

## CONGESTION PRICING INFO:

Facts and background:

1. Downtown Los Angeles is a likely target area, but other high-density and urbanized areas may be considered.
2. Revenue would fund mass transit expansion – new capital projects, increased service of existing lines, and rider amenities (shelters, information displays).
3. The goal is increasing funds for mass transit expansion, not ending gridlock and traffic.
4. No one will be prohibited from driving, they will have to pay for the actual cost of the pollution and harmful impacts that they cause.

Findings and justifications:

1. Concern that it is a regressive tax that would harm the poor, though the poor receive no subsidies for gasoline and car purchases. Their increased costs can be billed to their wealthier employers and clients as a cost of doing business.
2. Concern that mass transit service is insufficient, but the MTA is expanding service every day. The Los Angeles system is actually very useful once people make the effort to ride it, and its low cost of \$1.75 per ride is a good value.
3. Debate over congestion pricing's efficiency in Europe. People like the increased mass transit service and cleaner, quieter downtown centers, but traffic has not disappeared (which is not the goal of congestion pricing -- it is to provide a better alternative for those who care to ride mass transit and help the environment).
4. Los Angeles drivers need a stick to reduce driving or a direct financial benefit. Few drivers give up their cars voluntarily for incentives (the carrot), and most other TDM systems fail for that reason

Some question whether congestion pricing "works".

This article explains that it reduces traffic, speeds traffic for those who drive, and improves the climate, as shown in cities where it is implemented.

If those are our goals, then congestion pricing works.

One argument is that it's a regressive tax. The solution is for wealthy westsiders to pay their gardeners and nannies more (i.e. \$4 per day), to cover the cost of this fee.

We have the money, and should not be stingy with it.

Anyone who owns a car and lives on the west side can afford this fee. The cost of a car is \$8,000 per year, on the average.

Our transit system in the westside is actually good, and the money from congestion pricing will improve it more.

New York Times article (today):

"London, Stockholm and Singapore have been held up as international models for congestion pricing. In each city, the fees were greeted with skepticism and anger from many commuters and civic and business leaders. But the fees later proved effective in reducing traffic, congestion and air pollution. Within a year of the fees being charged in 2003, the number of vehicles entering an eight-square-mile area of London dropped by 18 percent, according to city officials. Traffic delays went down 30 percent. The average speed of vehicles in the zone rose to 10 miles per hour from 8.8 m.p.h. Air quality improved, too, with a 12 percent reduction in emissions of nitrogen oxides and particulate matter from vehicles in the zone."

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/26/nyregion/what-is-congestion-pricing.html?action=click&module=Top%20Stories&pgtype=Homepage>