
Local Funding Options for Public Transportation

5 November 2013

By
Todd Litman
Victoria Transport Policy Institute



Abstract

This report evaluates eighteen potential local funding options suitable to help finance public transit or other transportation projects and services. They are evaluated according to eight criteria, including potential revenue, predictability and sustainability, horizontal and vertical equity, travel impacts, strategic development objectives, public acceptance and ease of implementation. This is a somewhat larger set of options, and more detailed and systematic evaluation, than most previous studies of this type. This research discovered no new options that are particularly cost effective and easy to implement; each has disadvantages and constraints. As a result, the overall conclusion of this study is that a variety of funding options should be used to help finance the local share of transportation improvements to insure stability and distribute costs broadly.

This is a more comprehensive version of
Paper 13-3125 presented at the Transportation Research Board 2013 Annual Meeting

Todd Litman © 2013

You are welcome and encouraged to copy, distribute, share and excerpt this document and its ideas, provided the author is given attribution. Please send your corrections, comments and suggestions for improvement.

Contents

Introduction	3
Literature Review	3
General Transportation Funding (not specific to transit)	3
Transit Funding Studies	4
Evaluation Criteria	8
Potential Revenue	8
Predictability and Stability	8
Equity Analysis	8
Travel Impacts	9
Strategic Development Objectives	9
Public Acceptability	10
Ease of Implementation	10
Analysis	11
Fare Increases	11
Discounted Bulk Transit Passes	13
Property Taxes	14
Regional Sales Taxes	15
Fuel Taxes	16
Vehicle Levy	17
Utility Levy	18
Employee Levy	19
Road Tolls	20
Vehicle-Km Tax	21
Parking Sales Taxes	22
Parking Levy	23
Expanded Parking Pricing	24
Development Cost Charges or Transportation Impact Fees	25
Land Value Capture	26
Station Rents	27
Station Air Rights	28
Advertising	29
Options Summary	30
Conclusions	33
Bibliography	35
Acknowledgments	39

Introduction

High quality public transit can provide various economic, social and environmental benefits, including direct user benefits and various indirect and external benefits. Residents of communities with high quality transit tend to own fewer motor vehicles, drive less, and spend less on transport than they would in more automobile-oriented locations. Governments and businesses can save roadway and parking facility costs. It can support economic development. Appropriate public transit investments can provide positive economic returns: under favorable conditions transit investments can provide savings and benefits that more than offset costs (Litman 2010). As a result, public transit service improvements are an important component of many jurisdictions' strategic transport plans (Buehler and Pucher 2010).

Although federal and state/provincial funds can often help finance a portion of transit improvements, additional local funding is generally needed. Several previous studies identify and evaluate potential funding options for transportation (Huang, et al 2010; Sakamoto 2010; Reich, Davis and Sneath 2012) and public transit improvements (IPIRG 2007; TBoT 2010; TCRP 2009; DeGood 2012; Smith and Gihring 2003). However, many of these only consider a relatively limited set of options and evaluation criteria.

This report evaluates eighteen potential local funding options according to eight criteria, including potential revenue, predictability and sustainability, horizontal and vertical equity, travel impacts, strategic development objectives, public acceptance and ease of implementation. This is a somewhat larger set of options and evaluation criteria than considered in most previous studies. Much of this analysis can be applied to other types of transportation improvements besides public transit.

Literature Review

This section summarizes various publications on transportation and public transit funding options.

General Transportation Funding (not specific to transit)

Transportation Revenue Options: Infrastructure, Emissions, and Congestion (Huang, et al 2010), summarizes results of an expert workshop on transportation funding. It considers three main funding categories: fuel taxes, congestion fees and VMT fees. It explores the financial and environmental advantages and disadvantages of each option and discusses various policy issues. It highlights the additional benefits of road tolls and vehicle-travel fees which can reduce traffic congestion and pollution emissions, in addition to raising revenues.

Financing Sustainable Urban Transport (Sakamoto 2010) provides information on available options for financing urban transport improvements, particularly in developing countries. It identifies various funding options and evaluates them based on administrative levels, potential revenues, efficiency, equity, environmental objectives, stability, political acceptability and administrative ease. It also provides numerous examples and case studies from around the world.

Florida MPOAC Transportation Revenue Study (Reich, Davis and Sneath 2012) summarizes a detailed study which analyzed key state transportation funding issues, identified and evaluated potential sustainable funding sources. It recommends dedicated sales taxes, increased diesel taxes, gradually increase gasoline taxes and index them to inflation, redirect motor vehicle license and title fees to the state transportation funds, and conduct a study of VMT fees for possible future implementation.

Innovative Infrastructure Financing Mechanisms for Smart Growth (Tomalty 2007) describes and evaluates infrastructure (including but not limited to public transit improvements) funding options that support smart growth development. It includes examples from various cities. These include:

High Occupancy/Toll Lanes	Fuel Tax Transfer
Sector and Density Gradient Approach to Development Cost Charges	Tax Increment Financing
Parking Site Tax	Tax Base Sharing
Land Value Taxation	Vehicle Registration Surcharges
Standard Offer Contract	Commuter Tax
Storm Water Utility Fee Credits	Tax-Exempt Tax Revenue Bonds
TOD Policy Leveraging	Local Option Sales Tax
	Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicles

Transit Funding Studies

Local and Regional Funding Mechanisms for Public Transportation and its online *Regional Funding Database* (TCRP 2009) provides an extensive list of local and regional funding sources that are or could be used to support public transportation, plus guidance on factors to consider when evaluating and implementing these options. Table 1 summarizes the options identified. It evaluates based on revenue yield (adequacy and stability), cost efficiency, equity across demographic and income groups, degree to which beneficiaries pay, political and popular acceptability, and technical feasibility.

Table 1 U.S. Local and Regional Public Transport Funding Options (TCRP 2009)

Traditional Tax- and Fee-Based Transit Funding Sources	Common Business, Activity, and Related Funding Sources	Revenue Streams from Projects (Transportation and Others)	New “User” or “Market-Based” Funding Sources
General revenues	Employer/payroll taxes	Transit-oriented development/joint development	Tolling (fixed, variable, and dynamic; bridge and roadway)
Sales taxes (variable base of goods and services, motor fuels)	Vehicle rental and lease fees	Value capture/beneficiary charges	Congestion pricing
Property taxes (real property, includes vehicles)	Parking fees	Special assessment districts	Emissions fees
Contract or purchase-of-service revenues (by human service agencies, school/universities, private organizations, etc.)	Realty transfer tax and mortgage recording fees	Community improvement districts/community facilities districts	VMT fees
Lease revenues	Corporate franchise taxes	Impact fees	
Vehicle fees (title, registration, tags, inspection)	Room/occupancy taxes	Tax-increment financing districts	
Advertising revenues	Business license fees	Right-of-way leasing	
Concessions revenues	Utility fees/taxes		
	Income taxes		
	Donations		
	Other business taxes		

Various potential funding options are described in a Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) report.

Table 2 summarizes current local public transit funding sources for various size U.S. cities.

Table 2 U.S. Local Public Transportation Funding By System Size (TCRP 2009)

Funding Source	Percent Capital Investment			Percent Operating Expenses		
City population	> 1m	200k to 1 m.	50k to 200k	> 1m	200k to 1 m.	50k to 200k
Fares and Earned Income	—	—	—	58.2%	30.2%	37.8%
Sales taxes	35.5%	38.9%	51.1%	18.8%	25.8%	28.3%
Other directly generated local funds	33.7%	—	—	—	—	—
Local general funds	—	42.5%	32.7%	11.1%	26.9%	21.3%
Other Local Dedicated Funds	18.4%	—	—	—	—	—
Local Property Taxes	—	—	9.7%	—	—	—
Other local sources	—	8.2%				

Note: dashes indicate minor contribution.

The *Guide to Transportation Funding Options* (UTCM 2010), by the Texas Transportation Institute University Transportation Center for Mobility describes the following transit funding options:

General fund expenditures	Tollway revenues	Realty/mortgage transfer fees
Vehicle registration fees	Cigarette tax	Corporate franchise taxes
Employer/payroll taxes	Parking fees and fines	Hotel/motel taxes
Concessions	Property taxes	Utility fees
General sales taxes	Fares and fair related income	Public Private Partnerships (PPP)
Lottery and/or casino revenues	Contracts or purchase of service	Tax-increment Financing Districts
Vehicle leasing and rental fees	Lease revenues	Transportation Development Districts
Advertising	Concessions/rental income	

Primer on Transit Funding: FY 2004 Through FY 2012 (APTA 2012) describes existing U.S. public transit funding, including federal and state grant programs, and various regional and local funding sources including general fund, gas tax motor vehicle, rental car sales tax, vehicle registration fees (levies), bond proceeds, general sales tax, and interest income. *Financing Capital Investment: A Primer for the Transit Practitioner* (Transtech Management 2003), identifies and evaluates transit capital project financing options, primarily U.S. federal and state grants, and borrowing strategies, but also new revenue options.

TransLink, the Vancouver, Canada regional transportation agency, is evaluating new funding options (Cayo 2012). Table 3 summarizes the options identified.

Table 3 Potential Translink Funding Options (TransLink 2012)

User Fees and Taxes	Beneficiary Fees	Other Taxes and Financing Tools	Direct Government Grants
Transit fares	Land value capture levy	Carbon tax	Provincial grant program
Gas tax	Property tax	Debt instruments	Federal grants
Parking pricing	Employer/Payroll tax	Regional sales tax	Federal-provincial national transit strategy program
Road pricing	Development charges	Vehicle sales tax	Social service
Transportation Improvement Fee			
Vehicle-km travelled fee			
Flat levy (e.g. Hydro Levy)			

This table summarizes options for funding Vancouver region transportation improvements.

Finding Solutions To Fund Transit: Combining Accountability & New Resources For World-Class Public Transportation (IPIRG 2007) identified and evaluated various public transit funding options and evaluated them according to seven principles: market efficiency, low collection costs, reliability, diversity, “fare increases are self-defeating,” budget accountability and community participation. It evaluates general sales taxes, dedicated gasoline taxes, car rental taxes, registration fees, tire taxes, weight-based vehicle registration fees, vehicle battery taxes, weigh-mile truck fees, road tolls, development impact fees, stormwater fees, real estate transfer taxes and parking taxes.

Thinking Outside the Farebox: Creative Approaches to Financing Transit Projects (DeGood 2012) discussed various benefits from high quality public transport, and provides guidance on ways to finance transit improvement programs, based on current U.S. funding options, including various federal and state grants, bonds and loan programs, plus local funding options, particularly dedicated funds from general sales and property taxes. It evaluates local funding options based on their potential revenue, reliability, equity and political feasibility. These include:

Tax Increment	Sales Tax	Parking Fees
Special Assessment District	Road tolls	Fuel Taxes
Development Contributions	Vehicle Registration Tax	Land Sales

Financing Transit Systems Through Value Capture: An Annotated Bibliography (Smith and Gihring 2003) summarizes the findings of numerous studies concerning the impacts transit service has on nearby property values, and the feasibility of capturing a portion of the incremental value to finance transit improvements.

The Move Ahead: Funding “The Big Move” (TBoT 2010) describes and evaluates potential options for funding The Big Move, a 25-year, \$50 billion regional transportation infrastructure program. Each option is evaluated based on technical feasibility, projected revenue generation, predictability, sustainability and durability of the revenue, administrative cost and complexity, impact on consumer behavior (i.e. extent that the tool encourages commuters to reduce congestion through car-pooling or other measures that remove cars from the road), and social equity and fairness.

Time to Get Serious: Reliable Funding For GTHA Transit / Transportation Infrastructure, investigated options to fund *The Big Move*, a strategic transportation improvement program proposed for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (Irwin and Bevan 2010). It identified twelve potential funding options, described their benefits and drawbacks, and examples of their implementation. Table 4 shows that study’s evaluation summary table.

Table 4 Summary of Toronto Revenue Options Analysis (Irwin and Bevan 2010)

Source	Net Revenue	Basis of Estimate	Policy Advantages	Implementation Issues
1. Tolls on regional freeways (400 series highways and municipal controlled-access highways)	\$1 – 2 B/year	10 – 20 ¢/km	Relieves congestion hot spots. Revenue grows with demand. Encourages transit use. Increases traffic speed and road capacity. Moderates road expansion costs.	Traffic diversion concerns. “Double taxation” concerns. Much better transit required first. Social equity concerns.
2. Regional gas/diesel fuel tax	\$1 – 2 B/year	10 – 20 ¢/litre	Can marginally reduce auto use but not focusing on hot spots. Encourages energy-efficient, and transit use. Easy to administer.	Sales leakage to nearby areas. Declines as fuel-efficiency increases. Best introduced when gas prices are low.
3. Commercial parking levy	\$1 – 2 B/year	\$1.00 – 2.00/day per space	Reduces auto use to commercial areas. Encourages more use of transit and active transportation. Administratively straightforward	Employment leakage to surrounding areas. A version, the Commercial Concentration Tax, was previously rejected.
4. Regional sales tax	\$1 – 2 B/year	1 – 2% in addition to the HST	Administratively stable, reliable source	No direct incentive for more sustainable travel. Sales leakage. Political opposition.
5. High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes or express lanes on GTHA freeways	\$400 – 800 M/yr. for Express Lanes \$200 – 400 M/yr. for HOT Lanes	10 – 20¢/km for single-occupant vehicles (HOT Lanes) or for all vehicles (Express Lanes)	Encourages car-pooling. Increases person-carrying capacity and average speed on major highways. Provides a toll-free alternative in the freeway network	Relatively small revenue versus infrastructure and enforcement costs
6. Dedicate a portion of gas/diesel HST revenue to GTHA transit	\$400 – 600 M/year	May 2010 report of \$895 M additional gas tax revenue anticipated from 2010/11 HST	Same as above for Regional Gas/Diesel Fuel tax. Would be timely if dedicated as of July 1, 2010 or shortly thereafter.	As above except province wide application of HST avoids fuel sales leakage to surrounding areas
7. Congestion levy on private vehicles entering central area, 6:30 am–6:30 pm Monday – Friday	\$250 – \$500 M/yr	\$5 – 10/vehicle entry-charge at cordon	Reduces Central Area Congestion. Encourages more use of transit and active transportation. Improves mobility in Central Area	Potential Central Area employment loss. Congestion & parking spillover. Better transit needed first. Implementation cost and enforcement issues.
8. Vehicle registration fee (varies with vehicle GHG emission levels)	\$200 – 400 M/year	\$100 – 200/year per vehicle	Stable, reliable source. Encourages low-emission vehicles. Easy to administer	Does not moderate amount of use of the vehicle
9. Value capture levy (revenue from higher property values/taxes in areas served by higher-order transit)	\$50 – 100 M/year	N/A	Encourages compact development and increased transit use. May reduce land speculation. Easy to administer	Uncertainty in estimating increased value. Upward pressure on rents. May force out small business and low income residents
10. Utility bill levy	\$50 – 100 M/year	\$20 – 40/year per household	Stable, reliable source. Easy to administer	No direct incentive for more sustainable driver behaviour
11. Employer payroll tax in areas within walking distance of rapid transit	\$40 – \$80 M/year	\$100 – 200/year per full time employee	Stable, reliable source. Partially borne by incoming workers who benefit from improved transit. Administratively straightforward	Higher costs, potential loss of jobs in taxation zones. Benefits to local employees may not compensate for lower wages.
12. Additional federal funding (national transit strategy)	\$1 – 2 B/year	25 – 50% of transit capital costs 25 – 50% of net transit operating costs	Administratively straightforward. Provides relatively reliable funding plus a stable policy framework from the federal and provincial governments	Difficult in context of large federal/provincial deficits. Could stop, as in 1998. No direct incentive for more sustainable transport activity.

This table summarizes options for funding Toronto region transportation improvements.

Evaluation Criteria

This section describes the eight criteria used to evaluate funding options.

Potential Revenue

This refers to the amount of money that an option can be expected to generate, based on various assumption about how it is implemented. Some funding options have natural constraints, for example, there are limits to the amount of money transit agencies can generate through advertizing and station rents, but in most cases maximum potential revenues reflect assumptions about how an option is implemented and what is politically acceptable.

Predictability and Stability

Funding predictability and stability are desirable for planning and budgeting purposes. Some funding options fluctuate from year-to-year, while others are more predictable and stable. These evaluations are based on a general understanding of funding options, which may be modified in a particular situation. For example, sales tax revenues may be more predictable and stable in areas with diversified retail markets than where markets are more specialized.

Equity Analysis

One of the most common issues raised in public consultations is a desire that transport funding be *equitable*, that is, the distribution of costs and benefits should be considered fair and appropriate. Transport equity can be defined and measured in various ways that may lead to different conclusions concerning what is equitable (Litman 2002). There are two major categories:

- *Horizontal equity* refers to the distribution of impacts between people with similar wealth, needs and abilities. It assumes that similar people should generally be treated equally, and implies that people should “get what they pay for and pay for what they get” unless subsidies are specifically justified.
- *Vertical equity* refers to the distribution of impacts between people who differ in wealth, ability or need. It generally assumes that costs should be smaller and benefits greater for people who are physically, economically or socially disadvantaged. Policies that do this are called *progressive* and those that impose higher costs on disadvantaged people are called *regressive*.

Equity analysis can consider various types of impacts, and group people in various ways. For example, road pricing is generally considered regressive, since a given toll represents a larger portion of income to lower-income than to higher income motorists. However, lower-income people tend to own fewer cars and drive less than wealthier people, particularly on major urban highways that are candidates for tolling. Lower-income people tend to rely more on alternative modes, and can benefit directly if congestion pricing reduces delay for transit buses and rideshare vehicles. As a result, road pricing may be less regressive than other roadway funding options (such as general taxes), and may be progressive overall if it leads to improvements to alternative modes, such as faster bus service.

Horizontal equity requires that program costs be borne by beneficiaries. Public transit service improvements can provide various benefits to users (called *internal* benefits) and non-users (called *external* benefits). Some benefits result from the service improvements themselves, others only result if the improves reduce automobile travel or stimulate more compact development (Banister and Thurstain-Goodwin 2011; CTOD 2011; Litman 2011; EDRG 2007). These include benefits to:

- Transit users from improved convenience and comfort, financial savings, increased safety, and improved public fitness and health.
- Motorists from reduced traffic and parking congestion, improved mobility for non-drivers which reduces chauffeuring burdens, improved traffic safety, and emission reductions.
- Taxpayer from road and parking facility cost savings, improved safety, and increased public health.
- Businesses from congestion reductions, parking cost savings, improved employee safety and fitness, and in various ways, high quality public transport tends to support regional economic development.
- Benefits to residents (regardless of how they travel), including parking cost savings, improved mobility for non-drivers, increased safety, reduced pollution and improved public fitness.

Table 5 summarizes the distribution (also called the *incidence*) of transit benefits. Some are concentrated, benefiting certain people, businesses and jurisdictions. Others are more widely dispersed. Most people and businesses experience some savings and benefits. Under favorable conditions, high quality transit can provide financial savings and economic benefits that offset set, providing positive return on investments (Litman 2010). This suggests that various funding sources can be justified on a beneficiary-pays basis, including funding from people who do not currently use public transit but gain savings and benefits.

Table 5 **Distribution of Transit Benefits**

	Transit Users	Motorists	Taxpayers	Businesses	Residents
Improved convenience and comfort	✓				
Congestion reductions		✓		✓	
Roadway cost savings			✓		
Parking cost savings	✓		✓	✓	✓
User savings and affordability	✓				
Improved mobility for non-drivers	✓	✓			✓
Improved traffic safety	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Energy conservation	✓				
Emission reductions		✓			✓
Improved public health	✓		✓	✓	✓

High quality public transport can provide a variety of widely distributed benefits.

Travel Impacts

This refers to the effects an option has on how and how much people travel, and whether this supports or contradicts strategic transport planning objectives, such as objectives to reduced automobile travel and increased use of alternative modes. These are estimated based on our understanding of price impacts on travel activity.

Strategic Development Objectives

This refers to the effects an option has on the type and location of development in a community, and whether this supports or contradicts strategic planning objectives, such as objectives to encourage more compact, accessible development and discourage sprawl. These are estimated based on our understanding of tax and price impacts on development patterns.

Public Acceptability

Another important issue for this analysis is the degree of public acceptability of each funding option (Weinstein and Nixon 2013). The Victoria transit funding research project included surveys and focus groups that investigated public preferences concerning funding options (Earthvoice Strategies 2012; Quay Communications Inc. 2012). Such preferences can vary significantly depending on the group surveyed, existing tax conditions, and exactly how funding options are designed and implemented. For example, the public acceptability of a fuel tax increase may depend on existing fuel tax levels, when they were last raised, and exactly how revenues are used. Although past experiences can provide useful guidance for future studies and surveys, the results are not necessarily transferable to other times and places.

Ease of Implementation

This refers to a revenue option's *transition* (initial implementation) and *transaction* (ongoing collection) costs. These are estimated based on assumptions about how it will be implemented and what is required to do this.

Analysis

This section describes and evaluates eighteen potential public transit funding options.

Fare Increases

In most urban transit systems, current adult fares average \$2 to \$3 per trip or \$50 to \$80 for a monthly pass, with discounted (*concession*) fares for youths, seniors and people with disabilities. It is possible to increase all fares, selected categories, or change price structures, for example, to include higher fares for longer-distance trips or for special services such as light rail or express commuter buses.

Potential Revenue

The price elasticity of transit ridership with respect to fares is usually -0.2 to -0.5 in the short run (first year), and increases to -0.6 to -0.9 over the long run (five to ten years) (Litman 2004b; McCollom and Pratt 2004; Wardman and Shires 2011). This suggests that a 10% fare increase typically increases revenue 5-8% over the short run and 1-4% over the long-run. As a result, rising fare increases revenue, but less than proportionately (raising fares 10% provides less than 10% increased revenue), and revenue gains tend to decline over time. These impacts tend to vary depending on the types of riders and types of services. Transit dependent users and peak period travel tend to be less price-sensitive than discretionary travelers (people who could travel by automobile) and off-peak travel.

Predictability and Stability

As previously described, the additional revenues from fare increases can be difficult to predict with precision and tend to decline over time.

Horizontal Equity

Since transit services are subsidized, fare increases can be considered horizontally equitable (users pay for the services they receive). However, automobile travel imposes significant external costs, particularly under urban-peak travel conditions, including road and parking subsidies, traffic congestion, accident risks and pollution damages imposed on others (Litman 2009; TC 2008). Under urban-peak travel conditions, transit subsidies are often smaller than the subsidies that would be required to accommodate additional automobile travel on the same corridor. Described differently, to the degree that shifting travel from automobile to public transport is considered a sacrifice that benefits other people, fare increases can be considered horizontally inequitable because they double-charge transit users.

Vertical Equity

Since public transit provides basic mobility and many users are lower-income, fare increases tend to be regressive and vertically inequitable. This regressivity varies depending on specific factors, such as transit user incomes and price structures.

Travel Impacts

Fare increases tend to reduce public transit travel and shift travel to automobile (Litman 2004b; McCollom and Pratt 2004; Wardman and Shires 2011). They therefore tend to contradict planning objectives to reduce automobile travel.

Strategic Development Objectives

Transit fare increases may reduce the relative attractiveness of transit-oriented locations, such as downtowns and transit station areas.

Public Acceptance

Although there is general support for the user pay principle, surveys and focus groups indicate opposition to significant fare increases due to vertical equity concerns (a desire to keep public transit affordable to lower-income users), and a desire to encourage public transit travel.

Ease of Implementation

Fare increases are easy to implement.

Legal Status

Most public transit agencies or local governments have the legal ability to increase fares.

Examples

Most transit agencies regularly increase fares.

Discounted Bulk Transit Passes

Public transit agencies can sell transit passes to a group, such as all students at a college or university, all employees at a worksite or all residents of a neighborhood. They are often designed to be revenue neutral - the additional transit service costs are at least offset by the additional revenues. For example, if standard monthly passes are priced at \$80 and used for 40 average monthly trips, the transit agency can sell \$40 discounted passes to a group of students that average 20 monthly trips or \$20 to a group of residents that average 10 monthly trips.

Potential Revenue

Potential revenues depend on the scope of these programs, which could add hundreds, thousands or tens of thousands of new users. However, this also tends to increase transit service costs.

Predictability and Stability

Contracts for such services tend to be for one or more years, so transit agencies can generally plan for the additional revenue and ridership on an annual basis.

Horizontal Equity

Such passes tend to create cross-subsidies from those participants who seldom or never ride transit to those who ride more than average, although they may benefit from reduced congestion and accident risk.

Vertical Equity

Since physically and economically disadvantaged people tend to ride transit more than average and benefit most from financial savings, and since such programs tend to increase total transit service (for example, allowing increased frequency), this strategy tends to support vertical equity objectives.

Travel Impacts

This tends to increase transit ridership and reduced automobile travel, although impacts will vary depending on specific circumstances.

Strategic Development Objectives

This can increase the attractiveness of transit-oriented locations.

Public Acceptance

There is often high public acceptance of such programs, since they make transit more affordable and encourage transit ridership. U-Pass programs often receive high levels of student support, but neighborhood programs tend to receive less.

Ease of Implementation

Once a price structure is established implementation is relatively easy.

Legal Status

Most transit agencies have the legal ability to negotiate discounted fares for particular groups.

Examples

Many colleges and universities have U-Pass programs which provide transit passes to all students and sometimes staff at a campus (Brown, Hess and Shoup 2003). TransLink's *Employer Pass Program* offers a 15% discount to transit passes purchased through employers. Boulder, Colorado offers such a pass to residential neighborhoods, called the *Neighborhood Eco Pass* (Boulder 2013).

Property Taxes

Most municipal governments collect property taxes. In many jurisdictions a portion of property taxes are dedicated to public transit.

Potential Revenue

It is possible to increase property taxes by virtually any amount, but large tax increases are politically difficult and there are many demands on these tax revenues.

Predictability and Stability

Property taxes are relatively stable.

Horizontal Equity

To the degree that public transit improvements increase nearby property values or provide other savings and benefits to nearby residents and businesses (congestion reductions, parking cost savings, household savings, emission reductions, etc.), property tax funding can be considered horizontally equitable.

Vertical Equity

Property ownership tends to increase with income, and lower-income residents tend to qualify for various property tax discounts and exemptions, so this tax tends to be relatively progressive with respect to income. However, even poor people bear a portion of these taxes through rents, and property taxes are burdensome to some lower-income home owners.

Travel Impacts

Property taxes have few direct travel impacts.

Strategic Development Objectives

Large property tax differences may cause development to shift between jurisdictions, but transit taxes are relatively small and usually applied region-wide so impacts are likely to be minimal.

Public Acceptance

Although property taxes are widely used to finance public transit, and tend to be considered a default funding source (the source used if other options are infeasible), there may be resistance to significant increases in this tax.

Ease of Implementation

Since transit property taxes are already collected in most jurisdictions they are relatively easy to increase.

Legal Status

In some jurisdictions, state/provincial legislation or voter approval is required to raise property tax rates.

Examples

Many transit agencies rely on property taxes (TCRP 2009; UTCM 2010).

Regional Sales Taxes

Many jurisdictions (particularly in the U.S.) rely significantly on sales taxes to finance public transit. Variations include special taxes on particular transactions such as hotel room and vehicle rentals.

Potential Revenue

A regional general sales tax could generate virtually any amount of revenue. Revenues from taxes on sales of particular products tend to be modest.

Predictability and Stability

Moderately stable. Sales taxes tend to fluctuate more than property taxes.

Horizontal Equity

To the degree that public transit benefits consumers, sales taxes can be considered horizontally equitable, although the relationship is indirect (people and businesses that benefit most do not necessarily pay more sales taxes).

Vertical Equity

Sales taxes are regressive, and so tend to be vertically inequitable.

Travel Impacts

Sales taxes do not directly affect travel activity.

Strategic Development Objectives

Large sales tax differences may cause development to shift between jurisdictions, but transit taxes are relatively small and usually applied region-wide so impacts are likely to be minimal.

Public Acceptance

Mixed. Although there tends to be opposition to most tax increases, sales taxes are among the most often applied to fund transportation programs, including public transit improvements indicating a moderate degree of public acceptance.

Ease of Implementation

In jurisdictions that already apply sales taxes, there is minimal cost to increasing such taxes to fund public transit. Where no sales taxes is currently applied, implementation costs would be moderate.

Legal Status

In many jurisdictions, state/provincial legislation or voter approval is required to raise sales tax rates.

Examples

Sales taxes are the most common dedicated source of transit funding in the U.S. (IPIRG 2007). According to the Federal Transit Administration's *National Transit Database*, after federal funds, sales taxes comprised the largest source of revenues for capital spending (38%) and the second largest source of operating expenses (27%) after fares (32%). In 2008, more than two-thirds of Los Angeles County voters approved *Measure R*, a referendum that established a special 0.5% sales tax dedicated to rapid transit and some road infrastructure (METRO 2011).

Fuel Taxes

Special fuel tax can be collected in a jurisdiction to fund public transit. In some cases a portion of existing fuel tax revenue is dedicated to public transit programs without increasing fuel tax rates.

Potential Revenue

Assuming residents average 500 gallons of annual fuel consumption, each cent per gallon of taxes generates \$5. Although fuel price increases reduce demand (a 10% price increase typically reduces fuel consumption 2-4% in the medium-run), a few cents per gallon to fund transit generally have minimal impact (Litman 2013; Wardman and Shires 2011).

Predictability and Stability

Fuel tax revenue is moderately stable. It tends to fluctuate more than property taxes.

Horizontal Equity

To the degree that motorists benefit from public transit improvements, due to reduced traffic and parking congestion, and reduced need to chauffeur non-drivers, and to the degree that automobile travel imposes external costs on non-drivers, fuel taxes can be considered to increase horizontal equity.

Vertical Equity

Fuel taxes are regressive, but this regressivity is reduced if public transit improvements provide more convenient and affordable alternative to driving. Described differently, of all possible fuel tax uses, transit improvements are relatively progressive if they improve affordable mobility options.

Travel Impacts

Fuel tax increases tend to reduce automobile travel and encourage use of alternative modes, although typical transit funding taxes are small and so would have minimal impact. Travel impacts depend on whether the transit tax is in addition to, or a portion of, existing fuel taxes.

Strategic Development Objectives

Fuel tax increases tend to encourage more compact, multi-modal land development, although the effects of this are likely to be minimal.

Public Acceptance

In general, fuel tax increases tend to be unpopular. However, surveys and focus groups indicate moderate support to fuel tax increases that are dedicated to transportation improvements.

Ease of Implementation

Implementation is relatively easy and in jurisdictions where fuel taxes are already collected.

Legal Status

Fuel tax increases often require state or provincial approval.

Examples

At least twelve U.S. states have local option transit gasoline taxes (TCRP 2009). Such taxes are common in Canada. In Metro Vancouver, 15¢ per litre fuel tax is dedicated to transit. In Ontario, two cents per litre of the provincial gas tax is devoted to public transit, and Calgary and Edmonton receive 5¢ of the provincial gas tax collected in each city for road and transit funding (TBoT 2010).

Vehicle Levy

An additional fee for registering vehicles in the region.

Potential Revenue

Although vehicle levies can be any size, most are \$20-60 annual per vehicle, only a portion of which is dedicated to public transit, so their total transit revenue is small to moderate. High levies can motivate some motorists to register their vehicles in other jurisdictions.

Predictability and Stability

Stable.

Horizontal Equity

As previously discussed, to the degree that motorists benefit from public transit improvements, due to reduced traffic and parking congestion, and reduced need to chauffeur non-drivers, and to the degree that automobile travel imposes external costs on non-drivers, a vehicle levy can be considered to increase horizontal equity. However, since vehicle fees do not reflect use (fees are the same for vehicles driven high and low annual mileage), this fee poorly reflects the external costs imposed by a particular vehicle.

Vertical Equity

This fee tends to be regressive, particularly because lower-income motorists tend to drive their vehicles lower annual mileage and so pay more per kilometer than higher income motorists on average.

Travel Impacts

Higher vehicle fees may marginally reduce vehicle ownership and use, but impacts are likely to be small.

Strategic Development Objectives

No significant impacts.

Public Acceptance

According to survey and focus group responses, vehicle levies have less public acceptance than other transportation-related revenue options.

Ease of Implementation

Where vehicle registration fees are already collected an additional levy to fund transportation or public transit programs is easy to apply. Implementation costs are much higher if a special fee collection system must be established.

Legal Status

In most jurisdictions this would require state/provincial legislation and support.

Examples

In the United States, 33 states and 27 local jurisdictions have vehicle registration fees which help finance transportation improvements, which often includes public transport (IPIRG 2007). Toronto, Montreal, Quebec City, Gatineau, Trois-Rivières, Saguenay, Sherbrooke, and Saint-Jérôme all use a vehicle registration fee to help finance public transport (TBoT 2010). In Montreal and Quebec City, \$30 from the provincially-levied license/vehicle registration revenue is devoted to funding transit operations. Toronto collects \$60 annually per vehicle registration.

Utility Levy

Apply a special transit levy to all utility accounts in the region.

Potential Revenue

Small. Although such a levy could be any size, they are usually \$10-40 annual per meter, or \$5-20 per capita.

Predictability and Stability

Stable.

Horizontal Equity

Similar to a property tax, a utility levy charges residents.

Vertical Equity

A utility levy is likely to be relatively regressive, since it is a flat fee per household.

Travel Impacts

No significant impacts.

Strategic Development Objectives

No significant impacts.

Public Acceptance

According to survey and focus group responses, utility levies have low public acceptance. It had the greatest level of opposition of all options presented.

Ease of Implementation

Relatively easy to implement.

Legal Status

Would generally require state/provincial legislation.

Examples (TCRP 2009)

Some jurisdictions have local government utility taxes. TransLink receives a hydro levy of \$1.90 per month from each BC Hydro account within the service region. The hydro levy generates approximately \$18 million per year in revenue (TBoT 2010).

Employee Levy

A levy paid by employers (often only larger employers) located in a transit service area.

Potential Revenue

Small to moderate potential revenues, depending on the number of employees covered and the level of the levy.

Predictability and Stability

Stable.

Horizontal Equity

Can be considered fair to the degree that commuters create traffic congestion and create demand for public transit.

Vertical Equity

The ultimate incidence of this fee is difficult to predict. It may substitute for wages, reduce total employment, or shift employment location if a large levy is applied just in the urban core.

Travel Impacts

Travel impacts are likely to be small.

Strategic Development Objectives

If applied only in an urban core it may discourage downtown employment and encourage sprawl.

Public Acceptance

Uncertain.

Ease of Implementation

Would probably involve moderate implementation costs, similar to other business taxes and fees.

Legal Status

May require state/provincial legislation.

Examples (TBoT 2010; TCRP 2009)

In France, the *Versement Transport* (Transport Levy) taxes employers with more than nine staff to help finance local public transport services. A special 0.6% payroll tax is collected from most employers in the Portland and Eugene Oregon regions to help finance public transport services.

Road Tolls

Tolls are fees for driving on a particular road, bridge, or in a particular area. A variation is High Occupancy Tolls (HOT) lanes, which are free for use by high occupant vehicles (buses and carpools), but tolled for low-occupant vehicles. *Congestion pricing* refers to tolls that are higher during peak periods to reduce traffic congestion.

Potential Revenue

Although revenues are theoretically large if widely applied, most proposals only toll a minor portion of roads and vehicle travel, resulting in modest total revenues. For example, if 20% of commuters pay \$1.00 per trip (\$2.00 for a round-trip commute), revenues would average about \$50 per capita.

Predictability and Stability

Once established, revenues would probably be moderately stable, but may decline over the long run as travelers take tolls into account when making longer-term decisions (such as where to live).

Horizontal Equity

Tolls are generally considered vertically equitable, because they charge users directly for the congestion and roadway costs they impose, but they are often criticized as unfair if only applied on a few roadways.

Vertical Equity

Tolls are often criticized as regressive, since a given toll represents a higher portion of income for poorer than wealthier motorists, but overall regressivity depends on the incomes of actual road users, the quality of travel options on that corridor, and how revenues are used. Tolls are often progressive compared with other funding options, such as using general taxes to finance roads and public transit services.

Travel Impacts

Road tolls tend to reduce affected automobile travel, particularly if implemented with public transit improvements. Congestion pricing can be effective at reducing traffic congestion,

Strategic Development Objectives

Mixed. If applied only in central areas tolls may encourage more dispersed development, but if applied broadly and implemented with improvements to other modes, they may encourage compact development.

Public Acceptance

There is often public opposition to tolls, particularly on existing roadways, although surveys indicate some acceptance if revenues are used to support popular road and public transport improvements.

Ease of Implementation

Although there are many possible ways to implement road tolls, including new technologies that reduce costs, implementation is likely to be expensive, particularly if implemented by a single region.

Legal Status

Road tolling usually requires state/provincial legislation.

Examples (TBoT 2010; TCRP 2009)

London, Singapore and Stockholm apply congestion tolls for driving on urban roads during peak periods. New York City uses bridge toll revenue to finance both highways and public transit services.

Vehicle-Km Tax

A form of road pricing that charges motorists per kilometre travelled. Could vary by vehicle type, such as higher fees for higher polluting vehicles.

Potential Revenue

Potentially large.

Predictability and Stability

Moderate. Similar to fuel taxes.

Horizontal Equity

Similar to fuel taxes. To the degree that motorists benefit from public transit improvements, and to the degree that automobile travel imposes external costs on non-drivers, vehicle-kilometer fees can be considered to increase horizontal equity.

Vertical Equity

Is likely to be regressive. However, to the degree that public transit improvements reduce the need to drive, this regressivity is reduced.

Travel Impacts

Vehicle-kilometer fees tend to reduce automobile travel and encourage use of alternative modes, including public transit.

Strategic Development Objectives

Vehicle-kilometer fees tend to encourage more compact, multi-modal land development.

Public Acceptance

In general, vehicle-kilometer fees tend to be unpopular. However, survey and focus group responses indicate moderate support for this option.

Ease of Implementation

Would have high implementation costs since it would require a special system to measure annual vehicle travel in a region.

Legal Status

Would generally require federal state or provincial legislation and support.

Examples (Huang, et al, 2010; TBoT 2010)

Vehicle-kilometer fees have been proposed in many jurisdictions, but so far have only been implemented for freight trucks in Germany. Since 2005, all trucks have been charged a VKT of €0.09 to €0.14 per kilometer based on the truck's emissions levels and number of axles.

Parking Sales Taxes

A special tax on parking transactions (when motorists pay directly for parking).

Potential Revenue

Small to moderate. Only a minor portion (probably 5-10%) of parking activity is priced. It could encourage more businesses to provide free parking to employees and customers.

Predictability and Stability

Moderate to low stability.

Horizontal Equity

As with other vehicle use fees, it can be considered horizontally equitable to the degree that transit improvements benefit motorists and to the degree that motor vehicle travel imposes external costs.

Vertical Equity

Since this fee only applies when parking is priced, it is probably less regressive than other vehicle fees.

Travel Impacts

By marginally increasing parking fees it may slightly reduce vehicle trips, but by increasing the value to users of parking subsidies and reducing commercial parking profitability, it may reduce the total portion of parking that is priced (Litman 2013; Wardman and Shire 2011).

Strategic Development Objectives

Because this fee primarily applies in downtowns and other major commercial centers, it may discourage compact development.

Public Acceptance

There is often public opposition to parking fees. Survey and focus group responses indicate moderate support for this option.

Ease of Implementation

Implementation costs are likely to be small to moderate. It may require new accounting requirements for commercial parking operators.

Legal Status

Requires provincial or state legislation and support.

Examples (Litman 2012; TBoT 2010)

Many U.S. jurisdictions levy a parking surcharge. Chicago, Illinois assesses a flat parking surcharge, rather than a percentage charge, on daily, weekly and monthly parking, with charges ranging from \$0.75-\$2 for daily parking, \$3.75 to \$10 for weekly and \$15 to \$40 for monthly parking. TransLink has permission to collect a 7% parking surcharge to off-street parking transactions, but found it too administratively burdensome to collect.

Parking Levy

A special property tax on non-residential parking spaces throughout the region.

Potential Revenue

Potential revenue is large. Assuming that there are one to two qualifying parking spaces per capita, a \$50 per space annual tax could generate \$100 annually per capita.

Predictability and Stability

Relatively stable, although revenues could decline slightly over time if property owners are allowed to reduce their parking supply.

Horizontal Equity

Like a fuel tax, this can be considered fair to the degree that motorists benefit from public transit improvements, or to the degree that parking facilities or automobile travel impose currently uncompensated external costs.

Vertical Equity

The ultimate incidence of this tax is difficult to predict, and will vary depending on specific conditions. It will mainly be borne by commercial property owners (residential parking is exempt), and so may marginally increase retail prices, increase parking pricing, and reduce wages. Costs may be reduced if property owners are allowed to reduce their parking supply. To the degree that public transit improvements reduce the need to drive, any regressivity is further reduced.

Travel Impacts

This tax may reduce parking supply and encourage property owners to price parking, which can reduce vehicle travel (Litman 2013; Wardman and Shire 2011). Travel impacts therefore depend on its magnitude, how it is applied, and the flexibility of local parking requirements.

Strategic Development Objectives

This tax encourages reduced parking supply and therefore more compact development.

Public Acceptance

Surveys and focus groups indicate relatively high support for parking taxes. Vancouver region experience indicates possible opposition from suburban businesses.

Ease of Implementation

This tax would have relatively high implementation costs, since it requires adding a new field to property records, but once established, ongoing costs are likely to be modest.

Legal Status

May require state or provincial legislation.

Examples (IPIRG 2007; Litman 2012)

Melbourne, Perth and Sydney, Australia all impose levies on city center non-residential parking spaces to encourage use of alternative modes and fund transport facilities and services. Small businesses are exempted. TransLink implemented a parking levy in 2006, but this was subsequently rejected by the provincial government.

Expanded Parking Pricing

Expand where and when public parking is priced, such as metering currently unpriced on-street parking spaces in urban neighborhoods, and charging for off-street parking at public facilities such as for government employees, at schools and parks. This is best implemented as part of a comprehensive parking management program that also includes better pricing systems, user information and enforcement practices.

Potential Revenue

Small to moderate. In most urban areas there are many unpriced publically-owned parking facilities that could be priced, although motorists will avoid using priced parking if possible. Currently only 1-2% of non-residential parking activity is priced, which probably averages \$20-40 annual per capita. If this can be tripled to 3-6% it would generate an additional \$40-80 annual per capita.

Predictability and Stability

Relatively stable.

Horizontal Equity

Like a fuel tax, this can be considered fair, since these valuable spaces are currently provided free to motorists, and to the degree that automobile travel imposes currently uncompensated external costs, and to the degree that motorists benefit from public transit improvements.

Vertical Equity

Mixed. Lower-income households tend to own fewer vehicles and drive less than higher-income households, so overall impacts will vary depending on specific conditions, including lower-income vehicle ownership rates, and the quality and price of transport and parking options.

Travel Impacts

Parking pricing encourages people to reduce their vehicle ownership and use.

Strategic Development Objectives

Mixed. If implemented as part of an integrated parking management program efficient parking pricing can reduce the total number of parking spaces needed in an area, and total vehicle travel, supporting more compact development. However, if parking is priced in a few major commercial areas it may favor suburban commercial areas, encouraging sprawl.

Public Acceptance

Mixed. Motorists and businesses often oppose parking pricing, although the concept of user paid parking is gaining support as a way to reduce parking problems and generate local revenues.

Ease of Implementation

Parking pricing tends to have relatively high implementation costs to install and operate pricing systems, plus additional transaction costs to motorists.

Legal Status

Many jurisdictions already price public parking.

Examples (Litman 2012; TCRP 2009)

Many communities price a portion of on-street and publically-owned off-street parking spaces.

Development Cost Charges or Transportation Impact Fees

A fee on new development to help fund infrastructure costs, and allow existing development fees to be used for public transit infrastructure investments (MRSC 2010). Transportation or traffic impact fee are similar charges specifically intended to finance transport system improvements, which are sometimes limited to roadway expansion projects.

Potential Revenue

Small to moderate. Since it only applies to new development it depends on the amount of development occurring in the region.

Predictability and Stability

Is highly variable depending on how it is applied and the amount of qualifying development that occurs.

Horizontal Equity

To the degree that new development increases demand for public transit, or that developers benefit from high quality transit service, it can be considered equitable.

Vertical Equity

Uncertain. Although wealthier people tend to purchase more new housing, this fee will increase the costs of all new development and so will tend to increase rents and reduce housing affordability.

Travel Impacts

If the charges discourage more compact, infill development they may increase sprawled development and therefore automobile travel.

Strategic Development Objectives

If the charges discourage more compact, infill development they may increase sprawled development.

Public Acceptance

Surveys and focus groups indicate relatively high support for development fees.

Ease of Implementation

Implementation costs are minimal since development fees are already collected in most jurisdictions.

Legal Status

Most municipalities governments and many region governments have a legal ability to collect such fees, although the use of such funds is often restricted to specific infrastructure, which may exclude public transit facilities and services.

Examples (IPIRG 2007; TCRP 2009)

Many jurisdictions collect development or traffic/transportation impact fees.

Land Value Capture

A special property tax imposed in areas with high quality public transit, intended to recover a portion of the increased land values provided by transit and to help finance the service improvements. Sometimes called a transit benefit district tax (TRILLIUM Business Strategies 2009).

Potential Revenue

Moderate to large over the long-run.

Predictability and Stability

Difficult to predict, but stable once development occurs.

Horizontal Equity

Is considered horizontally equitable to the degree that high quality public transit provides an extra increase in land values and development revenues.

Vertical Equity

Vertical equity impacts depend on how the tax is structured and development conditions. It tends to capture value from developers and property owners, but some of the tax may be passed on to residents, and it can reduce housing affordability in transit-oriented developments, which is regressive.

Travel Impacts

Depends on details. If such a tax discourages development around transit stations it could reduce transit ridership and transit-oriented development.

Strategic Development Objectives

Mixed. May discourage some transit-oriented development, but it could encourage more concentrated development near transit stations.

Public Acceptance

Surveys and focus groups indicate relatively high support for land value capture.

Ease of Implementation

May require special analysis and legislation to determine the most appropriate tax structure.

Legal Status

In some jurisdictions, state or provincial legislation and support would be required.

Examples (TBoT 2010)

Land value capture in the form of transit benefit districts is used in some U.S. cities including Miami, Florida; Los Angeles, California; and Denver, Colorado.

Station Rents

Collect revenues from public-private developments on publically-owned land in or near transit stations.

Potential Revenue

Probably small. It depends on BC Transit's ability to obtain and develop land around transit stations, and the demand for such building space.

Predictability and Stability

Revenues are difficult to predict, but once established may be relatively stable.

Horizontal Equity

Is considered horizontally equitable to the degree that it captures the value of proximity to high quality public transit.

Vertical Equity

Vertical equity impacts depend on development conditions. It can be an opportunity for a community to raise additional revenue from businesses and higher income residents, but if rents are structured to maximize revenue it may reduce housing affordability in accessible locations (i.e., lower-priced housing in transit-oriented developments) which is regressive.

Travel Impacts

Uncertain. If this increases transit-oriented development it may help reduce total vehicle travel.

Strategic Development Objectives

Uncertain. It may increase or discourage transit-oriented development, depending on how development and rents are structured.

Public Acceptance

Surveys and focus group responses indicate relatively high support for station rents.

Ease of Implementation

Some station development may be relatively easy, but maximizing this revenue option may involve some effort and risks.

Legal Status

Most transit agencies have the legal ability to develop stations, but may require state or provincial approval to condemn land for station development.

Examples

Larger transit agencies with significant space in terminal and station facilities may enter into concession agreements (an income-generating strategy similar to leasing) with a variety of commercial and retail enterprises (TCRP 2009). TransLink has established a Real Estate Division is responsible for acquiring, managing and disposing of TransLink's properties in a manner that optimizes revenue, reduces capital costs and supports TransLink's strategic development goals, which includes station-area development (TransLink 2011).

Station Air Rights

Sell the rights to build over transit stations (Tompkins 2010).

Potential Revenue

Depends on demand for such development. There are generally few sites where such development is feasible, so total potential revenues are probably modest.

Predictability and Stability

Uncertain. Depends on demand for such development.

Horizontal Equity

Is considered horizontally equitable to the degree that it captures the value of proximity to high quality public transit.

Vertical Equity

Vertical equity impacts depend on specific conditions. It can raise revenue from businesses and higher income residents, but if structured to maximize revenue it may reduce housing affordability in accessible locations (i.e., lower-priced housing in transit-oriented developments) which is regressive.

Travel Impacts

Uncertain. If this increases transit-oriented development it may help reduce total vehicle travel.

Strategic Development Objectives

Uncertain. It may increase or discourage transit-oriented development, depending on how development and rents are structured.

Public Acceptance

Surveys and focus groups indicate relatively high support for revenue-generating station area development.

Ease of Implementation

Some station air rights development may be relatively easy, but maximizing this revenue option may involve some effort and risks.

Legal Status

Most transit agencies probably have the legal right sell or rent station-area air rights.

Examples (Tompkins 2010)

The Toronto Transit Commission has investigated options for selling air rights at the York Mills subway station, the Eglinton/Yonge bus terminal, the Sheppard/Yonge station bus terminal and land adjoining the Spadina station (Hall 2002).

Advertising

Most transit agencies collect revenues from transit vehicle, stop and station advertising.

Potential Revenue

Although expanding transit service and increasing transit ridership should allow more advertising, even doubling or tripling of revenue would provide relatively small additional revenue.

Predictability and Stability

Relatively unstable.

Horizontal Equity

No clear impact.

Vertical Equity

No clear impact.

Travel Impacts

No clear impact.

Strategic Development Objectives

No clear impact.

Public Acceptance

Surveys and focus groups indicate relatively high support for advertising. However, there may be public opposition to particular advertising methods or materials.

Ease of Implementation

Since most transit agencies already sell advertising, expansion is relatively easy.

Legal Status

Already widely used.

Examples (TCRP 2009)

Most public transit agencies generate revenue from advertising.

Options Summary

Table 6 summarizes the eighteen funding options evaluated in this review.

Table 6 Potential Public Transport Funding Options

Name	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Fare increases	Increase fares or change fare structure to increase revenues	Widely applied. Is a user fee (considered equitable).	Discourage transit use. Is regressive.
Discounted bulk passes	Discounted passes sold to groups based on their ridership	Increases revenue and transit ridership	Increases transit service costs and so may provide little net revenue
Property taxes	Increase local property taxes	Widely applied. Distributes burden widely.	Supports no other objectives. Is considered regressive.
Sales taxes	A special local sales tax	Distributes burden widely.	Supports no other objectives. Regressive.
Fuel taxes	An additional fuel tax in the region	Widely applied. Reduces vehicle traffic and fuel use	Is considered regressive.
Vehicle fees	An additional fee for vehicles registered in the region	Applied in some jurisdictions. Charges motorists for costs.	Does not affect vehicle use.
Utility levy	A levy to all utility accounts in the region	Easy to apply. Distributes burden widely.	Is small, regressive and support no other objectives.
Employee levy	A levy on each employee within a designated area or jurisdiction	Charges for commuters.	Requires collection system. May encourage sprawl if only in city centers.
Road tolls	Tolls on some roads or bridges	Reduces traffic congestion.	Costly to implement. Can encourage sprawl if only applied in city centers.
Vehicle-Km tax	A distance-based fee on vehicles registered in the region	Reduces vehicle traffic.	Costly to implement.
Parking taxes	Special tax on commercial parking transactions	Is applied in other cities.	Discourages parking pricing and downtown development.
Parking levy	A special property tax on parking spaces throughout the region	Large potential. Distributes burden widely. Encourages compact development.	Costly to implement. Opposed by suburban property owners.
Expanded parking pricing	Increase when and where public parking facilities (such as on-street parking spaces) are priced	Moderate to large potential. Distributes burden widely. Reduces driving.	
Development or transport impact fees	A fee on new development to help finance infrastructure, including transit improvements	Charges beneficiaries.	Limited potential.
Land value capture	Special taxes on property that benefit from the transit service	Large potential. Charges beneficiaries.	May be costly to implement. May discourage transit-oriented development.
Station rents	Collect revenues from public-private development at stations	Charges beneficiaries.	Limited potential.
Station air rights	Sell the rights to build over transit stations	Charges beneficiaries.	Limited potential.
Advertising	Additional advertising on vehicles and stations	Already used.	Limited potential. Sometimes unattractive.

This table summarizes potential funding options identified in this study.

For more quantitative analysis, each evaluation criteria was rated on a seven-point scale from 3 (strongly supports objective) to -3 (strongly contradicts objective), as illustrated in Table 7. Of course, such ratings are subjective so other people or groups may reach different conclusions. In a typical planning process an advisory committee consisting of informed citizens, technical experts and elected officials would perform these ratings. In this exercise all ratings have the same weight, but they can be weighted to give some objectives more importance than others. Many of these impacts can vary significantly depending on how an option is implemented, local conditions and community preferences, so it is helpful to develop more specific descriptions of how an option would be applied in a particular geographic area.

Table 7 Potential Local Public Transit Funding Options Summary Matrix

Name	Potential Revenue	Stability	Horizontal Equity	Vertical Equity	Travel Impacts	Development Impacts	Public Acceptance	Ease to Implement
Fare increases	2	2	2	-3	-3	-2	-3	3
Discounted bulk passes	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	3
Property taxes	3	3	2	-1	0	-1	-2	3
Sales taxes	3	2	1	-2	0	0	-2	3
Fuel taxes	2	2	2	-1	3	2	-2	3
Vehicle levy	2	3	2	-2	0	0	-2	-1
Utility levy	1	3	2	-3	0	0	-3	2
Employee levy	2	3	3	2	0	-1	-2	-2
Road tolls	1	2	3	-2	3	1	-2	-3
Vehicle-Km tax	2	2	3	-2	3	1	-3	-3
Parking taxes	1	2	2	0	2	-2	-1	-1
Parking levy	3	2	2	1	2	2	-2	-3
Expanded parking pricing	2	2	3	1	3	-1	-1	-1
Development cost charges	1	1	2	0	0	-1	3	-1
Land value capture	3	3	2	0	0	-2	2	-2
Station rents	1	2	3	0	0	0	3	-1
Station air rights	1	2	3	0	0	0	3	-2
Advertising	1	1	3	0	0	0	3	3

This table summarizes the degree that the funding options support various planning objectives. Rating range from 3 (strongly supports objective) to -3 (strongly contradicts objective). 0 = no or mixed impacts. Although these results are somewhat subjective and may vary depending on community values and conditions, this illustrates a method for quantifying the advantages and disadvantages of various options that can be applied in other situations.

Conclusions

Public transit service improvements are an important component of many regions' transportation system improvement plans. High quality public transit services can provide various economic, social and environmental benefits, including direct user benefits and various indirect and external benefits.

Implementing transit improvements often requires additional funding. Although some federal, state or provincial funding may be available, significant new local funding is often needed. Based on a detailed review of existing literature, this study identified eighteen funding options, including some that are widely used and others considered innovative and only used in a few jurisdictions.

These potential funding options were evaluated against eight criteria. Evaluation results can vary depending on perspective and assumptions. Equity analysis is particularly subjective depending on how equity is defined and impacts measured. From some perspectives, it is most equitable to generate transit funding from a narrowly defined group of beneficiaries, such as users of a new transit service, employers who generate commute trips, or owners of transit station area properties. However, high quality public transit tends to provide multiple, dispersed benefits, including external benefits to people who do not currently use the service but benefit from reduced traffic and parking congestion, improved safety, reduced need to chauffeur non-drivers, energy conservation and emission reductions, and increased regional economic development. Public transit improvements tend to provide a broader scope of benefits than highway expansion, so a wider range of funding options can be justified for horizontal equity (i.e., beneficiaries pay) sake.

Widely used public transit funding sources include fares, property taxes, sales taxes, fuel taxes, advertising and station rents. There is potential for increasing revenues from these options, although fare increases contradict other planning objectives. Fuel tax increases and expanded parking pricing (more frequently charging motorists for using public parking facilities, particularly on-street parking in urban neighborhoods) are particularly appropriate because they also encourage fuel conservation and more efficient transport, in addition to raising revenues. However, these taxes and fees are considered burdensome and regressive (their actual regressivity depends on the quality of transport options available, and so is reduced by public transit service improvements) and so should be implemented gradually.

The options that seem most acceptable to the public (development and transportation impact fees, station rents and advertising) tend to generate modest revenue. Economists are particularly enthusiastic about congestion pricing, but it tends to be costly and politically difficult to implement, and total revenues are often modest since tolls are only collected on a small portion of total vehicle travel.

Three new revenue options with significant potential deserve more consideration: *parking levies* (special property taxes on non-residential parking spaces throughout the region), *vehicle levies* (an additional fee on vehicles registered in the region) and *employee levies* (a levy on each employee, often only collected from larger employers). These could generate relatively large amounts of revenue, distribute costs broadly, and have a logical connection to transit improvements (high quality transit benefit motorists, businesses and employees). A parking levy applied to all non-residential parking spaces in a region would disperse the financial burden and support Strategic Development Objectives (reduce impervious surface and reduce excessive parking supply) by encouraging more compact development and more efficient parking pricing. These three options have moderate implementation costs, more than increasing existing transit funding options, but less than road tolls or vehicle-kilometer fees.

Where feasible, development and transportation impact fees, station rents and air rights can be used to generate funds, but their revenues will vary depending on future demand for transit-area development, and so are difficult to predict and are likely to be modest in most cases.

Land value capture taxes and levies should also be considered. They should be structured to avoid discouraging transit-oriented development (they should not be too high or geographically concentrated), and it may be best to defer their implementation for a few years until station-area demand rises sufficiently. It is particularly appropriate to create local area benefit districts around transit stations where modest special levies and parking meter revenues are used primarily to finance local improvements such as station amenities, streetscaping and special cleaning and security services, rather than financing system-wide transit services.

This research discovered no new funding options that are particularly cost effective and easy to implement. Each funding option has disadvantages and constraints. As a result, this study's overall conclusion is that a variety of funding options should be used to help finance the local share of public transit improvements to insure stability (so total revenues are less vulnerable to fluctuations in a single economic sector or legal instrument) and distribute costs broadly. Public transit improvements often provide widely dispersed benefits that can justify widely dispersed funding sources. Even people who do not currently use public transit benefit from reduced congestion, increased public safety and health, improved mobility option for non-drivers, regional economic development, and improved environmental quality.

Additional research is recommended to better understand the impacts of these options. Revenue options that are implemented should be structured to maximize benefits and minimize problems. Taxes and levies should be designed to support other regional planning objectives, including increased transit ridership, reduced automobile traffic, economic development, energy conservation, compact development and greenspace preservation and affordability.

Bibliography

- APTA (2012), *Primer on Transit Funding: FY 2004 Through FY 2012*, American Public Transportation Association (www.apta.org); at www.apta.com/gap/policyresearch/Documents/Primer_SAFETEA_LU_Funding.pdf.
- BA Group (2011), *TDM Migration Funding*, World Parking Symposium (www.worldparkingsymposium.ca); at www.worldparkingsymposium.ca/parking-library/download/196/R.Bond%20Funding%20TDM%20Migration.pdf.
- David Banister and Mark Thurstain-Goodwin (2011), "Quantification Of The Non-Transport Benefits Resulting From Rail Investment," *Journal of Transport Geography*, Vol. 19, Is. 2, March, pp. 212-223; earlier version at www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/pubs/1029-banister.pdf.
- BC Transit and CRD (2012), *Victoria Regional Rapid Transit Local Funding Options Website* (www.lrtlocalfunding.ca), BC Transit and Capital Regional District.
- Phineas Baxandall, (2007), *Finding Solutions To Fund Transit Combining Accountability & New Resources For World-Class Public Transportation*, U.S. PIRG (www.uspirg.org).
- Boulder (2013), Neighborhood Eco (NECO) Pass, City of Boulder (www.bouldercolorado.gov); at www.bouldercolorado.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=8835&Itemid=3002.
- Jeffrey Brown, Daniel Baldwin Hess and Donald Shoup (2003), "Fare-Free Public Transit at Universities: An Evaluation," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 23 (www.spsr.ucla.edu/dup/people/faculty/shoup/fare-free.pdf), pp. 69-82.
- Ralph Buehler and John Pucher (2010), "Making Public Transport Financially Sustainable," *Transport Policy*, Vol. 18; at <http://policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/pucher/Sustainable.pdf>.
- Cambridge Systematics (2006), *Future Financing Options to Meet Highway and Transit Needs*, NCHRP Document 102, Transportation Research Board (www.trb.org); at http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_w102.pdf.
- Don Cayo (2012), "Road Tolls Recommended For Metro – Extensive Levies Aimed At Raising Millions For Translink," *Vancouver Sun*, www.vancouversun.com/technology/Road+tolls+recommended+Metro/6203169/story.html.
- CBC (2012), *GTA Regional Sales Tax*, Canadian Broadcasting (www.cbc.ca); at www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/story/2012/04/18/gta-regional-sales-tax-toronto657.html.
- CNT (2012), *Average Annual Transportation Costs For The National Typical Household Ranked For Large Regions (2005-2009 Population Of 1,000,000 And Greater)*, Center for Neighborhood Technology (www.cnt.org); at www.cnt.org/repository/2012-Fact-Sheet-Rankings.pdf.
- CSG (2008), *Financing Public Transportation*, Council of State Governments (www.csg.org); at www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/TIA_PublicTrans_screen.pdf.
- CTE (2007), *Election Resources and Issues*, Center for Transportation Excellence (www.cfte.org); at www.cfte.org/success/elections.asp.
- CTOD (2011), *Transit and Regional Economic Development*, Center for Transit Oriented Development (www.ctod.org/portal); at <http://reconnectingamerica.org/assets/Uploads/TransitandRegionalED2011.pdf>.

CTS (2009), *Understanding the Impacts of Transitways: Demographic and Behavioral Differences Between Hiawatha Light-Rail and Other Transit Riders*, Center for Transportation Studies, University of Minnesota (www.cts.umn.edu); at www.cts.umn.edu/Research/Featured/Transitways.

Graham Currie (2011), “Agglomeration Economies: Understanding Benefits In Mass Transit Project Evaluation,” *The Economics of Transport: Smarter Transport – Better Cities*, Metropolitan Transport Forum (www.mtf.org.au), pp. 68-76; at www.mtf.org.au/site/files/ul/data_text12/2299874.pdf.

Kevin DeGood (2012), *Thinking Outside the Farebox: Creative Approaches to Financing Transit Projects*, Transportation for America (<http://t4america.org>); at <http://t4america.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/T4-Financing-Transit-Guidebook.pdf>.

Rodrigo Diaz and Daniel Bongardt (2013), *Financing Sustainable Urban Transport - International Review of National Urban transport Policies and Programmes*, Sustainable Transport in China (<http://sustainabletransport.org>), GIZ and Embarq; at <http://sustainabletransport.org/financing-sustainable-urban-transport-international-review-of-national-urban-transport-policies-and-programmes>.

Earthvoice Strategies (2012), *Victoria Regional Rapid Transit Project: Survey of Public Transit Capital Funding Strategies in Canadian Peer Communities*, CRD Local Funding Options (www.lrtlocalfunding.ca); at www.crd.bc.ca/reports/transportationselect_/2012_/06june27_/ppsrp201216appendixc/ppsrp201216appendixc.pdf.

EDRG (2007), *Time is Money: The Economic Benefits of Transit Investment*, Economic Development Research Group for the Chicago RTA; at www.chicagometropolis2020.org/documents/TimeisMoney.pdf.

Marcus Enoch and Stephen Ison (2006), “Levying Charges On Private Parking: Lessons From Existing Practice,” *World Transport Policy & Practice*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (<http://ecoplan.org/wtpp/general/vol-12-1.pdf>), pp. 5-14.

James Fletcher and Doug McArthur (2010), *Local Prosperity: Options for Municipal Revenue Growth in British Columbia*, Think City; at www.publicsolutions.ca/images/tc/Local%20Prosperity%20Final%20Med%20Res%20-%20Nov.%202019.10.pdf.

David J. Forkenbrock and Glen E. Weisbrod (2001), *Guidebook for Assessing the Social and Economic Effects of Transportation Projects*, NCHRP Report 456, Transportation Research Board, National Academy Press (www.trb.org); at http://gulliver.trb.org/publications/nchrp/nchrp_rpt_456-a.pdf.

Peter J. Haas and Katherine Estrada (2011), *Revisiting Factors Associated with the Success of Ballot Initiatives with a Substantial Rail Transit Component*, Mineta Transportation Institute (<http://transweb.sjsu.edu>); at <http://transweb.sjsu.edu/PDFs/research/2911-Ballot-Initiatives-Rail-Transit.pdf>.

Joseph Hall (2002), “TTC Explores Selling Station 'Air Rights,’” *Toronto Star*; at <http://transit.toronto.on.ca/archives/data/200203200100.shtml>.

Edward Huang, Henry Lee, Grant Lovellette and Jose Gomez-Ibanez (2010), *Transportation Revenue Options: Infrastructure, Emissions, and Congestion*, Belfer Center, Harvard Kennedy School (www.belfercenter.org/enrp); at <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Transportation%20Revenue%20Options%20Workshop%20Report%202010%20for%20web.pdf>.

Ryan Holeywell (2013), “To Toll or Not: Could the Feds Lift a Ban on Interstate Tolling?” *Governing Magazine* (www.governing.com); at www.governing.com/blogs/fedwatch/gov-could-feds-lift-ban-interstate-tolling.html.

IPIRG (2007), *Finding Solutions To Fund Transit: Combining Accountability & New Resources For World-Class Public Transportation*, Illinois Public Interest Research Group (<http://illinoispirg.org>); at http://financecommission.dot.gov/Documents/IL_transit_report_June%202007.pdf.

Neal Irwin and Andrew Bevan (2010), *Time To Get Serious: Reliable Funding For GTHA Transit / Transportation Infrastructure*, Transportation & Other Infrastructure Working Group Discussion Paper, Toronto City Summit Alliance (www.civicaaction.ca); at www.sustainableprosperity.ca/article170.

ITF (2013), *Funding Urban Transportation: A Case Study Compendium*, International Transport Forum (www.internationaltransportforum.org); at www.internationaltransportforum.org/Pub/pdf/13Compendium.pdf.

Adeel Lari, et al. (2009), *Value Capture for Transportation Finance*, Center for Transportation Studies University of Minnesota (www.cts.umn.edu); at www.cts.umn.edu/Research/Featured/ValueCapture/index.html.

Todd Litman (2002), "Evaluating Transportation Equity," *World Transport Policy & Practice* (http://ecoplan.org/wtpp/wt_index.htm), Volume 8, No. 2, Summer, pp. 50-65; at www.vtpi.org/equity.pdf.

Todd Litman (2004), *Rail Transit in America: Comprehensive Evaluation of Benefits*, VTPI (www.vtpi.org); at www.vtpi.org/railben.pdf; summarized in "Impacts of Rail Transit on the Performance of a Transportation System," *Transportation Research Record 1930*, Transportation Research Board (www.trb.org), pp. 23-29.

Todd Litman (2004b), "Transit Price Elasticities and Cross-Elasticities," *Journal of Public Transportation*, Vol. 7, No. 2, (www.nctr.usf.edu/jpt/pdf/JPT_7-2_Litman.pdf), pp. 37-58; at www.vtpi.org/tranelas.pdf.

Todd Litman (2009), *Transport Cost and Benefit Analysis*, Victoria Transport Policy Institute (www.vtpi.org); at www.vtpi.org/tca.

Todd Litman (2010), *Raise My Taxes, Please! Evaluating Household Savings From High Quality Public Transit Service*, VTPI (www.vtpi.org); at www.vtpi.org/raisetaxes.pdf.

Todd Litman (2011), *Evaluating Public Transit Benefits and Costs*, Victoria Transport Policy Institute (www.vtpi.org); at www.vtpi.org/tranben.pdf.

Todd Litman (2012), *Parking Pricing Implementation Guidelines: How More Efficient Pricing Can Help Solve Parking Problems, Increase Revenue, And Achieve Other Planning Objectives*, Victoria Transport Policy Institute (www.vtpi.org); at www.vtpi.org/parkpricing.pdf.

Todd Litman (2013), *Transport Elasticities: Impacts on Travel Behaviour: Understanding Transport Demand To Support Sustainable Travel Behavior*, Technical Document #11, Sustainable Urban Transport Project (www.sutp.org) and GIZ (www.giz.de); at www.sutp.org/index.php/en-dn-tp. Also see, *Understanding Transport Demands and Elasticities: How Prices and Other Factors Affect Travel Behavior* at www.vtpi.org/elasticities.pdf.

Brian E. McCollom and Richard Pratt (2004), *Transit Pricing and Fares*, Chapter 12, TCRP Report 95, Transit Cooperative Research Program (www.tcrponline.org); at www.trb.org/publications/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_95c12.pdf.

METRO (2011), *Measure R Works for LA*, METRO (www.metro.net); at www.metro.net/projects/measurer.

MRSC (2010), *Transportation Impact Fees*, Municipal Research and Service Center of Washington (www.mrsc.org); at www.mrsc.org/subjects/planning/transimpactfees.aspx.

Local Funding Options for Public Transportation
Victoria Transport Policy Institute

John E. Petersen (2008), “Planning and Financing The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority,” *Managing And Financing Urban Public Transport Systems An International Perspective*, Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative (<http://lgi.osi.hu>); at http://lgi.osi.hu/publications/2008/384/UT_A_416_WEB.pdf.

Quay Communications Inc. (2012), *Victoria Regional Rapid Transit: Local Funding Options Focus Group Report*, CRD Local Funding Options (www.lrtlocalfunding.ca), Capital Regional District (www.crd.bc.ca); at www.crd.bc.ca/reports/transportationselect_/2012_/06june27_/ppsrp201216appendixe/ppsrp201216appendixe.pdf.

Stephen L. Reich, Janet L. Davis and Braden Sneath (2012), *Florida MPOAC Transportation Revenue Study*, Center for Urban Transportation Research for the Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (www.mpoac.org); at www.mpoac.org/revenuestudy/RS_FINAL_REPORT.pdf.

Ko Sakamoto, Stefan Belka and Gerhard P. Metschies (2010), *Financing Sustainable Urban Transport*, GTZ Sourcebook Module, Sustainable Urban Transport Project (www.sutp.org) Asia and the German Technical Cooperation (www.gtz.de/en); at www2.gtz.de/urbanet/library/detail1.asp?number=8114.

K. Sakamoto, H. Dalkmann and D. Palmer (2010), *A Paradigm Shift Towards Sustainable Low-Carbon Transport: Financing the Vision ASAP*, Partnership on Sustainable Low-Carbon Transport (SLoCaT Partnership; www.slocat.net), Transportation Research Laboratory and the Institute for Transportation & Development Policy; at www.itdp.org/documents/A_Paradigm_Shift_toward_Sustainable_Transport.pdf.

Jeffery J. Smith and Thomas A. Gihring (2003), *Financing Transit Systems Through Value Capture: An Annotated Bibliography*, Geonomy Society (www.progress.org/geonomy); also at www.vtpi.org/smith.pdf.

TBoT (2010), *The Move Ahead: Funding “The Big Move”*, Toronto Board of Trade (www.bot.com); at www.bot.com/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Growing_the_Economy&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=4702.

TC (2008), *The Full Cost Investigation of Transportation in Canada*, Transport Canada (www.tc.gc.ca/pol/en/aca/fci/menu.htm).

TCRP (1998), *Funding Strategies for Public Transportation*, Report 31, Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), at http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_31-1-a.pdf.

TCRP (2008), *Uses Of Fees Or Alternatives To Fund Transit*, Legal Research Digest 28, Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), at http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_lrd_28.pdf.

TCRP (2009), *Local and Regional Funding Mechanisms for Public Transportation*, Report 129, Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), at http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_129.pdf.

Ray Tomalty (2007), *Innovative Transportation Infrastructure Mechanisms for Smart Growth*, Smart Growth BC (www.smartgrowth.bc.ca); at www.smartgrowth.bc.ca/Portals/0/Downloads/sgbc-infrastructure-report-web.pdf.

James Tompkins (2010), “‘Air Rights’ In Ottawa: Maximizing The Value Of Public Transit Infrastructure,” *Journal of Public Transit in Ottawa* (www.transitottawa.ca), at http://transitottawa.netfirms.com/transitottawa.ca/JPTO_Vol1_W2010.pdf

TransLink (2011), *Doing Business with Translink: Real Estate*, TransLink (www.translink.ca); at www.translink.ca/en/About-Us/Doing-Business-with-TransLink/Real-Estate.aspx.

TransLink (2012), *TransLink Funding Options Website*, www.translink.ca/~media/Documents/bpotp/10_year_plan/Supporting%20Docs/Mayors%20Curriculum%20Materials%20%20Research%20on%20Funding%20for%20Transportation.ashx.

Transtech Management (2003), *Financing Capital Investment: A Primer for the Transit Practitioner*; TCRP Report 89, Transportation Research Board (www.trb.org); at <http://pubsindex.trb.org/view.aspx?type=MO&id=644466>.

TRB (2011), *Equity of Evolving Transportation Finance Mechanisms*, Special Report 303, Transportation Research Board (www.trb.org); at <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/sr/sr303.pdf>.

Trillium Business Strategies Inc. (2009), *Land Value Capture as a Tool to Finance Public Transit Projects in Canada*, The Surface Policy Directorate Transport Canada (www.tc.gc.ca); at www.tc.gc.ca/eng/policy/report-acg-land-value-menu-1726.htm.

UITP (2003), *The Financing of Public Transport Operations*, International Association of Public Transport (www.uitp.org); at www.uitp.org/mos/focus/Financingen.pdf.

UTCM (2010), *A Guide to Transportation Funding Options; Transit Funding – Summary of Funding Strategies*, University Transportation Center for Mobility, Texas Transportation Institute (<http://utcm.tamu.edu>); at <http://utcm.tamu.edu/tfo/transit/summary.stm>.

VRRT (2012), *Victoria Regional Rapid Transit Local Funding Options Backgrounder*, Victoria Regional Rapid Transit Local Funding (www.lrtlocalfunding.ca); at www.lrtlocalfunding.ca/images/lrtlocalfunding/pdf/crd_rapid%20transit%20funding%20options%20backgrounder_09jan2012.pdf.

VTPI (2012), *Regional Transit Local Funding Options: Draft Technical Analysis*, Victoria Regional Rapid Transit Local Funding Options (www.lrtlocalfunding.ca); at www.lrtlocalfunding.ca/images/lrtlocalfunding/pdf/crd_local_transit_funding_options_report_22aug2012.pdf.

Mark Wardman and Jeremy Shires (2011), *Price Elasticities of Travel Demand in Great Britain: A Meta-analysis*, Paper 11-3544, Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting (www.trb.org); at <http://trid.trb.org/view.aspx?id=1093095>.

Asha Weinstein and Hillary Nixon (2007), *What Do Americans Think About Federal Tax Options to Support Public Transit, Highways, and Local Streets and Roads? Results From Year Four of a National Survey*, Mineta Transportation Institute (<http://transweb.sjsu.edu>); at <http://transweb.sjsu.edu/PDFs/research/1228-American-tax-poll-2013-public-transit-highways-streets-roads.pdf>

Dave Wetzel (2006), “Innovative Ways of Financing Public Transport,” *World Transport Policy & Practices*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (www.ecoplan.org/wtpp), pp. 40-46.

Acknowledgments

This paper is based on research sponsored by the Victoria Regional Transit Commission (VRTC) and the Capital Regional District (CRD). Thanks to my research partners Jan Pizarro and Mark Pizarro, and fellow Task Force members Robert Lapham, Jonathan Norgaard, Erinn Pinkerton and Marg Misk-Evans.

www.vtppi.org/tranfund.pdf