Welcome and Introductions

Karen Williams Seel,
Pinellas Board of County Commissioners
Agenda

• Approval of Minutes

• Transit Works Pinellas Polling
  
  **Joel Giles**, Attorney at Law Carlton Fields
  **Brian Shuford**, Director of Governmental Affairs, Pinellas Realtor® Organization

• PSTA Budget Challenges
  
  **R.B. Johnson**, Chairman, Board of Directors Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority

• Discussion
  
  Pinellas County Transportation Task Force
  Policy Recommendation Summary

• Next Steps

• Adjourn
Transit Works Pinellas Polling

Joel Giles,
Attorney at Law, Carlton Fields

Brian Shuford,
Director of Governmental Affairs,
Pinellas Realtor® Organization
Transit Works Pinellas Polling

November 8-9, 2010
September 7-9, 2010
Methodology
November Poll 8-9 Poll

- Likely municipal general election voters
- 300 completed surveys from both Hillsborough and Pinellas counties
- Live interviews on landline and mobile telephones
- Margin of error +/- 5.7% for each poll
Key Findings

✶ In Pinellas, odd year likely voters were more supportive than even voters polled earlier this year

✶ Pinellas voters continue to show soft overall support

✶ Pinellas voters weren’t heavily influenced by Hillsborough campaigns

✶ Referendum will be decided primarily by those who don’t use public transit
Key Findings

- In Hillsborough, lack of a clearly-defined plan, lack of perceived need, and a mistrust of handling of taxpayer money contributed to defeat.

- Extending Penny for Pinellas is favored by municipal election likely voters, but political environment will be key.

- If a tax increase can be taken out of the equation, the referendum would have a much better chance at passing.
Use of Public Transit

96% of Likely Municipal Pinellas Voters Rarely or Never Use Public Transit

Hillsborough:
- Very Freq: 6
- Somewhat Freq: 5
- Rarely: 12
- Special Occasions: 10
- Not at all: 67

Pinellas:
- Very Freq: 22
- Somewhat Freq: 14
- Rarely: 11
- Special Occasions: 71
- Not at all: 71
Support for Expanding Public Transit

Most Voters Support the Concept of Improving Transit

Hillsborough
- Strongly support: 43
- Somewhat support: 29
- Unsure: 6
- Somewhat oppose: 7
- Strongly oppose: 15

Pinellas
- Strongly support: 39
- Somewhat support: 30
- Unsure: 15
- Somewhat oppose: 8
- Strongly oppose: 8
Support for Extending Penny for Pinellas

Extension of Tax Enjoys Broad Support

- Definitely: 47
- Probably: 8
- Lean: 1
- No: 17
Support for Transit Referendum

In Hillsborough, municipal voters are more supportive than midterm voters.

Hillsborough Municipal Voters 2010 General Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for Transit Referendum
Hillsborough Voters vs. Pinellas Voters

Hillsborough Municipal Voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pinellas Municipal Voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Definitely
- Probably
- Lean
Support for Transit Referendum
2010 Pinellas Voters vs. Municipal Pinellas Voters

Pinellas 2010 Voters (9/7-9/10)

- Yes: 37
- No: 35

Pinellas Municipal Voters

- Yes: 44
- No: 31
Influence in Ballot Choice

Hillsborough Municipal Voters

- No tax increase: 35 (Much more likely) 18 (Somewhat more likely)
- Seeing final plan: 25 (Much more likely) 15 (Somewhat more likely)
- 25% goes to roads/trails: 19 (Much more likely) 14 (Somewhat more likely)
- Passed by neighboring county: 21 (Much more likely) 12 (Somewhat more likely)

Pinellas Municipal Voters

- No tax increase: 40 (Much more likely) 19 (Somewhat more likely)
- Seeing final plan: 30 (Much more likely) 19 (Somewhat more likely)
- 25% goes to roads/trails: 19 (Much more likely) 20 (Somewhat more likely)
- Rejected by neighboring county: 11 (Much more likely) 8 (Somewhat more likely)

Legend:
- **Blue** represents much more likely
- **Green** represents somewhat more likely
Why Hillsborough Voters Voted in Favor of Referendum

- "BECAUSE OF PROSPECTS OF MORE JOBS COMING INTO THE AREA. DOESN'T LIKE INCREASE IN TAX BUT (IT WOULD BRING) MORE JOBS FOR OTHER PEOPLE”

- "I MOVED HERE IN 1978 AND THEY HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT IT SINCE THEN AND I WANTED (IT) THEN AND WE NEED TO GET IT DONE. WE HAVE TO BE WILLING TO PAY IT.”

- "THE BETTER WE MAKE THE SYSTEM THE MORE PEOPLE WE GET OFF THE HIGHWAYS. THE TRAFFIC IS AWFUL.”

- "IT IT’S IMPERATIVE FOR THE COUNTY’S PROGRESSION. WE’VE ALWAYS BEEN IN FAVOR OF IMPROVING THE TRANSPORTATION.”

- "BECAUSE HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY WILL BE BECOME A HILLBILLY BACKWATER IF WE DO NOT ADDRESS EFFICIENT REGIONAL TRANSIT IMMEDIATELY”
Why Hillsborough Voters Voted Against the Referendum

- Because I like public transit but I don't like a tax increase.
- Because light rail doesn't work in Tampa. We don't have the population density in downtown to support it. We see empty buses and trolleys too often.
- I don't feel that they are using the tax dollars wisely that they have now.
- It is a bad time to be raising taxes right now. Be more efficient with the money they have now before spending it on this new proposed transit system.
- The government never met a project that they could correctly estimate the cost of. No methodology.
- They do not know what direction they are going in or how much it will cost, so until they make up their mind and have a plan I will vote against.
- I've studied it and it's like socialism.
Influence of Hillsborough Coverage

* Of all that you have seen, read or heard about the transportation referendum in Hillsborough county, would you say that it made you think more favorably about a potential referendum in Pinellas County, less favorably, or made no difference?

- More favorably: 19
- Less favorably: 10
- No difference: 67
METHODOLOGY

September Pinellas Benchmark Poll

* Likely General Election Voters
* 502 Interviews by telephone (includes cell phones)
* Margin of Error +/- 4.37%
KEY FINDINGS

* Soft overall support
* Economic concerns define the electorate
* Very low public transit use
* Traffic not a major perceived concern
* Rail not strongly supported
* Property taxes a hot-button issue
* Hillsborough will (and did) have impact
* PSTA well-respected
* Municipal voters more likely to support
Overall Support

Would you be voting 'yes' or 'no' for a one-cent sales tax increase to fund transit?
Key issues

What is the most important issue for local government to deal with?

- Job & Economic Development: 50%
- Lowering Taxes: 5%
- Education Standards & Funding: 15%
- Cutting Government Spending: 10%
- Reducing Traffic Congestion: 5%
- Fighting Crime: 5%
- Expanding Public Transit Systems: 5%
- Protecting the Environment: 5%
Use of public transit

How often do you use public transit?

- Very Frequently: 67%
- Somewhat Frequently: 3%
- Rarely: 3%
- Only on Special Occasions: 11%
- Not at All: 16%
How much of a problem would you say traffic congestion is in Pinellas County?
Do you support or oppose the following transportation initiatives in Pinellas County?

- Overall Expansion and Improvement of Transit Services
- More Trolley Routes for Tourist Areas
- Improved Bus Services
- Construction of a Rail System
- Combination of a Rail System and Connector Buses

Support
Oppose
How to Fund Transit

Do you support or oppose the following payment plans for enhanced transportation in Pinellas County?

- An $8-$16 Per Month Property Tax
- A 1/2 Cent Sales Tax Increase for Bus Service Combined with a Reduction in Property Taxes
- A 1 Cent Sales Tax Increase for Rail Combined with a Reduction in Property Taxes
Primary vs. General Election Scenario

- **Primary Voters**
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 40%
  - Unsure: 10%

- **Non-Primary Voters**
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 50%
  - Unsure: 0%
Questions?

- Brian Shuford
  - bshuford@tampabayrealtor.com
  - 727-216-3029

- Joel Giles
  - jgiles@carltonfields.com
  - 727-709-7660
PSTA Budget Challenges

R.B. Johnson,
Chairman, Board of Directors
Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority
## PSTA Three Year Budget Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenue</td>
<td>52,893,162</td>
<td>51,663,423</td>
<td>52,122,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expense</td>
<td>54,911,911</td>
<td>57,368,765</td>
<td>60,215,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Over/(Under) Expenses</td>
<td>(2,018,749)</td>
<td>(5,705,342)</td>
<td>(8,093,248)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Property Tax Values of Non PSTA Municipalities/Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Taxable Value</th>
<th>Property Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belleair Beach</td>
<td>$369,528,562</td>
<td>$206,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleair Shore</td>
<td>$95,520,471</td>
<td>$53,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth City</td>
<td>$119,763,778</td>
<td>$67,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pete Beach</td>
<td>$2,083,387,514</td>
<td>$1,166,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>$1,303,055,568</td>
<td>$729,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena Fire District</td>
<td>$103,579,223</td>
<td>$58,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Verde Fire District</td>
<td>$738,882,617</td>
<td>$413,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,813,757,871</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,696,164</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Cities</td>
<td>$49,200,662,399</td>
<td>$27,557,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PSTA Half-Cent Charter County Surtax Scenario:

- A one-cent sales tax is required for the full Vision Plan (enhanced bus and 26-miles of rail) to be accomplished in the 25-year scope.

- PSTA receives $26 million currently from property tax; a half-cent sales tax would generate approximately $64 million.

- The half-cent sales tax provides the ability to implement significant bus service improvements, particularly on the most productive route corridors; This funding would also provide for improved infrastructure (terminals, transfers centers, etc.) to support bus expansion.

- Rail service development could be done, but only at the expense of bus service (i.e., this would mean insufficient supporting/feeder bus service development).
Policy Recommendation Summary

Karen Williams Seel,
Pinellas Board of County Commissioners
Policy Recommendation Summary

Funding Allocation Alternatives
The Task Force recommended Alternative B, (Transit 88%, Roads 8% and Sidewalks/Trails 4%) based on the results of individual polling. 72% of the Task Force members voted to support this Alternative, while the other 28% voted to support a fourth Alternative. Consensus reached on supporting Alternative B.

Referendum on a Transportation Surtax
Transportation Task Force is recommending that Pinellas County pursue a regional transportation surtax. The potential scope of the transportation improvements that could be completed with the revenue generated from this surtax, coupled with the fact that as much as 1/3 of the tax will be paid for by tourists, was deemed significant enough for the Task Force to recommend putting the decision before the voters.

- Option A: Regional Tax, Coordinated by TBARTA
- Option B: Regional Tax with Interlocal Agreement for Joint Venture
- Option C: Pinellas County Tax, Coordinated with Other Counties
- Option D: Pinellas County Tax

Referendum Scheduling and Other Matters:

- Option A: Fall 2011
- Option B: Spring 2012
- Option C: Spring 2013
- Option D: Fall 2013
PSTA Ad Valorem Tax

Option A: (Ad Valorem Decreased to 0.50 mils) The Task Force Members concluded that if a sales tax is pursued for transportation improvements (regional or just in Pinellas County), the PSTA ad valorem tax should be decreased to a rate of 0.5 mils.

Option B: (Ad Valorem Eliminated) The Task Force Members concluded that if a sales tax is pursued for transportation improvements (regional or just in Pinellas County, the PSTA ad valorem tax should be eliminated.

Local Option Gas Tax

The Task Force discussed recommending a $0.05 increase to the Local Option Gas Tax be pursued by the Board of County Commissioners. This direction needs to be further defined as it relates to the recommendation by the Task Force of a Transit Surtax.
## Local Option Fuel Tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levying Authority</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Approval Requirements / Procedures</th>
<th>Sharing Provisions</th>
<th>Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of County Commissioners (BCC)</td>
<td>May be used for “transportation expenditures” needed to meet the requirements of the comprehensive plan capital improvements element or for expenditures needed to meet immediate local transportation problems and for other transportation-related expenditures critical to building roadway networks. “Transportation expenditures” means: a) public transportation operations and maintenance; b) roadway and ROW maintenance and equipment and structures used primarily for the storage and maintenance of such equipment; c) roadway and ROW drainage; d) street lighting; e) traffic signs, traffic engineering, signalization, and pavement markings; f) bridge maintenance and operations; g) debt service and current expenditures for transportation capital projects in the foregoing program areas, including construction of roads and sidewalks</td>
<td>Levied by ordinance adopted by a majority plus one vote of the BCC or by referendum; must be levied before July 1 to be effective January 1 of the following year; may be imposed for a specific term or until repeal</td>
<td>Must be shared with municipalities based on a distribution formula agreed to by interlocal agreement, or if no interlocal, pursuant to a statutory formula utilizing five years prior transportation expenditures</td>
<td>One to five cents on every gallon of motor fuel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Charter County Transportation System Surtax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levying Authority</th>
<th>Approval Requirements / Procedures</th>
<th>Sharing Provisions</th>
<th>Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each charter and consolidated county</td>
<td>Referendum approved by a majority vote of the electorate or referendum approval of a Charter amendment by a majority vote of the electorate; the surtax must take effect on January 1 and terminate on December 31 and may be imposed for a fixed term or until repealed; ordinance levying tax or proposing Charter amendment must be adopted at a regular or special BCC meeting (a super majority vote is not required) with at least ten days notice, and is subject to referendum approval as set out above; the referendum can be placed on ballot at a general or special election; the Department of Revenue must be notified within 10 days after final adoption of ordinance or referendum approval, but no later than November 16th prior to the effective date.</td>
<td>No sharing requirement, but county expressly authorized to enter into interlocal agreements and remit funds to cities, or expressway, transit or transportation authorities created by law; any interlocal entered into with cities must be revised no less than every five years to add newly created cities.</td>
<td>≤ 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Uses

Any combination of the following that the County Commission (BCC) deems appropriate:

1. Used by the county for the purposes of development, construction, equipment, maintenance, operation, supportive services, including a countywide bus system, on-demand transportation services, and related costs of a fixed guideway rapid transit system.

2. Remitted to an expressway, transit or transportation authority created by law to be used, at the discretion of such authority, for the development, construction, operation, or maintenance of roads or bridges in the county, for the operation and maintenance of a bus system, for the operation and maintenance of on-demand transportation services, for the payment of principal and interest on bonds for roads or bridges.

3. Used by the county for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads and bridges in the county; for the expansion, operation, and maintenance of bus and fixed guideway systems; for the expansion, operation, and maintenance of on-demand transportation services; and for the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for such projects; and such proceeds may be pledged by the governing body of the county for bonds for the construction of such fixed guideway rapid transit systems, bus systems, roads, or bridges and no more than 25 percent used for non-transit uses.

4. Used by the county for the planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of roads and bridges in the county; for the planning, development, expansion, operation, and maintenance of bus and fixed guideway systems; for the planning, development, construction, operation, and maintenance of on-demand transportation services; and for the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for such projects; and such proceeds may be pledged by the governing body of the county for bonds issued for the construction of such fixed guideway rapid transit systems, bus systems, roads or bridges. Pursuant to an interlocal agreement entered into pursuant to chapter 163, the governing body of the county may distribute proceeds from the tax to a municipality or an expressway or transportation authority created by law to be expended for the purpose authorized by this paragraph.
Pinellas County Transportation Task Force
Policy Recommendation Summary
Next Steps

Karen Williams Seel,
Pinellas Board of County Commissioners