



Metro

Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation  
Authority  
One Gateway Plaza  
3rd Floor Board Room  
Los Angeles, CA

## Board Report

---

**File #:** 2022-0792, **File Type:** Minutes

**Agenda Number:** 2.

---

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING  
DECEMBER 1, 2022**

**SUBJECT: MINUTES**

**RECOMMENDATION**

APPROVE Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting held October 27, 2022.



October 19, 2022

Chair Ara Najarian  
Metro Executive Management Committee  
*Submitted via email*

**Re: Item 20 – End of Line Policy & Unhoused Riders Motion**

Dear Chair Najarian,

Central City Association represents more than 300 businesses, nonprofit organizations and trade associations. Our mission is to enhance Downtown Los Angeles' (DTLA) vibrancy and increase opportunity in the region. **We are pleased to support Supervisor Hahn's motion to review Metro's end of line policy.**

**This policy has significant impacts on DTLA which is the region's center for transit and home to ends of lines at Union Station and other stations such as 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Metro Center.** The end of line policy currently requires any remaining riders to disembark from rail lines at the end of service. While it is known that many late-night Metro riders are using rail cars as shelter, the end of line policy takes effect late at night without a connection to outreach services or housing. This policy often leads to unhoused people exiting Metro trains and sleeping near the stations.

We share Supervisor Hahn's interest in studying the impacts of this policy and exploring opportunities to better meet unhoused riders' needs at the end of Metro service. **As part of the staff report, it may be beneficial to consider existing and future programs to coordinate with, like Metro's Transit Ambassador Pilot Program.** If needed, Transit Ambassadors could also collaborate with CIRCLE teams who will begin providing an unarmed crisis response to people experiencing homelessness in portions of DTLA. It may also be important to consider coordination with The People Concern's E6 teams who provide outreach and services in DTLA.

We appreciate the Metro Board of Directors and CEO Stephanie Wiggins for prioritizing solutions that support unhoused Metro riders and community needs. **We encourage you to support this motion and look forward to partnering with Metro staff to help gather information about community impacts near end stations.**

Sincerely,

Jessica Lall  
President & CEO  
Central City Association

CC: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Vice Chair  
Supervisor Kathryn Barger  
Mayor James Butts  
Mayor Eric Garcetti  
Supervisor Hilda Solis  
Gloria Roberts  
Stephanie Wiggins, Metro CEO

To: Metro Board of Directors

The residents, property owners, business owners and staff from the Downtown Long Beach area are pleading with the Metro to change your "end of the line" policy, which we believe is adding tremendously to our 62% increase in the homeless population.

This policy has had a serious impact on so many levels and we are at a breaking point. It has become unsafe to walk our streets as the mentally unstable and perpetually unhoused are causing havoc throughout the day. We feel abandoned by the City of Long Beach and completely left out of the equation, left to fend for ourselves when passengers are forcibly removed from your trains each and every night.

Every night, twelve uniformed and armed officers are present on the platform at 1<sup>st</sup> and Pine to remove everyone from the last four trains, regardless if they were headed to Long Beach or not. What is so dangerous that it takes that many armed officers to do the job, yet as soon as the passengers are off the platform, everyone else is safe? We know this is not the case. We feel it. We live it.

The Metro "honor system" for paid fares is partly to blame as well. Its as if you've turned over the A-line as a mobile homeless shelter and at the end of the night, you simply clean it out and dump everyone on our streets. Long Beach is forced to accept an unfair burden when it comes to this crisis. This policy is adding to this crisis. Why Long Beach every night of the week? Can other cities participate? We can almost guarantee they will be a solid NO.

We understand the removal is to clean and work on trains but we need you to take a creative look at other ways to mitigate the crisis our city and its inhabitants are dealing with on a daily basis. The current policy of free-delivery to Long Beach is unacceptable.

We've ridden the train at those hours to be kicked off with zero assistance to guide anyone to additional transportation options. Officers force them off and then they are left to simply fend for themselves. This is cruel. We talked with some passengers who had no idea what city they were in and had no idea where to go. A homeless woman that stays in Downtown Los Angeles was afraid after being woken up by officers and told to exit into a city she had not chosen or knew anything about. She didn't know where it was safe for her to be, to hide, or to get assistance.

We are hopeful you will conduct an investigation and take another look at this policy to help us get our streets back. We also invite you to join us one evening so you can see first hand what happens after the 12 officers clear the trains.

In the meantime, we have some more immediate changes that can help. There are no restrooms. Work with the city to get them open. No more feces and urine on our streets. Move the 60 bus right next to the platform at those hours so those that did not want to be in Long Beach can get on and head back to other places. Currently it is the furthest location from the train platform, sending people into the neighborhood. You need to have a metro liaison at the station to provide assistance to those displaced by your policy and provide assistance for alternate options. Many don't know about the 60 bus. It's a bit shameful that you kick them off and have no one there to assist. Change the Long Beach stations from the fare 'honor system' and have everyone pay. Chief Bratton in NYC Subway did this in 1993 to help with the ongoing issues way back then. The same applies today.

<https://www.city-journal.org/html/city-journal-interview-victory-subways-12689.html>

## October 2022 OPS Comments

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 10, 2022 10:42 PM  
**To:** Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; NextGen <NextGen@metro.net>; CommunityRelations <CommunityRelations@metro.net>  
**Cc:** MetroPlan <MetroP@metro.net>; Lyu, Daniel <LYUD@metro.net>; Roman, Anthony <RomanAn@metro.net>; Ramos, Dolores <RamosD@metro.net>; Litvak, Jody Feerst <Litvakj@metro.net>; Torres, Carl <TORRESC@metro.net>; Greene, Scott <GreeneS@metro.net>; Williams, Alonzo <WilliamsA@metro.net>; Fan, Jingyi <FanJ@metro.net>; MTA - planning 2 <sdea@planning.lacounty.gov>; MTA - planning 3 <kszalay@planning.lacounty.gov>; De Loza-Gutierrez, Lilian <DeLozaGutierrezL@metro.net>; Cortez, Michael <CortezMic@metro.net>  
**Subject:** Feedback on latest Metro changes / NextGen study  
**Importance:** High

Dear Metro Staff,

First off, my apologies for a mass-mailer; I believe, this would be an effective way of communicating the issues. As an L.A. transit rider for 30 years, I would like to comment regarding the NextGen service changes and other issues. For the most part, the latest service changes have been a failure. Lost Rapid service (except for 2-3 remaining routes), truncated and/or completely eliminated lines, reduced service, all of these have significantly dropped the level and quality of Metro service. The ridership is also on a noticeable decline, as a result. Not to mention severely jeopardized public safety on your rail system...

Below are some key factors I would like to point out.

### **1) METRO-RAIL LINE NAMES**

The recently assigned "Letters" to the Metro-Rail lines (e.g. "A Line", "B Line", "K Line", etc.) has caused nothing but complications, misunderstandings, and major confusion. This was totally unnecessary, and should have never been approved. **The letter names are meaningless, and serve no purpose** to passengers in L.A. Remember, we are not New York City (and never will be!), and there is no reason to try to emulate their naming method. Many major subway systems across the world do not assign letters for a reason -- including London, Moscow, Washington DC, etc. Therefore, I strongly urge Metro to officially **reinstate the traditional Line Names** -- back from the assigned Letters. For instance, the line names should be switched back to: the "Crenshaw line", "Expo line", "Red line", "Purple line", "Blue line" etc., etc. If you read the comments on Facebook and other social-media channels, you will see that most people have been against the "Lettered" lines!

### **2) BUS LINE #4: CONNECTIVITY WITH "UNION STATION"**

Unfortunately, the former (and popular!) Rapid line #704 -- that conveniently connected with the Union Station -- was eliminated by Metro; and the remaining line #4 has no connectivity with the Union Station. Where is the logic?? Mind you, the Union Station is located just 500 yards away (!) from Broadway (where line 4 currently runs); therefore Metro can effortlessly create a small deviation -- to ensure connectivity with the Union Station, a major hub! Please connect line 4 directly with the Union

Station. \*See attached image "[EXHIBIT A.png](#)", illustrating the proposed deviation. Bus line #4 should stop on Alameda Street, at the west terminus of the Union Station.

### **3) BUS LINE #212: SERVICE CUTS AND CONNECTIVITY**

The line #212 has been one of the few major north-south corridors. The scheduled 10/23 route truncation of the Hollywood segment is unacceptable; so is the lost connectivity with the Red line subway station (for the southbound direction). Metro should look into it, and reestablish the "Hollywood & Highland" to "Hollywood & Vine" segment. Even if you plan to cut the segment between Vine St. and Sycamore Ave., -- you should at least preserve the connectivity with the Red-line subway for the southbound buses! Again, it is imperative to do what is convenient for passengers, not what's strategically easier for Metro bus drivers - to avoid making additional "loops".

### **4) BUS LINE 222: ALIGNMENT AND CONNECTIVITY**

This is a critical regional connector, between Hollywood and the San Fernando Valley. However, Metro staff has been cutting this route back & forth, and recently removed a critical segment, while making a totally unnecessary deviation via Studio City and Universal City. I have contacted your staff numerous times, yet Metro has failed to make any improvements. Hence a further ridership drop. The following changes are essential, to ensure line #222 improved ridership:

- The southern leg should be extended through Hollywood, reaching the "Highland Blvd / Santa Monica Blvd", to also provide connectivity with the Santa Monica Blvd line #4. \*See attached images "[EXHIBIT B1.jpg](#)" and "[EXHIBIT B2.jpg](#)" (with a hypothetical bus schedule, between Highland Ave / Santa Monica Blvd and the Burbank airport). You can see a relatively short (yet important) extension -- that would provide much needed connectivity. Please note: line #222 has recently experienced a major loss of ridership -- due to eliminating the "Hollywood & Highland" subway station -- and all stops in between, along Hollywood Blvd;
- The former "Barham Blvd" alignment should be reinstated; the bus should run along Barham Blvd (not deviate to the Universal City station), to provide access to Warner Bros. studios, Universal Studios' east entrance, the New York Film Academy, to the Forest Lawn Drive, and other points of interests along Olive Ave. and Barham.

### **5) BUS SERVICE ON HOLLYWOOD BLVD:**

Due to your latest service cuts and route truncations (including line 212), the service on Hollywood Blvd, between La Brea and Vine St., has now shrunk to a bare minimum. This is shameful! Hollywood Blvd is a **key transit corridor**, and having only one (!) bus line is beyond absurd and inadequate. This is another sad example where Metro has clearly gone too far, with its unfounded route truncations and eliminations. Please note: the Red line subway is not an "*alternative*" to bus service on Hollywood Blvd. Once again: service on both truncated lines 212 and 222 should be reestablished along Hollywood Blvd., both for tourists and workers. Otherwise, purposely turning a one-seat ride to forced transfers -- will most certainly cause the ridership to plummet even further.

### **6) EXCESSIVE RUN TIMES FOR BUSES**

As reported many times before, Metro needs to reevaluate its current timetables system-wide -- and should **significantly reduce the run times**, including on line #2, #4, etc. Oftentimes, a bus ride becomes absurd and nonsensical -- as we have to have to endure abnormally slow speeds, and idling at bus stops. That is one of the reasons why you continue losing ridership. The slow speeds -- combined with unnecessary idling at some stops (due to buses running ahead of schedule) -- are indicative of lousy, slow, and uncompetitive service. This is caused by poor timetable planning by your staff. (Every time I see Metro's statement about "*providing world-class service*" -- this makes me laugh!).

**7) DEMISE OF THE 'RAPID' BUS LINES**

Cancelling the Rapid lines - was a major mistake. As a result, the bus system has become (sorry to repeat!) very slow, unreliable, and uncompetitive. The Rapid lines were implemented for a reason; they were proven to be very popular, reliable, fast, and successful. And now, we're "back to Square One", with just the clumsy Local buses -- which take forever to get to a destination. Again, just another example of the NextGen study's failures! It's time to rethink this wrong step, and bring back the Rapid lines! (By the way, I just returned from San Jose, and enjoyed riding their Rapid bus lines, which were not eliminated, unlike L.A.. Mind you, Los Angeles is a much larger -- and denser -- city than San Jose, and therefore Rapid lines in L.A. is a "Must"!)

I would appreciate it if Metro would look into each of these key points, and make proper adjustments. This is not only for your riders' benefit, but also for your own success, system reliability, and ultimately - for Metro's reputation. Please don't disregard this email. Time to look at the NextGen study -- and its failures -- at a new angle, and make some wise decisions!

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,


~ [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

*Transit Advocate. Metro Patron*  
*THE TRANSIT COALITION, SO.CATA.*  
[www.ProgrammingAndImaging.com](http://www.ProgrammingAndImaging.com)

**\*ATTACHMENTS\***


**LEGEND:**

- Existing line #4 route
- Existing segment btwn Temple St. and Cesar Chavez
- Proposed deviation - to connect with Union Station



**Proposed line #4 stop on Alameda, at the Union Station.**







# Monday through Friday

Effective Dec 27 2021

# 222

## Northbound Al Norte (Approximate Times / Tiempos Aproximados)

HOLLYWOOD	HOLLYWOOD	HOLLYWOOD HILLS	BURBANK	BURBANK
①	②	③	④	⑤
Highland & Santa Monica	Hollywood & Vine	Cahuenga & Barham	Hollywood Way & Magnolia	Regional Intermodal Transportation Ctr
4:53A	5:03A	5:07A	5:19A	5:26A
5:23	5:32	5:42	5:54	6:01
5:53	6:02	6:07	6:20	6:28
6:13	6:22	6:32	6:45	6:53
6:43	6:50	6:57	7:12	7:21
7:11	7:17	7:22	7:37	7:46
7:31	7:41	7:47	8:02	8:12
8:01	8:07	8:12	8:28	8:38
8:21	8:27	8:37	8:53	9:03
8:41	9:52	9:02	9:19	9:29
9:09	9:17	9:27	9:44	9:54
9:32	9:42	9:52	10:09	10:19
9:57	10:07	10:17	10:34	10:44
10:21	10:32	10:42	10:59	11:09
10:47	10:57	11:07	11:24	11:34
11:16	11:27	11:32	11:49	11:59
11:37	11:47	11:57	12:15P	12:25P
12:00P	12:12P	12:22P	12:40	12:50
12:26	12:37	12:47	1:05	1:15
12:51	1:02	1:12	1:30	1:40
1:16	1:27	1:37	1:55	2:05
1:45	1:57	2:02	2:20	2:30
2:06	2:17	2:27	2:45	2:55
2:34	2:43	2:52	3:11	3:21
2:56	3:07	3:17	3:36	3:46
3:15	3:27	3:42	4:01	4:11
3:45	3:57	4:07	4:27	4:37
4:15	4:22	4:32	4:52	5:02
4:34	4:47	4:57	5:17	5:27
4:57	5:07	5:22	5:42	5:52
5:24	5:37	5:47	6:07	6:17
5:56	6:02	6:12	6:31	6:41
6:15	6:27	6:37	6:56	7:05
6:45	6:52	7:02	7:19	7:28
7:07	7:15	7:27	7:44	7:53
7:34	7:42	7:52	8:07	8:15
7:58	8:17	8:27	8:41	8:50

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 14, 2022 12:03 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** Metro fares x improvements in the system

Hi - to whom it may concern,

Feedback re: pricing changes: You know what we really need? Price, unless you are going to do free transit, matters a lot less than other key criteria to a public transportation network.

*Pagar mas o menos.... al final lo que importa mas es:*

**#1 - dedicated bus lanes - ie better, faster, more reliable service.**

**#2 - safety & cleanliness onboard.**

Best,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:42 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[YOUR NAME]  
[YOUR CITY AND ZIP CODE]

--

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:46 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself. As someone who used to rely on the bike program but then moved to an area with no bikes, I beg of you to do better.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90008

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:47 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Cc:** Los Angeles Mayor's Office <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>; mikebonin@lacity.org  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself. Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include: 1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods 2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this) 3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Santa Monica 90402

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:47 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this) FIX THIS. This prevents people from seamlessly traveling around LA without a damn car! The first/last mile problem!
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:48 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles 90035



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:50 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

90025

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:50 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

90026

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:55 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles 90005

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:55 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[YOUR NAME]  
[YOUR CITY AND ZIP CODE]

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:04 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** NO PRIVATIZATION! PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

I oppose the privatization of the metro bike share program.

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Woodland Hills CA

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:15 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, CA

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:16 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
90039



-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:15 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[YOUR NAME]  
[YOUR CITY AND ZIP CODE]

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:22 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Hi Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Sherman Oaks 91423

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:24 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, 90016

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:25 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Northridge, CA 91325

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:25 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

I am originally from Minneapolis where we have a super successful bike share program called nice ride. Everyone likes it and they even have e-bikes now when you want to ride without getting too sweaty.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

And 4. We need more protected bike lanes to save lives and to get more people comfortable with riding a bike in LA. It should not be a death sentence.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Hollywood, 90028

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:25 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most *underinvested* neighborhoods
2. The ability to **put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations** (*right now, Metro's employee union blocks this.*)
3. Treating bike share like a **real transportation mode** part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought.

This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, 90057

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:27 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Please keep the Metro Bike Share program publicly funded and please EXPAND the system to all of the Los Angeles Area. I would love to take the bike share and would be a regular rider if Metro treated the program like the third transportation mode it should be. I often use the bikes when I am downtown for fun on the weekends, but my daily commute route isn't in any area that the bike share program currently serves. The bikes could be fulfilling the "last mile" problem of public transportation if the service was offered.

I live near Olive View Hospital in Sylmar and drive to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station because the only bus that serves me comes once an hour. At the other end of my commute, I take the 177 bus from the Del Mar Station on the Gold Line to JPL. However, the bus has been unreliable and often has a 30+ minute wait. I'd rather use a Metro Bike Share at both the beginning and end of my commute, but neither Sylmar nor Pasadena are serviced by the bike share program.

Please expand and invest properly in our bike share program, and keep it publicly funded as our transportation network should be!

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Sylmar, 91342



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:26 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system-- this includes a contiguous network of safe bike lanes, either protected on main streets or on side streets with synchronized lights at main cross streets.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, 90019

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:33 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Glendale, CA 91201

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:55 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90026

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 10:11 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

My name is Alfredo Tlaseca, I'm 26 and daily user of Metro as my primary form of transportation.

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles 90037

Sent from my iPhone

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 10:28 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Palms, Los Angeles 90034

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 10:31 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

LA, 90046 (hub of tourism @ sunset av and crescent heights = no bike share pickup points available)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2022 10:48 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Santa Monica, 90403



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 9:57 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE - make it a real transportation mode

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

323-868-7007

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 11:53 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[YOUR NAME]  
[YOUR CITY AND ZIP CODE]

Sent from my iPhone

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 11:55 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90015

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 12:40 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** Public comment for Item 40 / Metro Bike Share

For Operations, Safety, and Customer Experience Committee meeting on 10/20/2022.

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Please put metro bikes in equity focus communities (EFC), especially around existing Metro stations. For example, there is only one metro bike station east of the LA river. The sole Metro bike station currently east of the river on 1st & Utah doesn't serve the Boyle Heights community that well since there is nowhere else to dock it in the neighborhood. Metro's own EFC map shows that most of the EFCs are still without metro bikes. So please expand metro bikes to EFCs. It's amazing that we are doing the Universal Basic Mobility Pilot Program in South LA, but there is only metro bike stations around the USC campus. The vast majority of the pilot program area doesn't have metro bikes.

[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90039

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 12:42 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, 90010

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 1:02 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system without taking away other necessary multimodal investments.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Pico Rivera 90660

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 4:13 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
West Hollywood, 90046

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 5:40 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

I am a very big believer that we need to continue evolving our transportation system and bikes need to be a key part of it. We need to reduce congestion, we have the perfect weather to be a bike city ... and riding a bike is a great way to really experience the city.

Metro needs to treat its bike share program with the same weight and focus that you all think about busses and trains ... but that's not the case now. Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

355 S Lucerne Blvd

Los Angeles CA



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 6:03 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR CITY AND ZIP CODE]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 6:27 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles 90292

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 6:52 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Studio City, 91604

--

[www.loiskeller.com](http://www.loiskeller.com)

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 7:33 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90026

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 7:46 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Santa Monica, 90403

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 7:54 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

As a car-free-by-choice Angeleno I am both an avid Metro user and cyclist.

I understand that Metro is considering making changes to its bike share program. Up until now, Metro has treated its own bike share program like a supplement or adjunct to transportation modes like buses and trains, rather than a mode unto itself. As a result, we've been slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but to help LA become a more bike-friendly environment in general!

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. And perhaps most importantly-- treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought! This means real funding and integration into the rest of the Metro system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, CA 90013

(917) 512 9521

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 8:17 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

**Los Angeles 90019**

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 8:25 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles 90029



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 8:40 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program, and I hope they'd take this opportunity to finally treat it like a real transportation mode. If Metro did this, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains and make that part of our system more accessible, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself. There are so many trips in my neighborhood where biking makes the most sense, either because it's faster, more convenient, or just flat out because, all other things being equal, it's a more fun way to get my chores done.

While I would personally prefer public ownership of Metro Bikes to continue (because I have seen what privatized bike share looks like in other cities like San Francisco, where Lyft has continued to jack up the prices without any accountability), I am most in favor of doing whatever it takes to make this service a fully functional part of our transportation network. No matter what revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system. **This also means maintaining a fare structure that keeps it accessible to all users.** Public transportation is a public service, and Metro Bike Share must be a part of that.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90029

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 8:53 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, CA 90026

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 8:58 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** ITEM 40 - PUBLIC COMMENT for METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

As a weekly user of the Metro Bike, please invest more money, resources and time in program.

Thank you,  
Michael Yanow  
Los Angeles, 90064

--

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

“the impossible is a human invention.” - Philippe Petit

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 9:00 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Valinda 91744

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 9:01 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

My name is Edward Gonzales. I'm an engineer from La Crescenta that tries to use Metro services where they are available (which in my area, is unfortunately very limited at the moment). I am aware that Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

La Crescenta, 91214

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 9:03 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

I do not support the agenda item to make Metro bike share a Privately owned and publicly managed system for the following reasons:

- Public ownership will keep station location selection in the hands of people ensuring equity is prioritized over the profit of a private contractor.
- Public ownership will allow Metro to provide jobs to the community to manage the program.
- Bicycles are assets and should be owned by the public just as buses and trains are owned by Metro.
- The privately owned model will diminish the maintenance of bikes because the contractor will want to reduce maintenance costs and staff costs. This diminished quality of service will result in lower ridership over the course of the contract.
- The privately owned model diminishes the legitimacy of biking as a form of transportation. We need public ownership to solidify biking as the future of the first/last mile problem in LA county.

In conclusion, Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Metro bike share must focus on the following moving forward:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Montebello, 90640

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 9:16 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90027

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 9:17 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
North Hollywood, CA 91606

.....  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 9:36 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles 90065

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 9:58 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[YOUR NAME]  
[YOUR CITY AND ZIP CODE]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:05 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, CA 90036

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:10 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles 90005

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:12 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:15 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Board [Clerk@metro.net](mailto:BoardClerk@metro.net)

bcc [cta@streetsforall.org](mailto:cta@streetsforall.org)

I am low income LA resident without a car, and I benefit greatly taking the LA Metro E line train and other metro train lines regularly. Of course to get to my destination from the metro train line, there is usually a slow bus ride or no good bus ride to where I really have to get to, so I have to bring a bicycle to try to finish my trip almost two miles or more with hard hills on my cheap heavy bike. That is why AFFORDABLE and PRACTICAL bike share with E-bikes at metro stations would be fantastic for when I am not strong or healthy enough to do such a hard bike ride (or long walk) to finish my trip to my destination.

Streets for All tells us that they are concerned about Metro privatizing ride share, and other bike matters at metro stations. IF Streets for All is worried, I am worried.

I know Streets for All is working to make use of bicycles for transportation more affordable and common and practical and safe for LA residents like me. If Metro privatizes or otherwise does not hear Streets for All's ideas to help us LA residents use our bikes for part of our transportation, that is a big concern. **Please listen to and work with Streets for All to fund and integrate bike ride share into the Metro system in a way that will make it more affordable and practical for residents like me.**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:28 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Metro Bike Share (Item #40)

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

As someone who would like to see better public health outcomes in our communities + diversification in our modes of transportation in Los Angeles, **I am writing to ask Metro to treat its own bike share program as a key part of its network and strategy. I would like to see Metro's bike share program expand rapidly and become an integral part of transportation for the people of our communities.**

I understand Metro is currently looking to make changes to its bike share program. Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A **major expansion, based on equity**, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The **ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations** (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. **Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system**, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Resident of Los Angeles, Zip: 91214

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:34 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear honorable Metro folks,

I have been a long-time annual subscriber to the Metro bike share program, and it has truly changed my life and the way I live in this city. It's an incredible program already, and I've convinced so many of my friends to join. But it also has a deep untapped potential to be so much more, especially as we expand transit and bicycle infrastructure in Los Angeles. Bike share has been left out of the conversation so many times, despite being such a great system. With even just a bit of expansion and inclusion, I strongly believe Metro bike share could help transform Los Angeles into the worldclass city it deserves to be.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion to create a strong non-car travel network, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this).
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, CA 90012



**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:36 AM

**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

**Subject:** Item 40, Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee, Metro Bike Share

Dear Committee Members,

Metro Bike Share has a valuable role to play for Metro customers and for meeting the mobility goals of our region. But the program needs to be thoroughly integrated into the system and consistently funded at the level needed to assure its success.

First, Metro bike share needs to be at Metro stations! This is an obvious requirement and standard practice for all successful bike share programs.

Second, Metro bike share must be available where the need is greatest, in our underserved communities. Of course this is also where Metro ridership is high, so we need to take advantage of the synergy between these two modes.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:41 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Woodland Hills, 91364

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:46 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, CA 90029

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:52 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

I urge you to not privatize your bike share program, but rather to expand it into a truly ubiquitous, public transportation system.

Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

As Metro goes forward, the bike share program must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[YOUR NAME]  
[YOUR CITY AND ZIP CODE]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:03 AM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Monterey Park, 91755

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:08 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

As Metro is considering making changes to the bike share program, I've learned that bike share is not being administered and funded as a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. Bike share has been slow to expand, but expansion is essential for it to be useful. If there were more stations with better locations and high availability, bike share could be more desirable than buses and trains for not having to follow a schedule.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90025

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:10 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, 90026

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:34 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety, and Customer Experience Committee,

Give our Metro Bike Share program the attention, treatment, and funding that transit riders, bicyclists, pedestrians, citizens like me need.

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program a neglected child as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself. It is sad and disappointing that the Metro's employee union is opposing having bike share stations/hubs at transit stops but always remember that Metro exists to serve customers above all else. If we continue to uphold car culture over sustainable modes of mobility, Metro employees, transit users, bicyclists, humanity, non-human lives, the planet and climate will all suffer.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

**WARNING: we are in a climate emergency, biodiversity crisis, megadrought/rapid aridification of SoCal, environmental justice epidemic, severe housing shortage, systemic racism, inequities etc. Metro is not doing nearly enough at the required pace and scale to transform mobility in order to help mitigate those crises.**

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, CA 90024



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:34 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

90027

--

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:41 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, 90063

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:52 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

I'm a resident of South Pasadena, and despite often visiting DTLA and other parts of our region I've never taken a Metro bike. Why? From my experience, bike share stations are poorly integrated into the transportation system overall and to popular destinations, so it's never made sense to me. Shared bikes are a natural connector and can even act as a replacement for other modes of transit, for example when headways are too long.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

South Pasadena 91030

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:55 AM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles, 90066

**From:** [REDACTED] >

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 12:27 PM

**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro Bike Share is one of the most cost-effective investments available to the Board. Light rail and BRT expansion--which I support--require utility relocation, eminent domain, and endless lawsuit rebuttals (see: San Dimas Gold Line parking structure).

I live a block and a half from a Bike Share station and started using it during the pandemic because Metro's bus service along Vermont Ave was dreadful. I encourage you to ride a Metro bus for yourself if you haven't already done so--thank you to Supervisor Hahn for making herself available for this last week.

I now use Bike Share to get to the gym and a food distribution event, each two miles from me. It's much easier than dealing with the hassle of transferring buses that are slow, overcrowded, and unreliable.

I would use Bike Share even more if you added stations, PROTECTED bike lanes, and electric bikes to the fleet. My neighborhood, East Hollywood, has a smattering of stations: Vermont/ Beverly, Vermont/Maubert, Vermont/ Santa Monica, Sunset/ Normandie, and Melrose/ Edgemont. This is not a true network.

I hope you will expand the Bike Share network in East Hollywood, Hollywood, Koreatown, Pico-Union, MacArthur Park, and Mid-City. I would like to use Bike Share to get to the Home Depot on Sunset, the Food4Less on 6th and Bonnie Brae, Vermont/Venice, Vermont/3rd supermarkets, and the Costco/ my dentist in Atwater Village.

Likewise, I hope new Bike Share kiosks will offer more shading. This would keep the bike seats dry when it rains and less hot during heatwaves.

I oppose the Metro employee union's attempts to keep Bike Share away from bus and train stations. I am a proud union member myself, but this is counterproductive. Us Metro users should have more options, not fewer.

As it stands, we do not have a reliable network of Metro bus lines, train lines, or Bike Share stations. The train lines extend deep into low-ridership single-family neighborhoods without establishing a network in high-density renter areas with ridership potential. The bus lines suffer declining ridership due to LA City Council's manifest unwillingness to implement their own Mobility 2035 plan, as well as due to their lack of oversight of the contract to add benches and shade at busy bus stops. This week, I repeatedly got caught in traffic caused by utility work along Vermont Ave between 3rd and 6th Streets. Where is the BRT service Metro advertised on Measure M?

Metro should invest in Bike Share. When I go to the supermarket, I come home on the bus--biking home with bags of groceries isn't practical. I skip waiting for buses and transferring, and don't have to deal with the open air drug use and sales that occur daily at Vermont/Beverly and MacArthur Park stations, to name two. I'd go back to taking the subway if Metro implemented safety improvements to get to/from the subway stations above such as complete streets interventions, and offered trains more than once every 15 minutes during the day.

I also vastly prefer Bike Share to the bus and Metro after 7 PM, when bus and rail service is once every 20 minutes or less.

I used to use my own bike for these daily tasks, but gave up after experiencing my 3rd bike theft in three years in 2020. I miss having a bike, but there's no point spending hundreds of dollars to "gift" it to someone else. In the meantime, I use Bike Share and would use it more if I had a network of slow streets and protected bike lanes to use.

What percent of the City of LA's speed hump applications came from renter neighborhoods like mine? We account for the majority of collision deaths and injuries, yet I suspect most of the noise for speed bumps comes from single-family neighborhoods that already have amenities like trees and green space.

Thank you for your consideration of how to improve and expand BikeShare.

Sincerely,

■

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 12:35 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)(why??)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.
4. Funding good bike infrastructure to promote the growth and use of Metro Bike Share (or other bikes in general)

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

San Pedro, 90731

PS: If you like further resources regarding great bike infrastructure, take a look at this: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F4kmDxcfR48> and dozens of urbanist channels that will help us break free of car dependence.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 1:54 PM  
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

IF YOU BUILD IT (properly funded) THEY WILL COME (and use it)

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Sherman Oaks, 91423



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 1:32 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles, CA 90034

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 1:37 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Los Angeles 90012

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2022 1:38 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM 40 / METRO BIKE SHARE

Dear Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee,

Metro is currently considering making changes to its bike share program. Metro has often treated its own bike share program like the odd man out as opposed to a real transportation mode, like buses and trains. As a result, Metro has been incredibly slow to expand the program into something truly useful. If treated like a third transportation mode, along with bus and rail, bike share has the potential to not just help with first/last mile to buses and trains, but also to be a transportation mode in and of itself.

Regardless of which revenue/cost model Metro goes with for the future, it must include:

1. A major expansion, based on equity, starting in our most underinvested neighborhoods
2. The ability to put bike share stations at Metro train and bus stations (right now, Metro's employee union blocks this)
3. Treating bike share like a real transportation mode part of Metro's bus/rail system, not an afterthought. This means real funding and integration into the rest of the system.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Los Angeles 90026



October 7, 2022

Ms. Holly Rockwell,  
Senior Executive Officer – Community Mobility Planning  
Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-3-1  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952  
RockwellH@metro.net

*Via Electronic Mail*

Re: Extension of DEIR Comment Period – Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project

Dear Ms. Rockwell,

On behalf of The California Endowment (“TCE”), we respectfully request clarification regarding the deadline for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) comment period for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit (“LA ART”) gondola project (“Project” or “Gondola Project”). Additionally, for the below stated reasons, we seek a reasonable extension of 45 days over the minimum statutory comment period, so that the length of the comment period will be no fewer than 90 days.

**1. PREVIOUS EXTENSIONS HAVE BEEN GRANTED**

There is precedent for such an extension for CEQA projects in Los Angeles.

- In 2016, the City of Los Angeles extended the comment period for an additional 45 days for the South Los Angeles and Southeast Los Angeles Community Plan updates. (<https://planning.lacity.org/eir/SouthAndSoutheastLA/FEIR/files/1.0%20Introduction.pdf>.)
- This year, the Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering extended the comment period to 72 days for review of the Los Angeles Zoo Vision Plan. (<https://eng.lacity.org/about-us/divisions/environmental-management/projects/los-angeles-zoo-vision-plan>.)

A similarly complex project like the Gondola Project clearly warrants an extension.

**2. THE PUBLIC HAS NOT BEEN PROVIDED ADEQUATE INFORMATION**

Even though the Project application was submitted four years ago, and the Notice of Preparation was released two years ago, publicly available information regarding the Project has been sparse. Community members remain unclear regarding the details of the Project and its impacts.

We expect that a project like the Gondola Project—which is expected to cost over \$100 million to build and will require construction of large structures in areas like the LA State Historic Park, Union Station, and along Alameda Street—will need to involve numerous complex technical studies. We also expect that complex technical greenhouse gas and transportation studies will be required to support LA ART’s claims of zero emissions and community benefits relating to traffic. Nevertheless, the public has been provided little to no information regarding these and other potential impacts to their community.

Furthermore, prior to the September 15, 2022, Metro Executive Management Committee Meeting, LA ART promised “updated project information, including construction and operation costs and funding and financing plan” on or before September 30, 2022. (September 15, 2022, Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority Executive Management Committee Board Report). To date, that information has not been made publicly available. Without this information, how can stakeholders be expected to be able to fully evaluate the Project, or community members be sufficiently informed to understand the impact the Project will have on their day-to-day lives?

### 3. **A 45-DAY EXTENSION IS REQUIRED TO ENSURE MEANINGFUL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The notice sent out via email to stakeholders on September 28, 2022, stated that the DEIR will be released on October 17, 2022, for public comment, but did not specify the length of the comment period. The minimum 45-day comment period for this DEIR is far too short, prevents meaningful public engagement and comment, and will likely significantly limit the participation of those who require language assistance.

While we cannot know what issues the DEIR will focus on, we expect the DEIR to be voluminous given the complex and technical nature of the Project. For example, the Notice of Preparation was non-specific in stating the potentially significant impacts. It generally states that the Project will “address all environmental topics listed in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines,” and presents a list of all twenty topics, including aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and historic resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, wildfire. (October 1, 2020, Notice of Preparation; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15082 (a)(1)(C).)

As was previously mentioned, despite promises to the contrary, the public has yet to receive detailed information regarding the multitude of complex studies that will likely be needed for such a major undertaking as this multi-million-dollar Gondola Project. It would be unfair after repeatedly asking for this information for the last several years to give the public just 45 days to digest complex technical studies and attempt to understand their long-term implications. The public needs sufficient time to analyze such studies. Simply put, an extension of the comment

period is warranted given the historic and continuing lack of information provided to the public about the Gondola Project.

Furthermore, public comment regarding the Project has already been stifled and it appears as if it will continue to be limited moving forward. On September 15, 2022, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (“Metro”) Executive Management Committee held a public meeting, during which the Project was presented. During the conduct of that meeting, public comment was limited due to a multitude of issues with providing interpretation services for members of the public who required language assistance and Metro cut off over 40 members of the public who were in the queue to provide oral commentary.<sup>1</sup> With regard to the DEIR comment period, Board Director, Supervisor Hilda Solis forcefully expressed the community’s need for more comprehensive community commentary on the Project not just following the release of DEIR, but prior thereto. Likewise, Metro Board Director, Supervisor Janice Hahn, raised concerns regarding the Gondola’s impact on Metro’s current Free Dodger Express Bus system used by residents throughout the County. Metro has since posted “Community Information Sessions” on its website to “share details on the project”, however, not one of the four sessions – two held just the week prior to the release of the DEIR and two the week after – allows for live oral public comment.

The comment period is also occurring while the COVID pandemic is still making meetings and public accessibility difficult. According to the latest CDC data, community transmission of COVID-19 in Los Angeles County is “substantial.” ([https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-view?list\\_select\\_state=California&data-type=CommunityLevels&list\\_select\\_county=6037&null=Risk](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-view?list_select_state=California&data-type=CommunityLevels&list_select_county=6037&null=Risk) [select data type “Community Transmission”].) It is well-documented that the COVID pandemic has heavily impacted lower income communities and communities of color, like the communities surrounding the Project site. Additional variants and a surge in COVID cases are expected this fall and winter. (<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-10-01/new-coronavirus-subvariants-a-worry-for-winter-covid-wave>.) Community members are only recently receiving updated booster vaccinations. Frequent COVID infections require isolation and rest, and much time is required to devote to taking care of health issues and recovering from COVID and Long COVID, so expecting public attention and review of the DEIR during this period is unreasonable. A 45-day extension would be reasonable and help to ease the impacts of the COVID pandemic on community engagement.

Lastly, it is unreasonable to expect public comments on such an extensive document in a 45-day period that straddles important family holidays including Thanksgiving (on November 24, 2022) and December holiday season. TCE’s requested 45-day comment period extension would conclude the comment period after the winter holiday season and allow the public to have sufficient time to meaningfully review, assess, and respond to the DEIR.

---

<sup>1</sup> Metro referred those who were unable to voice their concerns during the conduct of the meeting with an option to email their comments. Following the email option being stated as the sole option to provide comment, this failure to account for the potential lack of accessibility for all members of the community was noted.

Please confirm that you have received this request, and we hope that you will respond favorably. Given the above-mentioned factors that are impeding the public's review, a 45-day extension of the minimum comment period is clearly justified in this instance. Public participation, a key component and pillar of CEQA, will be substantially improved with additional time and thus an extension would be much appreciated.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Martha I. Jimenez  
EVP / General Counsel/Secretary

CC:  
Ms. Stephanie Wiggins, Metro Chief Executive Officer  
Metro Executive Committee:  
Chair Ara J. Najarian  
Vice Chair Janice Hahn  
Director Katherine Barger  
Director James Butts  
Director Eric Garcetti  
Director Hilda Solis  
Director Gloria Roberts



1000 Broadway, Suite 480  
Oakland, CA 94607  
[www.latinoutdoors.org](http://www.latinoutdoors.org)  
*fiscally sponsored by  
Community Initiatives*

---

October 10, 2022

Ms. Holly Rockwell,  
Senior Executive Officer – Community Mobility Planning  
Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-3-1  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952  
RockwellH@metro.net

Re: Extension of Draft Environmental Impact Report Comment Period – Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project

Dear Ms. Rockwell,

On behalf of Latino Outdoors, I am writing to request that the public comment period for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit (LA ART) Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) be no less than 90-days.

From LA Metro's communication shared on September 28, 2022, there is no clarity on how long the public comment period will last or how community members are expected to participate. The two meetings scheduled after the DEIR is released clearly state that no public comment will be taken. It is imperative that the community be given an opportunity to meaningfully participate in the CEQA process by providing a total of 90-days to comment and a clear pathway to engage.

To date, our communities have been shut out of this process, with little to no details being shared. The few details provided by LA ART are wholly insufficient to understand the complexities of a project that will greatly impact surrounding communities.

Frankly, we deserve better. We must be heard and provided with a chance to meaningfully participate in the CEQA process. From our experience, we know that DEIR's like this one are lengthy, complex documents with technical information that will require significant time to review and analyze. The South Los Angeles, Southeast Los Angeles Community Plan and the LA Zoo Vision Plan were extended beyond 45-days for the same reason – to allow sufficient time for public review and comment.

The LA ART DEIR has been delayed numerous times, and if you proceed with a 45-day comment period, what message does that send to our communities? Releasing the DEIR but not extending public comment period during the holiday season when it is challenging for community members to participate is simply unreasonable. There is no need to rush through this important public review process.

Finally, extending the public comment period is critical for transparency and fairness. Councilmember-elect Eunisses Hernandez, who has voiced concerns and will represent the communities most impacted by this project, deserves the chance to review and analyze the DEIR.



Please do the right thing by extending the comment period to a total of 90-days.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard A. Rojas Sr." The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Richard A. Rojas Sr.  
Advisory Board - Immediate Past-Chairperson

CC: Ms. Stephanie Wiggins, Metro Chief Executive Officer  
Metro Executive Committee:  
Chair Ara J. Najarian  
Vice Chair Janice Hahn  
Director Katherine Barger  
Director James Butts  
Director Eric Garcetti  
Director Hilda Solis  
Director Gloria Roberts



October 11, 2022

The Honorable Ara J. Najarian  
Chair, Metro  
1 Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-3-1  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: Concerns Regarding Metro's Potential Partnership in Los Angeles County Land Bank Program**

Dear Chair Najarian:

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities (Division), and the California Contract Cities Association (CCCA), collectively representing every city in Los Angeles County, we write to express strong concerns regarding Metro's partnership in Los Angeles County's proposal to establish a land bank pilot program that would undermine local land use and zoning regulations and exempt property taxes while the county or Metro "holds" land for future use. We are disappointed that neither Metro Board nor the Board of Supervisors have engaged with the county's 88 incorporated cities in the development of this potentially expansive program.

As described in the June 23, 2022 Metro Board Agenda report, the proposed county land bank program would allow for the acquisition and retention of property to potentially build affordable housing and serve as an anti-displacement mechanism in areas where large infrastructure projects are planned. While discussions currently center around a pilot program, the Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office's June 3, 2022 report to the Board of Supervisors cites an interest to expand the program countywide, without designation of unincorporated or incorporated areas. Addressing our local housing crisis is a priority for cities throughout the county. However, we do not think that a land bank program, developed by the county in partnership with Metro, without city input, is appropriate for the following reasons:

**The land bank program undermines state-certified housing elements.** Cities under the Southern California Association of Governments have certified or are in the process of certifying their state-mandated Housing Elements to meet all income levels under the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The state-mandated process entails years of planning, community outreach and financial resources to identify sites suitable for housing units. In that process, cities may identify sites for mixed use development with retail-commercial, office, and residential uses to help generate the long-term revenue required to offset the cost of infrastructure improvements. Without dialogue from cities, the county's land bank program would undermine this state/city planning process designed to zone and ordinances and regulate land use decisions based on their input and on the unique needs of their community. Mayors and

council members are elected to listen, respond, and work with their community members in developing land-use and other community priorities. Many of the areas that the county and Metro have identified sensitive to gentrification because of large incoming infrastructure projects already have specific plans adopted by the locally elected city council. These local plans provide much-needed housing for both current residents and new residents through mixed-use developments that can generate tax revenues to sustain open space, parks, public works, and other essential community infrastructure and services. The county and Metro's plan to hold land for an indeterminate time and develop it, without regard for existing city land use laws and planning, is a severe overreach. It overrules local land-use decision making, cripples cities' ability to implement their prepared plans and threatens future funding for local services.

**The land bank program would compete with and unnecessarily duplicate the work of the Los Angeles County Affordable Housing Solutions Agency (LACAHS) recently created under SB 679.** Governor Newsom just signed SB 679 (Kamlager, 2022) to create LACAHS, a new countywide affordable housing agency to preserve, protect, and build affordable housing. LACAHS will have the authority to fund housing and preservation through bonds and other long-term revenue sources. The legislation to create the agency was developed and supported by months of stakeholder dialogue, including cities. The new agency's governance structure and regional funding allocation formulas can achieve the same goals as the proposed land bank program but with the structure and capacity to both purchase land and develop it. It is foreseeable that the county's land bank program could compete for the same funding and land as LACAHS. This proposed program is an unnecessary duplication of resources and adds another layer of regulation in the land use area that is already heavily regulated by the state and now by LACAHS.

**The land bank program would deprive cities of essential property tax income that financially support community services.** As described in the June 23, 2022 CEO's report, the proposed county land bank program would allow for the acquisition and retention of property tax free by the county. The report further recommended that the county's tax free status should be extended to private parties: "the land bank should be structured in a way that allows nonprofit affordable housing developers or Community Land Trusts to 'deposit' land into the land bank to hold properties (tax free) for future development (by the donating organization) as affordable housing." However, the report fails to address how cities are to recoup this proposed loss of property tax-based city income needed for community services.

We understand the dire need for affordable housing in Los Angeles County. Cities are responding and continue to plan, zone, and promote opportunities for the construction of housing projects to meet that need. Additionally, state legislation continuously propels cities and the county to reexamine current land-use functions. The implementation of major housing bills, like SB 9 (Atkins, 2021) and most recently AB 2011 (Wicks, 2022) and SB 6 (Caballero, 2022), will drastically transform the supply, affordability, and landscape of housing throughout the county. These statewide laws, along with the reasons stated above, make the creation of a countywide land program unnecessary. Nevertheless, we understand that the county, like cities, also has its own land use authority and must find opportunities to create and fund affordable housing in its unincorporated areas. We believe the land bank program, working with partners like Metro, may be most suitable for the unincorporated areas in each Supervisor's jurisdiction, or in cities that chose to participate.

While we have concerns with the program as currently presented, we certainly recognize the need for cities, the county, and Metro to work together to address housing production and affordability in the region. We would look forward to working collaboratively with both entities in that effort. If you have

questions or feedback, please contact Kristine Guerrero with the Division at [kguerrero@calcities.org](mailto:kguerrero@calcities.org), or Jorge Morales with CCCA at [jorge@contractcities.org](mailto:jorge@contractcities.org).

Sincerely,



Andrew Chou  
Mayor Pro Tem, Diamond Bar  
President  
Los Angeles County Division, League of  
California Cities



Jeff Wood  
Council Member, Lakewood  
President  
California Contract Cities Association

CC: Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, Metro 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair  
Mike Bonin, Metro Board Member  
Fernando Dutra, Metro Board Member  
James Butts, Metro Board Member  
Eric Garcetti, Metro Board Member  
Paul Krekorian, Metro Board Member  
Tim Sandoval, Metro Board Member  
Hilda L. Solis, Metro Board Member  
Sheila Kuehl, Metro Board Member  
Janice Hahn, Metro Board Member  
Kathryn Barger, Metro Board Member  
Los Angeles County Cities



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

September 29, 2022

Metro Board  
One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: State Route (SR)-710 Early Action Projects in City of Pasadena**

Honorable Chair Solis and Members of the Board:

At our meeting of September 19, 2022, the City Council reviewed a list of projects that the Pasadena Department of Transportation is proposing to be included in the City's State Route (SR) 710 Measure R Mobility Improvement Project (MIP) funding request to the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), in lieu of the Metro L Line grade separation at California Boulevard. After receiving public comments, the City Council unanimously approved a motion to authorize the Mayor to submit to Metro the attached project list.

On behalf of the City, we applaud Metro Board's decision to clarify the eligible uses for SR 710 North Mobility Improvement funding through the February 24, 2002 Board action on Agenda item 35. This action clarifies the types of pedestrian, bicycle and transit infrastructure improvements that are eligible for Measure R MIP funding both as standalone projects and as components to larger projects.

Nineteen projects have been identified with twelve proposed as priority projects to be carried out in-lieu of the Metro L Line California Boulevard Grade Separation Project, to significantly improve mobility in the region and enhance various modes of transportation. Project descriptions for all nineteen projects can be found in Attachment A, with our twelve priority projects listed below in Table 1. The projects were chosen with the goal of improving safety for all road uses, including motorists, pedestrians, and

cyclists. Consistent with the purpose of the SR 710 Measure R MIP program, the proposed projects effectively and efficiently accommodate regional and local north south travel demands in the study area while providing bus infrastructure improvements, bikeway improvements and pedestrian improvements. Measure R MIP funding criteria requires that funding be used towards capital infrastructure enhancements consistent with the purpose and need of the 710 N Project, while providing multimodal capacity enhancements to allow for connectivity to the regional network.

While all nineteen projects provide important enhancements to the multimodal transportation network, adjacent to the SR 710, Table 1 below prioritizes the top twelve priority projects in order of importance. I respectfully ask that the Board take into consideration our prioritized list in making its determination.

**Table 2: SR 710 Measure R Mobility Improvement Projects - Top 12 Priority List**

Project	Preliminary Cost Estimate
Pasadena Ave and St John Ave Roadway Network (Walnut St to Columbia St)	\$75.1M
Avenue 64 Complete Street Program	\$1.5M
Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility	\$62.4M
Columbia St (from Orange Grove Blvd to Fair Oaks Ave)	\$9.9M
Orange Grove Blvd at Colorado Blvd and Orange Grove Blvd at Holly St	\$4.5M
San Rafael Ave (between Linda Vista Ave and Colorado Blvd)	\$4.8M
Metro L Line At-Grade Crossing Enhancements	\$2.5M
Continental Crosswalks	\$6.8M
Orange Grove Mobility Improvement Program	\$5.4M
Greenways (Bike Boulevards)	\$12M
SR 710/SR 134/I-210 Ramp Modifications	\$150M +
Arroyo Link	\$45-65M

The City of Pasadena looks forward to working with Metro staff in a collaborative process to implement these projects in an effective manner, thereby reducing traffic congestion in the SR-710 corridor and enhancing mobility for all users.



Metro Board  
September 29, 2022  
Page 3 of 3

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Mrs. Laura Rubio-Cornejo, Director of Transportation at [lcornejo@cityofpasadena.net](mailto:lcornejo@cityofpasadena.net) or at (626) 744-6450.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Victor M. Gordo". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

VICTOR M. GORDO  
Mayor

VG: js

cc: Stephanie Wiggins, Metro CEO  
Ernesto Chaves, Metro Deputy Executive Officer, Complete Streets & Highways Group  
Michelle Smith, Metro Project Manager, Complete Streets & Highways Group  
Miguel Márquez, City Manager  
Laura Rubio-Cornejo, Director of Transportation

Attachment A:

List of Projects Proposed for Measure R – Mobility Improvement Project (MIP) Funding in lieu of the Metro L Line California Boulevard Grade Separation Project. September 20, 2022.

**Attachment A:**  
**List of Projects Proposed for Measure R – Mobility Improvement  
Project (MIP) Funding in lieu of the Metro L Line California  
Boulevard Grade Separation Project  
September 20, 2022**

**MULTI-MODAL MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS**

A number of complete streets projects are proposed to: improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists by reducing auto speeds; enhance efficiency to accommodate regional and local travel demands; reduce the impacts of regional traffic diverted to local residential streets from adjacent freeways; and work toward encouraging non-auto travel throughout the City and the northern segment of the State Route (SR) 710 North corridor.

**Pasadena Avenue and St John Avenue Roadway Network (Walnut Street to Columbia St)**

Pasadena Avenue and St John Avenue are the primary access routes to the SR 710 northern stub in the City of Pasadena. They connect to three sets of Interstate 210 (I-210) and SR 134 on- and off-ramps north of California Boulevard. The purpose of this project is to provide near-term multimodal improvements to enhance safety along this 1.8-mile corridor, while maintaining the number of vehicular travel lanes. This project includes the cross-street connections that create the roadway network.

On June 29, 2022, the California Transportation Commission approved the relinquishment of the SR 710 transportation corridor from Union Street to Columbia Street to the City of Pasadena. The City of Pasadena officially took ownership of this transportation facility of August 15, 2022. While the long term vision for this area requires a significant ~~mult~~ number to travel lanes, and with only a very limited reduction of on-street parking along this 1.8-mile corridor.

A key premise in developing the project enhancements for this corridor is that near-term projects shall not preclude future changes to land-use, roadway networks, or other community development concepts that could be considered as part of the larger scale future long-term planning effort for this area.

This comprehensive multi-modal project provides for the installation of Class II bike lanes, Class IV protected bike lanes, sidewalk construction (with appropriate street trees and lighting), traffic signal modifications and other related construction for the following streets and the intersections connecting this street network:

- € Pasadena Avenue from Walnut Street to Columbia Street
- € St John Avenue from Walnut Street to Del Mar Boulevard and from California Street to the Pasadena Avenue wishbone/fork
- € Union Street, Colorado Boulevard, Green Street, Del Mar Boulevard, California Boulevard and Bellefontaine Street, as they connect to Pasadena Avenue and St John Avenue

The preliminary cost estimate for this project is approximately \$75.1 million.



### **Columbia St (from Orange Grove Boulevard to Fair Oaks Avenue)**

As a corollary to the St John Avenue/Pasadena Avenue project, the City is also requesting funding for multimodal improvement of Columbia Street from Orange Grove Boulevard to Fair Oaks Avenue. The purpose of this project is to enhance safety of the corridor for all modes of travel while maintaining the existing roadway capacity for motorists. This project consists of the following elements:

- € Modifications to the intersection of Orange Grove Boulevard and Columbia Street to reduce the radius of the sweeping right turns, modify the traffic signal to provide vehicle and bicycle detection, add accessible pedestrian push buttons and modify the signal operations to enhance safety.
- € Enhance the safety of the split (dog-legged) intersections of Columbia Street/Pasadena Avenue and Columbia Street/Fremont Avenue through roadway striping and traffic signal modifications.
- € Installation of fiber optic communication infrastructure between Pasadena Avenue and Orange Grove Boulevard to support the signal modifications at the intersection of Orange Grove Boulevard and Columbia Street
- € Implement a bike lane along Columbia Street to compliment the proposed Pasadena Avenue bike network to the north.

Since this project is adjacent to the City of South Pasadena, the City will continue to coordinate any potential improvements with the City of South Pasadena.

The preliminary cost estimate for this project is approximately \$9.9 million.

### **Orange Grove Mobility Improvement Program**

Immediately to the west of the Pasadena Ave/St John Ave corridor, Orange Grove Boulevard carries a significant amount of traffic between, Colorado Boulevard and Columbia Street, along this SR 710 parallel route. The purpose of this project is to provide multimodal safety enhancements and mobility enhancements to intersections along the Orange Grove Boulevard. These include upgrades to traffic signals, installation of fiber optic communication and associated hardware along the corridor to allow for signal coordination to address motorist speed, and the replacement of a free right run slip lane with a standard right turn pocket at Orange Grove Boulevard and California Boulevard.

This project does not include improvements to the intersections of Orange Grove Boulevard/Colorado Blvd or Orange Grove Boulevard/Columbia Street. Those intersections are listed as separate projects.

The preliminary cost estimate for this project is approximately \$5.4 million.

### **San Rafael Avenue (between Linda Vista Avenue and Colorado Boulevard)**

The SR-134 on- and off-ramps at San Rafael Ave are immediately west of the SR 710 connector ramps, and create three closely spaced signalized intersections. This project provides for modifications to the traffic signals at the three signalized intersections on San Rafael Ave between Linda Vista Avenue and Colorado Boulevard. Mobility improvements include the upgrade of traffic signal controllers, installation of vehicle detection, installation of a CCTV camera and the installation of fiber optic communication and associated infrastructure from

Colorado Boulevard to Linda Vista Ave. A component of the work is the relocation of the traffic signal cabinet, and the communications cabinets from the south side of Colorado Blvd to the north side of Colorado Blvd at San Rafael Ave, and the widening of that south sidewalk to provide an ADA compliant pedestrian path. Since these three intersections include freeway off-ramp facilities, the City will continue to coordinate any potential improvements with Caltrans.

The preliminary cost estimate for this project is approximately \$4.8 million.

### **Avenue 64 Complete Street Program**

Improvements to Avenue 64 have been identified based on feedback obtained through a community process. While a portion of the speed reduction and pedestrian safety enhancements along the south end of this corridor are underway through the installation of a traffic circle at the intersection of Avenue 64 and Burleigh Drive, current economic conditions and supply chain constraints have significantly increased the cost of materials for construction. Also, an additional intersection to the north end of this corridor has been identified for pedestrian safety enhancements. This project would provide supplemental funding to allow for the construction of the Avenue 64 traffic circle at Burleigh Drive and would provide for the installation of curb extensions at the intersection of Avenue 64 and Glenullen Drive.

The preliminary cost estimate for this project is approximately \$1.5 million.

### **Continental Crosswalk Implementation**

In order to enhance pedestrian safety at crosswalks throughout Pasadena, the City has identified the continental crosswalk layout as the standard for new installations. In addition, the City has developed an implementation plan to replace existing marked crosswalks with continental crosswalks citywide. The City is requesting funds to replace all existing marked crosswalks within the SR 710 northern stub corridor to continental crosswalks. This project area includes approximately 140 intersections with marked crosswalks, west of Lake Avenue and south of the I-210 freeway.

The preliminary cost estimate for this project is approximately \$6.8 million.

### **The Arroyo Link**

One project that continues to garner attention due to the historic nature of prior trails leading from Arroyo Boulevard into the central business district is the Arroyo Link. The Arroyo Link would be a multi-modal path connecting from the intersection of Arroyo Blvd and Drive to the intersection of Orange Grove Boulevard, potentially connecting the bike facilities currently in construction on Union Street (a protected cycle track) to the existing Arroyo Seco Path. The project also includes a missing pedestrian link between the residential neighborhood on South Arroyo Boulevard to the Rose Bowl and other destinations within the Arroyo, including Brookside Park, Kidspace Children's Museum and the Rose Bowl Aquatics Center. With the completion of the Arroyo Seco Path to the Los Angeles River Path, the Arroyo Link could provide a key connection in the regional bicycle network to Old Pasadena, Pasadena Civic Center, Pasadena City College and the Rose Bowl.

This project has not yet been designed, and detailed cost estimates have not yet been developed. Project cost estimates currently reflect a planning level, rough order of magnitude cost. This project would include a new sidewalk from the intersection of Arroyo Blvd at Arroyo

Drive to the intersection of Arroyo Blvd at Seco Street (a distance of approximately 0.8-miles), providing a much needed pedestrian connection from Arroyo Blvd south of the SR 134 freeway to the Rose Bowl, Brookside Park, the Kidspace Museum and the Rose Bowl Aquatic Center. While most of the project would utilize city streets, a 1000-ft section of new, off-street path would be required for a zig-zag path between Orange Grove Boulevard and the Arroyo Seco Path. This project presents significant design challenges to be addressed, including topography and existing infrastructural constraints (primarily access across Colorado Boulevard at the Colorado Street Bridge and existing shoulder slope and geometry along Arroyo Boulevard, north of Arroyo Drive). New bridges and/or under-crossings would likely be required as well as a significant length of retaining walls.

The City anticipates the initial outreach, feasibility study and concept design to cost \$250,000. Once a concept is developed, the project costs could be separated into two phases with the zig-zag path and connection to Orange Grove Blvd at Colorado Blvd costing up to \$10 million as a Phase 1 project implementation, and the Arroyo Blvd multimodal connection to the Rose Bowl ranging between \$35 million and \$55 million as a Phase 2 project implementation. The phases could be constructed simultaneously or sequentially. The cost estimates, which total \$45 million to \$65 million, are contingent on the path selected and the type and number bridges affected.

## **TRAFFIC SIGNAL AND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS PROJECTS**

The City has implemented Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) signal technology on several major corridors that parallel the SR 710 to reduce delay and enhance safety. As a complement to this, the City is requesting funding for Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects traffic signal upgrades and fiber communication, data collection and data analytics capability for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians, and controller upgrades to provide high-resolution data.

### **Orange Grove Boulevard at Colorado Boulevard and Orange Grove Boulevard at Holly St**

The SR 134 on- and off-ramps at the Orange Grove Boulevard/Colorado Boulevard intersection and Orange Grove Boulevard/Holly St intersection carry a significant amount of traffic within the SR 710 northern stub area. The City has been working closely with Caltrans to identify potential safety concerns at these two adjacent intersections and potential safety and mobility enhancements. This project will address those concerns through upgrades to the traffic signal operations and associated roadway channelization and signage to separate vehicular movements in an effort to reduce collisions involving weaving and turning movements. A potential implementation includes separating the eastbound SR 134 off-ramp traffic from the eastbound Colorado Boulevard traffic as they approach Orange Grove Boulevard. This would require additional traffic signal hardware and upgraded traffic signal controllers, cabinets, vehicle detection and communication infrastructure to manage the split approach operation. In addition, the intersection of Orange Grove Boulevard and Holly Street could be equipped with protected permissive left turn green arrows for north/south traffic. Since these two intersections include freeway off-ramp facilities, the City will continue to coordinate any potential improvements with Caltrans.

The preliminary cost estimate for this project is approximately \$4.5 million.

### **Metro L Line At-grade Crossing Enhancements**

This project would provide for enhanced performance monitoring, data collection and analytics at intersections adjacent to the at-grade Metro L Line crossings of Glenarm Street, California Boulevard and Del Mar Boulevard to monitor and reduce intersection delay. Currently, the L Line operates at six-minute headways in peak periods, resulting in a train crossing these intersections every three minutes during the time of day with the highest vehicular and pedestrian volumes. The City of Pasadena has been actively working on enhancements to reduce delay, including the implementation of Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) along the corridors crossing and adjacent to the Metro L Line alignment.

This project would allow for greater reduction in delay through the implementation of a performance monitoring system that collects vehicular, bicyclist and pedestrian data and uses advanced analytics to report on performance measures and provide an analysis tool for making informed decisions. In addition, this project provides for the implementation of advanced video analytics to identify inherent risk based on near-miss occurrences. The project would provide for the installation of hardware at up to 15 signalized intersections, associated communication infrastructure and central system hardware and software to implement a performance monitoring system.

This project has preliminary been estimated to have a cost of \$2.5 million.

### **Holly Street, from Fair Oaks Avenue to Marengo Avenue**

This project would provide for traffic signal upgrades and needed fiber optic communication and associated hardware at four intersections on Holly Street, between Fair Oaks Avenue and Marengo Ave. These upgrades would allow for the development of improved coordination plans, improved traffic flow, reducing delay for roadway users while simultaneously providing the ability to manage traffic speeds. This corridor provides a vital link between the central business district, the civic center and multifamily residential housing to the SR 710 northern stub, as well as the SR 134 and I-210 on-ramps in this area.

This project has preliminary been estimated to have a cost of \$1.4 million.

### **Pedestrian and Bicyclist Automated Data Collection**

As the City of Pasadena continues to pursue the complete streets policies identified in the Mobility Element of its General Plan, the ability to collect, analyze and process pedestrian and bicyclist data takes on a more important role. This project provides for the installation of multimodal count stations that would collect motorist, pedestrian and bicyclist counts at 36 locations within a half-mile of the six L Line stations in Pasadena. The project would create an extensive database of multimodal traveler information, and would provide the analysis tools to report out on performance measures and make informed decisions based on advanced analytics.

This project has preliminary been estimated to have a cost of \$2.5 million.

### **High-Resolution Traffic Signal Data**

While the City is currently updating some corridors to ATCS, the vast majority of the signalized intersections in the City continue to be controlled by hardware and software unable to collect high-resolution vehicle arrival data. This project would allow the City to upgrade traffic signal controllers citywide to collect such high-resolution data. The ability to collect and analyze high-resolution data would allow for the development of improved coordination plans, reducing delay for roadway users while simultaneously providing the ability to manage traffic speeds. In addition, high-resolution data would provide a foundation for arterial performance monitoring and reporting.

This project would provide for traffic signal controller upgrades at up to 280 intersections, the upgrade of up to 110 traffic signal cabinets. In addition, this project provides for the use of cost-effective network communication hardware to allow for IP communication over existing copper infrastructure where the cost to install fiber optic communication cable would be prohibitive.

This project has preliminary been estimated to have a capital cost of \$12.5 million.

### **I-210 Connected Corridors Expansion**

A pilot for the California Department of Transportation's Connected Corridors program of integrated corridor management (ICM) measures is already underway in the I-210 corridor east of SR-134. This program includes measures such as:

- Integration of freeway ramp meters and arterial signal systems
- Arterial signal coordination
- Traffic re-routing due to incidents or events
- Traveler communication (via changeable message signs, 511, radio, social networks, mobile app) of traffic conditions, transit services, parking, alternate route/trip/mode options
- System coordination/communication between Caltrans (freeway operator) and local jurisdictions (arterial operators)

The I-210/SR 134 interchange has experienced a number of long-term closures resulting from collisions on the connector ramps. Additional funding would allow this innovative program to be expanded to the I-210 segment north of SR 134, facilitating the management of traffic resulting from the closure of the connector ramps at this interchange. Since the Connected Corridors project involves multiple jurisdictions, this project expansion would require continued coordination with Caltrans and Metro.

The estimated cost of providing these improvements is approximately \$5 million.

### **PASADENA TRANSIT SYSTEM EXPANSION FOR SR 710 CORRIDOR**

A primary component of increasing multimodal access and mobility is the implementation of transit services. The City has evaluated the SR 710 corridor and identified potential route options that would serve north/south travel along the SR 710 northern stub project area and into northwest Pasadena. These route options are proposed based on a variety of demographic factors and potential transit ridership considerations. While funding for operations of the transit system is not being requested through Measure R MIP funds, three capital projects are required to implement a service expansion. The three capital projects are described below.

## **Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility**

An expansion of transit service in Pasadena will require the construction of a new Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility. Not only is the City's current operations and maintenance facility already at capacity, but the facility is leased, and that lease will expire in three years. The City has already initiated the design and environmental clearance of a new Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility. However, funding for the facility has not been secured. Without a new facility, the City would not be able to provide an expanded transit service option for the SR 710 area. This new facility will have the ability to fuel/charge a future fleet of zero emission buses.

Construction of a new facility on City-owned property to accommodate these needs would cost an estimated \$62.4 million.

## **Zero Emission Buses (11) and Charging Infrastructure**

Eleven new zero emission buses would be required to provide system expansion to serve the SR 710 Norther Stub project area. In order to comply with the State's mandate and the City's goals of reducing emissions, the vehicles are required to be zero emission buses. This requires charging infrastructure to serve this additional fleet.

The estimated cost of purchasing 11 zero emission buses and the necessary charging infrastructure for those 11 buses is \$12 million.

## **Bus Stop Enhancements**

The transit system expansion for the SR 710 Norther Stub area would provide up to 24 new bus stops serving this area. All new bus stops along this corridor will require improvements to bus to provide accessibility for all users, and amenities to provide a space for passengers to wait for the bus. In addition, a number of existing bus stops within the SR 710 corridor area would be improved through this project. This includes items such as bus benches, bus shelters, ADA compliant landings, lighting, security features and shade structures as appropriate.

The estimated cost of the bus stop enhancements is \$3.6 million.

## **BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION ACTION PLAN PROJECTS**

The City completed an updated Bicycle Transportation Action Plan in 2015. While some of its recommended projects are underway, others remain unfunded. These projects allow for the implementation of a comprehensive bike network, to provide residents and visitors an alternate mode to travel throughout the City. Two projects with regional significance due to their proximity to Metro L Line stations and ability to provide bicycle network connectivity are included below.

### **Greenways (Bike Boulevards)**

Through the 2015 Bicycle Transportation Action Plan, the City identified various potential Greenways, also referred to as Bike Boulevards. The plan proposed Greenways as an enhanced set of calm, low traffic corridors with targeted traffic calming and gap crossing improvements such as narrower curbs and traffic signals. The four north/south Greenways

selected included Wilson Avenue, El Molino Avenue, Sierra Bonita Avenue, and Craig Avenue. These four north/south corridors serve similar functions in that they provide ideal bicycle friendly connections across the 210 freeway. Three of the four Greenways are within ¼-mile of a Metro L Line station, and all four connect to the stations through an existing bicycle network. These Greenways provide a bicycle network connection to Lake Station and Hill Station, and they will also provide future connectivity to the Memorial Park Station and the Del Mar Station, once the construction of the Union Street Protected Bike Lane and the Cordova Street Roadway Configuration projects is completed.

A robust community outreach phase targeting the residents and businesses along the Greenway alignment has been initiated for two greenways; however, other Greenways within the plan will still require additional community discussion and project refinement.

The estimated cost to implement the four north-south greenways is \$12 million.

### **SR 710/SR 134/I-210 RAMP MODIFICATIONS**

The relinquishment of the SR 710 northern stub from Caltrans to the City of Pasadena provides an opportunity to re-envision the land use, transportation network and utility infrastructure for this area. This community led planning effort to define the future use of the SR 710 northern stub will take a significant multi-year planning process. It is anticipated that this planning effort and environmental clearance would cost up to \$5 million to complete.

Any modifications to the freeway on- and off-ramps, as well as any modifications to the freeway-to-freeway connector ramps would require close coordination with Caltrans. An initial technical feasibility analysis and a subsequent supplemental traffic analysis confirmed that removing and/or relocating ramps is technically feasible and would not impact the safety or operations of the freeway system.

The I-210 stub between Union Street and California Boulevard, while less than one mile long, currently features two pairs of on- and off-ramps: north of California, and just north of Del Mar. The northbound on-ramps at Del Mar and north of California (between Bellevue and Waverly Drives) are less than 800 feet apart. In addition, the I-210 and SR 134 both have freeway connector ramps into the SR 710 ditch that would need to be removed or relocated to allow for the re-envisioning of the SR 710 stub.

Removal and/or relocation of the ramps would effectively shift north-south regional traffic (particularly southbound traffic) away from St. John and Pasadena avenues, relatively narrow residential streets, to Walnut Street, Del Mar Boulevard, Fair Oaks Avenue and Arroyo Parkway, broad commercial arteries that are designed to accommodate such traffic. This would be consistent with the City of South Pasadena's accompanying effort to shift regional traffic from Fremont Avenue to Fair Oaks Ave, and would enable multimodal improvements to Pasadena Avenue and St John Avenue.

Cost estimates have not been developed for this project, but costs for removal or relocation of four freeway on/off ramps and up to five freeway-to-freeway connector ramps within an active interchange, along with associated changes to roadway striping, signals and signage, could reasonably be expected to exceed \$150 million.

## **MOBILITY HUBS**

Consistent with recommendations of the SR 710 Working Group (recommendations that were based on previous concepts developed by the City of Pasadena), the City is requesting funding for “mobility hub” first/last mile access improvements at L Line stations and the future Metro North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit Line. Mobility hubs are activity centers that bring together transit, micro-transit and shared mobility to maximize first mile last mile connectivity through place-making strategies. Because Metro Rail station sites in Pasadena are generally constrained, and the future North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT line is still in preliminary design, further analysis would need to be conducted of space requirements for different potential elements, as well as other factors including costs and benefits.

At this time, the anticipated cost for mobility hub implementation is estimated to be \$24 million.



**SR 710 MEASURE R MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT FUNDING ESTIMATES**

Project	Preliminary Cost Estimate
<b>Multi Modal Mobility Improvements</b>	
Pasadena Ave and St John Ave Roadway Network (Walnut St to Columbia St)	\$75.1M
Columbia St (from Orange Grove Blvd to Fair Oaks Ave)	\$9.9M
Orange Grove Mobility Improvement Program	\$5.4M
San Rafael Ave (between Linda Vista Ave and Colorado Blvd)	\$4.8M
Avenue 64 Complete Street Program	\$1.5M
Continental Crosswalks	\$6.8M
Arroyo Link	\$45-65M
<b>Traffic Signals and Intelligent Transportation System Projects</b>	
Orange Grove Blvd at Colorado Blvd and Orange Grove Blvd at Holly St	\$4.5M
Metro L Line At-Grade Crossing Enhancements	\$2.5M
Holly St, from Fair Oaks Ave to Marengo Ave	\$1.4M
Pedestrian and Bicyclist Automated Data Collection	\$2.5M
High-Resolution Traffic Signal Data	\$12.5M
I-210 Connected Corridors Expansion	\$5M
<b>Pasadena Transit System Expansion for the SR 710 Corridor</b>	
Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility	\$62.4M
Zero Emission Buses (11) and Charging Infrastructure	\$12M
Bus Stop Enhancements	\$3.6M
<b>Bicycle Transportation Action Plan Projects</b>	
Greenways (Bike Boulevards)	\$12M
<b>SR 710/SR 134/I-210 Ramp Modifications</b>	\$150M +
<b>Mobility Hubs</b>	\$24M

PERMANENT SELECT  
COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE  
CHAIRMAN

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE  
EX-OFFICIO MEMBER

WEB ADDRESS AT:  
[www.house.gov/schiff](http://www.house.gov/schiff)

FACEBOOK:  
[www.facebook.com/repadam Schiff](http://www.facebook.com/repadam Schiff)



**ADAM B. SCHIFF**

October 17, 2022

WASHINGTON OFFICE:  
 2309 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515  
(202) 225-4176  
FAX: (202) 225-5828

DISTRICT OFFICE:  
245 EAST OLIVE AVENUE  
SUITE 200  
BURBANK, CA 91502  
(818) 450-2900  
FAX: (818) 450-2928  
Email: [Schiff.constituent@mail.house.gov](mailto:Schiff.constituent@mail.house.gov)

DISTRICT OFFICE:  
5500 HOLLYWOOD BOULEVARD  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90028  
(323) 315-5555  
(BY APPOINTMENT ONLY)

Stephanie Wiggins, Chief Executive Officer  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: Support for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Light Rail Extension TIRCP Application**

Dear Ms. Wiggins:

I write in support of the Gold Line Foothill Extension application for the upcoming cycle of the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) grant program to help secure the remaining funds needed to complete the Pomona to Montclair segment of the Gold Line Foothill Extension project.

The remaining segment of the Gold Line Foothill Extension will add miles of light rail service to our region's transit network, providing a reliable and efficient source of transportation for residents of the greater Los Angeles region and alleviating traffic in one of the state's most congested traffic areas. As we work to find solutions to solve our traffic congestion dilemma, this project is also a critical part of our fight to reduce pollution.

Communities along the corridor have been eagerly awaiting the completion the Gold Line Foothill Extension and this project will play an integral role in the economic development of the area, providing new opportunities to live and work near transit. This project will address existing and future traffic congestion by providing a cost effective and time effective alternative travel option for millions of commuters: residents, students, workers, and tourists. The extension will improve mobility, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, create new connectivity and corridor safety, and benefit numerous disadvantaged communities. The Gold Line Foothill Extension is a project I am pleased to support and believe it will tremendously benefit the residents of the greater Los Angeles area.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of the application.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Adam B. Schiff".

**ADAM B. SCHIFF**  
Member of Congress

October 2022 Other Comments

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2022 12:46 PM  
To: Rockwell, Holly <RockwellH@metro.net>  
Cc: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: Extend Public Comment Period for LA ART project Draft Environmental Impact Report

To: Holly Rockwell ([RockwellH@metro.net](mailto:RockwellH@metro.net))  
CC: [boardclerk@metro.net](mailto:boardclerk@metro.net)

Subject: Extend Public Comment Period for LA ART project Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Rockwell,

A 45-day extension of the public comment period for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Draft Environmental Impact Report so that the total comment period would be 90 days.

The community deserves to be heard and provided the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the CEQA process. We know that draft environmental impact reports like this one will likely be long and complex, requiring time to review and analyze the full details of this project.

LA ART and METRO have failed to provide opportunities for our community members to ask questions, raise concerns, and provide meaningful input. We have not received information on important details of the project and will need sufficient time to review and understand it. A 45-day extension of the public comment period is necessary for a public comment period that would fall squarely during the holiday season when COVID-19 is likely to spike, thereby limiting the ability for proper outreach and education efforts.

Please do the right thing in extending the comment period by 45-days to give our neighborhoods an opportunity to review and participate after the holiday season.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 11:43 AM  
To: Rockwell, Holly <RockwellH@metro.net>  
Cc: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: Extend Public Comment Period for LA ART project Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Rockwell,

A 45-day extension of the public comment period for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Draft Environmental Impact Report so that the total comment period would be 90 days.

The community deserves to be heard and provided the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the CEQA process. We know that draft environmental impact reports like this one will likely be long and complex, requiring time to review and analyze the full details of this project.

LA ART and METRO have failed to provide opportunities for our community members to ask questions, raise concerns, and provide meaningful input. We have not received information on important details of the project and will need sufficient time to review and understand it. A 45-day extension to ensure proper community engagement is not only the right thing to do, but also necessary for a public comment period that would fall squarely during the holiday season when COVID-19 is likely to spike, thereby limiting the ability for proper outreach and education efforts.

Please do the right thing in extending the comment period by 45-days to give our neighborhoods an opportunity to review and participate after the holiday season.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
resident of Chinatown/Solano Canyo

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2022 12:38 PM  
To: Rockwell, Holly <RockwellH@metro.net>; Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: Extension of Draft Environmental Impact Report Comment Period Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project

October 13, 2022

Ms. Holly Rockwell,  
Senior Executive Officer . Community Mobility Planning  
Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-3-1  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952  
[RockwellH@metro.net](mailto:RockwellH@metro.net)

Re: Extension of Draft Environmental Impact Report Comment Period . Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project

Dear Ms. Rockwell,

On behalf of Clockshop, we request that the public comment period for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) be no less than 90-days.

The public comment period will last or how community members are expected to participate. The two meetings scheduled after the DEIR is released clearly state that no public comment will be taken. It is imperative that the community be given an opportunity to meaningfully participate in the CEQA process by providing a total of 90-days to comment and a clear pathway to engage.

To date, our communities have been shut out of this process, with little to no details being shared. The few details provided by LA ART are wholly insufficient to understand the complexities of a project that will greatly impact surrounding communities.

Frankly, we deserve better. We must be heard and provided with a chance to meaningfully review lengthy, complex documents with technical information that will require significant time to review and analyze. It is our understanding that similar environmental review processes such as the South Los Angeles and Southeast Los Angeles Community Plan and the LA Zoo Vision Plan have also been extended beyond 45-days.

The DEIR has been delayed numerous times, and if you proceed with a 45-day comment period, what message does that send to our communities? You can delay the release of the DEIR but not extend a public comment period that will be held during the holiday season when it is challenging for community members to participate. There is no need to rush through this process at this stage.

Finally, extending the public comment period is critical for transparency and fairness. Councilmember-elect Eunisses Hernandez, who has voiced concerns and will represent the communities most impacted by this project, deserves the chance to review and analyze the DEIR.

Please do the right thing by extending the comment period to a total of 90-days.

Sincerely,

Sue Bell Yank

CC: Ms. Stephanie Wiggins, Metro Chief Executive Officer  
Metro Executive Committee:  
Chair Ara J. Najarian  
Vice Chair Janice Hahn  
Director Katherine Barger  
Director James Butts  
Director Eric Garcetti  
Director Hilda Solis  
Director Gloria Roberts

--



**Executive Director**

she | her | hers



P: 213-915-4311

[@clockshopla](mailto:clockshopla@clockshop.org)

[clockshop.org](http://clockshop.org)

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2022 9:08 AM  
To: Rockwell, Holly <RockwellH@metro.net>  
Cc: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: Extend Public Comment Period for LA ART project Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Rockwell,

Q Á |ãã \* Á } Á^ @-Á -Á@ Ádãf !} ãÁÙæ^ ÁÙæ \ ÁÙæ } \* ^! • ÁÉ • [ &ãã } ÁÇÙÜÜÇÉÁ Á^~^• ÁÁ Í -  
day extension of the public comment period for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Draft Environmental Impact Report so that the total comment period would be 90 days.

As this project will impact the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the public deserves to be heard and provided the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the CEQA process. We know that draft environmental impact reports like this one will likely be long and complex, requiring time to review and analyze the full details of this project. We have not received information on important details of the project and will need sufficient time to review and understand it.

A 45-day extension to ensure proper community engagement is necessary for a public comment period that would fall squarely during the holiday season when COVID-19 is likely to spike, thereby limiting the ability for proper outreach and education efforts.

Please extend the comment period by 45-days to give our organization and other interested parties an opportunity to review and participate after the holiday season.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[www.cspra.com](http://www.cspra.com)

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 7:04 PM  
To: Rockwell, Holly <RockwellH@metro.net>  
Cc: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
Subject: Extend Public Comment Period for LA ART project Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Rockwell,  
I am requesting a 45-day extension of the public comment period for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Draft Environmental Impact Report so that the total comment period would be 90 days.

The community deserves to be heard and provided the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the CEQA process. We know that draft environmental impact reports like this one will likely be long and complex, requiring time to review and analyze the full details of this project.

LA ART and METRO have failed to provide opportunities for our community members to ask questions, raise concerns, and provide meaningful input. We have not received information on important details of the project and will need sufficient time to review and understand it.

A 45-day extension to ensure proper community engagement is not only necessary for a public comment period that would fall squarely during the holiday season when COVID-19 is likely to spike, thereby limiting the ability for proper outreach and education efforts.

Please do the right thing in extending the comment period by 45-days to give our neighborhoods an opportunity to review and participate after the holiday season.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

LASHP Promotora



## October 2022 RBM Public Comments

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, October 24, 2022 10:11 PM

**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

**Subject:** October 27 2022 BOD Meeting, Public Comment: Agenda Item #22

### **Item #22, Item Needs More Consideration**

While reading the Item 22, Board Report #40, I read this very interesting quote: "Task Force found that a fareless system would grow ridership and help the region meet its mobility, congestion reduction, and sustainability goals more effectively than almost any other LA Metro initiative." (page 1).

LA Metro should continue to offer fareless bus & rail service like it did during the 2020 pandemic. If LA Metro hopes to have car drivers switch from driving to using public transportation, it needs a strong reason. Those reasons are not going to be faster time, reliability, or saving the environment (unfortunately).

LA Metro strongest reason should be its cost. No one having to pay for gas, or maybe even making monthly payments to a car. But unfortunately, once TAP cards and fares are involved, it makes people less willing to use public transportation because it becomes too inconvenient/complicated. Don't let this bug be the feature!

Please, eliminate fares and have a real Fareless System. Thank you for your time.

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 26, 2022 4:11 PM

**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

**Subject:** CONCERNS on Item #22 - FARELESS SYSTEM INITIATIVE AND LOW-INCOME FARE IS EASY (LIFE)

Dear Metro Directors:

I am writing to ask you to **commit to achieving universal fareless transit**. During the first two years of the pandemic, buses were free for all riders—relieving many of their second-highest living expense, after rent.

Fareless transit is economic justice. The pandemic is not over, and many LA residents remain burdened by rent and other debts. If we do not start working towards universal fareless transit, not only will Metro add onto the economic burdens community members already endure, Metro will also be forcing riders to overpay for public transportation. The majority (70%) of Metro's funding comes from local sales taxes. LA County residents, including me, already pay for public transit.

Fareless transit is racial justice and makes sense. For every dollar collected in fare, Metro spends nearly 90 cents on policing its buses and trains. Instead of adding to transit riders' already burdensome cost of living and instead of maintaining an expensive and unjust fare collection and enforcement system, Metro should be universally and permanently fareless for everyone.

Thank you.

--

[REDACTED] (she/her/ella)

Organizadora de Coaliciones y Recursos / Coalitions and Resourcing Organizer  
Colectivo Poder Comunitario / Community Power Collective



Twitter: [@CPCollectivo](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 26, 2022 4:58 PM  
**To:** Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>  
**Cc:** Patricia Sanders <patricias@strategies360.com>  
**Subject:** Public Comment, Item 40: Item needs more consideration

Dear LA Metro Board Members and Staff:

I am sharing these written comments with regard to Item 40: Metro Bikeshare. My name is Colin Hughes and I am the Senior Policy Manager for Lyft, the largest bikeshare provider in North America. Lyft systems include: Citi Bike in New York, Capital Bikeshare in DC, and Bay Wheels in San Francisco among many others. In Los Angeles we also operate dockless e-bikes and e-scooters. Lyft is very excited to participate in this upcoming RFP and to be a partner in the future of bikeshare in Los Angeles County. I want to thank LA Metro staff and the board for their efforts to put together the proposed plan.

**We believe that item 40 needs more consideration.** Lyft has shared feedback with LA Metro via its bikeshare stakeholder summit and survey. During those conversations we advocated for a system modeled after Washington DC: a regional, station-based system where the public sector owns the equipment and pays the operator an operating fee to deliver this service. In our considerable experience, this is the most successful way to operate a large, regional system of varying densities, while also ensuring a strong station footprint and high quality equipment.

Given that the current recommendation being considered today includes no upfront funding for the large capital equipment investment required for a regional system across Los Angeles County, we wanted to suggest smaller modifications for consideration.

1. If the region is not interested in owning all of the program equipment, we would encourage you to consider partial ownership of stations only. A strong station network will be critical to the success of this program and the upfront investment required would be a significant hurdle for any operator. Modifying the RFP to contemplate regional station ownership would ensure the system is station-based, that the equipment is high-quality, and that stations are located equitably throughout the city. Stations, by design, prevent theft, reduce sidewalk clutter, and stations can be leveraged for larger electrification efforts as a real public asset.
2. Alternatively, LA Metro could also fund only the initial equipment but no replacement equipment. This would address the underlying concerns around theft but would not place the large upfront hurdle for operators that would likely undercut the system design and equipment quality.

We would also stress the importance of a 10-year contract term for any station-based system to ensure the system has time to grow its ridership and the operator to recoup their investment. Such is the case with Mexico City and Barcelona - both used as examples in the staff report and both Lyft station-based systems that have 10-year contract terms. Also, it is important that as LA County ramps up for the 2028 Olympics, we have a sustainable and thriving bike program steadily in place – and a 10 year program would provide the best opportunity for that.

Thank you for considering our feedback, we are very excited to see LA Metro taking these steps to advance bikeshare and sustainable mobility in the County.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED] Senior Policy Manager, New Mobility, Lyft [REDACTED] | he/him/his





## **MINUTES**

**Thursday, October 27, 2022**

**10:00 AM**

### **Board of Directors - Regular Board Meeting**

#### **DIRECTORS PRESENT:**

**Ara J. Najarian, Chair**

**Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, 1st Vice Chair**

**Janice Hahn, 2nd Vice Chair**

**Kathryn Barger**

**Mike Bonin**

**James Butts**

**Fernando Dutra**

**Eric Garcetti**

**Paul Krekorian**

**Sheila Kuehl**

**Holly J. Mitchell**

**Tim Sandoval**

**Hilda Solis**

**Mark Archuleta, non-voting member**

**Stephanie Wiggins, Chief Executive Officer**

**CALLED TO ORDER: 10:00 A.M.**

**ROLL CALL**

1. APPROVED Consent Calendar Items 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 25, 30, 31, 32, 40, and 42.

Consent Calendar items were approved by one vote except item 25 which was held by a Director for discussion and/or separate action.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

2. **SUBJECT: MINUTES** 2022-0747

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting held September 22, 2022.

3. **SUBJECT: REMARKS BY THE CHAIR** 2022-0745

RECEIVED remarks by the Chair.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

4. **SUBJECT: REPORT BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER** 2022-0746

RECEIVED report by the Chief Executive Officer.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

\*\*\*\*\*

KB = K. Barger	FD = F. Dutra	SK = S. Kuehl	HS = H. Solis
MB = M. Bonin	EG = E. Garcetti	HJM = H.J. Mitchell	
JB = J. Butts	JH = J. Hahn	AJN = A.J. Najarian	
JDW = J. Dupont Walker	PK = P. Krekorian	TS = T. Sandoval	

LEGEND: Y = YES, N = NO, C = CONFLICT, ABS = ABSTAIN, A = ABSENT, A/C = ABSENT/CONFLICT P = PRESENT

**5. SUBJECT: FIRST/LAST MILE PROJECT PRIORITIZATION**

**2022-0265**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. RECEIVING AND FILING First/Last Mile (FLM) Project Prioritization Methodology; and
- B. ADOPTING Prioritized Project Lists for previously adopted FLM plans for the following plans:
  - 1. Aviation/96th Street Station, adopted June 27, 2019 (File #2019-0170)
  - 2. East San Fernando Valley, adopted December 3, 2020 (File #2019-0431)
  - 3. Gold Line Foothill Extension 2B, adopted June 27, 2019 (File #2019-0170)
  - 4. Purple Line Extension Sections 2 & 3, adopted May 28, 2020 (File #2020-0111)

**6. SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT MASTER PLAN AND PROGRAM CONTRACT**

**2022-0465**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute a five-year firm fixed price Contract No. PS88917000 to UrbanTrans Consultants, Inc., to develop a new regional Transportation Demand Management Master Plan and Program in the amount of \$1,463,580, subject to resolution of all properly submitted protest(s) if any.

<b>JDW</b>	<b>JH</b>	<b>KB</b>	<b>MB</b>	<b>JB</b>	<b>FD</b>	<b>EG</b>	<b>PK</b>	<b>SK</b>	<b>HJM</b>	<b>TS</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>AJN</b>
Y	Y	A/C	Y	A/C	Y	C	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**7. SUBJECT: MARIACHI PLAZA L LINE (GOLD) STATION JOINT DEVELOPMENT**

**2022-0574**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute an amendment to the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement and Planning Document (ENA) with East Los Angeles Community Corporation (Developer or ELACC) to extend the term for one year, with an option to extend the term for an additional year, for the joint development of Metro-owned property at Mariachi Plaza in Boyle Heights with up to 60 units of affordable housing, ancillary ground floor community space and a community garden (Project).



**8. SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM UPDATE - WESTSIDE CITIES SUBREGION** **2022-0633**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. programming an additional \$966,589 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Active Transportation 1st/Last Mile Connections Program (Expenditure Line 51);
- B. DELEGATING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee the authority to:
  - 1. Amend Measure M MSP funding agreements to modify the scope of work of projects and project development phases consistent with eligibility requirements;
  - 2. Administratively extend funding agreement lapse dates for Measure M MSP funding agreements to meet environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction time frames; and
- C. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements for approved projects.

**9. SUBJECT: STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM** **2022-0646**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the ATP Point Assignment Method Planning Supplement.

**10.1 SUBJECT: RAIL TO RIVER ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR - SEGMENT B MOTION** **2022-0750**

APPROVE Motion by Director Dutra and Hahn that the following are included as possible funding sources for the Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor, Segment B: "Reconnecting Communities/Highway to Boulevards Program" at the state level, and "Reconnecting Communities Program" and "Neighborhood Access and Equity Grant Program" at the federal level. Report back in April 2023 with more details on the eligible uses of these funds; agency responsible for managing the funding source next funding cycle including due date for grant applications; evaluation criteria used; and examples of local projects that have been funded by the source.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**12. SUBJECT: MEASURE M INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE SELECTION** **2022-0688**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR Paul Rajmaira, the recommended nominee for the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for area of expertise E, management of large-scale construction projects.

**13. SUBJECT: AUDIT SERVICES BENCH** **2022-0641**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to:

A. AWARD eight (8) task order-based bench Contract Nos. PS86611000 through PS86611007, for Audit Support Services to the firms listed below, for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$7,142,240 for the initial three-year base term, plus \$2,476,605 for the first, one-year option and \$2,526,140 for the second, one-year option for a total not-to-exceed cumulative amount of \$12,144,985, effective January 1, 2023, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any; and

Discipline 1: Staff Augmentation

1. BCA Watson Rice, LLP
2. Qiu Accountancy Corporation
3. Simpson and Simpson, LLP
4. TAP Financials, LLP
5. The Lopez Group, LLP

Discipline 2: Subject Matter Expertise

1. BCA Watson Rice, LLP
2. Qiu Accountancy Corporation
3. Simpson and Simpson, LLP
4. Talson Solutions, LLC
5. TAP International, Inc.
6. The Lopez Group, LLP
7. Vasquez & Company, LLP

B. EXECUTE or DELEGATE the execution of Task Orders under these contracts within the approved not-to-exceed cumulative value of \$12,144,985.

<b>JDW</b>	<b>JH</b>	<b>KB</b>	<b>MB</b>	<b>JB</b>	<b>FD</b>	<b>EG</b>	<b>PK</b>	<b>SK</b>	<b>HJM</b>	<b>TS</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>AJN</b>
Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	A	Y	C	Y	Y	Y



**15. SUBJECT: CALIFORNIA SB1 STATE OF GOOD REPAIR PROGRAM 2022-0667**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Resolution to:

- A. AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or designee to claim \$36,485,158 in fiscal year (FY) 2022-23 State of Good Repair Program (SGR) grant funds as the Regional Entity for Los Angeles County for this program;
- B. APPROVE the regional SGR Project List for FY22-23; and
- C. CERTIFY that Metro will comply with all conditions and requirements set forth in the SGR Certification and Assurances document and applicable statutes, regulations, and guidelines.

**17. SUBJECT: ACQUISITION OF COMPUTER HARDWARE, SOFTWARE AND SERVICES 2022-0614**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to continue to utilize the National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO) cooperative purchase program to purchase computer and network equipment, peripherals, and related software and services, at an increase of \$30,000,000 in total expenditure limit, increasing the total expenditure limit from \$30M to \$60M through January 2025. This request is not for a budget increase but is a request for an increase to the cooperative agreement expenditure limit.

**18. SUBJECT: LA METRO TREE POLICY 2022-0535**

ADOPTED ON CONSENT CALENDAR Metro Tree Policy.

**20. SUBJECT: END OF LINE POLICY AND UNHOUSED RIDERS MOTION 2022-0734**

APPROVED Motion by Directors Hahn, Najarian, Solis, Barger, Dutra, and Krekorian that the Chief Executive Officer:

- A. Evaluate Metro's end of the line policy and its impacts on communities that have a station that is the end of a Metro rail line;
- B. Conduct a thorough evaluation of the unhoused populations exiting trains at night and boarding trains in the morning at the ends of rail lines, to better understand the impact of the end of line policy and to inform future resource deployment;

(continued on next page)

(Item 20 – continued from previous page)

- C. Coordinate with the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) for its annual Point-In-Time Count, to determine the numbers of unhoused riders on Metro’s bus and rail system; and
- D. Report back on the above three directives no later than January 2023 with recommendations for what we can do differently.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**22. SUBJECT: FARELESS SYSTEM INITIATIVE AND LOW-INCOME FARE IS EASY 2022-0679**

RECEIVED AND FILED status updates on Fareless System Initiative (FSI) and Low-Income Fare Is Easy (LIFE) Programs.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

**23. SUBJECT: STATE AND FEDERAL REPORT 2022-0689**

RECEIVED AND FILED October 2022 State and Federal Legislative Report.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
P	A	P	P	P	P	A	A	P	P	P	P	A

**25. SUBJECT: SEPULVEDA TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT 2022-0529**

AUTHORIZED the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to:

- A. AWARD AND EXECUTE Contract No. AE82658000 to Anser Advisory Management, LLC for Program Management/Pre-Development Agreement (PDA) Oversight Services for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project in the amount of \$26,221,895 for the four-year base term, and \$14,440,545 for the two-year option term, for a total contract value of \$40,662,440, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any; and
- B. APPROVE Contract Modification Authority in the amount of 10% of the contract award value and authorize the CEO to execute individual Contract Modifications within the Board-approved Contract Modification Authority.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
Y	C	C	Y	C	Y	C	Y	Y	C	Y	Y	Y



**30. SUBJECT: PURCHASE THIRTY-THREE METRO TRANSIT SECURITY 2022-0423  
HYBRID SUVS**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to award a firm fixed price contract under IFB No. OP87524 with Elite Auto Network Corporation, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for thirty-three hybrid Metro Transit Security SUVs for a firm fixed price of \$2,340,195.31, inclusive of sales tax.

**31. SUBJECT: ETHERNET SWITCH 2022-0543**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to award a one-year Indefinite Delivery/ Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract No. MA89960000 to Peacock Systems, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for Ethernet Switches in the total contract amount of \$2,868,135.69, inclusive of sales tax, subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest(s), if any.

**32. SUBJECT: ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGER CONTRACT 2022-0638**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 6 to Contract No. OP55097000 with Axxera Inc. for the Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Services contract to extend the Period of Performance by 24 months through December 1, 2024, and increase the Not-to-Exceed Total Contract Price by \$250,000, from \$699,718.72 to \$949,718.72.

**40. SUBJECT: METRO BIKE SHARE PROGRAM 2022-0680**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the updated Metro Bike Share (MBS) operational model of Privately-Owned and Publicly Managed to improve overall performance and support a more sustainable regional bike share program.

**42. SUBJECT: FINDINGS REQUIRED TO CONTINUE TO MEET VIA 2022-0748  
TELECONFERENCE IN COMPLIANCE WITH AB 361  
WHILE UNDER A STATE OF EMERGENCY AND WHILE  
STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS CONTINUE TO PROMOTE  
SOCIAL DISTANCING**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR making the following findings:

Pursuant to AB 361, the Metro Board, on behalf of itself and other bodies created by the Board and subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act, including Metro's standing Board committees, advisory bodies, and councils, finds:  
The Metro Board has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency, and that:

(continued on next page)

(Item 42 – continued from previous page)

- A. The state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person, and
- B. State or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

Therefore, all such bodies will continue to meet via teleconference subject to the requirements of AB 361.

**43. SUBJECT: CLOSED SESSION**

2022-0751

A. Conference with Legal Counsel - Existing Litigation - G.C. 54956.9(d)(1)

1. Victoria Concha v. LACMTA, Case No. 20STCV34876

APPROVED settlement in the amount of \$320,000.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
Y	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	A

2. Joy White v. LACMTA, Case No. 20STCV24941

APPROVED settlement in the amount of \$250,000.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
Y	A	Y	Y	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	A

3. Robert Wiseman v. LACMTA, Case No. 19STCV03889

APPROVED settlement in the amount of \$700,000.

JDW	JH	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS	AJN
Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	A

B. Conference with Legal Counsel-Anticipated Litigation-G.C. 54956.9(d)(2)

Significant Exposure to Litigation (One Case)

NO REPORT.

(continued on next page)

(Item 43 – continued from previous page)

C. Conference with Legal Counsel-Anticipated Litigation-G.C. 54956.9(d)(4)  
Initiation to Litigation (One Case)

AUTHORIZED initiation of litigation.

<b>JDW</b>	<b>JH</b>	<b>KB</b>	<b>MB</b>	<b>JB</b>	<b>FD</b>	<b>EG</b>	<b>PK</b>	<b>SK</b>	<b>HJM</b>	<b>TS</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>AJN</b>
Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	A

D. Conference Regarding Potential Threats to Public Services or Facilities -  
Government Code Section 54957

Consultation with MTA's Deputy Chief Executive Officer Sharon Gookin and MTA's Deputy Chief Information Technology Officer Bryan Sastokas, or designees and related security representatives.

CARRIED OVER to a sequent meeting.

E. Public Employee Performance Evaluation - Government Code Section  
54957(b)(1)

Title: Chief Executive Officer

NO REPORT.

**ADJOURNED AT 2:54 P.M.**

Prepared by: Jessica Vasquez Gamez  
Administrative Analyst, Board Administration

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Collette Langston, Board Clerk