



**Metro**

Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

213.922.2000 Tel  
metro.net

**GATEWAY CITIES SERVICE COUNCIL  
MARCH 10, 2016**

**SUBJECT: FINDINGS OF THE FEBRUARY 2016 PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**ACTION: APPROVE FINDINGS OF PUBLIC HEARINGS AND STAFF  
RECOMMENDATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

- Approve findings of February 2016 Public Hearings for June 2016 Service Changes.
- Adopt Staff's Recommended Service Plan

**ISSUE**

Federal guidelines and MTA policy require that a public hearing be held when major service changes to the bus system are considered. Accordingly, Metro's Service Councils conducted a series of public hearings in each of the five service regions in February to obtain public input on the proposed changes, including a Saturday hearing that was held at Gateway Headquarters Building. The purpose of the hearings was to solicit public input regarding proposed changes to 24 bus lines that operate throughout the Metro region. These changes are slated for implementation on June 26, 2016 or later.

A summary of public input, an analysis of the potential impacts, and staff's recommended service change are outlined in this report. The Service Councils are required to consider the possible impacts from these proposals before approval.

**DISCUSSION**

In compliance with federal public hearing requirements and MTA's Administrative Code, each Service Council is required to conduct a public hearing and consider public testimony before approving significant modifications to the bus system. As part of this process, each Service Council is required to consider potential impacts these changes may have on the community.

Metro service development staff actively monitors the efficiency and effectiveness of the bus system to ensure its productivity, safety, cost effectiveness, capacity utilization, and service quality. During this round of public hearings, route modifications were proposed for several bus lines to achieve the following objectives:

- Introduce a new line in East Los Angeles to improve access to USC/LAC General Hospital;
- Join lines together which have common terminals to allow for improvements in service frequency and eliminate the need to transfer;
- Reduce duplication with Metro Rail and BRT lines; and
- Discontinue service on lines which may be duplicated by a municipal operator, allowing service hours to be reinvested into other Metro lines.

The official notice of public hearing was published in local newspapers beginning January 2016. Due to the system-wide nature of the proposals, public hearings were conducted in February at all five Service Council meetings, as well as one Saturday meeting held at the Metro Gateway headquarters building.

The published Notice of Public Hearing (Attachment A) gives the time, date, and location of each public hearing. Additional notices were subsequently published in other local, regional, and foreign language newspapers system-wide, where appropriate. Approximately 81,000 marketing take-ones were distributed on buses, trains, and at customer service outlets informing riders of the proposals under consideration. The Notice of Public Hearing was also posted on Metro’s main website with a link to maps showing the proposed changes. Patrons could also send responses to Metro via email at [servicechanges@metro.net](mailto:servicechanges@metro.net), fax, or mail.

In addition to the public hearings, staff presented the proposed changes to the February meetings of the Metro Citizen’s Advisory Committee, General Managers, and Quarterly Transit Providers.

At the public hearings, staff asked attendees to indicate how they heard of the hearings. Of the 180 who signed in at the six meetings, the following data was collected:

<b>Outreach Method</b>	<b>Number of Patrons</b>
Brochure	52
Friend	28
Metro Website	20
Email	17
Facebook	8
The Source Blog	7
Twitter	2

### **Summary Of Public Comment**

A total of 180 individuals attended the six public hearings; 118 of these individuals provided verbal testimony. In addition, 291 written responses were received from the public via letters, facsimiles and emails by midnight February 13, 2016, the close of the public record.

Of the total testimony received system-wide, approximately 19% (54 comments) supported the proposals. Nearly 57% (165 comments) opposed, and another 11% (33 comments) suggested modifications to the service change proposals. Roughly 13% (39) of the comments received were unrelated to the public hearing proposals.

Public comment received on the six bus lines under review in the Gateway Cities region showed similar trends compared to those noted for the system. A total of 123 comments were received on the Gateway lines. Of this total, 10% supported staff recommendations while 69% opposed them. Another 10% suggested modifications to mitigate various concerns, while 11% commented on other issues not part of this public hearing. Lines 460, 270 and 258-485 garnered the most comment from the public.

Line 460 received 50 comments from the public. Collectively, 84% of these responses (42) opposed the cancellation of the route segment between downtown Los Angeles and Norwalk Green Line Station. Virtually all said they would be forced to transfer, citing additional travel time as the most critical issue. Some noted there is no late night connection at the Norwalk Station after the Green Line stops running. This condition would leave late night riders of Line 460 stranded if the line is terminated there. They asked that it be addressed. Others cited the possible loss of employment should the change be approved, as their existing travel patterns would be impacted due to multiple transfers and the added travel time required to reach their jobs. Metro also received a petition with 152 signatures in opposition to discontinuation of the portion of Line 460 between downtown Los Angeles and Norwalk Station.

Line 270 generated 35 responses from the public. About 66% of these comments (23) opposed Metro's proposal to discontinue the service, and wanted it to be retained. This was due in part to a misinterpretation of the proposal, as service will continue with another operator, or Metro would retain the service. There was also concern from college students about the need to transfer from one carrier to another. Concerns were also raised about potential fare impacts if all media is not honored by Foothill or Norwalk. However, the Rio Hondo College student TAP is valid on all three carriers currently serving the college.

The proposal to restructure Line 258-485 received 25 comments from the public. About 64% of the comments (16) opposed the change. The main objection to the proposal was that it would force them to transfer where they now have a direct trip. The majority of those opposed to this change are Line 485 riders who would no longer have a direct trip from Union Station to the east valley since that portion of the route would be discontinued. Of the totally boardings east of Cal State LA, only 25% of the current Line 485 patrons are affected by the proposal. They may use the Silver Line and connect to the new service at Cal State LA.

Few public comments were received on the remaining three lines under review, namely Lines 51-52-351-352, Lines 111-311, and Line 577.

Specifically, four comments were received on Lines 51-52-351-352 proposal. Two

supported the change, one opposed it and one respondent suggested a Rapid bus be operated to replace Line 352.

Six comments were recorded for the Line 111-311 proposal. Half did not want Line 311 cancelled and asked that it be retained for convenience. Two others suggested adding a new Rapid bus to replace 352, or increasing the existing headways on Local 52. One respondent supported the change. Line 311 saves only eight minutes for customers travelling the entire Limited stop zone (10.4 miles from Crenshaw to Garfield). However, the average trip length on Line 111 is just 3.3 miles which results in only a 2.5 minute average savings for Line 311 riders. In contrast, riders at stops not served by Line 311 have to wait up to 20 minutes for a Local Line 111 bus in the AM and PM peaks. Discontinuing Line 311 and replacing with Line 111 will benefit riders with shorter wait times at over 20 Local bus stops between Crenshaw Bl and Garfield Av.

Three comments from the public were received on the Line 577 proposal. All were generally supportive of the concept, though suggestions were received that alternative streets and stops be considered, as well new destinations such as Seal Beach.

The table below provides a brief overview of public's general sentiments for each proposal. Attachment C provides a summary of the public comment received by the close of the public record.

Line	Line Description	Service Change Proposals	Support	Against	Modify	Other	
<b>51/52 /352</b>	Wilshire Ctr – Downtown LA – Compton- Harbor Gateway TC via Avalon Blvd.	Replace Limited Route Line 352 with new Limited Route 351 changing the southern terminus from Harbor Gateway Transit Center to serve Compton Station, providing a faster service option to Line 51 riders.	2	1	1	0	
<b>111 / 311</b>	LAX City Bus Center – Norwalk Station via Florence Av	Discontinue Line 311 limited stop service and operate as local service.	1	3	1	1	
<b>258 &amp; 485</b>	<b>258:</b> Alhambra - Paramount via Fremont Av & Eastern Av <b>485:</b> Downtown LA - Altadena via Freemont - Lake Aves.	Line 258 will absorb Line 485. Combine Lines at Commonwealth and Fremont. Continue current Line 485 route to Pasadena and current Line 258 route to Paramount. Discontinue portion of Line 258 from Fremont Ave/Commonwealth to Bay State/Garfield. Join Line 258 with Line 485 at Cal State LA to provide a continuous line from Paramount to Pasadena.	4	15	3	2	
<b>270</b>	Monrovia - Norwalk Station via Workman Mill - Peck Rd	Discontinue service due to excessive duplication with other carriers. Foothill has agreed to take over the Line and to continue to operate the same span of service and service frequencies.	3	22	1	8	
<b>460</b>	Downtown LA – Disneyland via Harbor Transitway – I-105 Fwy	Discontinue portion of route between downtown Los Angeles and Norwalk Green Line Station.	1	41	5	2	
<b>577</b>	El Monte Station –Long Beach VA Medical Center via I-605 Fwy	Add two stops between El Monte Station and Rio Hondo College. Remove Express fare charge.	1	0	2	0	
			<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>
			<b>TOTAL COMMENTS:</b>				<b>120</b>

Line 460: A petition against this proposal was signed by 152 individuals.

## **Recommendations**

The following summarizes the original staff proposal for each bus line and the current staff recommendation. Modifications have been made to several proposals as to address specific concerns that were raised during the public review period.

### **Line 51-52-351-352**

**Proposal** - Discontinue limited stop Line 352 service and replace with new limited-stop Line 351.

**Recommendation** – Approve as proposed. All existing limited stops on Line 352 will be served by the new Line 351. Local Line 52 will operate its normal route from Vermont Station to the Harbor-Gateway Transit Center. Line 51 operates more frequently than Line 52 due to higher passenger demand on the Compton segment of the route. The suggestion to add a new Rapid line to serve Harbor Transitway Station is not warranted due low demand.

### **Line 111-311**

**Proposal** - Discontinue Line 311 limited stop service and operate as Local service.

**Recommendation** – Approve as proposed. Service for all patrons would be improved from every 20 minutes to every 10 minutes in the peak periods. Converting Limited stop trips into Local trips will double the service for patrons at over 20 stops not served by the Limited stop service.

### **Line 258-485**

**Proposal:** Join Line 258 with Line 485 at Cal State LA to provide continuous service from Paramount to Pasadena.

**Recommendation** – Approve as proposed. Of the total boardings on Line 485, only approximately 25% ride beyond Cal State LA to Union Station; the majority of existing riders are not affected. The few riders who travel to Union Station are recommended to use the Silver Line to make this trip. The Silver Line operates frequent service (5 minutes in the peaks and 15 minutes in the base periods).

### **Line 270**

**Proposal** - Discontinue service. The line may be operated by another provider.

**Revised Recommendation** – Modify proposal. Metro (or another operator if available) will continue to operate the service along its current route from the Norwalk Green Line Station to El Monte Station only. The current service north of El Monte Station to Monrovia will be operated by Foothill Transit, which has agreed to operate the same route and schedule from El Monte to Monrovia as Line 270 does today. This change will ensure that patrons who now ride between Norwalk and El Monte Station will not be affected. Transfer connections will be made at El Monte Station for the small number of riders who will transfer between Metro and Foothill to continue travel north of El Monte Station.

### **Line 460**

**Proposal** - Discontinue route segment from Downtown Los Angeles to Norwalk Green

Line Station. Replacement service provided by Metro Silver Line, Silver Express, Blue Line, Green Line and other local bus services.

**Revised Recommendation** – Staff recommends the Council approve the following actions:

- Approve the original proposal to discontinue the affected route segment between Downtown Los Angeles and Norwalk Station; and
- Staff recommends Council approve the special operation of late night service for Line 460 riders traveling west of Norwalk Station after Green Line service has ended. Specifically, special late night trips will be operated by Line 460 from Disneyland to Downtown Los Angeles via the current routing. This will address concerns expressed by the public to ensure late night service between Norwalk and downtown Los Angeles is continued.

#### Line 577

**Proposal** - Add up to three stops between El Monte Station and Rio Hondo College. Exclude Line 577 from the Express premium fare policy (requires Board of Directors approval).

**Revised Recommendation** – Due to the recent passage of Motion 63 (study of Express bus connections from various Long Beach locations to the Metro Gold Line extension), staff recommends not implementing these proposals until the study is completed and brought back to the Board.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The Board of Directors consideration of the of the service changes presented in this report is included in the FY17 adopted budget. The implementation of these changes would have no negative impact to the agency.

#### Impact to Budget

Saved net revenue service hours from Lines 460 will be redeployed on lines in the Gateway Cities area to improve service and patronage. Lines earmarked to receive these improvements include Line 111 (extended late night trips to Norwalk Green Line); Lines 265 and 762 (improved service frequencies); and 760 (extended to Artesia Blue Line Station). In addition, the hours saved from Line 270 will be reinvested in Line 266 (additional service).

### **TITLE VI AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE EVALUATION**

The proposed service changes to Lines 51/52/352, 111/311, 258/485, 460, and 577 proposed changes did not create a Disparate Impact or a Disproportionate Burden. None of the changes were significant enough to meet the threshold for a major service change.

An analysis of the proposed cancelation of Line 270 (Monrovia – Norwalk Sta via Workman Mill - Peck Rds) found a Disparate Impact and a Disproportionate Burden

regarding two fare payment methods to a relatively small number of riders. This evaluation used systemwide data because ethnicity and poverty level information is not available by method of payment at the line level. In the case of these three lines, the Disparate Impact involved stored value TAP riders, who pay either the regular fare or the Elderly and & Disabled peak fare and do not transfer. These riders would experience a price reduction. However, minority ridership makes up 80% of this group, while the systemwide average is 89%. A Disparate Impact cannot be mitigated, therefore the Board must find that there is a business necessity to proceed with the action, and that there is no alternative that would accomplish the same result with a lesser desperate impact. In the case of the Disproportionate Burden, the percentage of minority bus riders who are below the poverty level systemwide is 62%. The areas through which these lines operate have a minority population of 44%. This is mitigated through the reinvestment of 25% of the net savings into lines with higher ridership within the San Gabriel Valley.

A third payment method, 7-Day pass holders, also has a Disproportionate Burden only if they ride more than 20 times a week on these specific lines. They could experience a price increase, which varies by how much they ride. These riders are more poor (69%) than the system average (62%). It is unknown whether any of the users of these lines ride often enough in a week to experience a price increase. This is mitigated through the reinvestment of 25% of the net savings into lines with higher ridership within the San Gabriel Valley.

The Title VI and Environmental Evaluations analysis are contained in Attachments B-1, B-2 and B-3.

### **NEXT STEPS**

The proposals considered for public hearing and final recommendations will be implemented with the June 26, 2016 service changes.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A – Notice of Public Hearing

Attachment B-1-Equity Evaluation of Proposed Major Service Changes for June 2016

Attachment B-2-Line 577 Proposed Exemption from Express Charges (Fare Equity Analysis)

Attachment B-3-Lines 190/194 & 270 Discontinuation and Replacement by Foothill Transit (Fare Equity Analysis)

Attachment C- Summary of Public Comment

Prepared by: Michael Sieckert, Transportation Planning Manager

Scott Page, Director, Service Performance and Analysis

Jon Hillmer, Executive Director, Service Development, Scheduling & Analysis

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority will hold public hearings in February 2016 to receive community input on proposed modifications to Metro's bus service. Approved changes will become effective June 2016 or later. Details of the hearing dates, times, and locations are listed at the end of this notice.

The upcoming public hearings are being held in conformance with federal public hearing requirements outlined in Section 5307 (d) 1 of Title 49 U.S.C., and public hearing guidelines outlined in Section 2-50-025 of Metro's Administrative Code, as amended.

Listed below are the service proposals to be considered at the hearings, and the respective Service Councils that will host the public hearings. In general, the proposed modifications will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the public transportation system through a better use of resources. The public can attend any of these hearings and comment on proposals of interest to them.

LINE	LINE NAME	PROPOSED SERVICE CHANGE	San Fernando Valley	San Gabriel Valley	Gateway Cities	South Bay	Westside Central
<b>16/316</b>	Downtown Los Angeles - Century City via 3rd St	Combine with Line 220 at Cedar Sinai Hospital, providing one continuous line via new branch Line 17.					<b>X</b>
<b>51/52/ 351/ 352</b>	Wilshire Ctr – Downtown LA – Compton- Harbor Gateway TC via Avalon	Discontinue Limited Stop Line 352 and replace with new Limited Stop Line 351. All existing limited stops on Line 352 will be served by the new Line 351. Line 51 operates more frequently than Line 52; therefore a new Line 351 will benefit more riders with a faster service.			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>68</b>	Downtown LA – Montebello via Chavez – E. 1st St	Replace the 1st St route segment from Indiana Station to East LA College with new Line 106. This new line will also operate to County USC Hospital and replace a large portion of Line 620. (See Line 620 below).		<b>X</b>			<b>X</b>
<b>106</b>	County USC Hospital – Indiana Sta – East LA College	Proposed new Line 106 will operate as a replacement to a portion of Line 68 on E 1st St and a large portion of Line 620.		<b>X</b>			<b>X</b>
<b>111 /311</b>	LAX City Bus Center – Norwalk Sta via Florence Av	Discontinue Line 311 limited stop service and operate as local service.			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	



LINE	LINE NAME	PROPOSED SERVICE CHANGE	San Fernando Valley	San Gabriel Valley	Gateway Cities	South Bay	Westside Central
156	Panorama City to Hollywood via Highland Av, Vineland Av & Van Nuys Bl	Combine with Line 236, Route 237 on Van Nuys Bl at the Orange Line, providing a new continuous line from Hollywood to Granada Hills. (See Line 236/237 below)	X				X
175	Silverlake – Hollywood via Hyperion Av – Sunset Bl	Remove two underutilized mid-day trips.					X
190/ 194	El Monte Sta - Cal Poly Pomona via Ramona Bl & Valley Bl	Discontinue service, possibly to be operated by another provider.		X			
220	Beverly Ctr – Culver City Sta via Robertson Bl	Replace Line 220 with a branch route of Line 16 at Cedar Sinai Hospital; new branch Line 17 would operate from downtown LA to Culver City Expo Station.					X
234	Sylmar – Westwood via Sepulveda Bl	Late night, early morning, Saturday and Sunday extension from Westwood to Sepulveda Expo Line Station, when opened.	X				X
236/ 237	Sylmar Sta – Encino via Glenoaks Bl, Balboa Bl Encino – Granada Hills – Sherman Oaks via Balboa Bl, Woodley Av, Victory Bl, Van Nuys Bl	Combine Route 237 with Line 156 on Van Nuys Bl at the Orange Line, providing a new continuous line from Hollywood to Granada Hills.	X				
258	Alhambra - Paramount via Fremont Av & Eastern Av	Join line with Line 485 at Cal State LA, providing a continuous line from Paramount to Pasadena.		X	X		
270	Monrovia – Norwalk Sta via Workman Mill – Peck Rds	Discontinue service, possibly to be operated by another provider.		X	X		
460	Downtown LA – Disneyland via Harbor Transitway – I-105 Fwy	Discontinue route segment from Downtown LA to Norwalk Green Line Station (replacement service provided by Metro Silver Line, Silver Express, Blue Line, and Green Line).			X		X
485	Downtown LA – Altadena via Fremont – Lake Avs	Discontinue service from Downtown LA to Cal State LA. Service north of Cal State LA will be operated to Altadena by an extension of Line 258.		X			X
501	NoHo – Pasadena Express	New express service between Metro North Hollywood Red/Orange Line Stations to Metro Del Mar Gold Line Station.	X	X			

<b>LINE</b>	<b>LINE NAME</b>	<b>PROPOSED SERVICE CHANGE</b>	<b>San Fernando Valley</b>	<b>San Gabriel Valley</b>	<b>Gateway Cities</b>	<b>South Bay</b>	<b>Westside Central</b>
<b>577</b>	El Monte Sta – Long Beach VA Medical Center via I-605 Fwy	Add three stops between El Monte Station and Rio Hondo College. Exclude Line 577 from the express premium fare policy (requires Board of Directors approval).		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>620</b>	Boyle Heights Shuttle	Discontinue service on Cesar E. Chavez, Forest Av, Wabash Av, Evergreen Av, Mott St, and 1st St. Replacement service is provided by the current routes of Lines 30, 68, 71, and 770. The remaining service will operate from the USC Medical Center, State St, 1st St, Boyle Av, Whittier Bl, Soto St, 4th St, Indiana St, then continuing out 1st St along the route of Line 68 to East LA College (see Line 68 above). The new service will be renumbered to Line 106 operating in both directions. Hours and days of operation will remain unchanged.		<b>X</b>			<b>X</b>
<b>704</b>	Downtown Santa Monica via Santa Monica Bl	Make permanent experimental improvement of weekday mid-day service from every 20 minutes to every 15 minutes.					<b>X</b>
<b>734</b>	Sylmar Sta – Westwood via Sepulveda Bl	Extend service from Westwood to Sepulveda Expo Line Station, when opened.	<b>X</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>788</b>	Metro Valley – Westwood Express	Extend service from Westwood to Sepulveda Expo Line Station, when opened.	<b>X</b>				<b>X</b>



**Metro**

## PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULE

### **SAN FERNANDO VALLEY**

**Wednesday, February 3, 2016**

**6:30PM**

Marvin Braude Constituent Center  
6262 Van Nuys Blvd.  
Van Nuys, CA 91401

### **SOUTH BAY**

**Thursday, February 4, 2016**

**6:00PM**

Carson Community Center  
Adult Lounge  
801 E. Carson  
Carson, CA 90745

### **REGIONAL LOCATION**

**Saturday, February 6, 2016**

**10:00AM**

Metro Boardroom  
1 Gateway Plaza, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

### **SAN GABRIEL VALLEY**

**Monday, February 8, 2016**

**6:00pm**

Metro El Monte Division 9 Building  
3449 Santa Anita Ave.  
3rd Floor Service Council  
Conference Room  
El Monte, CA 91731

### **WESTSIDE/CENTRAL**

**Wednesday, February 10, 2016**

**6:00PM**

Metro Headquarters Building  
1 Gateway Plaza  
Union Station Conference Room  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

### **GATEWAY CITIES**

**Thursday, February 11, 2016**

**6:00 p.m.**

Norwalk Arts & Sport Complex  
Sproul Reception Center  
12239 Sproul St.  
Norwalk, CA 90650

The public hearings will commence at the listed times and will close after all oral testimony has been received by those members of the public present in accordance with hearing guidelines.

**Note: These proposals may be approved in whole or in part at a date following the public hearings. Approved changes may also include other alternatives derived from public comment.** Interested members of the public are encouraged to attend the upcoming hearings and provide testimony on any service proposal under consideration (public comment will not be restricted to only bus routes operating in one geographical area). All public comment received will be forwarded to the responsible Service Council, and considered prior to taking action on the service proposals. Persons unable to attend the hearings may submit written testimony postmarked through midnight Saturday, February 13, 2016, the close of the public record.

Comments sent via U.S Mail should be addressed to: **Metro Customer Relations**

Attn: June 2016 Service Changes  
1 Gateway Plaza, 99-PL-4  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2932

Comments via e-mail should be addressed to: [servicechanges@metro.net](mailto:servicechanges@metro.net)

Attn: "June 2016 Service Changes"

Facsimiles should be addressed as above and sent to: 213-922-6988.

**ADA REQUIREMENTS:** Upon request, sign language interpretation, materials in alternative formats and other accommodations are available to the public for MTA sponsored meetings and events.

**LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:** Upon request, interpreters are available to the public for MTA sponsored meetings and events. Agendas and minutes will also be made available in other languages upon request.

All requests for reasonable accommodations, interpretation services and materials in other languages must be made at least three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please submit requests by calling (213) 922-4600 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Our TDD line is (800) 252-9040. Individuals with hearing or speech impairment may use California Relay Service 711 + Metro phone number.

**ATTACHMENT B-1**

**Service Equity Analysis  
Methodology & Results**

**June 2016  
Proposed Major Service Changes  
Prepared January 2016**

Service Planning and Scheduling  
Civil Rights Programs Compliance

# Contents

1.	Proposal Overview .....	1
2.	Methodological Approach.....	1
	Data Sources.....	2
	Methodology.....	2
3.	Results.....	2

## 1. PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

A proposed program of service changes for possible implementation in June 2016, or later, is scheduled for public comment in February 2016. The major service changes contained in that proposal are the subject of this equity evaluation.

## 2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

A Service Equity Evaluation is presented herein in accordance with the requirements of Federal Transit Administration Circular 4702.1B. The evaluation assesses whether or not there are adverse disparate impacts on minority passengers and/or disproportionate burdens on low income riders arising from the proposed major service changes that will be considered at public hearings in February 2016.

The proposed changes have been grouped by type of change for this analysis. There are three groups consisting of routes or segments proposed for discontinuation, routes or segments that represent new services, and routes proposed for increased service frequency. Each group is evaluated separately using demographic data associated with the group's services.

Only the major service change proposals as defined in Metro's Administrative Code Section 2-50 are included in this analysis. There are additional proposals being presented for public comment that are not a part of this evaluation. A service change is considered major if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

A revision to an existing transit route that increases or decreases the route miles by 25% or the revenue service miles operated by the lesser of 25%, or by 250,000 annual revenue service miles at one time or cumulatively in any period within 36 consecutive month;

A revision to an existing transit service that increases or decreases the revenue hours operated by at least 25% or by 25,000 annual revenue service hours at one time or cumulatively in any period within 36 consecutive months;

A change of more than 25% at one time or cumulatively over any period within 36 consecutive months in the number of total revenue trips scheduled on routes serving a rail or BRT station, or an off-street bus terminal serving at least 4 bus routes;

A change of more than 20% of the total system revenue miles or revenue hours in any 12 month period;

The implementation of any new transit route that results in a net increase of more than 25,000 annual revenue hours or 250,000 annual revenue miles;

Six months prior to the opening of any new fixed guideway project (e.g. BRT line or rail line) regardless of whether or not the amount of service being changed meets the requirements in the new subsections 1 – 5 above.

Two proposals meeting the criteria for major changes have been excluded from this analysis as the Administrative Code provides an exception to the equity evaluation requirement when a service is replaced by a different mode or operator providing a service with the same headways, fare, transfer options, span of service and stops. The proposed discontinuation of Lines 190-194 and 270 is contingent on the assumption of service by Foothill Transit. Because there are differences in the fares charged by the involved operators, these two proposals are the subject of a separate fare equity evaluation.

## **Data Sources**

Data on the ethnicity of Metro's service area population is obtained from block group level data from the 2010 U. S. Census. Poverty income data is from the American Community Survey administered by the U. S. Census for the five year period from 2006-2010 and is provided at the census tract level.

## **Methodology**

For any route or route segment included in this evaluation the population and minority population of each block group that is at least partially included in a buffer area around each stop served by the affected route or segment is accumulated. The buffer is generally a circle of one-quarter mile radius around each stop. For rail stations the buffer has a one-half mile radius, and for major park/ride facilities the buffer has a five mile radius. Similarly, census tract level data for population and poverty population is accumulated from all tracts at least partially included in each buffer.

The major changes are grouped by type of change (discontinuation, new service, or increased frequency), and the associated population, minority population, and poverty population is accumulated for each group. Each group's overall minority population share and poverty population share is compared with the corresponding Metro service area shares to determine whether or not a disparate impact, or disproportionate burden would result.

## **3. RESULTS**

The Board of Directors has adopted thresholds for determining when disparate impacts and/or disproportionate burdens are imposed by a proposed service change action.

A disparate impact occurs when the absolute difference between the minority share of the impacted population and the minority share of Metro's service area population exceeds 5%, and/or the relative difference between the minority share of the impacted population and the minority share of Metro's service area population exceeds 20%.

A disproportionate burden occurs when the absolute difference between the impacted poverty population share and the Metro service area poverty population share exceeds 5% and/or the relative difference between the poverty population share of the impacted population and the poverty share of Metro's service area population exceeds 20%.

The results of this equity evaluation are shown in Table 1. There is no disparate impact or disproportionate burden resulting from the service discontinuation and new service actions. The increased frequency proposed for Line 704 would result in a disparate impact on the minority population along its route, but would not result in a disproportionate burden on the poverty population in its corridor.

When a disparate impact is found the proposed action may only be implemented if (1) there is a substantial legitimate justification for the proposed service change, and (2) there are no alternatives that would have a less disparate impact and still accomplish the goals of the action. In this instance, the action is proposed to conform passenger loading during the midday to recently revised passenger loading standards. There are no alternatives to adding service to reduce passenger loading, and not doing so would violate adopted Board policy resulting in crowding.



Table 1 Equity Evaluation of Major Service Change Proposals for June 2016

**DISCONTINUATION OF ROUTE OR SEGMENT**

Line	Description	Adverse Action	Beneficial Action	Title VI			EJ		
				Population	Minority	%	Population	Poverty	%
111	Discontinue Route 311	X		-244,310	-228,526	93.5%	-349,160	-69,406	19.9%
156	Discontinue Burbank/Kester/Oxnard Loop	X		-18,579	-10,684	57.5%	-28,901	-5,638	19.5%
220	Discontinue line	X		-53,401	-16,915	31.7%	-68,042	-7,522	11.1%
236	Discontinue branch line 237	X		-164,559	-92,194	56.0%	-204,516	-24,570	12.0%
258	Discontinue service east of Fremont/Commonwealth	X		-32,739	-29,082	88.8%	-38,056	-6,028	15.8%
460	Discontinue service west of Norwalk Station	X		-81,896	-65,143	79.5%	-85,549	-34,872	40.8%
485	Discontinue line	X		-120,667	-87,390	72.4%	-154,781	-22,285	14.4%
620	Discontinue service between Indiana Station State St via Chavez	X		-44,714	-43,893	98.2%	-59,995	-15,659	26.1%
<b>Total</b>				<b>-760,865</b>	<b>-573,827</b>	<b>75.4%</b>	<b>-989,000</b>	<b>-185,980</b>	<b>18.8%</b>
						<b>Metro Service Area</b>	<b>70.5%</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	
						<b>Absolute Difference</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	
						<b>Relative Difference</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	

**NEW SERVICE**

Line	Description	Adverse Action	Beneficial Action	Title VI			EJ		
				Population	Minority	%	Population	Poverty	%
156	Extend from Van Nuys/Burbank via Route 237 to Mission Hills		X	95,656	63,639	66.5%	111,257	15,776	14.2%
258	Add extension to CSULA		X	10,547	9,585	90.9%	16,006	1,889	11.8%
258	Add extension from Fremont/Commonwealth to Altadena		X	74,390	46,329	62.3%	113,333	11,858	10.5%
501	New service		X	44,623	20,922	46.9%	63,759	8,731	13.7%
620	Extend service from Indiana Station to E. LA College via 1st. St.		X	49,274	48,029	97.5%	66,030	12,143	18.4%
<b>Total</b>				<b>274,490</b>	<b>188,504</b>	<b>68.7%</b>	<b>370,385</b>	<b>50,397</b>	<b>13.6%</b>
						<b>Metro Service Area</b>	<b>70.5%</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	
						<b>Absolute Difference</b>	<b>-1.8%</b>	<b>-2.3%</b>	
						<b>Relative Difference</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>	<b>-14.4%</b>	

**INCREASED FREQUENCY**

Line	Description	Adverse Action	Beneficial Action	Title VI			EJ		
				Population	Minority	%	Population	Poverty	%
704	Add midday service (cumulative impact)		X	259,255	126,979	49.0%	313,798	57,176	18.2%
<b>Total</b>				<b>259,255</b>	<b>126,979</b>	<b>49.0%</b>	<b>313,798</b>	<b>57,176</b>	<b>18.2%</b>
						<b>Metro Service Area</b>	<b>70.5%</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	
						<b>Absolute Difference</b>	<b>-21.5%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	
						<b>Relative Difference</b>	<b>-30.5%</b>	<b>14.6%</b>	

ATTACHMENT B-2

**Fare Equity Analysis  
Methodology & Results**

**Line 577  
Proposed Exemption from Express Charges  
December 2015**

Service Planning and Scheduling  
Civil Rights Programs Compliance

# Contents

1.	Proposal Overview .....	1
2.	Methodological Approach.....	1
	Data Sources.....	1
	Step By Step Methodology.....	1
3.	Results.....	3

## 1. PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

In an effort to increase ridership on a poorly patronized express bus line, Metro is proposing to eliminate express fare charges on Line 577 effective with the June 2016 Service Change Program.

## 2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

A Title VI Fare Equity Evaluation is presented herein in accordance with the requirements of Federal Transit Administration Circular 4702.1B. The evaluation assesses whether or not there are adverse disparate impacts on minority passengers and/or disproportionate burdens on low income riders arising from the proposed exemption of Line 577 riders from express fare charges.

Express fare charges are only applicable on Metro Express bus lines, including the Metro Silver Line for which the express premium is built into the line fare. As only the express premium fare is affected by this proposal, the demographics of Line 577 riders will be compared with those of all express riders to determine whether some portion of this group is disparately impacted and/or disproportionately burdened by the proposed action.

### Data Sources

Data on the ethnicity and household income levels of riders of specific Metro bus lines is obtained from the systemwide Onboard Survey conducted in 2012. Two express lines, Line 439 and Line 445, are no longer operated, however, riders of former Line 445 are now almost entirely users of the Metro Silver Line.

Poverty level household income was not determined in the Onboard Survey, so Low Income, defined as less than \$25,000, was used for the evaluation.

### Step By Step Methodology

The following steps were performed to complete the analysis:

- Data for the numbers of linked trips surveyed by express route and by ethnicity were obtained from the Onboard Survey database (Table 1);

Table 1 Surveyed Linked Trips by Route and by Ethnicity

	MT-439	MT-442	MT-445	MT-450	MT-460	MT-485	MT-487	MT-489	MT-534	MT-550	MT-577	MT-910	Total
Asian	5		9	13	11	39	53	23	1	18	17	31	220
Black	9	6	44	16	136	160	89	7	171	105	77	86	906
Hispanic	6		19	6	10	26	24	2	21	15	21	18	168
White	13	24	23	6	29	49	12	3	8	39	25	22	253
Native Amer					1	2				2	2	1	8
<b>Totals</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>1555</b>

Data for the numbers of linked trips surveyed by express route and by household income category were obtained from the Onboard Survey database (Table 2);

**Table 2** Surveyed Linked Trips by Route and by Household Income

	MT-439	MT-442	MT-445	MT-450	MT-460	MT-485	MT-487	MT-489	MT-534	MT-550	MT-577	MT-910	Total
\$10,000-\$14,999	2	2	10	2	28	30	19	2	41	32	25	14	207
\$135,000 and more	1	1	12	3	34	32	22		58	35	14	21	233
\$15,000-\$24,999	2	3	12	2	27	41	17	5	31	26	22	17	205
\$25,000-\$34,999	9	4	20	1	28	44	36		21	30	20	23	236
\$35,000-\$49,999	3	2	8	1	21	31	19	3	17	9	14	18	146
\$5,000-\$9,999	6	5	10	5	12	18	18	7	2	14	13	11	121
\$50,000-\$69,000	4	8	4	5	14	22	7	4	4	13	8	11	104
\$70,000-\$134,999	5	3	12	10	7	18	11	9	3	5	8	25	116
less than \$5,000			1	7	4	5	9	2	1	3	6	12	50
Totals	32	28	89	36	175	241	158	32	178	167	130	152	1418

- The percentages of surveyed linked trips by route and by ethnicity (Table 3), and the percentages of surveyed linked trips by route and by household income (Table 4) were then calculated;

**Table 3** Percentage of Surveyed Linked Trips by Route and by Ethnicity

	MT-439	MT-442	MT-445	MT-450	MT-460	MT-485	MT-487	MT-489	MT-534	MT-550	MT-577	MT-910	Total
Asian	15.15%	0.00%	9.47%	31.71%	5.88%	14.13%	29.78%	65.71%	0.50%	10.06%	11.97%	19.62%	14.15%
Black	27.27%	20.00%	46.32%	39.02%	72.73%	57.97%	50.00%	20.00%	85.07%	58.66%	54.23%	54.43%	58.26%
Hispanic	18.18%	0.00%	20.00%	14.63%	5.35%	9.42%	13.48%	5.71%	10.45%	8.38%	14.79%	11.39%	10.80%
White	39.39%	80.00%	24.21%	14.63%	15.51%	17.75%	6.74%	8.57%	3.98%	21.79%	17.61%	13.92%	16.27%
Native Amer	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.53%	0.72%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.12%	1.41%	0.63%	0.51%
Totals	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Table 4** Percentage of Surveyed Linked Trips by Route and by Household Income

	MT-439	MT-442	MT-445	MT-450	MT-460	MT-485	MT-487	MT-489	MT-534	MT-550	MT-577	MT-910	Totals
less than \$5,000	0.00%	0.00%	1.12%	19.44%	2.29%	2.07%	5.70%	6.25%	0.56%	1.80%	4.62%	7.89%	3.53%
\$5,000-\$9,999	18.75%	17.86%	11.24%	13.89%	6.86%	7.47%	11.39%	21.88%	1.12%	8.38%	10.00%	7.24%	8.53%
\$10,000-\$14,999	6.25%	7.14%	11.24%	5.56%	16.00%	12.45%	12.03%	6.25%	23.03%	19.16%	19.23%	9.21%	14.60%
\$15,000-\$24,999	6.25%	10.71%	13.48%	5.56%	15.43%	17.01%	10.76%	15.63%	17.42%	15.57%	16.92%	11.18%	14.46%
\$25,000-\$34,999	28.13%	14.29%	22.47%	2.78%	16.00%	18.26%	22.78%	0.00%	11.80%	17.96%	15.38%	15.13%	16.64%
\$35,000-\$49,999	9.38%	7.14%	8.99%	2.78%	12.00%	12.86%	12.03%	9.38%	9.55%	5.39%	10.77%	11.84%	10.30%
\$50,000-\$69,000	12.50%	28.57%	4.49%	13.89%	8.00%	9.13%	4.43%	12.50%	2.25%	7.78%	6.15%	7.24%	7.33%
\$70,000-\$134,999	15.63%	10.71%	13.48%	27.78%	4.00%	7.47%	6.96%	28.13%	1.69%	2.99%	6.15%	16.45%	8.18%
\$135,000 and more	3.13%	3.57%	13.48%	8.33%	19.43%	13.28%	13.92%	0.00%	32.58%	20.96%	10.77%	13.82%	16.43%
Totals	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

- The percentages of Line 577 and All Express Minority riders were compared, and the absolute and relative differences between these shares were calculated (Table 5); and

Table 5 Comparison of Minority Rider Shares

	MT-577	All Express
Minority Share	82.39%	83.73%
Absolute Difference	-1.34%	
Relative Difference	-1.6%	

- Finally, the percentages of Line 577 and All Express Low Income riders were compared, and the absolute and relative differences between these shares were calculated (Table 6).

Table 6 Comparison of Low Income Rider Shares

	MT-577	All Express
Low Income Share	50.77%	41.11%
Absolute Difference	9.65%	
Relative Difference	23.5%	

### 3. RESULTS

The Board of Directors has adopted thresholds for determining when disparate impacts and/or disproportionate burdens are imposed by a proposed action.

A disparate impact occurs when the absolute difference between the minority share of impacted riders and the minority share of similarly situated riders not directly impacted exceeds 5%, and/or the relative difference between the minority share of impacted riders and the minority share of similarly situated riders not directly impacted exceeds 35%.

A disproportionate burden occurs when the absolute difference between the low income share of impacted riders and the low income share of similarly situated riders not directly impacted exceeds 5%, and/or the relative difference between the low income share of impacted riders and the low income share of similarly situated riders not directly impacted exceeds 35%.

In the case of the proposed exemption of Line 577 from express premium charges, Table 5 shows that there is no disparate impact on minority riders from this action. Table 6 shows that there is an impact on low income riders, however, because this is a positive impact, no mitigation measures are required.

**ATTACHMENT B-3**

**Fare Equity Analysis  
Methodology & Results**

**Lines 190/194 & 270  
Discontinue & Replace with Foothill Transit  
January 2016**

Service Planning and Scheduling  
Civil Rights Programs Compliance

# Contents

1.	Proposal Overview .....	1
2.	Methodological Approach.....	1
	Data Sources.....	1
	Detailed Methodology.....	2
3.	Results.....	6



## **1. PROPOSAL OVERVIEW**

Metro currently operates two bus lines that are largely within the service area of Foothill Transit, a lower cost provider. Under consideration is discontinuation of these services by Metro, and assumption of their operation by Foothill Transit effective with the June 2016 Service Change Program. A fare equity evaluation is required because of differences between Metro's and Foothill's fare structures.

## **2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

A Title VI Fare Equity Evaluation is presented herein in accordance with the requirements of Federal Transit Administration Circular 4702.1B. The evaluation assesses whether or not there are disparate impacts on minority riders and/or disproportionate burdens on poverty riders arising from the proposed transfer of operational responsibilities.

This analysis derives bus rider minority and poverty populations by method of fare payment from the Spring 2015 Metro Customer Satisfaction Survey. These data are used to assign minority and poverty ridership shares to each method of payment in Metro's FY2015 Fare Mix data. A correspondence is established between Metro's methods of fare payment and those of Foothill Transit to establish, in each case, whether riders will pay more or less after the transfer of services. Finally, where there are significant differences between a payment method's minority or poverty shares and Metro's overall minority and poverty shares of riders a determination is made whether these constitute disparate impacts and/or disproportionate burdens.

### **Data Sources**

At least once per year Metro conducts a Customer Satisfaction Survey to assess ongoing rider perceptions of service quality, effectiveness, safety, etc. The Spring 2015 survey contains nearly 20,000 observations from riders including information about modal ridership, methods of payment, ethnicity, household size, and household income. The last two items allow determination of whether a rider met the thresholds for poverty established by the federal government.

Annually, following the close of the fiscal year, Metro compiles annual ridership data stratified by method of fare payment. This data is derived from a combination of modal ridership, farebox tabulations, TAP transactions, and prepaid media sales. The FY2015 Fare Mix report was used to obtain this data for this evaluation.

Finally, details of the pricing options afforded by each operator (fare structure) were compiled. This included determination of special considerations such as time of day or specific method of payment that might have a bearing on the amount paid.

## Detailed Methodology

Eleven methods of fare payment were specifically enumerated in the Customer Satisfaction Survey, but only seven of these were separately identified in the Fare Mix data for Metro. The payment methods from the survey and their relevance to Metro's Fare Mix data are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Correspondence of Customer Survey and Fare Mix Payment Methods

<b>Survey Payment Method</b>	<b>Fare Mix Method(s)</b>
Cash	81% Regular Cash 93% Eld/Dis Cash-Peak 93% Eld/Dis Cash-Off Peak 97% Stdnt Reduced Cash
Token	
Metro Xfer	
Interagency Xfer	Transfer (non-OCTA) Transfer-OCTA
Metrolink Xfer	
TAP Stored Value	19% Regular Cash 7% Eld/Dis Cash-Peak 7% Eld/Dis Cash-Off Peak 3% Stdnt Reduced Cash
TAP-Day Pass	Reg Day Pass Eld/Dis Day Pass
TAP-7-Day Pass	7-Day Pass
TAP-30-Day Pass	30-Day Pass Eld/Dis 30-Day Pass Student Pass College Pass
OCTA Pass	
TAP-EZ Pass	Regional Pass

The "Cash" methods of payment in the Fare Mix report included payment with actual cash as well as payment with a TAP Card having stored value. Source data for the Fare Mix report was analyzed to determine the percentage of boardings in each group that used each form of payment – those shares are shown in Table 1. Additionally, because a time of day price difference is offered to Elderly/Disabled riders, further analysis of source data determined that 73.4% of Elderly/Disabled "Cash" boardings occurred during the Off Peak.

For each of the seven payment methods from the Customer Satisfaction Survey with corresponding methods from the Fare Mix report annual bus boardings were obtained from the Fare Mix data. The observed minority and poverty shares of surveyed bus riders were then used to calculate the annual minority and poverty bus boardings for

each payment method. These were then summed to obtain systemwide minority and poverty bus boardings for all methods of payment combined from which an overall minority share of bus riders and poverty share of bus riders was calculated. (Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2 Determination of Minority Shares of Bus Riders

Survey	Metro Bus	Annual Bus Boardings	Annual Minority Boardings	Minority %
<b>Cash</b>		87,378,020	76,501,340	87.6%
	81% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	52,061,959		
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	5,982,300		
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	16,507,550		
	97% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	12,826,211		
<b>IA Xfer</b>		2,562,220	2,046,821	79.9%
	TRANSFER (non-OCTA)	2,366,724		
	TRANSFER OCTA	195,496		
<b>TAP-Stored Value</b>		14,301,536	11,159,300	78.0%
	19% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	12,212,065		
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	450,281		
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	1,242,504		
	3% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	396,687		
<b>TAP-Day Pass</b>		29,302,410	25,998,932	88.7%
	REG DAY PASS BRDGS	26,852,549		
	ELD/DIS DAY PASS BRDGS	2,449,861		
<b>TAP-7-Day Pass</b>	7 DAY PASS BRDGS	49,403,125	45,982,004	93.1%
<b>TAP-30-Day Pass</b>		91,428,226	81,828,547	89.5%
	30 DAY PASS BRDGS	23,972,914		
	ELD/DIS 30 DAY PASS BRDGS	41,163,219		
	STUDENT PASS BRDGS	17,806,822		
	COLLEGE PASS BRDGS	8,485,271		
<b>TAP-EZ Pass</b>	REGIONAL PASS BRDGS	7,684,111	6,579,614	85.6%
	<b>Mapped Totals</b>	<b>282,059,648</b>	<b>250,096,557</b>	<b>88.7%</b>

Table 3 Determination of Poverty Shares of Bus Riders

Survey	Metro Bus	Annual Bus Boardings	Annual Poverty Boardings	Poverty %
<b>Cash</b>		87,378,020	56,166,153	64.3%
	81% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	52,061,959		
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	5,982,300		
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	16,507,550		
	97% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	12,826,211		
<b>IA Xfer</b>		2,562,220	1,384,145	54.0%
	TRANSFER (non-OCTA)	2,366,724		
	TRANSFER OCTA	195,496		
<b>TAP-Stored Value</b>		14,301,536	6,280,073	43.9%
	19% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	12,212,065		
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	450,281		
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	1,242,504		
	3% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	396,687		
<b>TAP-Day Pass</b>		29,302,410	19,415,296	66.3%
	REG DAY PASS BRDGS	26,852,549		
	ELD/DIS DAY PASS BRDGS	2,449,861		
<b>TAP-7-Day Pass</b>	7 DAY PASS BRDGS	49,403,125	34,014,340	68.9%
<b>TAP-30-Day Pass</b>		91,428,226	55,079,800	60.2%
	30 DAY PASS BRDGS	23,972,914		
	ELD/DIS 30 DAY PASS BRDGS	41,163,219		
	STUDENT PASS BRDGS	17,806,822		
	COLLEGE PASS BRDGS	8,485,271		
<b>TAP-EZ Pass</b>	REGIONAL PASS BRDGS	7,684,111	3,689,728	48.0%
	<b>Mapped Totals</b>	<b>282,059,648</b>	<b>176,029,535</b>	<b>62.4%</b>

The next step was to establish a relationship between Metro’s methods of payment and Foothill’s methods of payment. This correspondence is presented in Table 4. Where there are differences in pricing the minority and poverty shares for the price group will be compared to the overall minority and poverty shares to determine whether a significant difference exists. In instances where Foothill does not offer a specific method of payment (shown is NA in Table 4), then other methods of payment applicable to a user of the payment method not offered would be looked at in order to determine whether the rider would be paying more or less than with Metro. Please note that the TRANSFER-OCTA payment method is not applicable to this analysis because such media are only accepted on Metro services operating within Orange County, and the lines being evaluated here do not do so.

Table 4 Metro & Foothill Pricing for Methods of Payment

Survey	Metro Bus	Metro Fare	Foothill Fare		
<b>Cash</b>					
	81% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	\$1.75		\$1.25	
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	\$0.75		\$0.50	
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	\$0.35		\$0.50	
	97% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	\$1.00		\$1.25	
<b>IA Xfer</b>					
	TRANSFER (non-OCTA)	\$.50/\$.25		\$.50/\$.25	
	TRANSFER OCTA	Not Applicable			
<b>TAP-Stored Value</b>					
	19% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	\$1.75	A	\$1.25	B
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	\$0.75	A	\$0.50	C
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	\$0.35	A	\$0.50	C
	3% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	\$1.00	A	\$1.25	B
<b>TAP-Day Pass</b>					
	REG DAY PASS BRDGS	\$7.00		NA	
	ELD/DIS DAY PASS BRDGS	\$2.50		NA	
<b>TAP-7-Day Pass</b>	7 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$25.00		NA	
<b>TAP-30-Day Pass</b>					
	30 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$100.00		\$70.00	D
	ELD/DIS 30 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$20.00		\$22.00	D
	STUDENT PASS BRDGS	\$24.00		\$33.00	D
	COLLEGE PASS BRDGS	\$43.00		\$33.00	D
<b>TAP-EZ Pass</b>	REGIONAL PASS BRDGS	\$110/\$42		\$110/\$42	
		Note A:	Free Transfer		
		Note B:	\$0.50 Transfer		
		Note C:	\$0.25 Transfer		
		Note D:	31-Day Pass		

### **3. RESULTS**

The Board of Directors has adopted thresholds for determining when disparate impacts and/or disproportionate burdens are imposed by a proposed action.

A disparate impact occurs when the absolute difference between the minority share of impacted riders and the minority share of similarly situated riders not directly impacted exceeds 5%, and/or the relative difference between the minority share of impacted riders and the minority share of similarly situated riders not directly impacted exceeds 35%.

A disproportionate burden occurs when the absolute difference between the poverty share of impacted riders and the poverty share of similarly situated riders not directly impacted exceeds 5%, and/or the relative difference between the poverty share of impacted riders and the poverty share of similarly situated riders not directly impacted exceeds 35%.

Table 5 shows the results of the comparisons of minority shares for each payment method to the overall minority share of riders. Significant differences could result in a Disparate Impact for riders using the applicable payment method.

Table 5 Identification of Possible Disparate Impacts

Survey	Metro Bus	Metro Fare	Foothill Fare	Minority Absolute Diff.	Minority Relative Diff.	Disparate Impact			
<b>Cash</b>									
	81% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	\$1.75	\$1.25	-1.1%	-1.3%				
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	\$0.75	\$0.50	-1.1%	-1.3%				
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	\$0.35	\$0.50	-1.1%	-1.3%				
	97% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	\$1.00	\$1.25	-1.1%	-1.3%				
<b>IA Xfer</b>									
	TRANSFER (non-OCTA)	\$.50/\$.25	\$.50/\$.25	-8.8%	-9.9%				
	TRANSFER OCTA	Not Applicable							
<b>TAP-Stored Value</b>									
	19% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	\$1.75	A	\$1.25	B	-10.6%	-12.0%	Yes	(1)
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	\$0.75	A	\$0.50	C	-10.6%	-12.0%	Yes	(1)
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	\$0.35	A	\$0.50	C	-10.6%	-12.0%		
	3% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	\$1.00	A	\$1.25	B	-10.6%	-12.0%		
<b>TAP-Day Pass</b>									
	REG DAY PASS BRDGS	\$7.00		NA		0.1%	0.1%		
	ELD/DIS DAY PASS BRDGS	\$2.50		NA		0.1%	0.1%		
TAP-7-Day Pass	7 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$25.00		NA		4.4%	5.0%		
<b>TAP-30-Day Pass</b>									
	30 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$100.00		\$70.00	D	0.8%	0.9%		
	ELD/DIS 30 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$20.00		\$22.00	D	0.8%	0.9%		
	STUDENT PASS BRDGS	\$24.00		\$33.00	D	0.8%	0.9%		
	COLLEGE PASS BRDGS	\$43.00		\$33.00	D	0.8%	0.9%		
TAP-EZ Pass	REGIONAL PASS BRDGS	\$110/\$42		\$110/\$42		-3.0%	-3.4%		
	Note A:	Free Transfer					Note (1):	non-Xfer only	
	Note B:	\$0.50 Transfer							
	Note C:	\$0.25 Transfer							
	Note D:	31-Day Pass							

Only two of the seven fare groups exhibited significant absolute differences in minority shares from Metro's systemwide minority share – Interagency Transfers and TAP-Stored Value. No group showed a relative difference in minority shares that was significant.

The significant difference in minority share for the Interagency Transfer payment group does not result in a Disparate Impact because riders in this group would not experience a price change. For riders in the TAP-Stored Value payment group there would not be a Disparate Impact on the ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak or STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS payment methods because the price increase for these riders would have an adverse impact on riders that are significantly less minority than Metro's overall ridership. However, riders using the REGULAR CASH BRDGS and ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak payment methods could experience a price reduction if they do not transfer which would result in a benefit to a group of riders significantly less minority than Metro's overall ridership; therefore, this results in a Disparate Impact. Riders using these payment methods who transfer would not realize a price reduction and would not experience a Disparate Impact.

Table 6 shows the results of the comparisons of poverty shares for each payment method to the overall poverty share of riders. Significant differences could result in a Disproportionate Burden for riders using the applicable payment method.



Table 6 Identification of Possible Disproportionate Burdens

Survey	Metro Bus	Metro Fare	Foothill Fare	Poverty Absolute Diff.	Poverty Relative Diff.	Disproportionate Burden			
Cash									
	81% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	\$1.75	\$1.25	1.9%	3.0%				
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	\$0.75	\$0.50	1.9%	3.0%				
	93% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	\$0.35	\$0.50	1.9%	3.0%				
	97% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	\$1.00	\$1.25	1.9%	3.0%				
IA Xfer									
	TRANSFER (non-OCTA)	\$.50/\$.25	\$.50/\$.25	-8.4%	-13.4%				
	TRANSFER OCTA	Not Applicable							
TAP-Stored Value									
	19% REGULAR CASH BRDGS	\$1.75	A	\$1.25	B	-18.5%	-29.6%	Yes	(1)
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak	\$0.75	A	\$0.50	C	-18.5%	-29.6%	Yes	(1)
	7% ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak	\$0.35	A	\$0.50	C	-18.5%	-29.6%		
	3% STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS	\$1.00	A	\$1.25	B	-18.5%	-29.6%		
TAP-Day Pass									
	REG DAY PASS BRDGS	\$7.00		NA		3.8%	6.2%		
	ELD/DIS DAY PASS BRDGS	\$2.50		NA		3.8%	6.2%		
TAP-7-Day Pass	7 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$25.00		NA		6.4%	10.3%	Yes	(2)
TAP-30-Day Pass									
	30 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$100.00		\$70.00	D	-2.2%	-3.5%		
	ELD/DIS 30 DAY PASS BRDGS	\$20.00		\$22.00	D	-2.2%	-3.5%		
	STUDENT PASS BRDGS	\$24.00		\$33.00	D	-2.2%	-3.5%		
	COLLEGE PASS BRDGS	\$43.00		\$33.00	D	-2.2%	-3.5%		
TAP-EZ Pass	REGIONAL PASS BRDGS	\$110/\$42		\$110/\$42		-14.4%	-23.1%		

Note A: Free Transfer

Note B: \$.50 Transfer

Note C: \$.25 Transfer

Note D: 31-Day Pass

Note (1): non-Xfer only

Note (2): more than 20 boardings in 7 days only

In this case, four of the seven payment groups exhibited significant absolute differences in their poverty shares from Metro's overall system average. No group exhibited relative share differences that were significant.

The Interagency Transfer and TAP-EZ Pass payment groups would experience no price change, so there is no Disproportionate Burden imposed upon these groups of riders. The TAP-Stored Value group has a significantly lower poverty share than Metro's overall ridership, so any benefit to members of this group would constitute a Disproportionate Burden. The ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Off Peak and STDNT REDUCED CASH BRDGS payment methods would experience price increases and no

Disproportionate Burden. However, the REGULAR CASH BRDGS and ELD/DIS CASH BRDGS-Peak payment methods would experience price reductions if such riders do not transfer. This would constitute a Disproportionate Burden because a benefit would accrue to a group of riders that have a significantly lower poverty share than Metro's overall ridership. If riders in these two categories were to transfer, then there would be no price reduction and no Disproportionate Burden.

Finally, the TAP-7-Day Pass group has a significantly higher poverty share than Metro's overall ridership, so an adverse impact on this group would constitute a Disproportionate Burden. Since Foothill does not offer a 7-Day Pass these riders would have to pay a cash fare each time they board. Twenty Foothill cash fares would equal Metro's 7-Day Pass price, so more than 20 base fare boardings on Foothill in a seven day period would constitute a price increase, and therefore an adverse impact on a group that has a significantly higher poverty share than Metro's overall ridership. This would be a Disproportionate Burden to these riders.

In summary, the analysis has found that there would be a Disparate Impact on Regular riders and Elderly/Disabled Peak riders who currently ride Lines 190/194 and/or Line 270 and pay their fare with a Stored Value TAP Card and do not transfer. Additionally, there would be a Disproportionate Burden imposed upon these same riders as well as on those riders who now use a Metro 7-Day Pass and board a bus more than 20 times a week.

An action which results in a Disparate Impact can still be carried out if (1) there is a substantial legitimate justification for the action, and (2) there is no alternative to the action having a lesser Disparate Impact and still accomplishing the goals of the action. In this instance the transfer of operating responsibilities from Metro to Foothill Transit saves scarce operating dollars while still providing service to the riders. There is no other mechanism for accomplishing this while maintaining current service levels. The Disproportionate Burden that results for some riders can be partially mitigated through reinvestment of cost savings into added service addressing needs elsewhere in Metro's service area.

**ATTACHMENT C**

**Line 51/52/352**

			COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
Date	Name	Comment	Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Supports	Against	Modify	Other
1/29/2016	Power, Max	Supports proposal.	X					1			
2/2/2016	Bonilla, Mark	New #752 should be instituted, in favor of replacing #352 and complementing #51 and #52: it would run between Downtown LA (Beaudry Av/5th St) and Artesia Transit Center through San Pedro Street and Avalon Boulevard. #52 would add additional peak service in favor of #352 being discontinued: chronologically, the stops would be	X							1	
2/4/2016	Drummond, J.K.	This brochure is deceptive about the 352. It says the 351 will serve all the limited stops that the 352 serves. No. The 352 serves the Harbor Gateway Transit Center, and that will be dis-served if it is substituted with the 351.				X		1	1		
<b>Total</b>								<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**Line 111/311**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY				
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Supports	Against	Modify	Other	
1/29/2016	Power, Max	Supports proposal.	X					1				
2/4/2016	Bazemore, Michael	I am against the taking away of the 311. I live by the 311 and 111, and I caught the 311 and 111 yesterday, and they are both slow --both slow and very overcrowded. I just -- I just hate the idea that during 2001 up to the present, all the limited bus line are leaving our community.				X			1			
2/6/2016	Benitez, Mario	I would like the option to use either Line 111 or Limited Line 311.				X			1			
2/6/2016	Lewis, Damar	I'm here for proposed -- regarding the 111/311. What I would like to see is -- you guys plan to discontinue 311. I would like to see service improved on the weekends, and I'd also like to see a rapid line during the weekdays, the 711. So on weekends, I would like to see every -- instead of every hour for LAX to every 15 minutes on Saturdays.				X			1	1	1	
<b>Total</b>									<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Lines 258 & 485

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Supports	Against	Modify	Other
1/24/2016	Alviti, Linda	<p>I strongly urge you to preserve current service (or even increase it) on bus lines 258 and 485. The 258 needs to run from Bay State, its current start point. Many people depend on this service along Main Street in Alhambra. Some transfer to the 485 to go to CSULA or downtown Los Angeles; some transfer to the 76, some continue on the 258 heading south. It would be very useful if it also ran on Saturdays and Sundays.</p> <p>The 485 is an extremely useful north-south bus line between Alhambra, Pasadena, and so on. In the other direction, it connects Alhambra with CSULA during the middle of the day, when there is no other service that does so. It also needs to remain at the current level of service, or increased service. It would be very helpful if the 485 ran on Saturdays and Sundays.</p> <p>To summarize, many different constituents use the 258 and 485 bus lines, across a broad geographical area, for school, work, and other purposes. Implementing your proposed changes to these lines would not be in their best interest, or in the interest of the cities of Alhambra or Los Angeles.</p>	X						1		
1/25/2016	Stine, Amber	I am opposed to Line 485 change because I commute to the Union Station and take this Line to CSULA followed by work in Alhambra. This change will add inconvenience or ability to even attend school.	X						1		
1/29/2016	Power, Max	Supports proposal.	X					1			
2/2/2016	Bonilla, Mark	Line 258, in addition to servicing CSULA, and replacing Line 485 to enhance connection to/from Line 79, should shorten on the southern end to Eastern Avenue & Union Pacific Avenue in Commerce. Service south of Telegraph Road would be replaced by Line 256 and service on Garfield Avenue between Firestone and Alondra Boulevards should be transferred to Montebello Line 30 if they express interest to backfill this portion of the corridor.	X					1			
2/4/2016	Drummond, J.K.	The combination of the 485 in with some other line, I don't think that's really practical at Cal State L.A.				X			1		
2/4/2016	Drummond, J.K.	In general though, without the maps, it's hard to figure out what is going on sometimes. If we knew more about it, the combination of the 485 in with some other line, I don't think that's really practical at Cal State L.A.				X			1		
2/4/2016	Truong, Jon	This change will require an additional transfer traveling to work for both my mom and I adding an addition 40 minutes to our commute times. Please do not discontinue the segment on Line 485 from CSULA to Downtown LA.	X						1		
2/5/2016	Fung, Hank	Support, provided span of service matches. Shortline trips between Cal State LA and Pasadena (Lake/Colorado) may be necessary after 7 pm, since Line 258 stops running at about 7 pm. I still advocate for a 10 pm trip northbound between Cal State LA and Pasadena to serve students after night classes, which could be done with the savings in cancelling duplicate service. Possibly reroute via Hellman during peak hours due to variability of traffic on eastbound 10 freeway during rush hour.	X					1		1	

**Lines 258 & 485**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Supports	Against	Modify	Other
2/6/2016	Perez, Mercy	Please keep the 485 Line. There is no other way for us to get to Union Station if we don't have the 485 Line on Valley and Fremont.				X		1			
2/6/2016	Zablen, Nate	As far as the 485, that also gives a continuous route between Los Angeles and South Pasadena, Alhambra, Pasadena -- a section that the Gold Line doesn't cover. I would continue with the 485.				X		1			
2/8/2016	McIntosh, Sonia	I don't understand it because you need one line going to USC Hospital on the freeway. People are hurt and sick and they need that line. We don't have weekend service. I walk six to eight blocks if I want to get home from Valley or Main Street in Alhambra because there's no buses out on Fremont anymore. You've taken everything away.				X		1			
2/8/2016	Meinert, Robert	Regarding the changes to lines 258/485: Are the frequencies going to be maintained or improved on a consolidated line? What is going to be the span of service? Currently, the 258 north last run is at Commonwealth & Fremont at 7:14. The 485 last run near that location is 9:20. I ask that the span of service be maintained to the 9 o'clock level as I work into the evening in that area.	X					1		1	
2/9/2016	Rhoads, Perry	I am concerned about the proposed 485 discontinued service from Union Station to Cal State LA. I am an Alhambra resident. I currently commute between Alhambra and Century City via the 485 and 534 Commuter Express. Will there be no other direct lines from Union Station to Alhambra via the HOV lane? I am aware that the 76 is an option, but this is a slow local bus that adds a lot of time to an already long commute. Discontinued service will also be a great inconvenience to Cal State LA students who ride this route to school. Please reconsider discontinuation of this line, or reduce service to morning and afternoon commutes if necessary. Thank you for your consideration.	X					1	1		
2/12/2016	Angulo, Suzanna	I catch bus line 258 Mondays through Fridays on Main Street at Garfield. Changing its route means I have to take more buses to reach my destination. Yes, I'm grateful to have other buses to ride, but isn't the whole idea to make bus riding easy?? Please keep bus line 258 as it is!	X					1			
2/12/2016	De Marco, Linda M.	Will service continue from Union Station to Alta Dena (Alhambra – Mission and Fremont) and returning to LA Union station from Mission to Fremont. If anyone takes the 485 at this time a Metro representative will see that this route/us is always filled. There are many people whose only means of getting to and from their place of work is this route. Discontinuing this route would be not only financial burden on passengers but make many of us very late for work causing written write ups. At the very least could you clarify or tell me what line from Union Station to Mission and Fremont and return Union Station about 15 passengers will be directed to take.	X							1	
2/12/2016	Merritt, Rosa	This proposed change would be a very poor decision and irresponsible to all of L.A. and Orange County commuter's. I take the bus from Union Station /Patsaouras Plaza and is full everyday especially between the early hours of 7:00, 7:30 and 8:10. It is actually only 10 minutes so taking that away would do so much more harm than good.	X					1			

Lines 258 & 485

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Supports	Against	Modify	Other
2/12/2016	Park, Samuel	I take this bus from Monday-thru Friday. It has been reliable source of transporation. I know there is not than many passegengers on 485, but many of them will lose their jobs.	X						1		
2/12/2016	Rodriguez, Jose M.	If MTA doesn't want to operate the route transfer it to LADOT, Commuter Express or Foothill Transit. We need the route and schedule the way it is on <b>175, 460</b> and <b>485</b> . We need the route 485 all day long Monday to Friday."					X		1		
2/13/2016	Fletcher, Jessica	I and many others take that bus every day to get to work. It is the only bus that will take us from Union station to Alhambra. It will be VERY hard to get to work every day. It makes it almost impossible to get to Alhambra I. It will also make all of us have to leave a tax 2 hours earlier.	X						1		
2/13/2016	Torres, Yolanda	Metro bus line 485 is the line I need daily. Please leave line 485	X						1		
2/13/2016	Wright, Wayne	Request that service south of Firestone be cancelled and that Montebello Bus Line #30 take over the service via Garfield so Garfield would be the true bus from Alhambra to Paramount and Long Beach Transit and Montebello Bus Lines would connect for the first time.	X							1	
<b>Total</b>							<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	

## Line 270

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
1/29/2016	Power, Max	Supports proposal.	X					1			
1/31/2016	Rosales, Consuelo	Please do not cancel Line 270.			X				1		
2/5/2016	Fung, Hank	I disagree that service is duplicative.	X						1		
2/6/2016	Cisneros, Yolanda	Losing Metro Line 270 would have a great impact on our whole family. It gets both me and my son-in-law to work and my grandchildren to Rio Honda College. I also use it to visit my mother in a Convalescent Home.	X						1		
2/6/2016	Groves, Alan	I work at Commerce Casino, and I hope you improve more frequent service on 270 line from Norwalk to Whittier.				X			1		1
2/6/2016	Raquel, Joe	I am the planning director with Foothill Transit. And should L.A. Metro decide to cancel Line 270, we will continue to operate the line at the same level and schedule.									1
2/6/2016	Tanaka, Duane	I was against this proposed change as I live in the city of Norwalk and often commute to Downtown Los Angeles.	X						1		
2/6/2016	Timberlake, B.	I just think that cutting out 270 north and south, which provides a real backbone route all the way into the San Gabriel Valley and into Pasadena, east of Pasadena, is really important. And relying upon these municipal operators is a foolish idea.				X			1		
2/7/2016	Hernandez, Fernando	I am here to protest the elimination of Line 270				X			1		
2/8/2016	Leon, Brandon	I'm a student attending Rio Hondo College. hopefully I can help you gain an understanding of how this can affect Rio Hondo College students. Currently about 80 percent of our students who rely on public transportation to get to school are using the Metro route 270. And use has more than doubled since 2007 from 660 users to 1,384. Specifically our Go Rio bus TAP card program is used predominantly by full-time students, and a disruption can seriously affect their academic standing, considering many of these students don't have any other way to get to school. I urge Metro officials if the Line 270 is canceled, to collaborate with another transit partner in order to provide a seamless transition that will ensure there are no delays in service that will affect our students.				X			1		1
2/8/2016	Najera, Emanuel	Pretty much what I'm seeing when I look at proposed changes is the continued assault of Metro, MTA, the county has on the San Gabriel Valley. 9 If these proposed buses, the 190 and the 194, the 270 are eliminated by Metro, the only bus that Metro will cover east of Pasadena will be the 64 and totally ignore the rest of the East San Gabriel Valley. And that's -- we should remember that next time they ask for money to raise our sales tax.				X					1
2/8/2016	Autney, William	I totally disagree with this. The reliability and the on-time-ness that Metro has versus Foothill is like Hatfields and McCoys. One is always on time and the other one -- well, you're lucky if you get one. I do a weekly TAP 4 card, but now I'm going to be forced to also purchase a Foothill weekly TAP card, because at times I take between two and three Metros.				X			1		



**Line 270**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/8/2016	Gutierrez, Timothy	The thing that I'm mostly concerned about is on the 190/194, 270, the east/west from Los Angeles to Covina, from Norwalk to -- to Monrovia, the fare cards, the TAP cards -- will they be -- use the same TAP card, Metro or Foothill, whichever you have - for both? Can you use Metro? Can you use Foothill on each? I have both TAP cards. I have only used Metro, only pay for Metro because I only use Metro. But in case I have to use Foothill, will my TAP card work for both? That's all.				X					1
2/8/2016	Hernandez, Javier	Read a quote from Supervisor Hilda Solis regarding Line 190/194 and the 270. She noted that she was aware of the proposed changes and familiar with many of the concerns by the community and that she will continue to accept input and comments from all stakeholders.				X					1
2/8/2016	Llerena, Patty	Line 270 is another bus that ends a little early at 7:30. I can't get to the station so I have to connect to another bus which is the Foothill. And, you know, it's true. They do come late and it's not a frequent bus. So I'm stressing and I'm pleading. Please don't discontinue Line 270.				X			1		
2/8/2016	Meinert, Robert	Regarding the 270, with the Gold Line coming online in March, good connectivity to Old Town Monrovia needs to be maintained. If you can't save the whole line (or transition to Foothill), consider maintaining the northern portion, as it is not duplicated & the only link directly into the Myrtle Av. corridor in Monrovia. It is 14 blocks from the Metro station. A suggestion would be to consolidate it with Line 79 in Arcadia as an extension serving the Monrovia Gold Line & the north corridor along Primrose in Old Town (reinstating Sunday service in that section).	X							1	
2/8/2016	Mendez, Gary	I ride the 270 line to get to Rio Hondo College where I've been a 60 member [sic] of the board of trustees there where I proposed the Go Rio program, which is a student self-subsidized program with various partners in order to increase ridership and accessibility to Rio Hondo College. Rio Hondo College has over 2,000 students who are on the Go Rio program, besides those who take it and pay out of their pocket. At one point three years ago, our students reported overcrowding on the 270 which led to the creation of Line 577 to provide increased service to El Monte. Route 270 continues to be heavily used. Today nearly 80 percent of our public transportation students take the 270. And the 270, as you may know, provides one of the only north and south going boundary or line of service east of downtown Los Angeles that connects our students to El Monte station, to the Green Line, to Metrolink and other areas. So it has been a feeder for our college for the last 25 years. If Metro decides to give this up, we hope that the various agencies that you get to participate make a commitment of service, create that connection to Rio Hondo College. But what I have to tell you is that Rio Hondo College has made a commitment to instill a culture of public transportation riders. So we hope you do what's best for the people. Thank you very much.				X			1		

Line 270

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/8/2016	Parra, Christopher	Currently the 270 is the only bus line that I can take that goes through Whittier. I -- I get on near the Presbyterian Hospital. It's the only way I can get up anywhere. I can't go down -- I can't go down on the Montebello buses because I can't afford it. It's the only bus that I can take that my bus pass actually works on. And hearing you guys say that it was going to be split between the Foothill and the Norwalk -- I can't use my bus pass on the Norwalk. I would end up having to fork over whatever amount of money that they charge as well as fork over money to the freaking Foothill Transits, which that bus sucks.				X			1		
2/8/2016	Phung, Austin	I'm a student at Cal Poly Pomona. I take the Silver Line and line 190 frequently, particularly at night when connections are really important. With the cancellation of lines 190 and 194, I'm concerned with the connections or time transfers that are currently in place. I'm also concerned with the quality of service once Foothill Transit takes over these lines. Foothill Transit has left me stranded and frustrated many times. When transferring from Metro to Metro, I can count on a transfer window of a few minutes, 23 maybe even two minutes. With Foothill, that would be a miracle even with a ten-minute window. And nothing fills me with greater dread than having to rely on Foothill for my daily commute. Their buses are constantly late and unpredictable, even with the use of Nextrip. Please do not discontinue lines 190/194 and 270. Thank you.				X			1		
2/8/2016	Sandoval, Eddie	And also for the 270, that would not be a smart move because right now I know it currently operates from Monrovia to Norwalk. If you guys were to give that line to another operator, they would probably end up splitting it altogether or demolishing the line. So please --please maintain the lines as the way they are now. Thank you.				X			1		
2/8/2016	Staples, Alex	I live in Norwalk and I go to college in Pasadena. I also work in Pasadena. So it's important for me to get from point A to point B at the El Monte station so I can then transfer to the 267 bus. And without the 270, it makes it nearly impossible to get to work or school, or even to visit with my grandmother who lives near the Monrovia area because the 270 also goes up there and sometimes I go visit with her. So it's kind of important to keep that bus 24 running, you know, just -- you know, it gets me to the places I need to go.				X			1		
2/8/2016	Strom, Henry	I disagree with this change because of the fact that the municipal lines that cover those portions of the 270 don't run at a service volume that's conducive to passenger ridership, particularly over the weekends. And those municipal operators may not necessarily be in a position to increase service to meet the demand. So I'll have to just very forwardly say that I do not support this change at all and I hope that you do retain the 270.				X			1		

Line 270

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/8/2016	Tirado, Tizoc	Tonight I'm here in support of my community and to oppose the closing of the lines 190/194 and 270. The 190 is the lifeline of my mother and father who are now in their 80s. And in the last decade, it has become their means of transportation for doctors' appointments, for shopping, for banking, for entertainment, all which they love for their independence. Discontinuing this doesn't make sense. About six months ago in 2015, a survey was conducted by the Metro by your very own blue ribbon committee. The 17 results revealed that more service was needed on the 190 and 194 lines. Why are these results not being validated or honored? That is my question to you.				X			1		
2/8/2016	Wu, Kai-Hsu	270 I rarely use. If you guys going to derail, fine. But if you're going to derail and reduce the bus service, then we should vote no on any measure. Raising a tax should be increasing the bus service, not decreasing the bus service. And I'm handicap. I'm visually impaired. So we should -- like me, those bus are very vital.				X			1		
2/11/2016	Castañeda-Calleros, Russell	I serve as a director of government and community relations at Rio Hondo College. I just want to let you know that almost 80 percent of our bus users use Route 270, and at one point about three years ago, our students reported overcrowding on 270, and that led to the creation of Line 577. And 270 continues to be heavily used even today. Our route numbers have shown that we've seen the numbers of students double from 2007 to 2014, and it continues to rise even to this time. And so, if Metro decides to discontinue Route 270, we just humbly ask and respectfully urge Metro officials to work with the other transit partners to provide a seamless transition so that there are no delays in service to our students. And I also urge the same stops and times to be used, as well. Any delays or interruptions, even if they're very brief, can disrupt the access our students have and jeopardize their academic success, and I thank you tonight for your consideration.									X
2/11/2016	Gutierrez, Jitro	I'm a student from Rio Hondo College, and I currently use the Line 270 on a daily basis. I'm the only one in my family to, actually, pursue college after high school, so it's just -- it's a big thing already, just being in college. 17 As of right now, public transportation is my only option to get into college and getting back home, and if the Line 270 were to be replaced by another line, it would be most beneficial to my schedule and to almost 80 percent of the bus users at Rio Hondo College if it were done -- if it were done with the least amount of effects including time and throughout the week, the days that those -- if the days would -- excuse me (sic). If the days weren't changed, that the schedule stay the same, it would be most beneficial to all of us.				X		X			X

**Line 270**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/11/2016	Kouster, Lisa	Line 270 drivers are forgetting to point out that what you really want is pretty much intact continuous continuation of your route. Just because you feel good that Norwalk or Foothill might take it over, I think that sounds good, too, but if they're only going to take over the little parts that they're already running on, that's not going to be a replacement. I like the 270, too. I ride it on the weekends. Discontinuing Metro 270 is a huge mistake. I go to Rio Hondo College and that bus line takes me there and takes me back home. If this line disappears I will be very upset.				X			1		
2/11/2016	Macias, Janet	I am here representing Rio Hondo College. Mostly, the students who use the public transportation, and currently our college has a program called Go Rio where they offer free bus rides to all full-time students. And so, you know, as a college student, that's a big relief, and the vast majority of these students, we use the Line 270. I personally use the Line 270 very heavily. I use it every day. Besides the Montebello, the 50, I use the 270, and it would just be great if, you know, the transition would be the same -- keep -- maybe keep the same, you know, schedules, 'cause you know, I have to get to college.				X		1			1
2/11/2016	Mr. Timberlake	I hope that -- I think it should be perfectly clear that the Line 270, all the way from the Green Line up to the extension of the Gold Line, needs to be in one single operator. And Foothill cannot do it, and certainly Norwalk Transit cannot do it. I have experience with both of those lines, with both of those muni operators. They do not provide the level of service of Metro, and they will not here. You cannot afford to cut that line in half. It needs to be one single operator all the way from the Green Line up to the extension of the Gold Line and Monrovia. It's ironic that at the last board meeting, the Metro Board passed a motion asking the staff to come up with a continuous link from Monrovia -- from the extension of the Gold Line south to the Green Line.				X			1		
2/11/2016	Olague, Dustin	Line 270 is always on time. It's a clean bus, and I enjoy riding it, and even today, I have a vehicle and a car. I still use the bus from time to time to, you know -- cause the rising gas prices, to reduce emissions and also stress. I enjoy taking the bus, 'cause, you know, driving is very stressful, and I enjoy it, and I just want to say thank you for letting me speak today and just think about saving the 270 Line.				X			1		

Line 270

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/11/2016	Parker, James	Real quickly, Norwalk Transit -- Jim Parker, Norwalk Transit, director of transportation. Norwalk presented a proposal endorsed by Foothill that we would operate -- Foothill would operate the northern portion of the route; Norwalk would operate the southern portion of the route. The concern about where that division occurs is still being discussed, but that -- in concept and in principle, both agencies are in support of that. We, along with Foothill, are acquiring new vehicles. Theirs are arriving sometime before the end of fiscal year, perhaps in June, likewise, with Norwalk, where we would have additional vehicles to support this service. This helps -- by doing this, you know -- and I'm not trying to be facetious, but yes. The Metro system is from the desert to the sea. I said that at many of their routes. So, no matter what you do, when you discontinue, you're gonna be entering different service reserve service areas for other transit systems when you eliminate some of these legacy routes. And we're trying to -- Foothill and Norwalk -- recognize and avoid any disputes in terms of competition or duplication when we make these kinds of proposals. It's just a matter of how that transition can occur. We've been copartners with Rio Hondo College as charter members of the Rio Go Rio Program. We support student transportation day one. So we are also recognizing that we do need to commit, so does Foothill, to any of this -- any part of this proposal that could be approved, and Foothill -- I can't speak for them, but I know I've heard they have that commitment, so does Norwalk. We've had these conversations. So there could be a benefit to this. We look at this in a long-term solution. So we hope you will support our proposals. Thank you very much.				X		1			1
2/13/2016	Corona, Anthony	First, of all I want to thank you guys for providing such a great bus service too your customers. On the other hand i am very disappointed to hear that metro wants to cancel bus routes. Metro, should not cancel lines such as 190, 194, and 270 because so many people depend on these lines. Hard working people, college students, and elderly people depend on these very important bus routes.	X						1		
<b>Total</b>							<b>3</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	



**Line 460**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/5/2016	Fung, Hank	Continue service due to Green Line maintenance issues and as a backup for frequent Blue Line service outages/private vehicle collisions which impact service. Reroute night service (after 8 pm) via I-605 and SR-91 to Harbor Gateway Transit Center and coordinate schedules on I-110 corridor to allow for 20 minute night service on the I-110 corridor between Downtown Los Angeles (7th/Figueroa) and HGTC.	X						1	1	
2/5/2016	Tran, Current	I use Line 460 between Downtown LA and Norwalk. Please do not cancel.			X				1		
2/5/2016	Truong, Terrisa	I have used Line 460 from Downtown LA to Norwalk for the last 15 years to get to work at night time. If I have to take the Blue Line at night I fear for my safety. Please do not cancel.			X				1		
2/6/2016	Grimes, Martin	Line 460 has help me travel to Anaheim more quickly and efficiently. I used to take the blue line and green, but don't like taking those train lines. The reason why it takes longer time travel on 2 trains, and easier to take one bus that cut right through that. Also for me I just have to take 1 REDLINE train and 2 buses just to get to Anaheim, instead of taking multiple trains and buses. Please don't change the route 460 bus line, and leave it the way it is.	X						1		
2/6/2016	Hernandez, Fernando	I am here to protest on the elimination between Downtown LA and Norwalk.				X			1		
2/6/2016	Rivera, Julio	This will require two transfers and it will take longer.				X			1		
2/6/2016	Tanaka, Duane	I was against this proposed change as I live in the city of Norwalk and often commute to Downtown Los Angeles.	X						1		
2/6/2016	Zablen, Nate	We would like to continue with the 460. That segment is very important because the 460 is the only express route, one-seat ride between Los Angeles and the most important tourist attraction in the world, probably, Disney World, Disneyland. Continue with it. Maybe you can improve that route. But the only other option to go one seat, one ride is to get to LAX and take Anaheim Resort, which is wonderful, but it's about \$20 or so. So please continue with that segment of the 460.				X			1		
2/7/2016	Reich, Denise	Removing the segment of the 460 route between Norwalk station and Downtown LA will provide a severe hardship for many. To reach Downtown LA without the 460, passengers will be forced to take the Green Line to the Blue or Silver Line. This makes the journey considerably longer, especially when one factors in the wait time for each of these connections. This would also adversely affect the many Angelenos who work at Disneyland and rely on the 460 to get to work. Direct bus service is important. Being able to reach a destination directly.	X						1		
2/8/2016	Cobos, Sabrina	I use 460 to get to Disneyland...please do not change.		X					1		
2/8/2016	Funk, Hank	With regard to the 460 -- and that's something that's not in your area, but that's a regional route that serves a lot of people in the area, connecting Norwalk to downtown Los Angeles. So therefore, we are opposed to that 460 being terminated at Norwalk because now you're adding additional transfers and additional unreliability.	X						1		
2/8/2016	Harminto, Johannes	I hope the line 460 from Downtown LA - Disneyland will not be discontinued, this is the only Metro bus that have easy, cheap & enjoyable connection to Disneyland for family/people from Downtown LA..	X						1		

**Line 460**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/9/2016	Borricano, Leonila	I commute this bus line every single day from Norwalk to Los Angeles since I no longer drive long distances anymore. This bus line is essential for me to get to work since I would have no other means of getting there.	X						1		
2/9/2016	Nicholas, Pete	I think it shortsighted and disadvantageous to the Greater L.A. tourist business and governmental revenues to eliminate the Downtown L.A. to Norwalk connections heading to Disneyland & Disney California Adventure parks. Creating another transfer impediment for Downtown L.A.-based tourists (growing by leaps and bounds with Downtown and its many new hotels) will just tend to send tourists away to Orange County and Anaheim-adjacent hotels. Continuation of current connections would allow stayers at Downtown hotels to BOTH visit studios AND visit the Disney parks.	X						1		
2/10/2016	Eddie	I'm a student at Los Angeles Trade Tech College. I'm here this evening to express my concern about the discontinued route segment on Line 460 between Norwalk Station and Downtown L.A. If this decision gets implemented, it will affect me as well as many other riders that utilize this bus line. Many of the passengers that board in Orange County end up riding into Los Angeles anyways. Why would you want to force passengers to have to make unnecessary extra time consuming connections? Also, the final 460 trip arrives at Norwalk Station at 1:23 a.m. How am I supposed to get to Downtown L.A. when the final Redondo Beach train leaves at 12:50 a.m.? Please make the right decision and don't leave riders stranded late at night in Norwalk, and keep Line 460 the way it is.				X			1		
2/10/2016	Lucero, Richard	Some of us live in the Valley. Some of us live in other parts of L.A. We catch buses, and we also catch the bus back to work. That's my real big concern. And what if you guys decide to cut the 460, what now? That line from L.A. to Norwalk, I know it's not too much, but in the morning, we catch it. Evening times, we catch it. Evening, come back out, and we also have guests that do ride that line a lot. So, if you guys want to make changes on the 460, you might as well cancel the whole line, and like I said, if you want to transfer the OCTA, congratulations. They're not going to do it. LADOT won't do it. So my suggestion is, please, keep the 460 as it is now, please.				X			1		
2/10/2016	Solis, Christian	I'm here for the Line 460. I very disagree with that, that change to L.A. to Downtown L.A. to Norwalk. I been that line for three years because I am 25 very ridiculous about this change. I don't really agree about this change because I -- for three years I head to Orange County and Disneyland, as well, and head Orange County because I want to get to Orange County, through my mom, and head to the beach in Costa Mesa and head back -- go back home to Downtown L.A., and I don't -- I don't agree with that change.				X			1		



**Line 460**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/11/2016	Canning, Kelley	Disabled and senior 460 Line riders depend on the service to and from Norwalk Downtown. Traversing stairs or elevators to the train platform are very challenging 'cause they have impaired mobility. The 460 bus kneels. They can get on it. They go straight Downtown. They don't have to get off to transfer to a train, to another train, to a bus. Students and faculty of USC and USC Hybrid High School who commute on the line would have increased commute time, because instead of taking a single bus, which is very efficient and very safe, they, again, have to take one train, two trains, a bus, a shuttle, maybe even three trains to get where they need to go. When you review the comments gathered for the 460 Line patrons, there's two overwhelming things: Safety and efficiency. The 460 bus gives us both. Thank you for your time.				X			1		
2/11/2016	Andrade, Mariana	I want to say at least a little over 60 percent are using this bus line in our community from Los Angeles to La Mirada, too, and this is the main line that they use. We currently have 115 employees that are enrolled in the TAP card with you. We also have employees that are waiting because we have a contract that we're renegotiating with MTA, with you. So we're currently -- most of our employees, I want to say at least a little over 60 percent are using this bus line in our community from Los Angeles to La Mirada, too, and this is the main line that they use.				X			1		
2/11/2016	Borup, Stan	I, along with many other people, rely upon the 460 bus line to get to and from work. The 460 line is a straight shot to downtown L.A. I am fully aware that I can take the green line to the blue line, but due my handicap and using a cane, the transfer is sometimes difficult. The morning Silver Line buses from the Green Line are generally full and I have to stand. People are rushing to their trains and busses as they push their way during the rush. I don't need to be pushed or tripped. Also, the escalators and elevators frequently don't work. By discontinuing the 460 bus line to L.A., it will be a hardship for me. The morning Green and Blue line trains are very crowded and many times I can't get a seat. The same applies to going home after work.  If you don't have enough riders during off peak hours, maybe you can keep this line during peak hours. When I do take the bus to work in the morning and home in the evening, it is always full and people I frequently have to stand.	X						1	1	
2/11/2016	Cruz, Helen	I like the 460, and I hope they don't cancel the 460 'cause it's a lot more easier for us to get on that bus. Although, the bus do have a lot of passengers on the early morning or later after, like, 6:00 or 6:30, it gets really bad. We have a couple of people standing up there, too, you know. So I hope they don't take it away.				X			1		

**Line 460**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other
2/11/2016	Kouster, Lisa	The train -- the word "train" is being used like a euphemism. Okay. We can take the train. So we think train, it runs fast. No. Green Line and Blue Line do not run like the Subway or Red Line. Do not pretend that they do. Two or three transfers is not an equal replacement to 460 express service. The Silver Line already is at -- packed closed to capacity, and it is, really, routed too differently to be considered equal service.				X		1			
2/11/2016	Means, Daniel	I work as editor with the Los Angeles Times, and it's shocking that I heard that you're gonna cancel that part going to Downtown, because it's a moneymaker. You know, not only do people pay fare, they're adding .75 for that little quickness because two years ago, I used to get off the bus because it was too crowded, and I was taking the Blue Line -- I mean, the Green Line to the Blue Line, and it would add an extra hour before I got to work. Yeah. Think about that, an extra hour. So to cancel this doesn't make sense.				X		1			
2/11/2016	Mr. Raymond	Patron states that he's a regular rider on line 460 late at night. Patron objects to the proposal to discontinue the segment of the 460 route from downtown Los Angeles to Norwalk Green Line Station. He contends that late at night the replacements referred to as Silver Line, Silver Line Express, Blue and Green Line don't have connections to get him to downtown L.A. Patron boards line 460 that departs Disneyland at 12:15 a.m. and arrives in downtown L.A. at 1:54 a.m.					X	1			
2/12/2016	Cruz, Helen	1) Keep services from Disneyland to Norwalk Station ONLY , and pick up passengers at Norwalk Station coming from downtown and head back down Disneyland, (some riders do work around Disneyland area and it's there only transportation that they rely on. 2) Keep services from ONLY Downtown LA to Norwalk Station so riders can catch its connection some passengers do either live around the area of Downtown or works. Respectfully request that the 460 will not be discontinued.	X					1	1		
2/12/2016	Kaster, Lisa	Please do not cancel or eliminate the 460 route north of the Norwalk I605/405 Green Line Station. No other equivalent express service exists. The 460 is safer than the trains.	X					1			
2/12/2016	Mayer, Steve	Reducing service on Line 460 will add travel time to people's commute, which is unbelievable that you would do it to those who use the service.			X			1			
2/12/2016	Miranda, Juan	I have a couple questions regarding the future of Line 460. American Apparel who is one of our Annual TAP clients contacted us because they received the attached notice of a public hearing in which Line 460 would be discussed. They are concerned because they have a factory in La Mirada and most some of their employees use Line 460 to get to and from work. They mentioned that if this line gets cancelled they would obviously have no need for their Metro passes.	X							1	

**Line 460**

Date	Name	Comment	COMMENTS					CATEGORY				
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Support	Against	Modify	Other	
2/12/2016	Mrs. Thomas	I am sending this email on behalf of a bunch of us that ride bus line 460, we had a representative at your town hall meeting yesterday. She gave us feed back of your intentions on bus 460. The reasons was well taken but we are compelled to offer a suggestion that could render a win win outcome and that is: Divide the route into two routes meaning run one line from Disneyland to Norwalk station and the second (a different line) line from Norwalk to LA. This way there will be a shorter turn around for both routes instead of the long route of LA to Disneyland. Speaking for my co-commuter friends, we will appreciate your understanding in this matter and putting the needs of your customers first.	X						1	1		
2/12/2016	Rodriguez, Jose M.	Route <b>460</b> needs to stay the way it is. It is the only bus going from downtown to Knots Berry Farm and Disneyland. Route 485 is important too. It is the only way from Union Station to Cal State L.A. Route 258 is not replacing the whole route. Buses get full from Cal State L.A. to Union Station due to students. If MTA doesn't want to operate the route transfer it to LADOT, Commuter Express or Foothill Transit. We need the route the route and schedule the way it is on 175, 460 and 485. We need the route 485 all day long Monday to Friday."					X		1			
2/12/2016	Rodriguez, Jose M.	If MTA doesn't want to operate the route transfer it to LADOT, Commuter Express or Foothill Transit. We need the route and schedule the way it is on <b>175, 460</b> and <b>485</b> . We need the route 485 all day long Monday to Friday."					X		1			
2/13/2016	Meyers, Bill	I am having trouble understanding the assertion of the planning staff regarding this line. The staff asserts that "THRU passengers account for 25% of the total boardings". But that's not the case. Based only on the figures given on chart 22 presented at the Regional Hearing on February 6, THRU passengers account for 58% of the total boardings or alightings. See the attached worksheet for a different analysis. Discontinuing the downtown leg forces those users to make unnecessary transfers especially if the riders are coming or going to points beyond Downtown like Hollywood, the Westside, and San Fernando Valley. Making this reduction is like giving away the crown jewels. I think you should reconsider this change at least pending further study.	X						1			
2/13/2016	Wright, Wayne	I ask that this change be put on hold for a year for the following reasons: 1. Operators relieving 460 operators would have to drive nearly 25 miles from Division 1 and it will be time consuming and make buses late. 2. Late night connections would be a problem if transferring from the Green Line only am few buses run 24 hours every hour on the , every hour except for Line 204 on Vermont, whioch runs every 30 minutes for owl service. 3. You have no later service on the Blue & Green Lines after 1am except Friday & Saturday nights. 4. Plain and simple the pieces are not connecting with the 460 alternative night services & would require major transfers which would be time consuming and a headache. I request Service Development do a round of workshops on how to deal with the 460.	X						1		1	
<b>Total</b>									<b>1</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>

Line 577

Date	Name	Comment	SOURCE					CATEGORY			
			Email	Comment Card	Letter	Oral	Social Media	Supports	Against	Modify	Other
1/29/2016	Power, Max	Supports proposal.	X					1			
2/5/2016	Fung, Hank	Santa Anita/Garvey and Peck/Garvey do not have left turn signals and Garvey is often congested during peak hours due to I-10 spillover traffic, requiring additional time for turning movements. I suggest use Santa Anita and Rush instead of Garvey. Add a stop at Santa Anita/Rush to serve South El Monte (long gap between stops). Renumber to 777 to reduce confusion about express nature of route.	X							1	
2/8/2016	Rodriguez, Richard	As respect for the 577, I was wondering if it can be extended to Orange County, namely Seal Beach. And I have the map if you want to see it. That's all.				X				1	
<b>Total</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	