MICHIGAN’S 2015 COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PACKAGE

Title of Bills: House Bills 4370, 4736, 4737, 4738

Purpose: To increase state gasoline and diesel fuel taxes to 26.3 cents-per-gallon; tax alternative fuels at the state motor fuel tax rate; establish an alternative fuel dealer license and fee; increase registration fees by 20 percent; and create a new annual fee for electric-powered motor vehicles.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>Senate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGAINST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History

State Gas Tax & Transportation Funding Sources/Distribution

Prior to the 2015 legislation, Michigan primarily funded the state’s transportation infrastructure through a combination of three sources: federal funds, state motor fuel taxes (last raised in 1997, to 19 cents-per-gallon on gasoline and 15 cents-per-gallon on diesel), and state registration fees.

In the 2013-2014 Fiscal Year (FY), it was determined that federal funds accounted for a majority of the state’s transportation revenue—31.6 percent ($1.2 billion). Motor fuel taxes made up 24.6 percent (with the gasoline tax contributing 21.2 percent, or $812.5 million; and the diesel tax adding 3.4 percent, or $130 million), and vehicle registration fees provided an equivalent 24.6 percent ($939.5 million).

Starting in FY 2011-2012 through FY 2014-2015, Michigan began allocating direct and indirect General Fund/General Purpose Revenue for transportation purposes, culminating is a total of $869.7 million over four fiscal years.

Additionally, Michigan applied an additional 6 percent general sales tax on motor fuel purchases, of which two percent, plus an addition 60 percent of the remaining 4 percent, was allocated to the School Aid Fund. Fifteen percent of the remaining 4 percent was distributed to local governments, and no less
than 27.9 percent of the 25 percent of the remaining 4 percent was deposited into the state’s transportation fund.

Need

An analysis of Michigan’s transportation infrastructure in an April 2015 report by TRIP, a national nonprofit transportation research group, found the state had significant unmet transportation funding needs, including:

- 27 percent of the state’s bridges were in need of maintenance or replacement;
- Roads within the state were rapidly deteriorating, with a 15 percent increase in roads classified as ‘poor condition’ over eight years, and a projected increase of roads in ‘poor condition’ to rise to 53 percent by 2025; and
- Poor road conditions were costing Michigan drivers an estimated $4.8 billion each year (an average of $686 per motorist) in the form of vehicle operating costs, lost time, wasted fuel, and the financial repercussions of traffic incidents.

The Michigan State Transportation Commission issued a resolution Dec. 4, 2014 urging the legislature to take action in order to address the projected transportation funding shortfall. The commission noted several pressing reasons to increase transportation funding, including:

- A projected increase of 13 percent in passenger and freight traffic by 2040;
- Erosion of the purchasing power of the state gasoline tax, rendering the 19 cents-per-gallon state gasoline tax to the equivalent of 13 cents-per-gallon when compared to 1997 values (when the gas tax was last increased);
- The inability to match federal highway funding beginning in 2016, which would result in the loss of up to $750 million per year in federal aid; and
- The creation of jobs by increased transportation construction investment, which would aid Michigan’s recovery from the 2007-2009 economic recession.

Additionally, uncertainty over long-term federal transportation funding had a strong impact on the state’s ability to plan projects. Jeff Cranson, Michigan Department of Transportation spokesperson, told Michigan Live on June 24, 2014, “Without the trust fund our state matching funds would be focused on minor projects and heavy maintenance. Nothing of significance would be completed. We would need to do pavement markings and reactive maintenance.”
May 5, 2015 Ballot Measure: Proposal 1

Lawmakers made increasing transportation funding a priority during the 2014 legislative session, spending months going back and forth on competing proposals. A package of bills was approved by the Michigan legislature on December 19, 2014 for inclusion on the May Special Election ballot (a requirement when a sales tax measure is being considered).

Michigan voters failed to pass the May 5, 2015 ballot measure which would have eliminated the state sales tax on motor fuels—which provides revenue for the School Aid Fund and local governments—and supplemented those programs by increasing the general state sales/use tax from six to seven percent. State residents voted 20 percent in favor of the measure and 80 percent against, with many voters—as well as several legislators—blaming the bill’s convoluted nature as a reason for its failure.

If voters had approved the measure, several “tie-barred” bills would have taken effect and generated new revenue for transportation. One such measure—House Bill 5477—would have eliminated the current flat excise tax on gas and diesel and established a 14.9 percent wholesale tax on motor fuels. HB 5477 was passed by the House 93-17 on Dec. 19, 2014 and by the Senate 23-15 later that day. Gov. Snyder approved the legislation on Dec. 31, 2014. Vehicle registration fees and heavy truck fines would have also been increased to provide funding for highway and street investment. Another provision would have guaranteed that even if fuel prices decreased, the total revenues collected from the new funding package would not have fallen below 2013 spending levels.

Strong opposition against Proposal 1 was swiftly raised upon legislative passage. Concerns included:

- Increasing the sales tax would make Michigan’s sales tax the highest in the country;
- Increasing taxes would make economic recovery from the 2007-2009 recession challenging, especially to lower-income families and small businesses;
- The ballot language was confusing, and did not even mention the subsequent gas tax increase that would take place if the measure had been approved; and
- Too many other increases for additional interests were included.
Following the failure of the statewide ballot measure, lawmakers proposed a number of other bills to increase transportation funding.

**Proposal 1 (2015) ballot measure text:**

A proposal to amend the State Constitution to increase the sales/use tax from 6% to 7% to replace and supplement reduced revenue to the School Aid Fund and local units of government caused by the elimination of the sales/use tax on gasoline and diesel fuel for vehicles operating on public roads, and to give effect to laws that provide additional money for roads and other transportation purposes by increasing the gas tax and vehicle registration fees.

The proposed constitutional amendment would:

- Eliminate sales / use taxes on gasoline / diesel fuel for vehicles on public roads.
- Increase portion of use tax dedicated to School Aid Fund (SAF).
- Expand use of SAF to community colleges and career / technical education, and prohibit use for 4-year colleges / universities.
- Give effect to laws, including those that:
  - Increase sales / use tax to 7%, as authorized by constitutional amendment.
  - Increase gasoline / diesel fuel tax and adjust annually for inflation, increase vehicle registration fees, and dedicate revenue for roads and other transportation purposes.
  - Expand competitive bidding and warranties for road projects.
  - Increase earned income tax credit

Should this proposal be adopted?
Polling

In the wake of the Proposal 1 ballot measure defeat, a study commissioned by Crain’s Detroit Business and Hongman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP found that 56 percent of Detroit business owners and managers believed a combination of fuel tax and fees should be used to close the transportation funding shortfall.

The poll of 300 local businesses, released May 17, 2015, also found that 67 percent of respondents believed it was essential for the legislature to develop a new road funding proposal as soon as possible. vi

An additional survey of 600 likely voters released May 21 corroborated these findings, concluding that 69 percent of respondents believed lawmakers should get back to work on finding a solution for the transportation funding gap ‘as soon as possible’. The poll, conducted by Public Sector Consultants and Denno Research, also found that almost half of respondents (49 percent) said that the reason Proposal 1 failed as because it “included money for special interests beyond just fixing the roads”. vii

Summary of Legislation

How the Bill Was Passed

The House passed a new transportation funding plan on Oct. 21 to gradually increase the state diesel tax by 7.3 cents-per-gallon and the gas tax by 3.3 cents-per-gallon, as well as tax alternative fuels at the state motor fuel tax rate. Starting October 2022, state motor fuels and alternative fuels taxes would annually adjust based off changes in inflation as reported by the Consumer Price Index, with a cap to ensure the tax does not raise more than five percent per year. The package of bills also included a 40 percent increase for vehicle registration and a new annual registration fee for electric and hybrid vehicles, as well as the transfer of $600 million per year from the General Fund to the state Transportation Fund. In addition to the road-funding measures, the package included bills to expand the Homestead Property Tax Credit, as well as decreased the state income tax rate if revenue growth exceeds the rate of inflation.

Upon review, the Senate returned the bills back to the House on Nov. 3 with several changes, including raising the state motor fuel tax increase, moving up the start of indexing fuels to inflation, and decreasing vehicle registration fee increases. The House voted later that day to approve the amendments and pass the legislation.

The compromise plan was narrowly approved along party lines by lawmakers on Nov. 3. The Senate passed HB 4738 20-18, with the House following quickly behind with a vote of 55-52. Only two Democratic lawmakers—4 percent of all Democrats in the legislature—approved the gas tax increase, while 73 Republican legislators—83 percent of all Republicans in the House and Senate—supported the increase.
Gov. Rick Snyder (R) released a statement upon passage of the package: “The state House and Senate today approved a fiscally responsible, comprehensive transportation plan that provides a long-term solution with new revenue that also provides long-term tax relief. This is the largest investment in Michigan roads and bridges in more than half a century, making them safer for Michiganders long into the future.”

What the Bill Does

Michigan lawmakers Nov. 3 approved seven bills fees as part of a $1.2 billion plan to fund the state’s transportation infrastructure.

Beginning in 2017, the plan will:

- Increase the state gasoline and diesel taxes to 26.3 cents-per-gallon (an increase of 11.3 cents-per-gallon for diesel and 7.3 cents-per-gallon for gasoline);
- Apply the state motor fuel tax to alternative fuels (based on the motor fuel gallon equivalent);
- Establish an alternative fuel dealer license and fee of $500;
- Raise vehicle registration fees by approximately 20 percent; and
- Create a new annual fee for electric-powered motor vehicles.

Beginning Jan. 1, 2022, the state motor fuel tax will be adjusted annually based off of changes in inflation as reported by the Consumer Price Index.

Additionally, starting in the 2018-2019 fiscal year a portion of the state income tax revenue will be earmarked for the Michigan Transportation Fund to be distributed to state and local road agencies. That amount will gradually increase for three years until the annual sum being transferred reaches $600 million.

As part of the compromise, the package of bills will also expand the Homestead Property Tax Credit and amend the state’s income tax.

The $1.2 billion per year in new revenue, gradually phased in over the next five years, would be distributed through the Michigan Transportation Fund to:

- The Comprehensive Transportation Fund for public transportation (10 percent of new revenues, excluding General Fund transfers, estimated at $62 million per year);
- The State Trunkline Fund for state highway construction and maintenance ($454 million, or 39.1 percent of remaining funds);
- County road agencies (39.1 percent of remaining funds, estimated at $454 million per year); and
- Cities and villages ($253 million, or 21.8 percent of the remaining funds).
Legislative Makeup

At the time of HB 4738’s passage, Michigan’s Governor Rick Snyder was Republican, and the legislature was majority Republican. Of the legislators voting on the bill, 52 percent voted to approve HB 4738, while 48 percent opposed it.

- There were 57 Democrats in the Michigan legislature, with 2 voting in favor of HB 4738 and 55 opposed.
- There were 88 Republicans in the Michigan legislature, with 73 voting in favor of HB 4738 and 15 opposed.
Supporters

Arguments:

- A January 2014 TRIP report estimated that poor roadway features were a contributing factor in approximately one-third of fatal traffic accidents. Improving roads will save lives.
- Cost of repairs due to poor road conditions is much higher than what drivers will pay in increased motor fuel taxes.
- Investing in transportation construction will increase jobs, which will aid in Michigan’s recovery from the 2007-2009 economic recession.
- Of Michigan’s roads, 32 percent were tanked in poor condition, with that number estimated to raise to 65 percent by 2018 with current transportation investment. The cost of bringing a road from ‘poor’ condition to ‘good’ condition is six times more expensive than taking a road still in ‘fair’ condition to ‘good’ condition. Increasing transportation investment now will save money for Michigan in the long-term.

Key Players:

“Just Fix the Roads” Campaign
Website: http://justfixtheroads.com/

Coalition members:

- Aggregate Carriers of Michigan, Inc.
- AAA Amalgamated Transit Union – Michigan Legislative Conference
- American Council of Engineering Companies of Michigan
- American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
- Asphalt Paving Association of Michigan
- Associated General Contractors – Michigan Chapter
- Construction Association of Michigan
- County Road Association of Michigan
- Dean Transportation
- Detroit Regional Chamber of Commerce
- Disability Advocates of Kent County
- Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce
- Grand Valley Metro Council
- Home Builders of Michigan
- International Brotherhood of Teamsters
- International Union of Operating Engineers – Local 324
- Kalamazoo Regional Chamber of Commerce
- Laborers’ Local 1191
- Lansing Regional Chamber of Commerce
- Metropolitan Affairs Council
- Michigan Aggregates Association
- Michigan Agri-Business Association
- Michigan Association of Counties
- Michigan Chamber of Commerce
- Michigan Concrete Paving Association
- Michigan Department of Transportation
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Coalition strategies:

Legislative Inaction Calculator: In order to highlight legislative inaction, MITA created a calculator assigning a dollar amount to every second the Michigan legislature did not take action to solve the state’s transportation funding shortfall.

Mike Nystrom, executive vice president of MITA: “As of this morning [Sept. 17], the cost of legislative inaction on road funding totaled $269 million. As each day passes, that figure climbs by $2.7 million, or $1 billion per year. Faced with that cost of delay, Michigan’s legislators must find a way to invest at least $2 billion more annually on roads, or the public will continue to bear the brunt of their inaction. As legislators continue to put off road funding, the cost of repairs will escalate even further. It is a major funding dilemma that will only get worse over time.”

Grassroots push: The coalition provided easy access for constituents to find their state lawmaker’s contact information through their website. Additionally, a social media page was set up to enable easy and quick information sharing. Responses to commonly-asked questions and links to resources and reports were also easily made available through the ‘Just Fix the Roads’ website.
Gov. Rick Snyder (R)

Gov. Snyder was a vocal proponent of increasing transportation funding beginning at the start of his term as governor, recommending it as an integral path to Michigan’s success.

In an Oct. 26, 2011 press release, Gov. Snyder stated,

“Michigan’s infrastructure is living on borrowed time. We must reinvest in it if we are to successfully reinvent our economy. I haven’t met a Michigan driver yet who is satisfied with the condition of our roads and yet we’re facing a $1.4 billion shortfall just to maintain our current system. If we want to grow our economy and keep our children here, then we need to fix the very foundation of our state. Michigan put the world on wheels. We can continue being a transportation leader through bold, innovative approaches to upgrading our infrastructure. It’s time to seriously engage in this discussion that is so vital to our state’s future.”

...The governor pointed out that Michigan loses nearly $3 million each day in the value of its transportation assets, or $1 billion annually. Each dollar spent today to preserve a road or bridge saves Michigan at least $6 in future rebuilding costs.”

Opponents

Arguments:

- The amount of General Fund transfers is too high and is not sustainable, likely resulting in cuts to social services and education.
- Inadequate amount of funding to address all of Michigan’s transportation needs.
- Lack of trust that revenue will be properly and fully utilized for its intended purpose.
- Unfair burden to middle- and lower-class, while income tax cuts solely benefit the wealthy.
- Takes too long until it is fully in effect.

Key Players:

Michigan House Democrats

“Legislative Republicans have failed our state,” House Democratic Leader Tim Greimel (D-Auburn Hills) said. “The Republican proposal raises taxes on middle-class families, does nothing to lower truck weights, and drains funding from education and public safety. Even worse, it doesn’t even start fixing our roads until 2021.”
House Democrats rejected the plan because it is unsustainable and prioritizes tax breaks for the wealthy over funding for roads and critically important state programs. In particular, the Republican road funding plan:

- Fails to identify where $800 million in funding cuts will be made, and fails to guarantee that public safety, education and health care funding will be protected.
- Offers income tax breaks targeted at helping millionaires and billionaires, while leaving regular working families to shoulder the burden of program cuts and road funding.
- Will only generate $425 million in the first year and $608 million in the second year of the $1.2 billion needed annually for road funding, and won’t reach $1.2 billion in annual funds until fiscal year 2021 – meaning Michigan’s roads will continue to deteriorate for years to come.

“It’s obvious that Legislative Republicans have other priorities besides protecting vital services and our communities,” said Rep. Marilyn Lane (D-Fraser), Democratic vice chairwoman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. “It’s disappointing Republicans have taken this long to present a road funding plan that doesn’t even fully fix our crumbling roads and bridges for years. The fact this is going to the governor’s desk to be signed into law is shameful.”

*Americans for Prosperity*

“...An excise tax on gasoline, which operates much like a “user fee,” is the best revenue mechanism to do this [repair roads and bridges]. However, raising gas or other taxes without serious spending reform and long-term tax relief for Michigan families will harm our economy even as it continues to recover from a lost decade of economic growth.

As evidenced by the overwhelming 80-20 rejection of Proposal One[1] (a $1.9 billion tax hike on the May 2015 ballot that would have funded roads along with a host of other projects), Michiganders simply don’t trust that the taxes they pay are going to be used to fix the roads they drive instead of unrelated expenditures.

... The adage first coined by Ronald Reagan applies: It’s not a revenue problem; it’s a spending problem. Citizens are right to be skeptical of state spending and apprehensive that promises to fix the roads will be kept.”

*Libertarian Party of Michigan*

“What part of “No” do our elected officials not understand? Michigan is still in recovery, and with inflation, the people cannot afford to give more money to the government when they have to trim back on expenses themselves. The State should look at other options!
We can look at decriminalizing victimless offenses that put people in jail/prison that cost several thousand dollars a year per person. We can look at turning a few roads into toll roads in order to pay for their upkeep. We can look at the warranties which should have come with the roads and have any that fall under these warranties fixed before those warranties expire. We can end subsidies to businesses that send their money out of state.”

Wayne County Taxpayers Association

“In Michigan, state Senate and House Republicans decided to hit working Michigan families with hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes. Michigan families will have to cut their family budget's because Michigan Republicans believe growing government in Lansing is a priority.

With what passed, Michigan went from the 12th highest tax on gasoline to the 5th highest (and automatic future increases). Plus a 20% increase in vehicle registration taxes.”

Why did it succeed?

Expansive Coalition

A large coalition that included a broad range of interests helped unite a comprehensive grassroots campaign to urge legislators to pass a transportation funding measure. The messaging focused on the economic benefits to Michigan residents as well as the safety component.

Clearly Defined Need

Numerous reports and testimony from transportation organizations, state advocacy groups, and legislative committees thoroughly documented the dire necessity to raise new transportation revenue. The clearly defined need was used in grassroots advocacy efforts, with poll results reflecting the effectiveness of the message. Legislators additionally felt the pressure and persevered in finding a transportation funding solution.

Governor as a Champion

Gov. Snyder campaigned from the beginning of his time in office for improved transportation infrastructure. He consistently pushed the legislature for results, and campaigned to voters in order to gain support. Gov. Snyder’s involvement provided a strong incentive for legislators to continually work towards a compromise in order to increase revenue.
National Momentum

In passing this bill, Michigan became the eighth state in 2015 to increase their taxes on motor fuels. Five other states—Idaho, Georgia, South Dakota, Utah, and Washington—also passed comprehensive transportation funding packages that included a combination of transportation-related fee increases (such as raising vehicle registration fees, taxes on alternative fuel and electric vehicles, indexing taxes to inflation, etc.) as well as a fuel tax increase. Additionally, two other states—Iowa and Nebraska—approved measures to increase their state gasoline tax.

In the two years prior to 2015, eight other states had increased their taxes on motor fuel.

State Motor Fuel Tax Increases: 2013-2015

ARTBA Contact:
Carolyn Kramer
Transportation Investment Advocacy Center Manager
202-289-4434
ckramer@artba.org
The Transportation Investment Advocacy Center ™ (TIAC) is a first-of-its kind, dynamic education program and internet-based information resource designed to help private citizens, legislators, organizations and businesses successfully grow transportation investment at the state and local levels through the legislative and ballot initiative processes.

The TIAC website, www.transportationinvestment.org, was created so transportation investment advocates do not have to “re-invent the wheel” to mount successful campaigns. It exists to put in one place—and promote the sharing of—strategies... sample political and communications tools... legislative and ballot initiative language... and information on where to obtain professional campaign advice, research and help. To subscribe to at no cost—and receive via email—the regularly updated TIAC blog, visit the website.

In addition to the website, the TIAC program includes an annual workshop in Washington, D.C., and ongoing webinars for transportation investment advocates featuring case studies, best practices, and the latest in political and media strategies. State and local chamber of commerce executives, state legislators, state and local transportation officials, “Better Roads & Transportation” group members, industry and labor executives, and leaders of state and local chapters of national organizations who have an interest in transportation development programs are welcomed to participate.

The TIAC is a project of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association’s “Transportation Makes America Work!”™ (TMAW) program (www.tmaw.org) and funded through voluntary contributions and sponsorships. To become a sponsor or to make a contribution, visit the ARTBA store or contact TIAC Manager Carolyn Kramer at ckramer@artba.org or 202-289-4434. Also contact Ms. Kramer if you have questions or comments about any reports or case studies published through the TIAC.
Appendix

I. Breakdown of votes for Michigan HB 4738

SENATE

Senators who voted in favor of HB 312:
Darwin L Booher (Republican - District 35)
Rick Jones (Republican - District 24)
Arlan B Meekhof (Republican - District 30)
Tonya Schuitmaker (Republican - District 26)
Tom Casperson (Republican - District 38)
Marty Knollenberg (Republican - District 13)
Mike Nofs (Republican - District 19)
Mike Shirkey (Republican - District 16)
Judy K Emmons (Republican - District 33)
Mike Kowall (Republican - District 15)
Margaret O’Brien (Republican - District 20)
Virgil Smith (Democratic - District 4)
Goeff Hansen (Republican - District 34)
Peter MacGregor (Republican - District 28)
David B Robertson (Republican - District 14)
Jim Stamas (Republican - District 36)
Ken Horn (Republican - District 32)
Jim Marleau (Republican - District 12)
Wayne A Schmidt (Republican - District 37)
Dale Zorn (Republican - District 17)

Senators who voted against HB 4738:
Jim Ananich (Democratic - District 27)
Vincent Gregory (Democratic - District 11)
Joe Hune (Republican - District 22)
John Proos (Republican - District 21)
Steven M Bieda (Democratic - District 9)
Hertel Jr., Curtis (Democratic - District 23)
Bert Johnson (Democratic - District 2)
Tory Rocca (Republican - District 10)
Jack Brandenburg (Republican - District 8)
Dave Hildenbrand (Republican - District 29)
Knezek, David (Democratic - District 5)
Rebekah Warren (Democratic - District 18)
Patrick Colbeck (Republican - District 7)
Hood Ill, Morris W (Democratic - District 3)
Phil Pavlov (Republican - District 25)
Young II, Coleman (Democratic - District 1)
Mike Green (Republican - District 31)
Hoon-Yung Hopgood (Democratic - District 6)

House

Representatives who voted in favor of HB 4738:
Chris Afendoulis (Republican - District 73)
Daniela Garcia (Republican - District 90)
Andrea LaFontaine (Republican - District 32)
Earl Poleski (Republican - District 64)
Tom Barrett (Republican - District 71)
Ben Glardon (Republican - District 85)
Dan Lauwers (Republican - District 81)
Phil Potvin (Republican - District 102)
John Bizon (Republican - District 62)
Ken Goike (Republican - District 33)
Tom Leonard (Republican - District 93)
Amanda Price (Republican - District 89)
Jon Bumstead (Republican - District 100)
Joseph Graves (Republican - District 51)
Eric Leutheuser (Republican - District 58)
Al Pscholka (Republican - District 79)
Mike Callton (Republican - District 87)
Kurt Heise (Republican - District 20)
Lisa Posthumus Lyons (Republican - District 86)
Bruce Rendon (Republican - District 103)
Edward Canfield (Republican - District 84)
Martin Howrylak (Republican - District 41)
David Maturen (Republican - District 63)
Brett Roberts (Republican - District 65)
Lee Chatfield (Republican - District 107)
Holly Hughes (Republican - District 91)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed McBroom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Santana</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triston Cole</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt Iden</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McCready</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Sheppard</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Cotter</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Inman</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Miller</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Tedder</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Cox</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Jacobsen</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Muxlow</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob VerHeulen</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Crawford</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representatives who voted against HB 4738:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Banks</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaTanya Garrett</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Lane</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Runestad</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnie Brinks</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Gay-Dagnogo</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill LaVoy</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rutledge</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Brunner</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Geiss</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Liberati</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Schor</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Byrd</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Glenn</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Love</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Singh</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Chang</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Greig</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lucido</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Smiley</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chirkun</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Greimel</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Miller</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Somerville</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Clemente</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Guerra</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Jenkins</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aric Nesbitt</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Victory</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Farrington</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Johnson</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Outman</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Webber</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Forlini</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Kelly</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Pagel</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yonker</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Franz</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klint Kesto</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Pettalia</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>District 106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“The Long and Winding Road: Proposal 1 and Road Funding Reform” by Glenn Steffens, Fiscal Analyst (Michigan Senate Fiscal Agency)

“Metro Detroit businesspeople favor road fix now even if they have to pay more, poll shows” by Lindsay Vanhulle, Crain’s Detroit Business, May 19 2015.
http://www.crainsdetroit.com/article/20150519/NEWS/305179974/metro-detroit-business-people-favor-road-fix-now-even-if-they-have

http://www.pscinc.com/News/tabid/75/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/343/PRESS-RELEASE-Voters-Point-to-Complexity-Leadership-Issues-for-Prop-1-Failure.aspx

http://www.michigan.gov/snyder/0,4668,7-277-57577_57657-368635--,00.html

January 2014 TRIP Report: Michigan Transportation by the Numbers

“How Much is Legislative Inaction on Road Funding Costing Us?” Sept. 17, 2015.

http://www.michigan.gov/snyder/0,4668,7-277-57577_57657-264676--,00.html

http://housedems.com/article/house-democrats-reject-republican-road-funding-plan-0
http://americansforprosperity.org/michigan/article/policy-statement-road-funding/

http://michiganlp.org/?page_id=886