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Top Problem Statements

1. There is unpredictability in the state level of transit finance. (74% strongly agree, 21% somewhat agree)

2. There is a structural funding shortfall for transit system expansion and maintenance. (63% strongly agree, 21% somewhat agree)

3. There is too much complexity and lack of transparency in transit decision-making and financing. (42% strongly agree, 32% somewhat agree)
Others From Members

A. Need to connect problem statements to funding solutions, ensure equity integration in design and impact.

B. There is a lack of funding to address last-mile connections to transitways, biking, and walking connections.

C. Structural budget shortfalls is the result of state’s unreliability as a funding partner for regional transit.
Top Smaller Dollar Funding Scenarios

1. Met Council to increase its fare box recovery to hit efficiency targets. (56% strongly support, 33% minimally support)

2. Consider developer fees, transit-oriented dev tax increment financing, special assessment, capture portion of increased property taxes, etc. (26% strongly support, 57% minimally support)

3. Increase the transit taxing district. (22% strongly support, 61% minimally support)
Others from members

A. I support the possibility of a far box increase but not if it is paired with a requirement that Metro Transit meet a certain recovery rate.

B. I strongly disagree with characterizing the far box and benefit-related fees as “smaller $ options.” As to the transit taxing district, I would support adjusting it to fit the area served.
Top Larger Dollar Funding Scenarios

1. State funds Metro Mobility through a line item in the base General Fund appropriation for Met Council. (56% strongly support, 39% minimally support)

2. Two Tiers of Sales Tax. Create two tiers of taxation in the metro area. Cities want more, pay more, etc. (33% strongly support, 44% minimally support)

3. State authorizes a legislatively determined metro sales tax (ranging from ¼ to 1 cent). Revenue to Met Council. (33% strongly support, 22% minimally support)
4. State dedicates a portion of General Fund surplus to transit for operations. *(29% strongly support, 41% minimally support)*

5. State imposes a legislatively determined metro sales tax (ranging from ¼ to 1 cent). Revenue to Met Council. County commissioners cannot deny tax. *(22% strongly support, 33% minimally support)*
6. State dedicates transportation-related General Fund revenue (e.g., motor vehicles lease sales tax, rental tax) to transit, with no reduction in General Fund base appropriation for transit. (18% strongly support, 53% minimally support)

7. State imposes a legislatively determined metro sales tax (ranging from ¼ to 1 cent) with guaranteed allocation to Met Council for operations and a guaranteed allocation to CTIB for capital. Remainder allocated per “joint certification” process. (6% strongly support, 60% minimally support)
Others From Members

A. I see 6, 7, and 18 as complementing one another. My highest support is for 18.

B. Former CTIB counties maintain ability to impose up to 1/2% sales tax for transportation purposes and state imposes 1/4-1/2% metro sales tax for non-LRT purposes, including bus operations and bus expansion.
Do you like winter?

1. Yes 67%
2. Sometimes 5%
3. Hell no 29%
Assumption #1 (Aspirational)

Without having to consider the future of CTIB and/or other legislative activities, what is the best way to fund transit in the metropolitan region?
Met Council to increase its fare box recovery to hit efficiency targets.

1. Strongly support 40%
2. Minimally support 45%
3. Absolutely no support 15%
Consider developer fees, transit-oriented dev tax increment financing, special assessment, etc.

1. Strongly support 32%
2. Minimally support 58%
3. Absolutely no support 11%
Increase the transit taxing district.

1. Strongly support (30%)
2. Minimally support (50%)
3. Absolutely no support (20%)
State funds Metro Mobility through a line item in the base General Fund appropriation for Met Council.

1. Strongly support
2. Minimally support
3. Absolutely no support
Two Tiers of Sales Tax. Create two tiers of taxation in the metro area. Those who want more, pay more, etc.

1. Strongly support
2. Minimally support
3. Absolutely no support
State authorizes a legislatively determined metro sales tax (ranging from $\frac{1}{4}$ to 1 cent). Revenue to Met Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimally support</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely no support</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State dedicates a portion of General Fund surplus to transit for operations.

1. Strongly support
2. Minimally support
3. Absolutely no support
State imposes a legislatively determined metro sales tax (ranging from $\frac{1}{4}$ to 1 cent). Revenue to Met Council. County commissioners cannot deny tax.

- 45% 1. Strongly support
- 30% 2. Minimally support
- 25% 3. Absolutely no support
State dedicates transportation-related General Fund revenue (e.g., motor vehicles lease sales tax, rental tax) to transit, with no reduction in General Fund base appropriation for transit.

1. Strongly support (45%)
2. Minimally support (30%)
3. Absolutely no support (25%)
State imposes a legislatively determined metro sales tax (ranging from $\frac{1}{4}$ to 1 cent) with guaranteed allocation to Met Council for operations and a guaranteed allocation to CTIB for capital. Remainder allocated per “joint certification” process.

1. Strongly support 40%
2. Minimally support 15%
3. Absolutely no support 45%
Former CTIB counties maintain ability to impose up to 1/2% sales tax for transportation purposes and state imposes 1/4-1/2% metro sales tax for non-LRT purposes, including bus operations/expansion.

1. Strongly support 35%
2. Minimally support 45%
3. Absolutely no support 20%
Assumption #2 (Political reality)

Given the likelihood that CTIB will disband and no new state authorized/imposed sales tax, how would you fund transit activities?
Met Council to increase its fare box recovery to hit efficiency targets.

1. Strongly support
2. Minimally support
3. Absolutely no support
Consider developer fees, transit-oriented dev tax increment financing, special assessment, etc.

- **50%** 1. Strongly support
- **40%** 2. Minimally support
- **10%** 3. Absolutely no support
Increase the transit taxing district.

1. Strongly support (40%)
2. Minimally support (40%)
3. Absolutely no support (20%)
State funds Metro Mobility through a line item in the base General Fund appropriation for Met Council.

1. Strongly support
   70%

2. Minimally support
   30%

3. Absolutely no support
   0%
Two Tiers of Sales Tax. Create two tiers of taxation in the metro area. Those who want more, pay more, etc.

1. Strongly support
2. Minimally support
3. Absolutely no support
State dedicates a portion of General Fund surplus to transit for operations.

1. Strongly support (45%)
2. Minimally support (20%)
3. Absolutely no support (35%)
State dedicates transportation-related General Fund revenue (e.g., motor vehicles lease sales tax, rental tax) to transit, with no reduction in General Fund base appropriation for transit.

1. Strongly support
2. Minimally support
3. Absolutely no support
Former CTIB counties maintain ability to impose up to 1/2% sales tax for transportation purposes and state imposes 1/4-1/2% metro sales tax for non-LRT purposes, including bus operations/expansion.

1. Strongly support (20%)
2. Minimally support (60%)
3. Absolutely no support (20%)
Group Discussion