

Q1 Tell us whether you voted YES or NO on the income tax proposal, and then please explain your reasons.

Answered: 114 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I voted YES. It is an important and responsible plan, much needed to keep our city financially stable, cover costs of services, and protect pensions and other legal required obligations. It asks only half from the many people who work in the city, but may not live here. [MSU employees, mostly] They use the services of EL too, and should pay a modest amount.	8/12/2018 7:44 PM
2	NO	8/12/2018 7:53 AM
3	Yes. Reluctantly because my net cost is 1300 to 1400 per year after the property tax reduction. My property is very modest so we are penalized. I voted yes to avoid draconian changes in EL quality of life. I dearly hope the council acts fiscally wisely and prudently.	8/10/2018 7:32 PM
4	Yes - Because I care about sustaining the city of East Lansing and saw it as the only strong option. The thought of MSU paying zero in property taxes is mind-boggling, I think it is a fair request for employees	8/10/2018 2:38 PM
5	YES. Regardless of causes, the budget hole needs to be fixed. This was a more precise proposal. MSU fails to step up to pay its fair share, so this is the only option. Fairness to first responder pensions is the only honorable thing to do.	8/10/2018 11:27 AM
6	I voted No. I did not feel the proposal would be fair to be people who rent in East Lansing. They would be a the mercy of their landlord to lower rent with the decrease in property taxes.	8/10/2018 11:01 AM
7	I voted yes. I recognize the financial challenges that our city is facing, and though - ideally - past Councils would have foreseen the factors that led us here, they didn't, and now we're here. I don't believe it is fair to take away what has been promised to past employees, and I see an income tax as the most fair approach towards financial sustainability. I don't think the opposition presented any viable solutions.	8/10/2018 8:12 AM
8	I voted yes so Lou Anna Simon would have to pay 0.5% of her \$700,000 salary to East Lansing.	8/10/2018 7:03 AM
9	I voted No. I will not "reward" the disgusting, corrupt and moronic City Manager and City Council by rescuing them from THEIR mistakes. Their incompetence is amazing and I am ashamed to be associated with such corrupt management of a city as wonderful as EL. My wife and I are in the process of selling our house and while we had always planned to remain in EL when buying our new house, I cannot abide paying for the mistakes of others. This is a disgusting money-grab and the City government criminals should be imprisoned for robbing the hard working people of EL.	8/10/2018 1:42 AM
10	Voted "no". Should cut expenditures and make fewer costly decisions and mistakes than increase taxes, particularly on non-residents who didn't get to vote on the tax that will now be levied on them. Council should make "hard" decisions (and less waste) than force all workers to \$hell out more so the status quo can continue.	8/9/2018 3:52 PM
11	Yes Because non-residents, who make up a majority of persons living in East Lansing most of the year, have historically had no obligation to pay taxes for local services (emergency services, roads, etc.). Our property taxes were already enormously high compared to other municipalities, and it makes sense to spread the tax burden to non-residents who we consider part of our East Lansing Community. The only way to reasonably do that was through an income tax. The 2018 proposal specifies how the tax revenue will be used, it will have a minimal impact on businesses, minimal on low income earners, on on retirees.	8/9/2018 3:42 PM
12	No: as property taxes are way too high already; this will in all likelihood drive property values down; the city has not demonstrated a willingness to make serious modifications on the expense side; the city has demonstrated incompetence in several ELI publications over the last 3 months which does not provide any comfort in their ability to administer another new program.	8/9/2018 3:16 PM
13	Yes. Instead of trying to pass an open-ended tax increase that was vague, ill-explained, and rushed, City Council took the time to do research, listen to citizens, and limit the tax-increase to 12 years.	8/9/2018 1:03 PM

14	No it just gives them more money to waste which is why we got here in first place -- where is the offset of money remember they still have previous \$ ---- MSU is reason City exists this is major economic engine that drives this City what an insult--- Can they make this City more anti business ?? don't believe that millage carrot won't go up --- pretty smooth to hold this election when many voters are on vacation	8/9/2018 12:21 PM
15	I voted no because at my income level and age, the savings I would obtain on my property taxes would not offset the additional taxes paid on my earnings. The tax would then end right as I reach retirement and have a reduced, fixed income thus increasing my property taxes just as I have decreased income. The math just didn't make sense for my family. I will now be listing my home for sale and leaving East Lansing. Very disappointed in the No campaign for not lobbying harder for working families.	8/9/2018 11:21 AM
16	I voted no. I would have liked to see a proposal that combined reasonable cuts with new revenue. Frankly, it was difficult to stomach an additional \$500 out of my pocket for something that I'd only vaguely benefit from. Between the new income tax and general mistrust of the City's governmental bodies it really makes me reconsider if East Lansing is the community I want to live in long term.	8/9/2018 11:19 AM
17	No - It is an unfair tax that screws younger working people	8/9/2018 10:41 AM
18	I voted NO for several reasons: 1) Something seems off when our pension funding levels are in the bottom 20% while our property tax bills/millage rate are in the top 20%. A) At this point I would have preferred State intervention to fully investigate the finances of the City. 2) I'm not confident the City has implemented cost-saving measures or is as lean as purported. For example, the City uses two trucks and four employees to do leaf pickup. In other cities that I've lived in only one truck and one employee was used. It seems excessive to me. 3) This income tax alone will not solve our budget woes without implementing the recommendations by the FHT or doing other drastic measures such as contracting out ambulance and trash pickup. I believe the City will be back before 2023 to seek a headlee override or other special millages. 4) The cost to live in East Lansing compared to other cities I've lived in is not commensurate to the city services provided. To illustrate this, I'll provide examples including East Lansing below. Ferndale (rented) -Weekly trash pickup. I could leave as much as I wanted at the curb. (Left a 55 gallon fish tank once) -Weekly recycling pickup. I could leave extra at the curb too. -Weekly bulk pickup without any additional fees. -Weekly yard waste pick up. I could leave bundled branches and twigs too. No charge. -Tax bill: unknown since I rented. -Parking downtown: \$0.50 per hour. Royal Oak (owned) -Weekly trash pickup. I could leave as much as I wanted at the curb. (Left a tub and toilet once) -Weekly recycling pickup. I could leave extra at the curb too. -Weekly bulk pickup without any additional fees. -Weekly yard waste pick up. I could leave bundled branches/twigs and branches/stumps up to six inches in diameter too. No charge. -Tax bill: \$3,000.00 -Millage rate: 39 -Water bill: \$140-\$170 quarterly and I watered my grass frequently. I also had a non-high efficiency laundry washer and dishwasher. -Parking downtown: First two hours were free. Lansing (owned) -Weekly trash pickup. 96 gallon trash container with the ability to have three additional bags on the outside. This cost \$52.00 every quarter. -Weekly recycling pickup. I could leave extra at the curb too. I once placed 9 collapsed cardboard boxes next to the container and they were picked up. -Weekly bulk pickup for \$30.00 -Weekly yard waste pick up. I could leave bundled branches/twigs. No charge. -Tax bill: \$2,100.00 -Millage rate: 55 -Water bill: \$40-\$60 monthly and I watered my grass frequently. I had high efficiency appliances. -Parking downtown: Never parked downtown. East Lansing (own) -Weekly trash pickup. 64 gallon trash container with the extra bags allowed with \$2.00 tags. -Weekly recycling pickup. **I once placed 1 collapsed cardboard box next to the container and it was NOT picked up. -Weekly bulk pickup for \$20.00 -Four "free" days a year for yard waste pick up. All other days require \$2.00 tags and a phone call. -Tax bill: \$5,700.00 -Millage rate: 55 -Water bill: \$200-\$250 quarterly and I don't water my grass otherwise it would be \$300.00 plus. We have high efficiency appliances. -Parking downtown: \$0.75 per 30 minutes up to \$15.00 daily. For those who say the City services are great, must not have lived anywhere else. For those who say the City provides great assets like the Hannah Center, Aquatic Center and Library -- you can utilize those services without being a resident of East Lansing. I could move to Dewitt and save \$1,700.00 in my property tax bill. Pay the non-resident fee for the combo pass, which is only \$200.00 or so more. Buy a library pass for \$30.00 (last I heard). Even with the extra charges for being a non-resident, I would still come out ahead! But East Lansing schools are good you say? You are right! However, with their generous School of Choice policy, there is a high probability of getting in! Last I heard the student population was approximately 30 percent School of Choice. And the schools that we are building -- are being built to support this population. Which is unfortunate, because it dilutes the non-homestead taxes received within East Lansing. If you think about all of the renters in East Lansing, there are quite a few properties paying non-homestead taxes. Last time I ran the numbers, if East Lansing was exclusively for residents, there would be around \$500 to \$700 extra per pupil.	8/9/2018 9:12 AM

19	I voted NO as a protest against the past and current City Council(s) who I believe have done great disservice to East Lansing residents. The fiscal irresponsibility and arrogant "we know what's best" attitudes of mayors and council members and the city attorney are abhorrent.	8/9/2018 7:47 AM
20	Yes, so EL could pay its obligations promised to employees.	8/9/2018 7:09 AM
21	I voted YES because I felt the plan was well thought out with input from the community with a very reasonable plan for using the funds generated. I felt that the city personnel for the last fifteen years have taken many steps to deal with the financial problems. Reducing staff and adjustment of benefit packages have been a part of the ongoing work to get ahead of the problem, but the city has fought an uphill battle when faced with reduced state funding, a depressed housing market and reduced investment returns. East Lansing is a great town to live in and a no vote did nothing to maintain the things that make it so nice and I did not hear any viable suggestions that seriously addressed the problem. The income tax was a positive step forward. Living in a civil society takes a joint effort by all of us.	8/8/2018 8:48 PM
22	Yes: 1) any local fiscal mismanagement is history, need to move forward with where we are today and 2) simply don't want the city in which I live to go broke.	8/8/2018 8:43 PM
23	I voted yes. I don't see another way to make the finances work. I remember as a kid thinking of Michigan as the coolest state - beautiful, surrounded by the Great Lakes, forward thinking - with some of the best public educational institutions in the country and proactive environmental measures like a 10-cent deposit on pop bottles. Cutting taxes hasn't benefited our state nor our city. I am willing to pay the extra to have a community that can have the elements that we need and that people want.	8/8/2018 8:05 PM
24	Voted no, because I believe an income tax is the wrong way to fix East Lansing's serious financial problems. The state of Michigan has failed its responsibility to support local municipalities, and MSU has also dodged its financial responsibilities to East Lansing. I don't believe in using the wrong method to obtain a needed fix -- like using a hammer on a screw instead of a screw driver. Also, unhappy with marijuana money going to the "yes" campaign, and unhappy with most of the money now being spent on development.	8/8/2018 7:20 PM
25	I am not surprised this tax passed. Those harmed the most by it were not eligible to vote in East Lansing (non-residents who work in the city). Retired citizens who remain year round were both available and eligible and benefited the most from the property tax reduction and income tax exemptions. Because the vote was conveniently held in the summer, many student renters were away from the city on break and also missed voting. Would the tax have passed if held in the spring or fall? Taxation without representation goes against the very principle of our country's founding.	8/8/2018 7:19 PM
26	My wife and I voted Yes on the income tax. we live in East Lansing and paying 6000 in property tax that can go up 3% per year (and will need to if East Lansing doesn't find another revenue source) will long term cost us more than twice as much as the income tax. I work in the city of Lansing so I already pay a 1% on my income which will not increase if passed. 1% on my wife's income (which won't realistically increase 3% each year like property taxes will) would cost us less then the adjustment and long term rate of increase in our property tax. Our home value in a city like east lansing is lower because prospective buyers have access to tax records and know they can't afford the mortgage + taxes compared to similarly priced homes in their approved loan rate because we can't compete with such high property tax.	8/8/2018 6:49 PM
27	I voted yes because I read about how this tax will help our city as a whole, now and in the future. I see it as a solution to some real budget problems. When I read the information from those supporting a "no" vote, I heard anger and blame, but no solutions.	8/8/2018 6:19 PM
28	Yes! Financial support from grants are not sustainable. Financial support from the state is declining. Property taxes are already high. The services and programs the city provides make this a community that help make this a desirable place to live. MSU is the life blood of our city but it also costs the city. Blaming city employees and previous councils does not justify voting the income tax down. Invest in our city, and stay informed and involved in decisions is my goal.	8/8/2018 5:36 PM
29	Yes - because we have no alternative but to pay the pensions accrued by our EL employees, the City already had made many drastic cuts, and infrastructure needs that the taxes will support are pressing, plus we are a wealthy enough community to bear the costs of the tax. I did not want to see either closing Hannah Ctr or further personnel cuts.	8/8/2018 5:22 PM
30	Yes	8/8/2018 4:55 PM

31	I voted YES. I do not wish to see any cuts in the services and feel the current and future councils cannot be responsible for inheriting legacy costs which need to be paid one way or another.	8/8/2018 4:49 PM
32	yes	8/8/2018 4:23 PM
33	Yes. It solved so me immediate \$ problems - provided a grace time for other cuts - and gives time to try to finally resolve the issue.	8/8/2018 4:06 PM
34	YES EL absolutely mismanages money but they cannot do whatever they want with this money. I believe if you want a great community you have to be willing to help provide for it. I'm tired of trying to avoid potholes without causing an accident or destroying my car.	8/8/2018 3:50 PM
35	No. Our city leaders can't manage things now. Why give them more money to mismanage. Why does the aquatic center lose money?	8/8/2018 3:47 PM
36	I voted No. We are a two income family and even with the property tax reduction, we will pay a significant amount each year. I do not think we should be responsible for the large pensions of people who worked for the city long before we ever moved here.	8/8/2018 3:32 PM
37	Yes I chose to live in EL because of the combination of amenities and diversity. Amenities cost \$	8/8/2018 3:03 PM
38	MSU drains the city without compensating for use of our facilities and services. This will lesson the burden of us homeowners/taxpayers. Thank you for realizing this EL voters!	8/8/2018 2:46 PM
39	I voted no because I don't feel as though the city council has been a good steward of the current taxes I pay. I see inconsistent code enforcement, poor property management, and a climate that is unfriendly to small businesses. This income tax will be inconvenient for many residents, make it harder for businesses to hire staff, and may force them to raise prices. In addition, this tax will also affect the city of Lansing on that half the revenue of employees living in Lansing and working in EL will now go to EL.	8/8/2018 2:20 PM
40	YES, because the city needs the money. I support more and better city services and am willing to pay for them.	8/8/2018 2:18 PM
41	I voted "no" (again) largely because a "yes" vote would hurt me and my family, still relative newcomers to East Lansing. My spouse and I still work and are 20+ years from retirement, so both will have a bigger ding from our income along with the state income tax and higher-than-average property taxes. Separate from personal impact, the other reason I voted "no", as did my spouse, was because we know this is a half-assed stopgap solution that won't solve the problem, it just takes away a bit of the sting. We agreed with everything local resident Roy Saper wrote in his essay that you published a week or so ago. The sad part? We bought our home here hoping to raise our son in it, staying until he was ready to leave the nest. Now we will most likely be looking to move in the next couple years to a nearby town that doesn't overtax its residents while big business gets perk after perk, incentive after incentive.	8/8/2018 2:08 PM
42	Yes because regardless of the reason, we have a deficit and I don't want to see many cuts.	8/8/2018 1:47 PM
43	I voted no because I don't think the city made meaningful budget cuts before putting the income tax back on the ballot. I would rather have had them make budget cuts first. I also didnt want to be taxed for the city's poor financial decisions.	8/8/2018 1:46 PM
44	Yes. I paid the Flint city tax when I commuted and thought it was only fair since UM-Flint used many city resources but paid no taxes. I feel that people who work in EL should help pay for city services.	8/8/2018 1:40 PM
45	I voted YES, mainly because I believe one must be willing to pay, if able to do so, for the benefits one receives.	8/8/2018 1:37 PM
46	I voted yes because the city needs more income if it is to meet its financial obligations while continuing to offer such amenities as parks and the Hannah Center, and because income taxes, based on the same dollars in which the tax is paid, are fairer than taxes based on fluctuating property values and assessors' judgements.	8/8/2018 1:24 PM
47	Yes, because revenue needs to come from somewhere. 20% of the city is taken up by MSU and does not receive taxes from the land. There needed to be a change to how revenue was generated for the city.	8/8/2018 12:58 PM
48	Yes, so msu will pay their fair share	8/8/2018 12:54 PM

49	I narrowly voted "No." I was a strong "No" until the last week before the vote, because of the way the City revealed over the course of its "town hall" meetings on the issue that it did not know what it was spending money on nor how much. Over the course of those meetings it became clear that they were claiming to spend money they had not spent, and were not reporting income they had received. I won't pour money into a lie. But the childish "No campaign" mailers with the stock-photo "clown" theme were an insult to my intelligence, and a direct insult to the MSU students by portraying them as all drunks. That was a stupid, short-sighted move that likely cost the No side some votes.	8/8/2018 12:51 PM
50	Yes. Faced with losing essential services and amenities without the additional revenue this proposal brings was just too much to lose. MSU drains City resources without compensation. I work in Lansing and gladly pay Lansing taxes even though I'm not a Lansing resident. I like that non-residents who earn their living in EL now must contribute to the City's bottom line.	8/8/2018 12:43 PM
51	NO, for two reasons. First, recent city actions (the curb repair kerfluffle involving the law firm of city counsel, the nonsense with the home owner who received permission to expand his driveway, the legal fees wasted trying to exclude a farmer from the farmer's market due to his refusal to host a gay wedding) cause me to question the fiscal responsibility of the current city council. Second, I am not convinced that the massive tax abatements being doled out to developers are necessary to get development projects done, and they seem to be costing the city rather badly needed property tax revenues.	8/8/2018 12:37 PM
52	No	8/8/2018 12:35 PM
53	Voted YES. Why? Because EL residents already pay some of the highest taxes in the state. Why the hell would I live here if we had to pay those high taxes and still had services cut. Might as well pay more to keep them.	8/8/2018 12:34 PM
54	I voted YES. I have lived in the city only since December of 2017 and I'm not a fan of income taxes levied by cities (I already pay one for working in Lansing, now I'll pay one for living in East Lansing. It's a hassle and the arguments I saw about relief of property taxes don't work out in my circumstance). However it became clear to me that the city's financial status is a risk to our community, and I haven't seen or heard of a viable alternative proposed by anyone who could seriously move it forward. This issue has to be resolved and we have to be able to move ahead on this divisive issue.	8/8/2018 12:29 PM
55	I voted no. The state restricts exemptions, so we could not exempt the poorest people from the tax. I also was not interested in taking tax money away from the City of Lansing. I also was not interested in taxing my colleagues at MSU. As a staff member that lives in the city, as many faculty, staff and students do, East Lansing is already getting tax money from me.	8/8/2018 12:29 PM
56	Taxation is theft. Don't burden the taxpayers with past city mismanagement (pension liabilities). Also, put the vote on a regular November ballot so students can vote.	8/8/2018 12:20 PM
57	I voted NO because poor city management is what needs to change, not more taxes.	8/8/2018 12:14 PM
58	I voted yes. I value city services and want them to continue. The state has so severely constrained the ability of cities to raise funds that there was no other option other than draconian cuts to services that would make this city one in which I (and my family) would be far less happy.	8/8/2018 12:08 PM
59	I voted no because I was not confident that property taxes would actually go down. As a family with two people with income, I saw this as an overall increase in our tax burden.	8/8/2018 12:08 PM
60	I voted yes. Last time around I voted no, but was swayed by the time-limit and the defined designations for the funds. I fully agreed with all the points of the vote no campaign (especially that our city council/staff, now and in the past, has mismanaged funds and has questionable business practices), but felt that a yes vote was the best option. I am concerned that new families and businesses will not want to locate in EL, but cutting all city services and maintaining one of the highest tax rates in the state would not be a draw either. Finally, my house was recently broken into and robbed and I cannot see any positive outcomes from having even fewer police officers on the streets.	8/8/2018 12:00 PM
61	Yes. We have a unique and special community that values education, diversity and the right for all to be treated humanely.	8/8/2018 11:52 AM
62	Voted "No". A tax shift at best! Another method for the current government to reach into its citizens pockets!!!	8/8/2018 11:45 AM
63	Yes. Continuing to raise property taxes is not a solution. This seemed like an effective way to keep all the parts I love about east Lansing without paying too much more.	8/8/2018 11:37 AM

64	Yes. Felt it made sense to have people who work in EL pay some support toward city services. Also liked the idea of reducing property tax.	8/8/2018 11:26 AM
65	No. Tax is extremely regressive. We've already voted on this issue, so this was a transparent attempt to subvert the will of the electorate.	8/8/2018 11:18 AM
66	Voted no. Sick of paying above average taxes with no benefits. My income tax will result in an increase. I didn't leverage myself into a more expensive home like some residents so my property tax break won't offset the income tax. I don't like that retirees get a break while working families are stuck with an increase in tax	8/8/2018 11:17 AM
67	No, I don't think that city is capable of good money management. As shown by giving away taxes via TIF's in public private development. If a development project is really a viable think then private money should be able to complete it without money help form the city.	8/8/2018 11:15 AM
68	No. The Hannah Center is a run down money pit. The 10M 1998 renovations could not cover any 3rd floor retrofitting or updates. Twenty years later we still can not afford a third floor renovation. The Hannah Center's inefficient energy use and large parking infracture are environmentally irresponsible.	8/8/2018 11:13 AM
69	Voted yes. 1) No or almost no other ways to increase revenue. 2) Can't reasonably blame (punish?) current city administration for problems created by past governance. Hobble ourselves even more now because of irritation with past mistakes?!?	8/8/2018 11:13 AM
70	I voted no. I don't have faith in the people in charge to use the money in the best interest of the City.	8/8/2018 11:09 AM
71	I voted FOR the East Lansing tax. In the end it came down to needing to be financially responsible. We've incurred financial obligations, and we need to find a way to pay for them. Expenses have already been cut a great deal, and cutting them enough to cover our obligation would essentially gut the local government on which we all rely. I wouldn't want EL to become the type of community it would become if the remaining staff had to be let go. Moreover, after studying the issues and numbers very carefully, I decided that most of the anti-tax arguments were disingenuous and/or misinformed.	8/8/2018 11:08 AM
72	I voted no because I believe the distribution of the tax burden to be unfair. As a renter, I will not benefit from the property tax reduction so the income tax represents a non-trivial reduction in my disposable income. Further, many who will be affected by this income tax, such as many students and employees of MSU whose primary residence is not in East Lansing, did not have the opportunity to vote on it. Overall, I perceive the income tax proposal to be essentially a way for the long-term residents of East Lansing to force short-term residents and many non-residents to pay for poor management and planning on the part of the East Lansing city government.	8/8/2018 11:07 AM
73	I abstained because I wasn't sure what I was voting for or against. I regret not voting no because I'm starting to think the tax was an easy fix without working on the root of the issue.	8/8/2018 10:56 AM
74	No. While I appreciate the real need and favor the 12 year sunset clause, overly prescribing how the money is to be spent (police, fire, pensions) is hubris in the face of certainly uncertain financial and practical imperatives that will arise over the next decade plus. Moreover, having the money earmarked in this way undermines and unnecessarily hamstring our elected officials capacity to make short and long-term decisions.	8/8/2018 10:55 AM
75	Yes sick and tired off people kicking problems down the road it is our responsibility to pay for pensions and I want high quality city amenities for my kids	8/8/2018 10:52 AM
76	YES. I want to have a high level of services, I think it makes sense for people who work at MSU but live elsewhere contribute to those services, and I decided to overlook what I consider rather careless fiscal behavior of the city council.	8/8/2018 10:19 AM
77	Yes. I want the quality of life in EL to be higher with improved roads, infrastructure, parks, and services. The income tax was best way to achieve this desire.	8/8/2018 10:12 AM
78	Yes. As citizens we must value and protect each other and our services. City services aren't free; pension obligations just won't go away. It's basic common decency in my eyes, let's take care of each other.	8/8/2018 10:07 AM
79	No. City leadership is both inept and afraid to have an enlightened discussion about its vision for the city beyond embracing developers and bars.	8/8/2018 10:05 AM

80	Yes. I found the tax regressive (and would rather have seen either an increase in property taxes or no change but a 0.5% income tax), but the city needed income and unfortunately it seems like this was the only feasible way to do so right now.	8/8/2018 10:03 AM
81	No: There were a lot of reasons. Mark Meadows has been involved in critically bad decision making for years that have us involved in this financial catastrophe, and I would have been more supportive of the proposal if he wasn't involved, asking for money to cover the terrible decisions he presided over throughout the years. Another reason is that I see this as yet another example of robbing the young--people working--to pay for the retirements of older people. Promises were made, yes, but not by the people who will have to sacrifice their own futures to pay for the poor planning of others. My teenage daughter will now have to contribute part of her paycheck to cover for people who have been retired longer than she has been alive, while not being able to use that money to pay for her own schooling or saving for her own retirement which, unlike this debacle, no tax money will support (also true for us, being young enough to bear the entire cost of our futures ourselves, with zero support from taxes or being able to rely on a pension). I also fully expect the council and city employees to fritter away this extra money, and come begging for more taxes in the coming years...past performances predicting future terrible decision-making and all.	8/8/2018 9:59 AM
82	Yes, in hopes it will lower my property taxes (I am retired)	8/8/2018 9:52 AM
83	Yes. I think it's a good idea to spread the tax base. Property owners pay very high taxes in E.L. An income tax would bring in a contribution for schools, services, etc. from renters and those who work here and use the services. I think property taxes have hit a tipping point.	8/8/2018 9:43 AM
84	I voted No. Of course any additional revenue will help EL's dire situation; however, I strongly believe it is only a band-aid, a short term fix. It will not fix the long term, systemic problem (liabilities looming in the future) and only forstalls making the really tough choices. I am afraid it will be back to Business as usual. Frankly, I believe EL is not a large enough entity to sustain the services it provides. We need to look for a regional solution probably meaning consolidation with other municipal, gov't entities.	8/8/2018 9:41 AM
85	I and my wife voted yes. one of us worked in Lansing and paid income tax to lansing for more than 40 years. We did not object to pay some taxes to the city in which we worked. We understand that the city is obligated by the Michigan Constitution to pay the retirement benefits the city has incurred. It is time the university pays its share of the cost or services provided by the city. Those that opposed the income tax could not provide a reasonable argument against the tax.	8/8/2018 9:39 AM
86	No, because the State caused this issue and needs to be the one to fix it. I anticipate that they will at some point, and East Lansing will find a way to happily keep spending the extra money instead of finding a way to let the citizens keep their hard earned funds.	8/8/2018 9:34 AM

87	<p>I voted no. I previously voted "yes" in 2017, but voted no on the proposal to decrease the property taxes in the case of an income tax (which ended up passing). The reason I voted "no" on the income tax this time around was due to the inequity of the situation. While it provides some financial stability, the issue is that it doesn't solve the underlying issues of the city's track record throwing money at developers and impacting the tax base on multimillion dollar developments. Added to that reason is that a .5% income tax on students who work in East Lansing (which will, I believe, include basically any student who works on campus) will decrease their discretionary income, and thus their discretionary spending. As much as we residents are dismissive of college bar culture, the fact is that student spending drives the economy of this town 2/3 or more of the year. If students are not spending as much, who's to say which businesses will still be able to be profitable, and which will be unable to continue existing in downtown. Will a new store in the development on Albert, should one open, be able to survive if the students who live in walking distance are unable to spend as much at that market? Do the "quick eats" joints on Grand River suffer and close? What about the bars? Those two sections of the economy make up a solid 50+% of the businesses downtown, so if some of them disappear, that is bad for the health of the city overall. While something was needed to help with revenue, the entire way this income tax has been handled has been completely backwards. Instead of working with MSU to find a solution that benefits students and residents alike, the city and its residents chose a path that provides tax relief to the most enfranchised citizens (and large property management corporations) while placing a burden of taxation upon the shoulders of those who least have the means to handle it, which seems especially heinous given the venomous relationship so many residents (and City Council) seem to have toward students (who make up 40%+ of the population when school is in session). That's not to mention the issues the tax will cause with Lansing's potential revenues, given how many people work in East Lansing but live in Lansing given the outrageous nature of the housing market in East Lansing. Keeping our neighbors strong makes us safer, but with this tax East Lansing has managed to weaken both the MSU student body and the City of Lansing, which seems like a poor idea. It's slapping a band-aid on a wound that needs sutures.</p>	8/8/2018 9:25 AM
88	<p>I voted yes because I value commitment and community. Fiscal responsibility and fiscal justice are inseparable from the idea of common good.</p>	8/8/2018 9:20 AM
89	<p>Voted No. East Lansing is now the highest taxing city in the state of Michigan. Think about that...The #1 highest cost of living in the state. Contrast that with level of services provided and infrastructure, which have to be in the bottom quartile. It is really sad, especially combined with the school system's issues. Incredibly expensive bond that they way overspent on. We experienced unbelievable issues in the middle school last year from multiple lock downs, vice principal getting tackled, drug sniffing dogs going through lockers. Starting to look like a inner city school. We pulled our youngest out of the system and school of choiced to neighboring community for high school. East Lansing Property Tax Rate: #20 in Michigan at 62.1. The 5mil reduction still puts them at #26. East Lansing Property Tax \$ Collected Per: #5 at \$4,955 per parcel. The 5mil reduction will move East Lansing to #6. Top 1% in rate (#26 of 3063) and #6 in total taxes per parcel!?. Now East Lansing becomes one of roughly 20 communities with an income tax. Others: Albion, Battle Creek, Big Rapids, Flint, Grayling, Hamtramck, Hudson, Ionia, Jackson, Lansing, Lapeer, Muskegon, Muskegon Heights, Pontiac, Port Huron, Portland, Springfield and Walker. Hard to justify living here.</p>	8/8/2018 9:18 AM
90	<p>Voted no bc city "council/leaders" are corrupt Yes ppl just got fleeced again EL needs new leadership new ppl on DDA</p>	8/8/2018 9:14 AM
91	<p>No. This was essentially a rehash of the proposal that was voted down recently.</p>	8/8/2018 9:10 AM
92	<p>The city needs the revenue, and since MSU is a non-tax paying, for empire institution, the city has expenses from its major employer without the support of a tax-paying entity.</p>	8/8/2018 8:59 AM
93	<p>I voted No because it's just a short term solution. In 5-10 years we are going to be right back here because the pension costs are unsustainable.</p>	8/8/2018 8:53 AM
94	<p>I voted No because the city's financial woes should not rest squarely on the backs of MSU students/faculty.</p>	8/8/2018 8:50 AM

95	I voted "No". While I was very confident that the measure would pass, I couldn't quite bring myself to approve of it, which is what a "Yes" vote would indicate. At this point, it's a very difficult question. However, the circumstances that have made it so difficult are exactly the things that I find so offensive. For example, this is not a new problem. It's been festering for 30+ years, but mayors, councilpersons and paid staff have been loath to address it, focusing instead on the perks of their fiefdom: photo ops, giveaways and the bi-monthly care and feeding of their inner control freaks. :-D Certainly, this council had no direct responsibility for the situation, and for that they have my sympathy: this is not at all what they signed up for. On the flip side, virtually none of today's citizens are getting *anything* from payments to the hundreds of retired city workers that continue to drain the current budget, either. (And remember, generous allowances were made, and set aside from their respective budgets to supposedly take care of those payments.) That is every bit as immoral as they call the notion of reexamining or restricting those benefits today. Not only do Council & Staff ignore that argument, but they have the nerve to craft such a proposal as this, clearly intended to gouge our "guest workers", who equally, receive no/scant benefits from such payments but, conveniently, have no form of retaliation. There are many lengthy and complex aspects to this issue, that go well beyond a survey. Suffice it to say that we will find ourselves back in the crock pot, time and again, until we establish and adhere to a viable form of government. (Good luck with that!)	8/8/2018 8:43 AM
96	Voted No. Even with the property tax decrease my household is looking at a tax increase of almost \$800 a year (\$61k taxable value home with combined income of just under \$110k). Now instead of using that money to continue restoring my 85+ year old historic district home I have to send it to the city where I don't believe I'll see any benefit. We have to live within our budget, I believe the city should too.	8/8/2018 8:39 AM
97	I voted YES. Because I did not want East Lansing to go bankrupt. I have very mixed feelings about my yes vote. I am glad that it sunsets after 12 years. The whole situation is very frustrating.	8/8/2018 8:36 AM
98	NO -- high taxes already, mismanaged government doesn't deserve more.	8/8/2018 8:35 AM
99	I voted yes because, regardless of how we got to where we are (and the reasons are complex), our city cannot function in the way we want—good infrastructure and ample police/fire protections, etc.) unless there is revenue to pay for it. For me, it was simple math. I chose to live in EL because of the excellent city services, and I am still willing to pay for these.	8/8/2018 8:32 AM
100	No. a) it will punish students whom a lot of will make more than \$5,000 a year. b) It is hypocritical to have the election when the students aren't here and then complain when they don't engage. c) the income tax takes money out of Lansing which is highly unfair. d) it is also unfair to tax MSU workers who's only interaction with East Lansing is driving up and down Trowbridge road once a day. e) we wouldn't need this income tax if we had made better decisions in the past, including the Virginia Avenue development, various other bad deals, extensive and poor use of TIF, signing bad pension deals, STILL not reforming pensions. f) passing an income tax to keep the community center open is as tone deaf as it gets in how East Lansing thinks about students and MSU employees. We are turning them into our piggy banks so we don't have to make hard decisions. g) and finally, years and years of being anti business and anti development has cost us so much in potential revenue that we are essentially backed into a corner financially. Empty storefronts and lots don't pay taxes! I am disgusted by this vote and it makes me question why I live in East Lansing and work for MSU (since I'm on the hook for the tax even if I leave East Lansing)	8/8/2018 8:24 AM
101	No. The primary reason given for the need for increased revenues by the city is to pay for generous retirement benefits for its employees. The city has not asked the employees who are still entitled to these plans to contribute significantly more to the increased cost of their pension. Indeed, there is now no reason they would have such talks. Moreover, the city is continuing the practice of allowing employees to buy credits. It is a disgrace.	8/8/2018 8:09 AM
102	NO. Once established it is much easier to raise the % of taxation. East Lansing needs to learn how to budget for their obligations. This is simply kicking the can down the road. We pay enough in taxes already.	8/8/2018 8:06 AM
103	No. Thought the city has not looked at all options to stream line cash expenditures and also have had issues with treasurer in Lansing and their income tax in the past	8/8/2018 8:06 AM
104	No. This city has mismanaged money for years. Why should we give them more money to spend irresponsibly. Instead taking measures to get more residents, more businesses and generate income that way, they instead rely on penalizing residents and citizens with absurd fines and fees.	8/8/2018 7:56 AM
105	I voted yes, and mainly because it was explained to me that it would help ensure that the wonderful Hannah Center remains operational.	8/8/2018 7:56 AM

106	I voted yes. It was a difficult decision because 1% is a big deal to people with lower income, but EL is in a difficult spot with financial obligations that could impact the quality of life in our city. I have seen no evidence of another plan that could meet these obligations AND support the kind of infrastructure, public safety, recreation, etc. that our city needs.	8/8/2018 7:54 AM
107	I voted No. I'm worried about it negativity impacting students who work in EL/at MSU who are already facing tight budgets. If they live in EL, the lowered property tax that accompanies this proposal should ideally lower rents, but I doubt it will. Instead, financially tight or struggling students will face a double whammy.	8/8/2018 7:48 AM
108	No; it's a bailout and a wealth transfer from working families to retirees. This robs money from current citizens retirement savings and hands them to people that didn't plan very well. Taxes were already too high and this increases them significantly. We will get no benefit from this and the city will continue to waste money. We will speed up our plans to move away from EL.	8/8/2018 7:46 AM
109	I voted YES. I recognize the financial problems EL is having and how little MSU contributes, given it's high cost of emergency services.	8/8/2018 7:46 AM
110	I voted yes because the state has failed to provide local government the proper resources to fund our obligations. Between cuts to revenue sharing, the stock market crash, and the housing crash, the City has few options. Prop A will never allow the City to regain tax revenue from rebounding house values. The City is responsible for unfunded services (like fire) at MSU. This was one of the few legal tools that would allow the City to capture some revenue.	8/8/2018 7:45 AM
111	Voted no. It comes tied with a huge property tax reduction. The city says it's about pensions and services, but it seems more like redistribution of wealth from poor to rich. I doubt this income tax will stop the impending cuts, but I hope I'm wrong and that the city can move forward after this unfortunate result.	8/8/2018 7:45 AM
112	Yes	8/8/2018 7:43 AM
113	No—I don't feel like the residents of el need to fix the mismanagement of our city council. Our taxes are already extremely high.	8/8/2018 7:43 AM
114	I voted yes because it was a well thought out, reasonable proposal.	8/8/2018 7:42 AM