

**Attachment A - Public Comments received on Title VI Analyses of
Crenshaw Light Rail Project and Regional Connector Transit Project Service Plans**

Committer Name	Comment	Date Received	Method of Submission	Agency Response
Mark R. Johnston	<p>1/ Long Beach to Azusa or Pomona and especially Montclair is WAY too long of a line to function with any kind of on time performance. Should be Long Beach to East LA (for now). And Santa Monica to Azusa. Now if you were to send the Blue Line up Alameda instead of the WSAB, then maybe that works by cutting some time and distance off. Or you can try alternating trains, but will you right a tight enough operations plan to make that happen(?)</p> <p>2/ Crenshaw South Bay line issue is not right either. Part of the issue in my opinion is because you chose to put a very poorly placed Bike Path on METRO OWNED right of way along Slauson, We have so few good corridors and this was wasted on a bike-walk path that will basically be inhabited by trash, homeless etc. Your Redondo Beach (and someday Torrance) line should have been thru routed thru LAX and Inglewood and then out the Slauson ROW to the Blue and WSAB station in South Gate. Crenshaw is ok from Norwalk/605 to Exposition Blvd and eventual Wilshire and Hollywood. This would have created 4 directional service to the LAX Rail Station/People Mover connection. We need to start thinking outside the box and further ahead when piecing and connecting lines- we still do a very poor job at junctions and connection points. Thank you.</p>	2/11/2022	Email to servicechanges@Metro.net	<p>Rail schedules will be designed for reliable operations.</p> <p>The West Santa Ana Branch has adopted a preferred alignment that includes the east side of downtown LA to Union Station.</p> <p>Thanks for the suggestion for a Slauson rail corridor. There is no rail project proposed for that corridor at this time.</p>
Brenda Ashby	Crenshaw Manor the neighborhood in which I live is located in direct proximity to the Crenshaw/LAX Line. The opening will provide much-needed transportation to many along its path. The completion of the Title VI Analysis will ensure the minority populations and others impacted by this 8.5 project that is being conducted consistent with FTA guidelines. I am looking forward to the completion of the Title VI Analysis.	2/12/2022	eComment	Metro also looks forward to opening the Crenshaw/LAX Line in 2022 once construction, testing, and training are completed.
Jose Dennis Alabaso	It's still okay, but I'm concerned about the proposed completion for both the Metro K (Crenshaw) Line and the Regional Connector Projects. First, they all knew that the Metro K (Crenshaw) Line is still 98% complete	2/12/2022	eComment	Metro looks forward to opening the Crenshaw/LAX and Regional Connector

Commenter Name	Comment	Date Received	Method of Submission	Agency Response
	<p>and it looks like the Los Angeles Regional Connector is about to be completed sometime the Fall of this year (2022). My other main concern is the extension for the South Bay Metro C (Green) Line that should add with the Redondo Beach/South Bay Galleria Transit Center and of course the proposed Torrance Transportation Center which will open on or before 2030. Are there any possible way to help speed up the processes?</p>			<p>Lines in 2022 once construction, testing, and training are completed for both projects. Comments relating to the Green Line Torrance Extension Project will be shared with that project team.</p>
Peter Wei	<p>With the current service plan, I'm seriously concerned that the section between Willowbrook/Rosa Parks station and Aviation/Imperial station will become a bottleneck for future LAX service increase demands. After the Airport Metro Connector (AMC) begins operation in 2024, the Crenshaw/LAX line will become one of the main ground transportation options for LAX. A frequency of 20 minutes during evening/late night is not enough to serve one of the busiest airports in the world. Even the 12 minute off peak and weekend service is not enough once the LAX ridership picks up.</p>	2/15/2022	eComment	<p>Simulations suggest the proposed operating plan can be operated reliably through the junction west of Imperial/LAX Station.</p> <p>Rail frequencies are set systemwide but can be adjusted based on ridership levels on each line.</p>
Wayne Wright	<p>My comments for the two upcoming projects...</p> <p>LAX/Crenshaw Line (K Line) Have no issues with what Metro will open up with, would like South Bay & Westside service development to look hard again on the bus routes that Metro will be serving the K Line in the future, as well as the municipals that want to connect with the K Line .</p> <p>Would like to see two shuttles between Westchester Veterans Station & the existing Aviation C Line Station....</p>	2/15/2022	<p>Email to servicechanges@Metro.net</p>	<p>Metro will be working with LAWA to ensure an efficient connection is available to LAX shuttles and the LAX People Mover once it opens if that occurs prior to the opening of the Airport Metro Connector Station. Metro does not operate bus service into the LAX terminals due to the congestion and not wanting to</p>

Commenter Name	Comment	Date Received	Method of Submission	Agency Response
	<p>Shuttle one: which would operate direct from Westchester Veterans K Line station to Aviation C Line Station, via Aviation Bl</p> <p>Shuttle two: which can be operated by LAX to operate from Westchester Veterans K Line Station to central terminal area of LAX, that would operate via Aviation, Arbor Vitae, Airport, to 96th St, to 96th St bridge to central terminal area, or use Century Blvd. from Aviation.</p> <p>Reason: is by going all the way to Aviation C Line Station, passengers would have to go all the way to that Station to catch G Line LAX shuttle, which would be time consuming & out of the way, the shuttle from Westchester Veterans K Line Station to LAX central terminal area is better & direct if LAX would provide the shuttle.</p> <p>Regional Connector: two of the 3 proposed stations I have concerns for & they are...</p> <p>Bunker Hill: existing Foothill Transit commuter busses & Big Blue Bus Rapid 10 & LADOT DASH cover by the Bunker Hill Station, would like to see Metro routes like the 53, 55, 60 & other Metro lines if possible, to serve the future Bunker Hill Station.</p> <p>2nd & Broadway: since proposed station is already covered by numerous Metro routes & municipal routes, I have no comments for future 2nd & Broadway Station.</p> <p>&...last Little Tokyo Station: would like to see not only LADOT DASH & Metro 30 line serve the little Tokyo Station, but want G-Trans 1x to serve that station as well & maybe Montebello bus lines? & some Metro routes close to the little Tokyo Station also.</p>			<p>duplicate LAWA shuttle bus services.</p> <p>Metro will review options to bring some bus lines closer to the new station at Bunker Hill, subject to provision of necessary bus stops which is under consideration with City of LA.</p> <p>The new station at Little Tokyo will be served by both Metro and DASH bus lines. Other municipal bus lines may also opt to serve this station.</p> <p>Rail operating hours are established systemwide. There are no plans to extend service beyond the current 12 midnight last trips.</p>

Commenter Name	Comment	Date Received	Method of Submission	Agency Response
	<p>Would like trains to operate till nearly 1 or 2 am on the A & E Line & separate on the K Line also when K Line & Connector opens.</p> <p>Thank you...</p>			
Faramarz Nabavi	<p>I wanted to express my concern about the proposed operational plan for the K Line and G Line. believe the original staff proposal would have been better, and I'm concerned that because of some elected officials in the South Bay, in a more affluent area that is not subject to the same type of Title VI concerns that affect the Crenshaw Corridor and also the existing G Line corridor east of the airport station's -- Aviation Station, that the operational plan that Metro is currently pursuing is going to unduly reduce the amount of service to people who are supposed to be protected under Title VI. I believe the original staff proposal would have been better, and I'm concerned that because of some elected officials in the South Bay, in a more affluent area that is not subject to the same type of Title VI concerns that affect the Crenshaw Corridor and also the existing G Line corridor east of the airport station's -- Aviation Station, that the operational plan that Metro is currently pursuing is going to unduly reduce the amount of service to people who are supposed to be protected under Title VI. And so I would urge staff to present to the board, based on the additional analysis they've done, the pros and cons of going back to the original staff proposal based on the Title VI analysis. I don't believe that the current proposal, which was driven by the board, meets the Title VI requirements of being better than what staff had originally proposed. So I respectfully request the implementation of the original plan. Thank you.</p>	2/15/2022	Phone	<p>Metro Board adopted Operating Plan for Crenshaw LAX rail service does not reduce service levels at any existing station. A Title VI analysis is required for any operating plan for a new rail line.</p>