

Friday, September 10, 2010

9:30am

---

# MINUTES

South Bay Governance Council

Regular Meeting

Congresswoman Juanita Millender-  
McDonald Community Center  
801 E. Carson Street, Room 209 A/B  
Carson, CA 90745

Call to Order at 9:30am

Council Members:

Ralph Franklin, Chair  
John Addleman, Vice Chair - absent  
Devon Deming  
James Goodhart  
Rena Kambara - absent  
Lou Mitchell  
Robert Pullen-Miles  
Kim Turner  
Don Szerlip

---

Officers:

Jon Hillmer, Director Governance Council  
Richard Morallo, Community Relations Mgr.  
Suzanne Handler, Council Secretary

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Safety Tip
  - Lt. Obermeyer: park in well lit areas, keep your doors locked
4. Public Comment for items not on the agenda

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS OF PUBLIC INTEREST WITHIN  
COUNCIL'S SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

Public Comment:

**Michael Bazemore:** has rode Line 442 since 1980, almost 30 years; right now it is running very well. The 5 months prior was not so good with buses not showing up or broken down. Now new buses have improved the service. How come it was not doing this 5 months prior? We want to stop elimination of the route, and get our full route back from South Bay Cities to downtown LA, and leave it alone for 2 years, because it is doing well. We lost some riders but now we are gaining more riders. Eliminating this bus line would be a travesty.

**Chair Franklin:** The 442 is still under review by the Metro board. Anyone who rides that bus may want to reach out to the board members I have received a number of e-mail messages from riders on the 442 and I will make sure it gets forwarded to the Metro Board so they will have it in their records as well.

**Barbara Lott-Holland:** I am co-chair of the BRU and I am here today because MTA staff is recommending cutting 3 of the rapid buses in South Central LA, the 753, the 711 and 715. We are asking you to recommend to the MTA staff that they give these lines the resources that are needed. If they were running the timetable that a rapid bus should run then they would see an increase in ridership. It's running every 30 to 45 minutes and that is not what we bus riders consider a rapid bus. Seven of the 13 lines that are slated to be cut are in South LA and Southeast LA. South LA already suffers from some of the worst service in the county and these cuts will only exacerbate already devastating conditions in some of the poorest and working class black and Latino communities. These cuts constitute civil rights violations as MTA continues to raise the fare and cut service and it can not deny that this budget has grown from the stimulus package to the state transportation assistance fund. And yet they continue to take funds from the buses to build rail projects that they do not even have the money to operate. We are again asking you to recommend to the MTA staff they do a current economical and equity analysis. Then apply this to the cuts. Today I have copies of over 900 signatures that we have gotten from people that are riding these lines.

We did submit to the MTA however they indicated to us that they did not get them, so we have sent them again but we would also like to leave this with you today. Thank you.

**Chair Franklin:** This time was for public comment for items not on the agenda.

**Wayne Wright:** Again my topic is on Line 212 / 312 limited, and my request is to have line 312 go back to AM/PM peaks only and eliminate the all day service so Line 212 runs more frequently. Line 312 is causing the 212 to be late. Line 312 passengers must walk two blocks west of the Metro Red Line Station at Hollywood/Highland, catch the bus at Hollywood/Sycamore in front of the CVS drugstore as well as the 212 after 7 pm. Between 6 and 7 pm NB 212 passengers have to wait nearly 50 minutes because the 212/312 NB starts running at 30 minute headway. The last 312 leaves Hawthorne Station at 6:09 pm and it should stop 30 minutes earlier. Passengers have to wait until after 7 pm to board a 212 and when it does come after 7 pm it is extremely overcrowded. Please reduce the 312 and reinvest back into the 212.

**JK Drummond:** MTA has a hostile day pass policy and does not publicize the day pass to potential new riders including tourists. There is a tremendously under publicized way that occasional riders can get a one day pass. You can go to Ralphs or one of the places that sells the Transit Access Pass (TAP). You can load it on board the bus as a day pass. But I just do not see anyone doing it. There is a wonderful international hostel in San Pedro, and I frequently meet misguided foreigners. MTA gives really rotten directions taking them out of their way. I did buy a number of TAP cards at Ralphs and donated them to the American Youth Hostel International in San Pedro. You can use the TAP card on any bus and load a day pass for \$6.

I would like to see the council resume their trip reports. The new Line 445 schedule is in black ink which is good, however it could be improved. They do not list the Arts district or Little Tokyo Gold Line Station on the downtown inset map. Also the Artesia Transit Center inset map still omits the 190<sup>th</sup> / Victoria and Figueroa intersection, the place where you can transfer to the Line 52 and the Line 130 eastbound. You can save time by transferring here instead of at the Transit Center. These little omissions in these schedules and maps hurt ridership and make it more difficult. They are not user friendly.

**Chair Franklin:** That closes the public comment

5. APPROVE Minutes from July 9, 2010 meeting - Approved
6. RECEIVE Director's Report, Jon Hillmer
  - July Performance Report

MTA's on-time-performance report goal is 80%, system-wide we are at 75.1%;

Complaints per 100,000 passengers, goal is 2.5; system-wide it is 2.9;  
Miles between Mechanical road calls the goal is 3,664, system-wide it is 3,483;  
Accidents per 100,000 miles the goal is 3.14, system-wide is 3.08; and  
Bus ridership the target is 29,400,000, system-wide is 29,620,000.

South Bay Cities performance Division 5 and 18  
On-time-performance report: target 80%, July 73.6%  
Complaints per 100,000 passengers: target 2.7, July 3.01  
Miles between Mechanical road calls: target 3,635, July 3,912  
Accidents per 100,000 miles: target 3.45, July 2.97  
Bus Ridership: target 7,340,000, July 6,860,000

South Bay Cities is showing improvement in On-time Performance:  
Customer Complaints are down slightly;  
Miles Between Mechanical road calls are up which is good;  
Accidents are down both for the system and South Bay Cities; and,  
Bus Line Ridership is down system-wide, South Bay Cities did not drop very  
much from June figures.

Rail Ridership monthly trends:  
Red line is slightly up from 4,000,000 riders per month, and steady;  
Blue Line is steady at over 2,000,000;  
Green line is steady at 1,000,000; and,  
Gold Line with the eastside extension has risen considerably from 500,000 to  
1,000,000.

Preliminary estimate on fare increase impact: Using July 2009 to July 2010 the  
Metro Bus system ridership showed a decrease of 3.2% during the weekdays;  
Saturday ridership decreased by 1.9% and Sunday decreased by .9%.  
The rail increased by 0.1% during the weekdays, increased by 5.1% on Saturday  
and increased on Sunday by 4.3%.

- Silver Line Ridership

Silver Line trend is upward for both daily and weekends. Pattern on ridership  
from El Monte Station to Artesia Transit Center shows ridership peaking on the  
El Monte Busway, then the buses distribute passengers through downtown Los  
Angeles while picking up riders going to the South Bay Cities. And vice a versa,  
boardings at the Artesia Transit Center are 750 or more and it also distributes  
through downtown Los Angeles. Trip by trip data is available and could be sent  
to interested council members.

**Action:** e-mail trip data on Silver Line to council members

- Revenue from advertising

Advertising Revenue, how much money does Metro garner from our advertising on the buses and trains:

FY 09	23.6 million;
FY 10	25.6 million; and,
FY 11	28.0 million (estimated).

The percent of the budget is nominal at .8%, .7% and .7% respectively. We have expanded our advertising to include rail cars and other locations that help the revenue to go up. Nationwide, and particularly in Southern California advertising dollars are down.

- Meet and Confer with Art Leahy

The Meet and Confer with Art Leahy on September 30 at 10 am on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor Wilshire Conference Room. We will have a different format for questions; we are asking that each council propose 2 questions for discussion. After the meeting we are organizing a tour of our facilities: Bus Operations Control; Customer Relations, Regional Rebuild Center, and Division 10. The tour will begin at approximately 11:30 am and end at 2:00 pm. Lunch will be provided. An e-mail will be sent with further instructions.

**Chair Franklin:** Any questions or comments?

**Representative Goodhart:** One of the things that I would ask about is our customer complaint trends, I trust that you analyze complaints by category so you can determine highest number of complaints to the lowest?

**Director Hillmer:** The complaints/commendations come in and they are placed in 25 different categories. We do have a high number of pass ups that tend to be the higher number that comes in. I can provide more detail showing the breakdown by category. I will put them in common format.

**Representative Goodhart:** That would be helpful. This is the one area even though the trend is down, attitude of the operators/staff is important to the riders so it would be helpful to understand where complaints are higher.

**Action:** Bring the breakdown of complaints to October meeting

**Representative Szerlip:** On your performance measures on South Bay Cities versus the system-wide, why are the measures in certain categories for South Bay Cities different than the full system?

**Director Hillmer:** Actually there are different standards set for different divisions, based on past performance in a variety of categories. We have the same on-time-performance measure even though we have very different on-time-performance by line and division.

Our expectations are for the service to be reliable, and Mr. Leahy has established 80% for all. Most of our other categories recognize the trend at each operating division, and we are trying to move that trend in a positive direction.

**Chair Franklin:** I have a couple of comments.

- Identification of accidents per 100,000 miles causes concern for public safety. We need to know more about crime with the heightened publication of homicides or fatalities on bus lines. I want to find out how many there are, whether it is monthly or annually, and do we need to reevaluate the speed or some kind of safety mechanism so we can avoid the tragedies that seem to occur.
- I also want to address the disconnect between the cities and Metro on being able to work together. We need a team effort of safety at bus stops. I am concerned that there have not been any reports regarding assaults at the bus stop. Is that something we need to be made aware of? Metro provides funding for cities to help oversee these bus stops and if we are not doing our job as cities we need to know that, because we get that information from the riders that the stops are unsafe. The same thing, once you are inside the bus, we need to know if there are any reports of assaults.
- Park and Ride locations, we need to know the number of burglaries or break-ins of vehicles that are left unattended while riders use the Metro service.
- Reach out to the board members later to find who will be attending the Meet and Confer meeting with Art Leahy. Let us know your questions so we can make sure Art Leahy addresses our concerns in the South Bay Cities, whether you go or not. Please forward questions for Art Leahy to me and I will take a consensus and we will ask the questions that get the most votes.

**Action:** bring to council crime reports on buses and at bus stops, also statistics on types of accidents i.e., pedestrian or auto.

**Chair Franklin:** The concerns brought up during public comment in August reflected safety at the bus stops. Talking about transferring and waiting in the evening at dangerous, unlit bus stops, there is a heightened concern about my well-being at a bus stop especially when dealing with the homeless and drug addicts in the area of Figueroa and Manchester. Where is Metro showing any kind of compassion to me as your rider. I need the level of confidence and comfort knowing that I am safe going to and from using your lines. That was repeatedly brought out in the public hearing. I do not see anything noted in the staff report. I know the money is there for public safety; we just have to make sure that it is being used appropriately.

**Representative Goodhart:** Much like customer complaints and we get into the detail of crime that the Chairman has outlined it would be helpful to understand what Metro has done in response to that information and/or the sheriffs department or local police agencies. Just having the data is not really adequate; it is more important to understand what is being done about crime and safety.

**Chair Franklin:** Reading my watch commander reports for the Inglewood police department, I have noticed on more than one occasion the funding has been made available by Metro. We ask our police to ride the bus in plain clothes. We have a black and white in the vicinity and they have removed several individuals on the bus that were creating a disturbance. It does work.

JK Drummond, member of the public, asked if the Meet and Confer with Art Leahy is for council members only. Is it closed to the public? Mr. Hillmer responded that it is open to the public.

7. APPROVE Recommended Service Changes for December 2010, Scott Page, Operations Planning Manager

- On August 13, we had our public hearing, we had 17 people speak, 12 were comments regarding the changes that were before us and 5 were regarding Line 44442 and other issues. We also received 140 comments by e-mail and fax.

First I would like to go through the changes and staff recommendations. The changes were to restructure or discontinue poor performing routes that had 20 boardings or less per revenue service hour. That would be Line 202, where we would discontinue AM and PM peak trippers and keep the rest of the service; Line 439 was up for cancellation; Lines 607 and 608 were up for reduction and cancellation, respectively, and Line 626 had 2 proposals: (1) out right cancellation of Line 626, or (2) fold the route of 626 into Line 625 with route modification. The second area we discussed were the rapid lines and right sizing rapid corridors to meet service performance. In this particular area we had proposed to cancel Line 711 on Florence and Line 715 on Manchester and Firestone.

Line 202, again we proposed to discontinue the short line trips and leave the base service in the AM and PM creating a one-hour headway as opposed to a half-hour headway. We had one comment in support, 2 opposed and 0 modified. The staff recommendation is to discontinue the short line trips leaving hourly service.

For Line 439, we had 3 comments in support, 35 opposed, and 4 to modify. On Line 439 we had proposed cancelling this line completely, then we had some very good public input relative to the opening of the Exposition light rail so staff is recommending to continue operating this line in the AM and PM peaks only and not in the mid-day and not on Saturday, Sunday or Holidays. Also the route will be shortened to run only from downtown LA to Fox Hills Mall. The key point is it will continue operating until the Expo Line opens. When the Expo Line opens we will then discontinue Line 439 and extend Line 217 south to Fox Hills Mall.

For Line 607, staff recommends discontinuing counter clockwise service on Line 607 and maintaining the clockwise service. For Line 608 we recommend

cancellation. Line 608 is a shuttle in the Crenshaw/Leimert area where we had one comment in support of cancellation, 2 opposed and 0 modified.

For Line 625 we had two proposals; 1) to combine the 626 with the 625 however the segment south of Imperial is heavily duplicated by Line 232, the Torrance bus and Beach Cities Transit Line 109. So we had a 2<sup>nd</sup> proposal to cancel the 626 and extend some Line 625 trips east of Aviation/LAX Station to the courthouse. Our recommendation is to cancel Line 626 and slightly modify the 625 to serve the courthouse with selected trips.

Next is the system-wide Metro evaluation. We measured our Metro rapid lines against criteria that were established for the Metro rapid service: Round trip running time 20% faster than local; bus stop spacing should average 0.7 miles or greater; service operates every 10 minutes in the peak, 20 minutes in the base; boardings per revenue hour should be at least 80% of the system average; and that rapid average trip length should be at least 25% longer than the average local trip length.

Line 711 is recommended for cancellation. Public comments registered one support, 21 opposed and 3 modify. In the discussion it appeared that the public still desired faster service, not necessarily a rapid service but a limited stop service, so what we are proposing is to have a limited Line 311 that would replace the rapid service in the morning and afternoon peaks. The Gateway Cities Council met yesterday afternoon and they approved the limited Line 311 should replace Line 711. They suggested that Line 311 should go all the way to the Norwalk Green Line Station, as an improvement over Line 711 which only went as far east as Florence and Garfield.

On Line 715 which is the Manchester Rapid, we are proposing to cancel this line because the ridership is half of what the local line is. The roundtrip travel reduction time is not even up to 20% faster, and the Rapid does not achieve the trip length ratio of 1.25. Again, the Gateway Cities Council approved the cancellation of Line 715 and recommended any new short lines on local Line 115 be established at Lakewood Bl. to serve the Stonewood Mall, further east than the existing Line 715 terminal at Downey Depot.

That concludes my presentation.

Comments from Council Representatives and Public Comment

**Chair Franklin:** As stated in the budget the MTA is at a critical juncture resulting from a major economic downturn. To ensure a balanced budget for the year 2011 the budget has to be reduced by \$95 million from the previous year. The budgeted year for 2011 calls for a fare increase on July 1 and reduction in staff by 10% for non-represented and 3.5% for contract staff. The fare increase with staff reductions would help offset approximately \$60 million. Furthermore, reducing the annual revenue service by

387,000 hours or 5% of the bus system should achieve an additional \$35 million in savings through more efficient scheduling and reducing service levels. In order to reach this budget shortfall of \$95 million, both union and non-union staff will be impacted and we as riders will also be impacted by the service hours being reduced.

**Representative Goodhart:** In our public hearing meeting this proposal was presented and has been modified based on some of the comments. For those areas where service is going to be eliminated or reduced, I understand there will be a reliance on other regional providers to offset that load. It's not like people will not have a way to get to their destination. The question that I have is, has there been any survey of those other providers to see if they can manage that increase in ridership.

**Scott Page:** In the case of the rapid lines of course, we are just going to reinvest the hours back into our local service. In the case of the local lines being canceled, we have not surveyed the other providers but on the other hand the ridership is so low that I do not think that it would be an impact.

**Chair Franklin:** Rapid line 753, that was another one being cut, I don't see it on your presentation. Mr. Page responded that Line 753 was the Gateway Cities responsibility, and was heard yesterday. They concurred with staff that the line be discontinued and hours be reinvested back into Line 53.

Public Comments on staff recommendations:

- **Barbara Lott-Holland:** I wanted to comment on safety. One of the big safety issues on the bus is when you have to wait a long time at a bus stop. There is inconsistency in the time that a bus comes and this creates an atmosphere for crime. With regard to the 626 Line, I work at the Siemens Building by the Courthouse, and public transportation is supposed to be for the public to have access. This too is also a safety issue when you have a bus which takes you to work in the morning, and picks you up in the afternoon but in the midday there is no service making you almost a prisoner at your job. In the event there is a family emergency you cannot get out. Or if you have a doctor's appointment you end up having to take the whole day off. Also if there is only a bus that runs Monday-Friday and not weekends then the transit dependent person is at a loss getting to where they are going. I was out talking to riders on the Florence Avenue Line - that particular bus serves LAX City Bus Center. For the people living between La Brea Bl. and Aviation Bl. , the Line 111 is the only way out for the people in this community who are transit-dependent. If the bus is not running on a regular schedule, there again you are a captured person trying to navigate and negotiate your life. Again, where is the public assistance? The same with Line 608, a lot of our elderly ride this inner city shuttle because it is easier to get on and off and they are on a fixed income so \$.25 is a lot easier than getting on a large bus. Please consider those things as well.

- **Rosa Miranda:** I'm a member of the bus riders union and we very firmly oppose the staff recommendations. The lines that you are cutting have not really worked effectively because you have not invested the resources to serve passengers well. So you should put more resources into the lines to ensure that they work efficiently and serve bus riders. I personally have ridden these bus lines and talked to bus riders on these lines and we know from talking with them that the buses don't run on schedule. Mr. Franklin raised the issue of safety and our concern is that crimes happen when someone is waiting for an hour for a bus on the street corner and we should not have to wait for an hour or 45 minutes for a bus. So what you are proposing is a clear violation of civil rights of the black and Latino bus riders. In this south LA region we understand that as many as 70% of the people are unemployed according to recent statistics. With these cuts you are taking away tools that are necessary to look for jobs, as well as to get to school, or access medical care. What the agency is effectively proposing is to balance the budget on the backs of bus riders and out of our pockets. My question is who is going to fix the deficits in our family budget? I ask that you all represent the community by standing with us in opposing these bus cuts. Thank you.
- **Eric Roman:** Just a procedural manner that is important to point out. Our colleagues that went to the meeting yesterday with over 800 signatures that we collected and turned in to the MTA office, Customer Relations Office on time were neither turned over to the operations department or to the service office. Today you are considering recommendations without having considered the 800 signatures that we collected opposing the service cuts. We specifically concentrated on south LA and surrounding region. It is especially frustrating that a staff member erred, when we went out and collected these signatures from overwhelming black and Latino bus riders in south LA and they know they are disproportionately carrying the brunt of the cuts that are being proposed. I think we are seeing a slippery slope or a downward spiral. You have not invested sufficient resources especially on some of the rapid lines that just hit the streets a few years ago to make them successful. Every time you chip away at bus service by eliminating service during the day or eliminating a rapid line, and reinvesting into a local line, the system is hurt, ridership goes down, creates further justification to cut service. We have put the challenge to the board directly and to you as well that we don't think that the agency actually lacks the funds to maintain the bus service. We think the agency is choosing to invest in construction and rail at the expense of bus operations and on the backs of bus riders by cutting service and raising fares. These are the most economically hard hit people in the county that rely on this bus service and yet the agency is basically balancing its budget by cutting bus service and raising fares, yet at the same time they are spending money hand over fist on highway and rail projects. We ask that you reject the recommendations made by staff. These are reductions, over 100,000 hours on top of several hundred thousand hours in previous years. Request a full equity analysis to look at the civil rights implications on low income black and

Latino bus riders of the service changes in this sector and really in all the sectors throughout the county.

**Chair Franklin:** For clarification the same packet that we received from Barbara is the same packet you were addressing in your public comments. (Eric Answered Yes)

**Brian Marisio:** I am one of the organizers who have been going on the buses and talking to people about how these reductions are actually going to affect them. You spoke of safety. Actually one of the times one of my partners and I were waiting for the bus (715) for an hour, and then we got frustrated and went to a restaurant 30 minutes into our dinner we saw the bus pass by. It would have been an hour and a half for a person waiting outside unprotected. How is that safe? This was during the day; imagine if they were waiting in the dark outside? That's crazy. We know that your hands are tied and there is only so much you can do but we are suggesting that you reject the staff proposals.

Public Comment Closed

Comments from the Council on the Agenda and Service Changes for December 2010

**Chair Franklin:** Board members, two things for consideration, I would recommend that we vote individually per line and limit our comments to the line in question.

**Representative Szerlip:** I wish to say something before we continue. There have been comments here that have been made to us that are not specific to line general comments. I wish to have the opportunity to make the same. Firstly, thank you very much to staff. This is a long and arduous process; this is not the first time I've been through it, nor the members of this council. Council Members were concerned that the changeover in the way that support is being given to these bodies might affect things in a negative way. And I am pleased to say that I feel that it was very much a positive situation. Our staff went out of its way to reach out to gather public opinion in not just public forums but on buses, to make certain that comments were solicited at every level that they were heard. I think that was witnessed by the fact that not everything that was proposed is what is being proposed now. There are changes and modifications in response to what the public has brought forward in hopes that we will do the best job that we can in making these unfortunate cuts. I am also happy to see that there are people here that attended the public hearing and recognize that the public hearing is not the end of the process and that our deliberations today are equally as important. At the same time, I do not believe that just say no is a productive approach. It's been outlined that we have mandates that we must cut overall budget as we move forward. Let me speak to that for a second. Those who would mix the idea or propose the idea that capital improvement funds could be used for on-going operation expenses just don't really understand budgeting and certainly budgeting

for a public agency. Generally funds available for capital improvements are constrained funds that cannot be used for ongoing operations. It is imprudent to take monies that are designed for one-time expenditures and allocate them to ongoing expenditures. The fact that we have to make cuts and we have to make changes is unfortunate but as our Chair has said, this is not the only thing that is being done to control budget. Staff has been cut and in trying to do more with fewer resources we must reprogram the resources to make the best use of them for all the people we serve. Also when I heard these mandates as expressed by our Chairman I heard nothing in those mandates that said to us that we must consider and reduce more in one area or for one group of people than another. And the fact that people suggest that actions taken by this council or the Metro board are based upon some kind of racial civil rights discrimination is purely inflammatory language, and frankly it has had its desired results with me because it really makes me upset to hear people try to say that this is being done purposely to affect one socio-economic group, one racial group, one sexual orientation group. I have seen no evidence of that in anything that has been said by these council members, said by Metro, that have been brought forward by our staff. These are business decisions, unfortunate business decisions, but it is the nature of the climate that we live in. And if we don't do something the entire system could collapse. And then there will be no service for anybody. We have to look at performance, purely and simply and reallocate our resources to the best way that we can serve the entire public. Thank you.

**Representative Turner:** I, too, would like to thank staff for their presentation, we know this is a hard thing to do. But as a director of a municipal operator I share the same concern as council member Goodhart in that we need to look at how these service reductions impact other municipal operators. As chair of the Los Angeles County Municipal Operators Association, we are working with Metro staff to ensure that whatever reductions take place include coordinating services to ensure that the riders are not stranded.

**Representative Pullen-Miles:** In general, I share the notion that Metro should increase bus service rather than rail service. As I have said all along we need more bus service on the streets because we are able to maneuver the buses better, able to modify the schedule as needed, and in my opinion there is more of a demand for buses rather than rail. So we do see an instance where we are spending a lot of money on rail, when we could invest that money in buses which do a much better job moving the people around as needed. I am opposed to the rail projects. Also we do have to speak to the issue of equity because a lot of the time in public service agencies have unintended consequences. Discretionary riders can make a decision on whether to ride or not but those that are not discretionary riders cannot make those types of decisions. These type of cuts can only have an adverse affect on the transit dependent. As a result it can be an inequitable situation although not by design. That is why we should have some economic analysis to consider. We need a broader picture to see exactly how this is going to affect all of our riders.

**Representative Goodhart:** Similar to my colleagues on the council here I would like to thank staff and the BRU and many of the public comments that are offered here because it gives us information and insight into the real issues. I think that the process is good. It has been suggested that resources being applied to one or more of these lines would improve service and as the newest member on this council I am not quite sure what that means. So if staff could address that it would be helpful.

**Director Hillmer:** When they say they will add more resources to the line that means more buses, less wait between buses or lower numbers of riders per bus.

**Representative Goodhart:** That means if you have low ridership on a few buses that adding more buses may be productive in a sense for riders but more costly.

**Director Hillmer:** It would definitely be more costly. It may attract more riders but experience has shown us that if you double the service you do not double the ridership.

**Representative Goodhart:** As was commented by the chairman, this is a business, and we are running it as a business here. I understand that it is not an easy decision or choice but it happens. There have been some allegations about civil rights violations, and frankly I see no evidence of that. I am not one to make a judgment on civil rights violations but I would ask Metro to make sure that whatever processes that have taken place, hasn't been directed at any particular ethnic group that we have in the South Bay Cities or any other areas in the county. Mr. Conan Cheung of Metro responded that we conduct a Title VI Analysis, the Environmental Justice analysis, which requires us to look at disproportionate adverse impacts on certain minority groups, certain groups with limited English proficiency and lower income. We have done that analysis and if there is a disproportionate impact we need to make sure there are mitigation measures. Every single line that we have on the list has gone through that analysis and every line has alternative services available that are viable for riders. So we are not leaving anyone stranded. Some of the proposals we initially had could have left people stranded and that is why we pulled them back.

**Representative Pullen-Miles:** Concerning the Title VI Analysis, I was wondering if that was available. Mr. Cheung responded that it will be attached to the board report for the ratification of the service change items.

**Representative Goodhart:** Regarding the Title VI analysis, since that was not provided to us and will be provided to the board, isn't it appropriate that it be provided to the BRU?

**Conan Cheung:** It will all be public record once it gets posted, probably early next week. Federal regulations state that we conduct the analysis and have it within our files. But we will make it public.

**Representative Deming:** Thank you to the staff for all the hard work. It is clear in all the research that the lines that have been brought forward for cancellation are the lines with the lowest ridership affecting the least number of riders in the system. I appreciate that the changes affect the least number of people in a negative way. And I guess that would have been more evident if the council could have seen a list of the lowest performing lines in the system, so that the council and public could see these are the lines that people are not riding

**Chair Franklin:** I just want to thank the public for speaking and reemphasizing the importance of the role we play here. The number of issues you brought weighs in our consideration but ultimately this is a business. Some of us who run various cities have budget issues. First thing that happens when we identify a deficit is we have to figure out a way to cut. Metro is no different except in a larger scale of course. We are not talking about a few million dollars, we are talking about \$95 million of which \$60 million has been offset primarily with the reduction of employees of Metro. The public service which is about 5% or \$35 million is the issue that we are here to address. We do not agree on all these proposals. Staff did their due diligence by taking the testimony in August and tweaking their proposals in response. They were sensitive to your comments and responded accordingly to be able to provide some alternatives on how we can move forward on meeting the \$35 million. In this case we are talking about making a business more efficient and more effective. Yes, the reason why the lines are considered for cancellation is because they are not being utilized. And so I would encourage that we reach out to the public to use the system because ultimately if you don't it will be cut. Clearly that was the action last year on Line 442 and it was appealed by the community to the Metro board. So voices can be heard.

I want to get a level of confidence here among the council and Mr. Hillmer that whatever decisions we make that in fact these decisions are taken under serious consideration by the Metro Board. We have done this on previous occasions and made some significant decisions only to find out the Metro Board rescinded those recommendations and did something different. We want a level of confidence that whatever decisions are made here today have weight.

Are we ready to start voting line by line? In the South Bay Cities service area, staff proposes the following service changes:

- Lines 111/711 – Florence Avenue Local/Rapid lines: Discontinue service on Rapid line 711 and replace it with a new Limited Stop Service Line 311. Gateway Cities recommended the new 311 extend to the Norwalk Transit Station.

Council approved 7-0 and concurred with Gateway Cities' recommendation.

- Lines 115/715 – Firestone/Manchester Rapid: Discontinue service on Rapid Line 715, and replace with additional service on Line 115 as appropriate. Gateway Cities recommended the 115 extend to Lakewood Bl. to serve the Stonewood Mall.

Council approved 7-0 and concurred with Gateway Cities' recommendation.

- Line 202 – Willowbrook – Compton – Wilmington: Discontinue short line trips but maintain the service on Line 202 operating every 60 minutes.

Council approved discontinuation of short line trips 6-1.

- Line 439 – Aviation/LAX station – downtown LA – Union Station via LAX, Westchester, Culver City: Continue to operate weekday AM/PM peaks only from Fox Hills Mall to downtown Los Angeles until the Exposition Light Rail opens for service. The segment on Sepulveda south of Fox Hills Mall would be discontinued and no service would be provided during the midday, weekends and holidays. When the Exposition Light Rail Line opens, Line 439 would be cancelled in entirety (a possible modification to be voted on later would extend Line 217 on Fairfax to the Fox Hills Mall so the people in the La Cienega corridor would have service). This was suggested by people at the public hearing.

Council approved Line 439 reductions 7-0

- Line 607 – Inglewood – Windsor Hills – Inglewood: Discontinue counter clockwise service, maintain clockwise service.

Council approved 7-0

- Line 608 – Crenshaw Connection: Discontinue service

Council approved 7-0

- Line 625/626 – LAX Green Line Shuttle: Discontinue service on Line 626 and extend Line 625 to the Superior Courthouse on select trips. The 626 only serves the Courthouse, by canceling line 626 the line 625 will extend its route to the Superior Courthouse on select trips. Line 120 on Imperial connects the Courthouse to the Green Line in the midday.

Council approved discontinuation of Line 626 and modification of Line 625 to serve the Courthouse with selected trips, 7-0.

These recommendations were given much consideration. Discussion among the council members and staff was extensive.

**Representative Szerlip:** Chair, thank you very much for doing this individually.

**Chair Franklin:** We can hold Item #8 to the next meeting in October 2010. Item #9 Decide two Questions for the Meet and Confer, we can do that now, or as I suggested earlier, e-mail me your suggested questions and I will circulate it back. We can vote on it and the top two votes. I will give you the results.

8. RECEIVE Presentation on the Web-site for the Governance Councils, David Hershenson, Community Relations Manager – Moved to October Meeting
9. DECIDE and APPROVE two questions for Meet and Confer meeting  
September 30, 2010, 10:00 am, All Council Representatives
10. Chair and Council Member Comments

**Representative Szerlip:** No adopt-a-line report this month but two comments: firstly the information for the public about Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail maintenance facilities. Several sites are being considered. Environmental assessments and a draft EIR focusing solely on maintenance sites is scheduled to be available for public review and comment this year. Originally scheduled for summer release it has been determined that further evaluation needs to be considered. As soon as the evaluation is complete, a save-the-date notice will be sent out to the public for public hearings. Also in October or November 2010 there will be station area planning workshops. Lastly, I have to comment on the 511 system which is still being tested. It does not have voice recognition in place as it could not recognize “405” and continually said “I don’t understand what you are saying”. There are bugs in that system.

**Representative Pullen-Miles:** Lost TAP card on the bus in Inglewood but it was returned. Rode Line 740 northbound to Hawthorne, bus #9570, 25548 badge. Bus was clean except for the floor. The bus was on time, ridership was light. Returned southbound on Line 40, bus #6420, no badge recorded. This bus was OK except lots of papers on the floor.

**Representative Deming:** Speaking of Beta, there is a new I-phone app out for go Metro Los Angeles which is fantastic. I believe the announcement came out last week - it is a free app downloadable and has a trip planner, scheduling information, and general bus riding information. It is an excellent application. I used it to see if it would identify my regular trip home on the 625 and it was to the minute. I was very pleased by that. It routed me on a bus that was scheduled to leave at 5:34 pm from World Way West scheduled to arrive at the train station at 5:50 pm which it did. We are still loving the new buses. They are very clean and the riders rave about the new buses. It is so much nicer to ride down Imperial Highway on the new buses. The driver on this September 7 was a safe driver, friendly and the voice annunciator was working. My only complaint is the air was on and we were freezing uncomfortably; otherwise an excellent ride.

**Representative Goodhart:** On September 9, rode Line 232 from Redondo Beach to El Segundo and back. The northbound bus #11034 was about 25 minutes late as there was a problem with one of the buses according to Operator 70969. As we got further along the route, bus #11058 passed us with very few people on-board. How does this happen?

**Director Hillmer:** Any number of things, a new bus would be brought out to fill the gap left by the bus that dropped out, other than that the supervisors can adjust the service by holding the bus a little longer. Problem with that is riders expect the bus to be at the stop at a certain time and when you hold a bus back from its regular schedule it will be running late and once again a problem incurs with either pass ups or late.

**Representative Goodhart:** (continued) the air conditioning, apparently set for the regular summer, was too cold. The operator did not announce bus stops until Artesia. On the return southbound, the operator on bus #11065 showed courtesy for the elderly, as the operator waited until they took their seats. No schedules, no trash bags or pamphlets for safety straps were on-board. The operator announced all stops and greeted every rider as they boarded and disembarked.

**Chair Franklin:** On September 1, rode Line 210 Coach #6348 Operator 16546, at 11:12 am northbound on Crenshaw, from Thoreau. The bus was full, standing room only. The operator had a very rigid personality and gave everyone a cold look. The operator allowed a woman to stand next to him for 3 stops beyond the yellow line. The ride was nice and the bus was clean with plenty of bags and schedules. Returned on Line 210 at 11:25am, bus 7642, operator 14892, southbound on Crenshaw Blvd. It was a very pleasant experience; it was like night and day with this operator. Please give her a commendation. She was courteous when you boarded and left the bus. She was firm on company policy - there was a passenger on the bus that opted to get off the bus at a location that was not part of the regular bus stops and the bus driver politely told him no. The person was very cooperative and responded to her reasoning. More importantly about this particular driver, two young teens on bicycles were riding the lane closest to the curbside. They were riding in and out of parked cars in front of the bus and the bus operator passed them safely giving them ample distance. I was very pleased to see she kept them out of harm's way. The bus was clean, plenty of bags and schedules.

**Chair Franklin:** In conclusion I would just like to tell staff thank you. To my fellow council members, please let us know if you are going to attend the meeting when my assistant Claudette Matthews e-mails you.

Adjourned at 12:00 noon.