sources as practical?
1. THERE IS UNANIMITY THAT THE ROADS IN PIMA COUNTY ARE IN POOR CONDITION.

2. RESIDENTS THROUGH SURVEYS AND COMMENTS IN PUBLIC SESSIONS HAVE URGED THAT THE ROAD CONDITIONS BE ADDRESSED WITH SPECIFICITY, AND IN A LIMITED TIME PERIOD.

3. COUNTY OFFICIALS AND ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COUNTY, OVER YEARS, HAVE EXAMINED MULTIPLE NON SALES TAX OPTIONS TO SECURE THE FUNDING NECESSARY TO REPAIR THE ROADS, HOWEVER, NO ACCEPTABLE MECHANISM HAS BEEN AGREED UPON TO DATE.

4. THE ROADS WHICH REQUIRE REPAIR HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED.

5. A PRIORITY ASSESSMENT PROCESS AS TO WHICH ROADS TO REPAIR HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY A COMMUNITY BASED TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. IN ADDITION THIS GROUP HAS REPORTED THAT THERE IS URGENCY TO ACT.

6. THE DOLLARS NEEDED TO REPAIR THE ROADS TO A FAIR CONDITION HAS BEEN CONFIRMED.
7. MULTIPLE ENTITIES HAVE CONCLUDED THAT EVEN WITH THE COUNTY’S RECENT ACTION ON A PROPERTY TAX THERE WILL CONTINUE TO BE INSUFFICIENT FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE TO ACHIEVE REPAIR THAT WILL SOLVE PIMA RESIDENTS CALL FOR ACTION

8. AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION BY PAG HAS CONFIRMED THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM, THE USE AND AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AND ALL POSSIBLE OPTIONS TO SECURE ADDITIONAL NECESSARY FUNDING

9. IT IS CLEAR THAT FUNDING SUPPORT FROM STATE OR FEDERAL LEGISLATORS IS EXTREMELY REMOTE IN THE NEAR TERM NOR CAN BE ASSUMED IN THE LONG TERM

10. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THIS COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND A PROPOSAL BY A COUNTY SUPERVISOR AND COUNTY ADMINISTRATION LEADERSHIP AND STAFF SUPPORT FOR THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE DEMONSTRATES A COMMITMENT TO TAKE ACTION ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE
11. CURRENT ANALYSIS INDICATES THAT IF A SALES TAX PROPOSAL PASSES AND DEPENDING ON THE FINAL STRUCTURE; IT CAN RESOLVE THE ROAD REPAIR FUNDING DILEMMA NOW AND IN THE FUTURE. ALSO VARIOUS IMPLEMENTATION SCENARIOS HAVE THE POSITIVE ASPECT OF REDUCING AND/OR LEVELING PROPERTY TAXES FOR COUNTY RESIDENTS.

12. MUNICIPALITIES ACROSS THE COUNTRY ARE ALSO CHALLENGED BY THIS ISSUE AND ARE SEEKING TO FIND A SOLUTION THAT FITS THEIR NEEDS.
Questions Needing More Information

1. IS THE RTA WILLING TO ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS NEW TASK FOR ROAD REPAIR INTERNALLY AS A FUNCTION OF RTA STAFF AND OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITY OF THE RTA BOARD? CAN THE ROAD REPAIR RESPONSIBILITY BE DELEGATED TO RTA FROM THE COUNTY? IS THERE A MECHANISM THAT CONVEYS CONFIDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTERING THE ROAD REPAIR PROGRAM THAT IS MORE EFFICIENT AND LESS ADMINISTRATIVELY CUMBERSOME?

2. IF FUNDING IS ESTABLISHED AND PIMA RESIDENTS HAVE FUTURE CONCERNS WITH SPECIFIC ROAD REPAIR DECISIONS—WHO DO THEY GO TO FOR A TIMELY RESPONSE AND RESOLUTION?

3. HOW ARE LOW INCOME AND ELDERLY EFFECTED EVEN WITH SALES TAX NOT APPLYING TO UNPREPARED FOOD OR PRESCRIPTION MEDICATION?