Keep NYC Free

www.keepnycfree.com

For Immediate Release: May 23, 2016 Contact: Corey Bearak (718) 343-6779; cell: (516) 343-6207

A Message on Transit Funding from Keep NYC Free: Stop those promises in disguise!

A consensus exists around the need to support Mass Transit. Unfortunately, some persist to use that imperative to promote ideologically driven funding <u>schemes</u> which lack merit by suggesting various projects offered as "bones" to various interests and constituencies. Those misguided in looking to that scheme for <u>new</u> funding need to understand the dollars and sense. "It's the same old wine" <u>we continue to get pitched</u>, but "From a brand new bottle." Keep NYC Free (<u>KeepNYCFree.com</u>) <u>documented</u> that any toll-tax scheme fails to raise the revenues needed, offers no benefits and hurts the <u>economy</u>.

Keep NYC Free <u>again cautions</u> against this weekend's editorial board rant joining the usual toll-tax crowd to prop up the MoveNY <u>toll-tax scheme</u>. When discussing <u>revenue</u>, Keep NYC Free <u>cautions</u> against any reliance on this congestion tax <u>scheme</u> marketed by <u>MoveNY</u>. It offers neither net revenues nor relief from traffic.

We previously shared in <u>A Message for some legislators</u>:

Those who claim to be about "fair tolling and transportation reinvestment" <u>ignore</u> the record about the City residents who use the free roads that connect Manhattan to Brooklyn, Queens and The Bronx. This <u>toll-tax scheme</u> asks these city residents to bear a cost just above \$11 (\$11.08; \$16 cash) per day.

Tolling New York City's free East River bridges connecting Brooklyn and Queens to Manhattan will not <u>move New York</u>.

Tolling proponents argue revenue – that cannot be realized – to mask a campaign where they act as <u>social engineers</u> to take moderate, middle and lower income New Yorkers out of cars.

Any discussion on revenues ought to be about what makes sense, not what appeals to some <u>ideological</u> bent.

Keep NYC Free <u>emphasizes</u> how <u>alternative revenues</u> could secure much of the revenue needed, and in a more <u>progressive</u> manner. While some offer <u>wasted words</u> for the <u>scheme</u>, recall <u>many more already concur</u> in finding it far from fair and lacking in promise of returns.

It's time to stop those promises in disguise.

See The New York Times, May 21, 2016