



April 2016

EnviroMetro Talking Points for Coalition Members – Re. feedback on Metro’s draft expenditure plan

- We are opposed to expanding highway capacity. It would just bring about more traffic, more sprawl, more climate change. We urge you to eliminate the highway expansions that are part of the current expenditure plan in favor of more forward-looking solutions like transit and bikeways.
- Transit expansion, bikeable & walkable streets, and clean freight are investments for the future that deliver real sustainability and livability benefits.
- The expenditure plan should increase funding for:
 - Regional active transportation network connections. Right now it’s a piecemeal effort by local jurisdictions, and Metro needs to play a greater role in making biking a real commute option for people.
 - Complete, green streets, with tree canopy cover and cool surfaces so that it’s pleasant to walk or wait for the bus.
 - Permeable surfaces and other green infrastructure elements, which help prevent pollution in our oceans and capture what little rain water we do get. These should be design standards — not just as pilot projects, but as Metro’s standard way of doing business – in all capital projects, including those funded through Local Return.
 - Transitioning the goods movement sector towards zero-emission vehicles.
 - Transportation to parks and open spaces like the beach & the San Gabriel Mountains. People of all income levels should be able to enjoy our region’s spectacular natural landscapes.
- We like that the measure funds:
 - Maintaining affordability of fares and improving service to those who are most in need.
 - Expansion of the transit network.



April 2016

EnviroMetro Suggestions for Responses to Metro's Polling Questions

Q1: What is your top priority for more investment?

1. Local street improvements such as signals and potholes
2. Repairs to the existing highway, rail and bus system to improve service
- 3. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities**
4. New rail projects to serve more of the County
5. Increase capacity on freeways and highways

→ *Our reasoning: Right now bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is vastly underfunded. State grant programs are extremely competitive (local projects keep applying and not receiving funding that way), so it's critical that we develop a local funding source for making walking and biking more safe and appealing mobility options.*

Q2: Would you prefer that we...

- 1. Build as many projects as possible, no matter how long it takes?**
2. Build fewer projects, but get them done faster?

→ *Our reasoning: there's great need in Los Angeles to build out our transit and active transportation networks. Let's not sell ourselves short by having lackluster ambitions.*

Q3: If the election were held today, how would you vote on the proposed sales tax for transportation?

1. Yes
2. No

→ *We're encouraging you to not provide a response to this question. Our reasoning: the lower response rate will send a message to Metro that the proposal needs some fixing yet and it's not an undertaking that should be abandoned.*

Q4: Would you support a 50-year sales tax so more projects could be built?

- 1. Yes**
2. No

→ *Please also SPEAK UP when this question is asked, and say that you'd support a longer tax that could deliver more projects, but that they need to be the right kind of projects: not highway expansion, as is currently the proposal.*

Q5: After projects are built, would you support part of the tax continuing to keep the system in good working condition?

- 1. Yes**
2. No

→ *Our reasoning: it's never a good idea to let our infrastructure crumble. Maintaining it is important.*