



Appendix C

Arizona Transit Governance



Central Yavapai Transit Implementation Plan Update



CYMPO
Central Yavapai Metropolitan
Planning Organization



Transit Governance Options: Central Yavapai

Feasible in Yavapai County	Governance Strategy	Overview	Membership	Establishment
Yes	County Transit System	County provides transit services to provide regional services and/or fill gaps	County Board of Supervisors	Cities and counties in AZ may provide public transportation services or by contract with a private party.
Yes	Metropolitan Public Transit Authority (MPTA)	Counties and cities (but not Indian nations) can create MPTAs to acquire, own and operate public transportation authorities	Board of Directors elected by popular vote	Can serve all or part of a county, but if serve part of the county, must serve at least 51%
Yes	Regional Transportation Authority (RTA)	Public, political, tax levying public improvement and taxing sub-division. Independent of governments in area it serves Powers equal to a municipal corporation.	Each municipality in the county and any other members of the regional council of governments from the county.	Established in county with population of more than 400,000 but less than 1.2 million. County Board may establish RTA in county with less population of 400,000 or less.
Yes	Joint Powers Organization/Non-Profit Corporation	Counties, cities and other partners form a separate legal entity to operate transit service	JPO members negotiate functions, roles and terms	Arizona political subdivisions have authority to create JPOs Governing bodies of member agencies would need to approve development of the JPO
Yes	Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)	County, cities and Indian nations (+ others) develop intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) that define respective roles and responsibilities	Determined by members	Cities and counties in AZ may provide public transportation services or by contract with a private party. (40-1152) Cities, counties and other entities may create agreements to jointly provide services (11-952)
No	Regional Public Transportation Authority	Public, political, tax levying public improvement and taxing sub-division. Independent of governments in area it serves Powers equal to a municipal corporation.	Elected officials from each municipalities	Counties with 1.2m or more
No	Intergovernmental Public Transit Authority (IPTA)	Public, political public improvement district	Determined by cities and towns interested in establishing IPTA. Can span county boundaries but all counties must meet population threshold. Can include universities under jurisdiction of AZ board of regents and Indian nations	Counties with population of 200,000 or less

Transit Governance Options: Central Yavapai

Feasible in Yavapai County	Governance Strategy	Authority	Enabling Legislation	Arizona Example	Able to receive FTA 5307 funds?
Yes	County Transit System	Has the powers of County government, which includes authority to develop, operate and contract for public transportation service	40-1152	None	Yes
Yes	Metropolitan Public Transit Authority (MPTA)	MPTA has the powers/authority to operate (or contract for) public transportation services	ARS 40-1111 and 40-1152	None yet	Yes
Yes	Regional Transportation Authority (RTA)	RTA has the powers/authority to operate (or contract for) public transportation services	ARS 48-5301 through 49-5354	Pima County	Yes
Yes	Joint Powers Organization/Non-Profit Corporation	Has all the powers of its members, which include powers necessary to develop, operate and contract for transit services	ARS 11-951 - 11-952 and ARS 40-1152	Valley Metro Light Rail	Unclear, but likely
Yes	Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)	Members have powers necessary to implement interagency agreements to develop, operate and contract for transit services.	ARS 11-951 - 11-952 and ARS 40-1152	Yavapai (previously)	Unclear
No	Regional Public Transportation Authority	RPTA has the powers/authority to operate (or contract for) public transportation services	ARS 48-5101-48-5175	Maricopa County	Yes
No	Intergovernmental Public Transit Authority (IPTA)	IPTA has the powers/authority to operate (or contract for) public transportation services	ARS 28-9101-28-9143	Yuma County	Yes

Transit Governance Options: Central Yavapai

Feasible in Yavapai County	Governance Strategy	Fund Raising Powers	Oversight	Advantages	Disadvantages
Yes	County Transit System	With voter approval, can use county excise tax Potential for transportation tax (?) Dedicate portion of transportation tx	County Board of Supervisors	Opportunity to address regional needs and regional coordination Access to funding	May be mismatch with Central Yavapai
Yes	Metropolitan Public Transit Authority (MPTA)	Member municipality contributions (general funds), plus fares, partnerships, and contracts If approved by voters, can use transportation excise tax revenues	Elected officials	Organization focused on public transit; allows for sub-division of county; ability to fund transit services;	Less control for county and cities Cannot directly include universities as agency partners
Yes	Regional Transportation Authority (RTA)	With voter approval, existing "roadway" excise tax would be replaced by a transportation excise tax to fund all modes. Requires voter approval	RTA Board would be same as Regional Council of Government (NACOG?)	Focuses authority for a multimodal, regional transportation system successful tax provides fundign for all modes	Requires development of a 20-year plan Transitions transportation authority from county to RTA (including roads) Potential less control for cities and tribes
Yes	Joint Powers Organization/Non-Profit Corporation	No taxing authority but can raise funds through member contributions, contracts, partnerships and fares	Determined by mem	Focused organization and platform for collaboration May be expanded to include relevant partners, regardless of geography	No taxing authority Requires approval of JPO and structure for sharing authority and funding
Yes	Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)	No taxing authority but can raise funds through member contributions, contracts, partnerships and fares	Determined by mem	Focused organization and platform for collaboration May be expanded to include relevant partners, regardless of geography	No taxing authority Requires approval of JPO and structure for sharing authority and funding
No	Regional Public Transportation Authority	Member municipality contributions (general funds), plus fares, partnerships, and contracts If approved by voters, can use transportation excise tax revenues			
No	Intergovernmental Public Transit Authority (IPTA)	No taxing authority but can raise funds through member contributions, contracts, partnerships and fares	Board has some reps specified others based on population. Limit seats to 9	Easy to form Can be tailored to Quad Cities	longer term limits on growth (potentially)