Meeting of the Independent Oversight Committee
For the Transportation Sales Surtax

AGENDA
Monday, January 27, 2020, 6:00p
Location: 601 E Kennedy Blvd, 26th floor, Conference Rooms A&B

Watch the HTV live-stream. Send comments in advance on facebook.

I. Call to Order

II. Public Comment – please limit to 3 minutes per speaker

III. Members’ Interests

IV. Approval of Minutes – November 21, 2019

V. Workshop Topics
   A. How to Foster Transparency & Accountability
   B. Storyboard of Forthcoming IOC Annual Report
      i. Messaging & Content Guidance
   C. Rapid Fire Updates
      i. Website & Mapping Tool
      ii. Logo & Branding

VI. Old Business & New Business
   i. Public hearing scheduled for April 27, 2020 with town-hall style presentation of citizen project proposals

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Addendum

The full agenda packet is available on the web at www.independentoversight.org, or by calling the Hillsborough MPO office at (813) 272-5940.

Public comments are welcome, and may be given in person at this meeting; via e-mail to mpo@plancom.org, or by visiting the event posted on the Facebook page, until 3pm the day before the meeting. Written comments will be provided in full to the committee members.

Administrative support for the Independent Oversight Committee is provided by the Hillsborough MPO.
The MPO does not discriminate in any of its programs or services. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Learn more about our commitment to non-discrimination.

Persons needing interpreter services or accommodations for a disability in order to participate in this meeting, free of charge, are encouraged to contact Johnny Wong, 813-273-3774 ext. 370 or wongj@plancom.org, three business days in advance of the meeting. Also, if you are only able to speak Spanish, please call the Spanish helpline at (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

Si necesita servicios de traducción, el MPO ofrece por gratis. Para registrarse por estos servicios, por favor llame a Johnny Wong directamente al (813) 273-3774, ext. 370 con tres días antes, o wongj@plancom.org de correo electrónico. También, si sólo se puede hablar en español, por favor llame a la línea de ayuda en español al (813) 273-3774, ext. 211.

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, materials attached are for research and educational purposes, and are distributed without profit to MPO Board members, MPO staff, or related committees or subcommittees the MPO supports. The MPO has no affiliation whatsoever with the originator of attached articles nor is the MPO endorsed or sponsored by the originator. Persons wishing to use copyrighted material for purposes of their own that go beyond ‘fair use’ must first obtain permission from the copyright owner.

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the committee, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.
The Independent Oversight Committee (IOC) for the Transportation Sales Surtax, Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Thursday, November 21, 2019, at 5:00 p.m., in the 26th Floor Conference Room, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present:

Sean Shaw, Chairman  
Arthenia Joyner  
Dan Aprile  
Vanetta Kilpatrick  
Ray Chiaramonte  
Dustin Lemke (arrived at 5:12 p.m.)  
Ricardo Fernandez  
Manuel Menendez  
Chip Fletcher  
Audrey Sullivan Moore  
Jay Hollenkamp  
Dan Raulerson  
Robert Hunter  

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Shaw called the meeting to order at 5:08 p.m. and asked the members to introduce themselves.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Shaw referred to an electronic message from Mr. Christopher Vela.

III. MEMBERS’ REPORTS - None.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - OCTOBER 21, 2019

Chairman Shaw entertained a motion to accept the minutes. Attorney Fernandez moved approval, seconded by Attorney Joyner, and carried twelve to zero. (Mr. Lemke had not arrived.)

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. Transportation Surtax Plans for Calendar Year (CY) 2020

i. HART

Ms. Carolyn House Stewart, interim chief executive officer, HART, deferred to Mr. Justin Willits, HART, who expounded on a presentation. Mr. Raulerson sought the definition of a non-revenue vehicle. Ms. Moore asked for actual rider data and the implementation schedule determinants. Mr. Chiaramonte considered the Flamingo Fares technology funding and bus schedule improvements.
Referencing the idea of the transportation surtax supplanting existing funds, Attorney Fernandez sought verification no funding had been lost, inquired on the Invision Streetcar Phase 4 extension plans, and wanted clarity on real property evaluations and the writer of the transportation plan 30-year vision study. Judge Menendez desired to know the route/service area determining factors. Ms. Kilpatrick considered the population distribution in relation to the service routes/centers, opined the County should include public transit in future building plans, and wanted to know if a County representative could explain whether the previous County-funded services were being covered by HART. After Chairman Shaw advised keeping questions focused on the presentation, Mr. Willits and Ms. Cynthia Stiglich, interim chief financial officer, HART, clarified the funding situation. Chairman Shaw requested further information on the $8 million for labor and the eligible funding categories. Attorney Fletcher touched on expanded public transit options and operating contingencies. Attorney Fernandez inquired about funds going to safety enhancements, possible additional expenses for retrofitted gear, and heavy maintenance building renovations/replacements, which Ms. Lynda Crescentini, project management director, HART, supplied. Attorney Fernandez asked for the difference between compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles and electrical vehicle (EV) classifications and the CNG-to-EV trajectory over the life of the surtax. Mr. Lemke petitioned for the definition/implied meaning of enhanced bus service and expanded on the public transit options spending schedule.

Mr. Hollenkamp sought the role of city of Plant City (Plant City) for future HART plans. Observing HART concerns due to funds not be divided by jurisdictions, Mr. Chiaramonte opined HART would have to figure how to get new riders and weekend usage and touched on State grant funding, shelters as part of the service, and whether Plant City was part of HART. Mr. Hunter pondered street car advertising revenue generations/usage, when HART would expand the modern street car study, and whether the current cars would be used. Ms. Moore asked about study funds and customer amenities excluding shelter specifics and prioritization. Mr. Hollenkamp sought clarification on whether Plant City was paying a portion of the tax dollars that went to HART. Mr. Lemke analyzed the industry standard for covered shelters. Following comments from Chairman Shaw, Attorney Joyner moved the IOC certify HART’s surtax project plan for FY 2020 complied with governing law, seconded by Mr. Chiaramonte. Following plan certification confirmation and upon roll call vote, the motion carried thirteen to zero.
ii. City of Tampa (Tampa)

Ms. Jean Duncan, Tampa, spoke on the item. Mr. Hunter moved the IOC found the Tampa submittal consistent. Upon comments, Mr. Hunter moved the IOC certify the Tampa transportation surtax plan for CY 2020 complied with governing law, seconded by Judge Menendez. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried thirteen to zero.

iii. Hillsborough County

Deputy County Administrator Lucia Garsys, Infrastructure and Development Services, reviewed the item. Ms. Kilpatrick pondered supplementary service accounting in part of the surtax. Mr. Chiaramonte moved the IOC certify the Hillsborough County transportation surtax project plan for year 2020, and that complied with governing law, seconded by Mr. Aprile. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried thirteen to zero.

iv. City of Temple Terrace (Temple Terrace)

Responding to inquiries from Chairman Shaw on the timing of the Temple Terrace information released to the IOC, Messrs. Troy Tinch and Vincenzo Corazzo, Temple Terrace, expounded on a presentation. In answer to Chairman Shaw, Dr. Johnny Wong, Metropolitan Planning Organization, addressed Temple Terrace surtax funding entitlements CY 2020. Mr. Chiaramonte pointed out Temple Terrace/Plant City were under different rules/requirements than other jurisdictions. Attorney Fletcher noted IOC role in fitting projects in statute. Mr. Lemke observed no Temple Terrace congestion reduction in the plan. Chief Assistant County Attorney Samuel Hamilton addressed legal concerns, believed statutory framework for uses needed to comply, and touched on funding expenditure regarding over-budget status on the plan. Confused on what was being asked of the IOC to approve, Attorney Fletcher favored continuing the item until the next IOC meeting. Attorney Hamilton cited the Capital Improvement Program CY-based timing deferential. Mr. Tinch referenced background material. Ms. Moore perceived haste with the project. Dialogue occurred on the over-budget calculations range, surplus funds carrying over to the following year, project rollover intent, and available options.

Talks continued on what would happen to available funds with no approved project, project prioritization, different funding percentages, the project funding list, a possible check and balance for certified information, and
specifying the conversation for transparency. Perceiving nothing objectionable in the information, Attorney Fernandez would not approve the item with any funding discrepancies. Subsequent to discussion on IOC overreach affecting litigation, Mr. Raulerson moved the IOC certify the agency’s transportation surtax project plan for year 2020 complied with governing law, seconded by Mr. Hollenkamp. Mr. Hunter suggested the motion include the phrase: “Temple Terrace would not exceed the project funding for CY 2020 beyond the amount of $2,422,462,” to which Attorney Hamilton cautioned the additional language might go outside IOC domain. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried eleven to two; Attorney Fernandez and Ms. Moore voted no.

v. Plant City

Mr. Michael Schenk, Plant City, sought budget allocations and relayed a presentation. Ms. Kilpatrick pondered consequences when revenue was greater than the certified amount. Mr. Chiaramonte asked about the tax revenue basis. Mr. Hollenkamp moved the IOC certify Plant City’s transportation surtax project plan for CY 2020 complied with governing law, seconded by Mr. Aprile. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried thirteen to zero.

VI. STATUS REPORTS - None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS AND NEW BUSINESS

A. Cost Estimate for Surtax Legal Defense

Chairman Shaw touched on the item.

B. Next Meeting was December 9, 2019, at 5:00 p.m.

Chairman Shaw noted there would be no December 2019 IOC meeting.

VIII. ADDENDUM

A. Memo from Ms. Sharon Sweet-Grant, Board of County Commissioners Records, regarding Corrected Minutes – September 23, 2019, and August 27, 2019

B. Corrected Minutes – September 23, 2019

C. Corrected Minutes – August 27, 2019
IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:19 p.m.

READ AND APPROVED: ______________________________

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
PAT FRANK, CLERK

By: _______________________
Deputy Clerk

jh
Independent Oversight Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
How to Foster Transparency & Accountability

**Presenter**
Johnny Wong, IOC Support Staff

**Summary**
In 2011, the Hillsborough MPO commissioned a white paper to document the experiences of several communities with successful transportation sales tax referenda. The research was intended to generate a discussion about how lessons learned might be applied in Hillsborough County.

Several case studies serve to highlight exemplary practices regarding accountability, transparency, and public information.

Staff will present a summary of this research and generate a discussion about how best to ensure transparency in the transportation surtax process and how to communicate progress to the public.

**Recommended Action**
None. For information only.

**Prepared By**
Johnny Wong, PhD

**Attachments**
1. Executive Summary
Executive Summary

The Post-Referendum Analysis is an effort to reexamine the transportation needs of the community following a transportation sales tax referendum in 2010 not approved by a majority of Hillsborough County voters. As part of its mission to understand the transportation needs of the county and prepare a plan the community supports, the Hillsborough MPO is looking at other areas around the country.

Best Practices Review

This white paper documents several communities that held successful referenda for transportation funding over the past decade. It is not intended as a critique of past efforts. The review of best practices concluded with three exemplary themes that are of particular interest or practical application in Hillsborough County. They include Project Mix, Selection, and Distribution of Funds; Accountability; and Public Education and Outreach. Additional discussion includes the special cases of the state of Minnesota’s project prioritization method for its state transportation plan and Hillsborough County’s existing Community Investment Tax, as well as a simple tally and description of successful city-only referenda in the past five years.

Transportation Referenda—National Trends

Between 2000 and 2011, 344 transportation funding-related referenda went before voters across the country. These referenda are mechanisms for voters to choose to raise funds, often through locally-initiated sales tax increases, for desired transportation improvements. Of those 344 measures, 70 percent were approved. Over the last decade, the trend has shown overall high voter support for transportation improvements with local funding (Figure 1). This figure shows all votes for local transportation funding such as sales tax, ad valorem (property tax), and bonding options, among others. Sales tax referenda made up 141 of the measures, of which 58 percent passed. However, among the sales tax referenda that were approved, only four were for one percent (of which one was vetoed after approval). The following breaks down the sales tax approvals:

- <0.50% sales tax: 74 total – 65% passed
- 0.50-0.99% sales tax: 54 total – 56% passed
- 1.00% sales tax: 10 total – 40% passed (Of 4 that passed, 1 had mix of transit, road, community projects; 1 dedicated 10% of revenues to transit; 1 funded a transit center (among other infrastructure projects); and 1 was vetoed by the Wisconsin Governor.

![Figure 1: Transportation Funding-Related Referenda by Year, 2000-2011](image)

---

1 Center for Transportation Excellence (www.cfte.org)
Best Practices: Project Selection, Accountability, and Public Information

Common Traits
The following common themes were identified in the 23 case studies researched.

- Transit agencies and local municipalities typically led the effort.
- Planning areas typically match transit service boundaries, most often encompassing multiple municipalities.
- Of the 23 cases, 22 referenda have a sunset; the shortest length of time was nine years, and the longest, 30; the three-county Salt Lake effort (2000) does not sunset.
- Of the 23 cases, 8 sales tax increases ranged from 0.125 cents to 0.49 cents; 11 were 0.5-cent increases.
- California requires 66 percent voter approval for a local sales tax to pass, an expenditure plan outlining how funds will be allocated, and an independent citizen oversight committee; therefore California cases are similar in regards to accountability and transparency.

Best Practices

Project Selection
1. Balance the mix based on public’s needs with “no less than %” as guidelines with flexibility.
2. Develop the plan with the public and make sure it is completed and solidified before the vote.
3. Encourage use of funds as the “local match” and communicate the “multiplier effect”.
4. In most cases the plan components were solid for first five years; some were more flexible after that timeframe.
5. The Plan needs to have something for everyone during each time period.

Accountability
1. A citizen oversight committee or a publicly trusted independent review committee MUST monitor the funds.
2. Referendum language should clearly state how the agency will be accountable to the taxpayers.
3. Transparency of process, projects, and progress is needed to gain public support.
4. Funds should be managed and distributed by the implementing agency (e.g., planning or transportation agency).
5. An informative, easy-to-navigate website is essential for people to easily find information.

Public Information
1. Highlight past successes and accomplishments as collective successes—“We did this.”
2. Involve the public early, often, and completely in the process.
3. Personalize the benefits of the Plan to the community (e.g., university, business, environmental, Environmental Justice, neighborhoods, etc.).
4. Share the communication responsibilities to convey message(s) from multiple sources; recruit professional volunteers (e.g., planners, engineers, economic development, and business leaders) as part of Speakers Bureau.
5. Clearly communicate consequences if plan does not pass.
6. Respond to opposition quickly and stay on point, then move on.

Cases Studied
City of Glendale, AZ - GO Program
Maricopa County, AZ - Proposition 400
Pima County, AZ
Contra Costa County, CA - Measure J
Los Angeles County, CA - Measure R
Marin County, CA - Measure A
Orange County, CA - Measure M
San Joaquin County, CA - Measure K
San Mateo County, CA - Measure A
Santa Barbara County, CA - Measure A2008
Santa Clara County, CA - Measure B
Boulder County, CO - Issue 1A

Denver Region, CO - FasTracks
Miami-Dade County, FL - People’s Transportation Plan
St Paul/ Minneapolis, MN - MVST Amendment
St Louis County, MO - Proposition A
Dallas Region, TX - Bond approval
Salt Lake, Weber, & Davis Counties, UT - County Measure #2
Salt Lake & Utah Counties, UT - Proposition 3/ Opinion Question
City of Seattle, WA - Bridging the Gap
Washington State - Nickel Package

Executive Summary of Best Practices: Project Selection, Accountability, and Public Information
Independent Oversight Committee Agenda Item

**Agenda Item**
Storyboard of Forthcoming IOC Annual Report

**Presenter**
Caroline Charles, Planning Commission Staff

**Summary**
The Independent Oversight Committee is charged with preparing an annual report to the Clerk and each Agency, presenting the results of the annual audit process and any findings made.

Because the 2019 surtax funds have not been expended, the results and findings of the audit process will be abbreviated. To complement this information, the annual report storyboard may include an overview of the sales tax; role and responsibilities of the IOC; and, project highlights from the CY2020 plans.

Planning Commission staff will present a draft storyboard outline of the annual report and solicit feedback from IOC members about what information to include. Staff will present the annual report to the IOC at the April public hearing for approval.

Upon finalizing the annual report, the IOC shall publish a summary of the report in a local newspaper, make the report and audit available online, and deliver a copy to every library located within the County for public review.

**Recommended Action**
None. For information only.

**Prepared By**
Johnny Wong, PhD

**Attachments**
None.
Independent Oversight Committee Agenda Item

Agenda Item
Rapid Fire Updates

Presenter
Johnny Wong, IOC Support Staff and Caroline Charles, Planning Commission Staff

Summary
The presenters will briefly provide status updates regarding the ongoing construction of the IOC website, including the forthcoming Project Mapping Tool, as well as show sample renderings of an IOC logo and branding materials.

Recommended Action
None. For information only.

Prepared By
Johnny Wong, PhD

Attachments
None.