MEMORANDUM

Date: February 13, 2014

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

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

Re: **Agenda Item 11 – Payment Preservation Project Allocations and Funding Approvals for Fiscal Year 2013/14**

Enclosed please find a memorandum I received from Supervisor Carroll with regard to this item. Any allocations or reallocations of funds are a decision for the Board.

I do understand there are significant, competing interests in the allocation of payment preservation and highway maintenance funding. As I have stated on a number of occasions, there is simply not enough funding available; and any reasonable hope to resolve the problem in the near term requires a substantial funding increase. I have favored a user fee funding increase, which does not appear likely.

I also have recommended the Board consider a small property tax allocation next year similar to the amount included in this year's budget. These are funds from the General Fund that will be in competition with other program budget needs for the County next year unless the County budget can be adopted unanimously. I would recommend no General Fund allocation be made for transportation next year unless the funds are allocated by the Board at the time of budget adoption. Post-budget adoption allocation of these funds, as it is now occurring, is not appropriate.

The County continues to hear mixed messages with regard to how Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) are being utilized. Attached is a message from Supervisor Ally Miller that states, "Pima County already has a road fund; however, the problem in the county is the mismanagement of those funds, which have been used to pay off bonds as well as the salaries and overhead of the Department of Transportation." I have repeatedly stated and can provide the budgets of every county in Arizona, the Arizona Department of Transportation, and the budgets of the cities and towns within Arizona, which all clearly indicate that HURF is used to pay salaries and overhead, as well as to pay off bonds that have been issued by other cities and towns. The use of these funds for this purpose is not mismanagement.

CHH/dr
Attachments

c: John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
Priscilla Cornelio, Director, Transportation Department

PIMA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
130 WEST CONGRESS, 11th FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701-1317
(520) 740-8094
(520) 740-2721 FAX

RAY CARROLL
COUNTY SUPERVISOR
DISTRICT 4

Memorandum

To: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator

From: Ray Carroll, District 4 Supervisor Ray Carroll

Date: February 11, 2014

Subject: **Your February 18, 2014 Board of Supervisors Memorandum regarding Pavement Preservation Project Allocations and Funding Approvals**

In response to your Board of Supervisors memorandum for the February 18, 2014 Board meeting titled *Pavement Preservation Project Allocations and Funding Approvals* (Attachment 1), I would like to request a reconsideration to modify the Pavement Preservation FY 2013-14 project list for the purpose of allocating funds for Colossal Cave Road in Vail and Placita de la Cotonia in Green Valley.

Colossal Cave Road: Acacia Elementary School to Old Vail Middle School

The improvements on Colossal Cave Road are critical to ensure the safety of Vail residents, especially in the vicinity of the two schools. The two-lane, high traffic road is currently rated "Poor/Fail" by the Pima County Department of Transportation and has been subject to accidents and near accidents, as can be seen by a four-car pile-up on the morning of September 19, 2013 (Attachment 2). Fortunately, though one individual was taken to the hospital, there were no casualties. I urge you to consider moving some of the pavement preservation funds to address this emergency before a serious or fatal accident occurs. Students' safety is at stake.

Placita de la Cotonia: Camino del Sol to I-19 Frontage Road

Placita de la Cotonia is a thoroughfare road that links Camino del Sol to the I-19 Frontage Road in Green Valley. The road is currently rated "Poor" and would be a good candidate for a chip seal or overlay. It is used as a direct route by heavy-duty construction vehicles and constant traffic flow, and I fear that the wear and tear on this street from these vehicles will increase its rating to "Fail" which would cost the County more money to repair. Preventative measures would prove to be more cost-efficient in the long run.

There are many factors that have affected the roads in District 4 including the Great Recession, State-wide sweeps of road money, and the fact that District 4 only received a mere 8 percent of the total HURF Revenue Bonds for new roadway capacity as illustrated in Table 3 of your November 18, 2013 memo, *Transportation Funding Needs and Facts* (Attachment 3). Though, it is clear that the management of these road funds were conducted properly, all these factors combined have resulted in deteriorating roads and safety concerns. While the Board has gone on record with a supermajority to the State Legislature in support of a motor vehicle fuel tax increase, these new funds, if approved, will take considerable time to become available. We in District 4 need road funds now.

During our ongoing discussion of pavement preservation fund allocation, I urge you to consider the flexibility of these funds to address the emergency needs of District 4 constituents.

Attachments: 3

ATTACHMENT 1

Board of Supervisors Memorandum

February 18, 2014

Pavement Preservation Project Allocations and Funding Approvals

Introduction

In adopting last year's budget on a three-to-two vote, the Board included a General Fund allocation of $5 million for pavement preservation to be expended by the Department of Transportation for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013/14. The Department then, based on their professional judgment, developed a project list of where these funds could be best expended to maximize the investment, including maintenance activities of pavement systems that were on the verge of failing and that with little additional investment much costly repairs could be avoided. This list was transmitted to the Board of Supervisors on September 6, 2013 for review and comment.

Supervisor Miller has since requested the County reprioritize the projects within District 1 as shown in Attachment 2 of Ms. Cornelio's memorandum. Given weather conditions that split the timeframes for most pavement repair and maintenance operations between the fall and spring, a portion of these repairs have already been completed; others have not.

Are there any additional changes or modifications the Board wishes to make regarding allocation of these project funds? The Board is free to change allocations, as well as project priorities.

Recommendation

I recommend the Board of Supervisors provide direction regarding expending the balance of the General Fund Pavement Repair Program approved by the Board and budget adoption for Fiscal Year 2013/14.

Respectfully submitted,

C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

CHH/anc – February 3, 2014

Attachment

c: John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
Priscilla Cornelio, Director, Department of Transportation

PIMA COUNTY

TRANSPORTATION

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 3, 2014

TO: C.H. Huckelberry, County Administrator

FROM: Priscilla S. Cornelio, P.E., Director

SUBJECT: **Pavement Preservation FY 2013-14**

In the FY 2013-14 approved budget for the Department of Transportation (DOT), $5 Million in General Funds were approved. The funds were to be used for pavement preservation activities only. DOT has a pavement management system that rates the conditions of all 1786 miles of paved roadways maintained by the County. DOT uses this system to identify roads to be programed for pavement preservation treatments. Since nearly 61% of County paved roads are in the "poor or failed" category there are many possible roads to be selected for inclusion in an annual program.

DOT prepared a suggested list of roads to be treated in FY 2013-14 (Attachment 1) which was forwarded to the County Administrator for consideration. Subsequently, the list was forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for their review. Supervisor Miller asked that the roads in District 1 be modified to those shown in Attachment 2. No other changes were made to the DOT prepared list. DOT has initiated the pavement treatments and the status of the activities is also shown in Attachment 2. To date, over $1.7 Million of the $5 Million program has been obligated.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

PSC:dg

Attachments

cc: John M. Bernal, Deputy County Administrator – Public Works
Ben Goff, Deputy Director – Transportation Systems, Support and Operations
Dave Cummings, Operations and Maintenance Division Manager

ATTACHMENT 1

Key	Route	From	To	Length	BOS	Condition	Treatment	Engineer's	BOS
			$5 Million General Fund Pavement Preservation Program						
	River	La Cholla	La Canada	6,600	1	Good / poor	Patch / Crack / Micro	$205,333	
	River	Campbell	Dodge	9,715	1	Good	Crack / Fog	$151,122	
	River	Shannon	La Cholla	5,730	1	Poor	Patch / Crack / Micro	$178,267	
	Thornydale	Rudolf	Daphne	8,157	1	Good / Fair	Patch / Crack / Micro	$253,773	
	Sabino Canyon +	Ventana	River	6,743	1	Fair	Patch / Crack / Micro	$209,782	
	Sunrise	Swan	Craycroft	5,394	1	Good / Fair	Patch / Crack / Micro	$167,813	
								District 1 Total	$1,166,091
	Palo Verde	44th	Gas	6,028	2	Good	Crack / Fog	$93,769	
								District 2 Total	$93,769
	Tucson Mountain	Subdivision		10,241	3	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$541,635	
	Ruthrauff	I-10	La Cholla	5,098	3	Poor	Patch / Crack / Micro	$181,262	
	Curtis	Kain	La Cholla	2,624	3	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$106,126	
	Manville	Avra	Anway	5,280	3	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$213,547	
	Kinney	Ajo	Naomi	11,473	3	Fair - Poor	Patch / Crack / Micro	$318,694	
	Kain	Ruthrauff	Davis	2,561	3	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$103,578	
	Wade	Valencia	Pebble Valley	4,083	3	Failed - Poor	Overlay 2"	$266,756	
	Ruthrauff / Wetmore	La Cholla	Fairview	9,419	3	Good	Crack / Fog	$146,518	
								District 3 Total	$1,878,117
	Freeman	Calle Aurora	north 1 mile	5,280	4	Failed	Overlay 2"	$253,440	
	Esperanza	Abrego	Desert Bell	3,721	4	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"+ patching	$525,488	
	Ventura	Subdivision		11,434	4	Good	Crack / Chip / Fog	$97,824	
	Pistol Hill	Old Spanish	Colossal Cave	10,689	4	Good / Fair	Patch / Crack / Micro	$171,024	
								District 4 Total	$1,047,776
	Los Reales	Mission	Sorrell	8,699	5	Poor - Failed	Overlay 2"	$301,565	
	Irvington	Mission	Cactus Wren	5,714	5	Failed	Overlay 2"	$319,984	
	Mountain Gardens	Subdivision		4,392	5	Poor	Crack / Chip / Fog	$44,408	
	Valencia	Camino de la	Mark	10,715	5	Good	Crack / Fog	$161,916	
								District 5 Total	$827,873
							Grand Total	$5,013,626	$5,013,626

ATTACHMENT 2

$5 MILLION PAVEMENT PRESERVATION PROGRAM
FY 2013/14

Key	Route	From	To	BOS	Condition Rating	Treatment	Engineer's Estimate		Comments
*	Thornydale	Linda Vista	Daphne	1	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$186,713		
*	Sabino Town and Country Estates	Subdivision		1	Poor	Overlay 2"	$189,835		
*	Golden Heritage Village	Subdivision		1	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$167,580		
*	Oasis	Cmo de Oeste	Twin Peaks	1	Poor	Overlay 2"	$330,789		Start date 2-15
*	Bowman	Golder	Rollins	1	Failed	Overlay 2"	$181,723	$1,056,640	
	Palo Verde	44th	Gas	2	Good	Crack / Fog	$93,769	$93,769	
	Tucson Mountain Village	Subdivision		3	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$541,635		Under construction
	Ruthrauff	I-10	La Cholla	3	Poor	Patch / Crack / Micro	$181,262		
	Curtis	Kain	La Cholla	3	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$106,126		Pre bid 2-4-14
	Manville	Avra	1 mile west	3	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$213,547		
	Kinney	Ajo	Naomi	3	Fair - Poor	Patch / Crack / Micro	$318,894		
	Kain	Ruthrauff	Curtis	3	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"	$103,578		Pre bid 2-4-14
	Wade	Valencia	Pebble Valley	3	Failed - Poor	Overlay 2"	$266,756		Start date 3-1-14
	Ruthrauff / Watmore	La Cholla	Fairview	3	Good	Crack / Fog	$146,518	$1,878,117	
	Freeman	Calle Aurora	Saint James	4	Failed	Overlay 2"	$253,440		Complete 11-2013
	Esperanza	Abrego	Desert Bell	4	Failed	Mill / Fill 2"+ patching	$525,488		
	Ventura	Subdivision		4	Good	Crack / Chip / Fog	$97,824		Complete 9-2013
	Pistol Hill	Old Spanish Trail	Colossal Cave	4	Good / Fair	Patch / Crack / Micro	$171,024	$1,047,776	
	Los Reales	Mission	Sorrell	5	Poor - Failed	Overlay 2"	$301,565		
	Mountain Gardens	Subdivision		5	Poor	Crack / Chip / Fog	$44,408		
	Irvington	Mission	Cactus Wren	5	Failed	Overlay 2"	$319,984		
	Valencia	Camino de la Tierra	Mark	5	Good	Crack / Fog	$161,916	$827,873	
							$4,904,175	$4,904,176	

Complete	$351,264
Pending - awarded	$1,139,180
Pre - bid	$209,704
Obligated	$1,700,148

* District 1 Revisions

1/30/2014

ATTACHMENT 2

Greater VAIL Area Chamber of Commerce
PO Box 153
Vail, AZ 85641

vail community action board

VAIL SCHOOL DISTRICT

September 23, 2013

Pima County Supervisor Ray Carroll
130 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Pima County Manager C. J. Huckelberry
130 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Dear Supervisor Carroll and County Administrator Huckelberry,

I am sad to inform you that on Thursday, September 19th at approximately 7:20 a.m. an Acacia Elementary School staff member was driving northbound on Colossal Cave Road. She stopped to make a left hand turn into the Acacia parking lot. The car behind her rear-ended her, causing a chain reaction crash involving a total of four vehicles. The Acacia staff person was transported to a local hospital. The other involved in the accident were released at the scene. Fortunately **this time**, everyone appears to be all right.

If the 2002 Pima County approved and funded three-lane road were in place this and other accidents would not have occurred.

The need for the three lanes with sidewalks between Acacia Elementary and Old Vail Middle School is an issue of safety for students walking to and from school, for parents dropping their children off at school, for Vail citizens and commercial vehicles traveling to and from the interstate and for tourists traveling to visit Colossal Cave Mountain Park and Saguaro National Park.

We urge you to move to reinstate the project as approved in 2002 before there is a fatality.

Sincerely,

Calvin Baker, Superintendent Vail School Unified District	Anne Gibson President Vail Community Action Board	Peter Minot President Greater Vail Area Chamber of Commerce	Richard Katz Chairman VCAB Community Development Committee

C.C. Pima County Transportation Director Priscilla Cornelio

13801 E. Benson Highway ♦ P. O. Box 790 ♦ Vail, AZ 85641 ♦ 520-879-3916 ♦ Email anneg@vailcab.org
♦ Web Site vailcab.org ♦ EIN 46-1229293 ◆ 86-0617696

ATTACHMENT 3

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 18, 2013

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

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

Re: **Transportation Funding Needs and Facts**

At the Board of Supervisors November 12, 2013 meeting in which the 2014 Legislative Agenda was approved, regarding increasing transportation revenues, the Board asked for additional information. The requested information is provided in this memorandum.

Roadway Condition Improvement Cost Per District

Table 1 below (originally shown as Table 9 in my May 7, 2013 memorandum to the Board) recaps the various costs associated with bringing the streets and highways in all supervisorial districts up to a good condition.

Table 1: Roadway Condition Improvement Cost Estimates.

District	Miles	Cost Per District
1	558	$ 88,311,016
2	115	13,364,191
3	538	79,800,994
4	506	67,012,752
5	125	19,510,615
Totals	**1,842**	**$267,999,569**

Highway and Street Maintenance Mileage Obligations by District

Table 2 below provides an analysis of highway and street maintenance mileage obligations in each supervisorial district.

Table 2: Highway and Street Maintenance Mileage Obligations by Supervisorial District.

	Paved		Unpaved		Total All	
District	Miles	Percentage	Miles	Percentage	Miles	Percentage
1	593.1	27.2	26.2	1.2	619.3	28.4
2	112.3	5.1	7.6	0.3	119.9	5.5
3	555.5	25.5	170.3	7.8	725.8	33.2

Table 2: Highway and Street Maintenance Mileage Obligations by Supervisorial District.

	Paved		Unpaved		Total All	
District	**Miles**	**Percentage**	**Miles**	**Percentage**	**Miles**	**Percentage**
4	497.7	22.8	75.4	3.5	573.1	26.3
5	143.2	6.6	1.4	.01	144.6	6.6
Totals	**1,902.0**	**87**	**281**	**13**	**2,183.0**	**100.0**

District Distribution of 1997 Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) Revenue Bonds

Table 3 below (shown as Table 2 in my May 31, 2013 memorandum) indicates the capital HURF bond funding allocated to each district for new roadway capacity development.

Table 3: Bond Project Funds Entirely in One District.

District	Completed Bond Projects	Active Bond Projects	Future Bond Projects	Total Bond Projects	Percentage of Total
1	$ 89,861,843	$30,750,000	$23,909,843	$144,521,686	64
2	21,545,192	11,000,000	10,000,000	42,545,192	19
3	12,662,028	0	0	12,662,028	6
4	18,051,517	0	0	18,051,517	8
5	6,461,990	0	0	6,461,990	3
	$148,582,570	$41,750,000	$33,909,843	$224,242,413	100

Department of Transportation (DOT) Staffing Trends Over Time

Table 4 below illustrates the changes in DOT staffing over time. Department staffing is now 32 percent less than it was 10 years ago.

Table 4: DOT Staffing History.

Timeframe	Fiscal Year	Budgeted Full-time Employees
Current Year	2013/14	306.5
Last 5 Years	2012/13	297.7
	2011/12	294.7
	2010/11	295.6
	2009/10	354.1
	2008/09	414.7
10 Years Ago	2003/04	447.2
15 Years Ago	1998/99	399.0

Personnel Service Costs within the DOT Over Time

Total personnel services cost in the DOT, as shown in Table 5 below, is also less than it was 10 years ago.

Table 5: DOT Personnel Services Cost History.

Timeframe	Fiscal Year	Adopted Personnel Services Budge
Current Year	2013/14	$17,926,550
Last 5 Years	2012/13	17,308,397
	2011/12	16,801,139
	2010/11	16,669,604
	2009/10	17,282,082
	2008/09	18,256,515
10 Years Ago	2003/04	18,545,306
15 Years Ago	1998/99	10,463,622

Revenue Bond Debt Service Over Time

Revenue bond debt service, as indicated by Table 6 below, has remained relatively consistent over the past 10 years.

Table 6: Revenue Bond Debt Service History.

Timeframe	Fiscal Year	Budgeted Debt Service
Current Year	2013/14	$17,578,019
Last 5 Years	2012/13	18,441,703
	2011/12	16,579,804
	2010/11	16,417,530
	2009/10	19,428,259
	2008/09	19,573,643
10 Years Ago	2003/04	15,773,163
15 Years Ago	1998/99	6,151,333

Operating Expenses Over Time

Table 7 below illustrates that DOT operating expenses decreased substantially in Fiscal Year 2009/10 and have averaged approximately $21 million since that time.

Table 7: DOT Operating Expenses History.

Timeframe	Fiscal Year	Budgeted Operating Expenses
Current Year	2013/14	$21,606,869
Last 5 Years	2012/13	20,971,539
	2011/12	19,708,192
	2010/11	20,643,331
	2009/10	22,922,849
	2008/09	29,980,322
10 Years Ago	2003/04	21,402,700
15 Years Ago	1998/99	18,246,488

Total Budgeted HURF and Vehicle License Tax Revenues for the DOT

As shown in Table 8 below, budgeted HURF and Vehicle License Tax (VLT) revenues for the DOT decreased substantially from a high of over $59 million in Fiscal Year 2008/09.

Table 8: Budgeted HURF and VLT Revenues for the DOT.

Timeframe	Fiscal Year	Budgeted HURF/ VLT Revenues
Current Year	2013/14	$49,233,840
Last 5 Years	2012/13	46,964,305
	2011/12	46,738,197
	2010/11	48,134,746
	2009/10	51,655,216
	2008/09	59,429,451
10 Years Ago	2003/04	50,690,079
15 Years Ago	1998/99	39,300,000

The table below, Table 9, summarizes the Fiscal Year 2013/14 revenues and expenses for the DOT.

Table 9: Fiscal Year 2013/14 Revenues and Expenses for the DOT.

Description	Adopted Budget
Beginning Fund Balance	**$18,268,287**
PLUS	
HURF/VLT Revenues	$49,233,840
Other Revenues	1,643,037
Pavement Preservation from General Fund	5,000,000
Graffiti from General Fund	120,662
LESS	
Debt Service	($17,578,019)
Personnel Costs	(17,926,550)
Operating Costs	(21,606,869)
Capital > $5,000	(1,498,000)
Operating Transfer to Capital Projects	(12,564,052)
Ending Fund Balance	**$ 3,092,336**
Total Budgeted Reduction in Fund Balance	**($15,175,951)**

Clearly, there is no extra funding available for pavement preservation; and the funding available to the DOT is being used fully and wisely.

Based on available revenues, which the Board can see from comparing the tables above, is equivalent to the same revenues the DOT received nearly 10 years ago. The expenses are fixed and real: in HURF revenue and bond debt service, personnel service expenses, operating expenses and required transfers to the Regional Transportation Authority for transit Maintenance of Effort. There are no remaining monies to perform any type of pavement preservation, other than the General Fund transfer.

We had hoped to finance a revenue bond sale of $10 million for pavement preservation by program reallocation in the bond implementation ordinance for the 1997 bonds; however, given the dire revenue position of HURF/VLT to the County, it appears such is not possible and will not occur. Hence, in formulating the budget for Fiscal Year 2014/15, I will again place in the County Budget for Board consideration over the base budget of the General

Fund, $5 million for the DOT to use for pavement preservation. This will require the Board to affirmatively vote for an approximate $0.07 increase in the property tax primary rate.

I had hoped for more positive news; but given the debt service obligations of the revenue bond issue, the legislative sweeps by the Arizona Legislature, and the fact that basic HURF revenues have not been increased in 22 years, such is not possible. Our roadways will continue to deteriorate unless the Board determines it appropriate to increase the primary property tax rate for transportation pavement preservation purposes or sweeps are reversed and user fees increased.

CHH/mjk

c: Martin Willett, Chief Deputy County Administrator
Hank Atha, Deputy County Administrator for Community and Economic Development
John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Priscilla Cornelio, Transportation Director

A Message from Supervisor Ally Miller

District 1 Supervisor goes to State capitol fighting for Pima County taxpayers

When running for office, I promised to fight for the taxpayers of Pima County. Since being elected in 2012 to serve on the Pima County Board of Supervisors, I have **kept that promise** and remained committed to Pima County's hard-working taxpayers and have now taken the fight to the Arizona State Capitol.

To that end, I visited the State Legislature on Monday February 3, 2014. It was a visit prompted by a bill , SB1264, the County Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax introduced by State Senator Steve Farley. Read the bill: http://azleg.gov/DocumentsForBill.asp?Bill_Number=SB1264&Session_ID=112

Though the state is not willing to increase the state gas tax, which is currently 18 cents per gallon, Farley's plan would permit counties throughout Arizona to impose a 3% fuel tax of its own. That is, a new county fuel tax in addition to the state and federal fuel taxes consumers already pay. This is an additional 3 % per the cost of a gallon of gasoline.

The county that appears to be the most eager to assess a new tax on an already struggling community is Pima County, which is currently among the nation's poorest regions.

Though gas taxes were initially imposed to generate funds for road maintenance, the tax dollars collected by the county would not necessarily serve such purposes. In fact, the language of the bill cites that "The county shall transfer the monies to the Council of Governments for the County" wherein The Council of Governments would then proceed to distribute the funds; however, the destination of the funds is not articulated. There is no language in the bill assigning the monies for the purpose of road repairs, new roads, mass-transit, etc. Such an ill-defined bill would leave tax dollars vulnerable to questionable use.

Pima County already has a road fund; however, the problem in the county is the mismanagement of those funds, which have been used to pay off bonds as well as the salaries and overhead of the Department of Transportation.

I gathered information from the following Gallup gas tax poll (conducted in April 2013) and personally delivered it to twenty state legislators and all of the bill's sponsors.

http://www.gallup.com/poll/161990/oppose-state-gas-tax-hike-fund-repairs.aspx
An overwhelming 66% of the American public are solidly opposed to new gas taxes.

Clearly, a sound majority of Americans represented in the Gallup poll do not support increases in the gas taxes for their states, even when presented with promises of mass-transit and infrastructure projects. There is also no evidence that such legislation is at all supported by the majority in any of the political parties or in any region of the country, and I am committed to making sure the voices of Pima County's majority of taxpayers are being heard above the political fray.
Also found is data showing that 10 states with the best roads in the country actually having the lowest gas taxes nationally, as opposed to the states with the highest gas taxes possessing the worst rated roads. ***Therefore, there is no correlation between the condition of roads and gas taxes.*** It is the mismanagement of our tax dollars that is at issue here.

What Pima County does ***not*** need is a new gas tax. While fuel costs alone have already increased exponentially, hiking the taxes - and imposing a new set entirely by the county - will create even more unnecessary burdens on struggling families and businesses, while filling the pockets of those who deliver nothing more than empty promises.

To stop the 3% county gas tax from becoming a new fixture in Pima County , it is imperative your state legislators and board of supervisors hear from *you!* Call, fax and email their offices and Inform family, friends and neighbors. Join me in stopping a 3% county gas tax from taking more hard-earned dollars from the pockets of the residents of Pima County.

Regards,
Ally Miller
Pima County Board of Supervisors, District1 (520)724-2738
Email Direct to office: dist1@pima.gov