



MEMORANDUM

Date: December 14, 2017

To: Chair and Members
Sales Tax Advisory Committee

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

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

Chair and Members
Transportation Advisory Committee

Re: **Pima County Supervisor Miller's 30-Day Challenge to Find Road Repair Money – Response Part 5**

This memorandum is Part 5 of a response to false and misleading information posted on Supervisor Ally Miller's webpage, regarding a variety of County expenditures that she alleges should instead be available to spend on road repair.

27. Kino South Sports Bridge Installation - \$1,500,000

As I stated in Part 2 of the responses to Supervisor Miller, the improvements at Kino Stadium and the proposed sports complex south of Kino Stadium, are to be funded with Stadium District revenues; specifically our share of the hotel/motel bed tax and the car rental surcharge, both of which are limited by statute as to what they can fund, **and neither can fund road repair**. In addition, the bridge estimate is \$650,000, not \$1.5 million.

28. Annual Maintenance Costs for "The Loop" - \$3,930,000

While the Regional Flood Control District does have a budget for maintenance of public assets including The Loop, which Supervisor Miller apparently thinks would better be used elsewhere, the funds are not spent solely on maintenance of The Loop. According to Supervisor Miller: "It's not about the benefits of the Loop; it's about the lack of basic core services like 'safe' roads which are critical for the community, economic development, law enforcement and emergency services, among others. Core road improvement services were needed long before the start of the Loop in 2005." This statement, like so many of Supervisor Miller's, is misleading. What Supervisor Miller does not seem to understand, or is unwilling to accept, is that the recreational aspects of The Loop are a byproduct of its larger purpose.

Much of The Loop grew out of the County's comprehensive flood control efforts. Following several major flood events in the late 1970s and the historic 1983 flood, erosion of the river and wash banks resulted in millions of dollars in property damage and loss and left thousands of homes vulnerable to flooding. The County Flood Control District's work to shore up miles

Chair and Members, Sales Tax Advisory Committee
Chair and Members, Transportation Advisory Committee
Re **Pima County Supervisor Miller's 30-Day Challenge to Find Road Repair Money – Response**
Part 5

December 14, 2017

Page 2

of river and wash banks with soil-cement reinforcements removed thousands of homes and businesses from flood plains and protected hundreds of millions of dollars in real estate from annual flooding.

Those bank-protection construction projects necessarily required access points and easements be built along the watercourses. This work, in effect created a series of linear pathways along miles of washes and rivers throughout the metropolitan area. These pathways serve as maintenance and emergency access for flood response, first responders, utility companies and others.

Regardless of the recreational use, these pathways would require regular maintenance, such tree trimming, landscaping, debris removal and other repairs. Since the Regional Flood Control District does not have staff dedicated for this regular maintenance and repair, the District pays Natural Resources Parks and Recreation and private contractors to conduct the work.

The suggestion that Regional Flood Control District not maintain an important taxpayer asset is irresponsible. The implication that Regional Flood Control District taxes that pay for required maintenance be used for transportation purposes would be illegal.

Finally, the cost is way too high since it represents not only The Loop but many other Regional Flood Control projects or programs maintained by our Parks department.

29. Road Repairs: The Cost of Not Having Your Voice Heard/Meeting Costs - \$25,000-\$50,000 est.

First, as Supervisor Miller should know, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) requested that staff propose a prioritization methodology for identifying which roads in unincorporated Pima County should be repaired first with the limited funding available. Staff recommended focusing first on poor rated roads (PASER 5) prioritized based on average daily traffic volumes, to prevent these roads from falling into a failed condition, which would then be much more expensive to rebuild. PASER refers to the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating system that ranks road condition on a 1 to 10 scale, the lower numbers representing a worse condition.

The Committee approved staff's recommended prioritization method, allowing for supervisorial district representatives to propose tweaks to the final list of roads. When the time came for the Committee to consider the final list of roads, District 1 and District 4, deleted the far majority of roads for Year 1 that had met the prioritization method, and instead recommended completely different roads that were much further down the list of priorities. The District 1 changes, in particular, would have removed 47 neighborhoods from the list of those whose roads would receive repairs in the first year and added 14 others, essentially cutting out road repairs for 33 neighborhoods.

Chair and Members, Sales Tax Advisory Committee
Chair and Members, Transportation Advisory Committee
**Re Pima County Supervisor Miller's 30-Day Challenge to Find Road Repair Money – Response
Part 5**

December 14, 2017

Page 3

The Committee voted 7-6 to approve the staff recommended list. If District 1 and District 4 had recommended reasonable changes to just a portion of the list, instead of gutting the list, then the Committee may have approved them.

Second, an estimate of \$25,000 to \$50,000 for the TAC meetings and the Sales Tax Advisory Committee (STAC) meetings, is absurd. The meetings are held in County or other facilities that do not charge us rent, parking is free, food is provided for the TAC meetings as they meet during lunch time at a cost of no more than \$250 a meeting for eight meetings so far, minimal refreshments are provided for the STAC meetings as a cost of less than \$50 a meeting for three meetings so far, and document preparation and printing is estimated to cost no more than \$25 per meeting. If these advisory committees did not exist, the same documents would have to be prepared and provided directly to the Board of Supervisors. In contrast, the eight town hall style meetings that District 1 and District 4 chose to hold on their own, separate from the regular public TAC meetings, did require staff attendance after hours at an estimated cost of \$300 a town hall. The costs associated with these town halls were directly caused by the District 1 and District 4 supervisors.

30. Want to know how much HURF and VLT money Pima County has received for our roads during the period 2008-2017? - \$686,123,500.32

I have addressed this issue countless times with Supervisor Miller, including in my Part 1 response to Supervisor Miller's 30-day challenge. The entirety of the state-shared HURF and transportation VLT funding that the County received is spent on transportation. Arizona Revised Statutes clearly state that general VLT is for general funded services and programs and therefore the general VLT funds received from the State are deposited in Pima County's general fund. Historically, all VLT funds use to be directed to the general fund until State Statutes were amended to allocate some for transportation and some for general fund support.

CHH/dr

Attachment

c: The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator
Carmine DeBonis, Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
Tom Burke, Deputy County Administrator for Administration
Ana Olivares, Director, Transportation Department
Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator
Michael Racy, Racy Associates, Inc.

PIMA COUNTY SUPERVISOR
ALLY MILLER
REPRESENTING DISTRICT 1



Day 30: [Want to know how much HURF and VLT money Pima County has received for our roads during the period 2008-2017?](#) Think about this as you drive over our roads, trying to avoid potholes, and being asked to pay more taxes:

- **Where did all this money go?**
- **How many repairs could have been done if we had dedicated even half of this funding to our roads?**
- Total HURF & VLT Funds received for the past 10 years = \$770,123,500.32
- Total HURF & VLT Funds \$770,123,500.32 less \$84 million reported on Day 1
- **Adjusted HURF & VLT Funds received for past 10 years = \$686,123,500.32**

Day 29: [Road Repairs: The Cost of Not Having Your Voice Heard ...](#) Sales tax, property tax, and road repairs. On November 29, 2017, Interim Transportation Department Director Olivares issued a memo re local road repair recommendations. Staff recommendations for District 1 road repairs did not take into consideration the recommendations proposed by District 1 Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) reps Chris DeSimone and Reggie Drout. **Example:** Hidden Valley subdivisions were excluded from county staff recommendation list. District 1 TAC reps objected and responded, "***We proposed adding Hidden Valley to the road repair list. Our modifications to the list were ignored by a 7:6 vote from committee members not even involved with District 1 roads.***" [Hidden Valley residents read here.](#) Why bother leading the public to think they have a say in their roads if this was virtually a "done deal" using a pre-determined prioritization model? [Read the full document.](#) Estimated costs for 17 committee/community meetings held and 12 upcoming sales tax meetings, document preparation, printing costs for meeting materials, etc.**\$25,000-\$50,000 est.**

Day 28: [Annual Maintenance Costs for "The Loop"](#) ... annual cost estimate is \$30,000 per mile x 131 miles completed = \$3,930,000 per year. Funding source: Flood Control District (Flood Control reimburses Parks & Recreation for providing maintenance of the Loop). Flood Control District funds are derived from your Secondary Property Tax! It's not about the benefits of the Loop; it's about the lack of basic core services like "safe" roads which are critical for the community, economic development, law enforcement and emergency services, among others. Core road improvement services were needed long before the start of the Loop in 2005. ***It's not about needing more taxes, it's about spending priorities.*** Maintenance costs for the Loop for the next five years will be **\$19,650,000**

Day 27: [Kino South Sports Bridge Installation](#) (yes, that's right!) ... read the memo dated Sept. 25, 2017 re: Kino South Sports Complex-Alternatives to Accelerate Project. Despite voters saying "NO" in the 2015 Bond Election, the "County" decided to move forward with this portion of the project on July 10, 2017. Increase in Master Agreement for \$1.5 mil ... read the fine print on page 3 of the memo **\$1,500,000**