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Overview and Research Objectives

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments commissioned Godbe Research to conduct a survey of local voters with the following research objectives:

- Gauge the public’s perceptions of local government entities;
- Assess initial reaction to a policy that would fund the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan;
- Determine the importance and priority of a variety of transportation policies;
- Test the impact of factual informational statements; and
- Identify demographic and/or voter behavioral characteristics to assure a representative sample.
Methodology Overview

- **Data Collection**: Telephone Interviewing
- **Universe**: 3,044,937 likely November 2016 voters in Los Angeles County
- **Fielding Dates**: August 10 through August 18, 2016
- **Interview Length**: 21 minutes
- **Sample Size**: n=1,008
- **Margin of Error**: ± 3.09%

The data have been weighted to reflect the actual population characteristics of likely November 2016 voters in Los Angeles County in terms of a variety of demographic, geographic and behavioral characteristics.
Key Findings
Government Agency Job Performance
(n=1,008)

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Very Accurate” = +2, “Somewhat Accurate” = +1, “Somewhat Inaccurate” = -1, and “Very Inaccurate” = -2.
Initial Policy Measure Reaction (n=1,008)

To improve freeway traffic flow and safety; repair potholes and sidewalks; repave local streets; earthquake retrofit bridges; synchronize signals; keep senior, disabled and student fares affordable; expand rail, subway and bus systems; improve job, school and airport connections; and create jobs; shall voters authorize a Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan through a ½ cent sales tax and continue the existing ½ cent traffic relief tax until voters decide to end it, with independent audits and oversight and all funds controlled locally?

- Definitely Yes 38.4%
- Probably Yes 26.5%
- Total Support 64.8%
- Definitely No 20.7%
- DK/NA 5.2%
- Probably No 9.3%

Note: “DK/NA” = Don’t Know/No Answer
### Initial Policy Measure Reaction

#### Supervisorial District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA County</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Yes</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably No</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely No</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Total Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Total No</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanation of Policy Measure Rates & Sunset (n=1,008)

If you heard that this measure would make the 2008 voter approved, Los Angeles County one-half cent sales tax permanent and increase that tax by one-half cent would you vote yes or no on this measure?

- Definitely No: 31.2%
- Probably No: 14.3%
- DK/NA: 5.9%
- Probably Yes: 19.1%
- Definitely Yes: 29.4%

Total Support: 48.5%
Importance of Transportation Policies (n=1,008)

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Very Important” = +3, “6” = +2; “5” = +1; “4” = 0; “3” = -1; “2” = -2, “Not At All Important” = -3.
Funding Priorities (n=1,008)

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Much More Likely” = +2, “Somewhat More Likely” = +1, “No Effect” = 0, “Somewhat Less Likely” = -1, and “Much Less Likely” = -2.
Informational Statements – First Battery
(n=1,008)

H. The measure supports public transit projects that will protect our water, air and coastline

A. The measure requires independent audits and oversight to prevent cost overruns, and that all funds be controlled…

C. A countywide coalition says this measure will create jobs, clean air, and better transit for students and seniors…

G. The measure will improve air quality

B. The measure will reduce traffic congestion on the 405 from the San Fernando Valley to LAX

F. The measure will improve the freeway connections around downtown LA on the 5, 10, and 60 freeways…

E. The measure will improve the traffic flow along the 405 between LAX and the South Bay by widening the road at…

I. The measure would put more money into expanding mass transit

D. The measure would be in effect until voters decided to end it

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores:
Second Policy Evaluation
(n=1,008)

Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan.
To improve freeway traffic flow and safety; repair potholes and sidewalks; repave local streets; earthquake retrofit bridges; synchronize signals; keep senior, disabled and student fares affordable; expand rail, subway and bus systems; improve job, school and airport connections; and create jobs; shall voters authorize a Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan through a ½ cent sales tax and continue the existing ½ cent traffic relief tax until voters decided to end it, with independent audits and oversight and all funds controlled locally?

Definitely Yes  Probably Yes  Probably No  Definitely No  DK/NA

Second Evaluation

Initial Evaluation

70.5%
64.8%
### Second Policy Evaluation

#### Supervisory Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA County</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Yes</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably No</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely No</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Yes**: 70.5% 76.5% 72.4% 68.2% 71.0% 66.4%
- **Total No**: 25.5% 16.0% 25.6% 25.6% 25.7% 31.7%
Informational Statements – Second Battery
(n=1,008)

B. Metro plans to dig a tunnel under Sepulveda Pass from...
J. The measure prioritizes many projects for the City of...
L. A coalition of more than 40 communities voted to...
E. In Los Angeles County, taxpayers already pay some of...
D. Local streets and roads are falling apart, but this...
H. The light rail line from downtown LA to the Orange...
F. Since 2009 there has been nearly a billion dollars of...
I. Transportation projects to blue collar communities...
   A. The tax would have no end date
G. Improvements to the South Bay Curve on the 405 will...
K. Taxpayers in many blue collar communities will be...
C. Under this measure, improvements on the 5, 605 and...

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Much More Likely” = +2, “Somewhat More Likely” = +1, “No Effect” = 0, “Somewhat Less Likely” = -1, and “Much Less Likely” = -2.
Third Policy Evaluation (n=1,008)

Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan.
To improve freeway traffic flow and safety; repair potholes and sidewalks; repave local streets; earthquake retrofit bridges; synchronize signals; keep senior, disabled and student fares affordable; expand rail, subway and bus systems; improve job, school and airport connections; and create jobs; shall voters authorize a Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan through a ½ cent sales tax and continue the existing ½ cent traffic relief tax until voters decided to end it, with independent audits and oversight and all funds controlled locally?

Definitely Yes  Probably Yes  Probably No  Definitely No  DK/NA

Initial Evaluation

Third Evaluation

58.0%

64.8%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA County</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Yes</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably No</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely No</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Yes</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total No</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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