

Communication from Public

Name: Tom Jakubowski

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 06:35 PM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, As a weekly rider of the E line, nothing is more frustrating than sitting in a packed train, full of hundreds of commuters, standing still and delaying our arrival because a traffic light has prioritized the movement of a dozen people in cars. Metro and LADOT have long talked about signal priority for light rail in the city of Los Angeles, but have so far failed to deliver on it. The need for reliable throughput on our public transit is only becoming more important as the World Cups and Olympics loom. Now is the time to step up and actually make improving transportation throughput a priority for LADOT. Thank you, Tom Jakubowski

Communication from Public

Name: Matt Nielsen

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 02:51 PM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: Please do whatever it takes to implement signal preemption for all light rail lines for LA Metro. We need to prioritize the rail transit that is efficiently moving hundreds if not thousands of people at a time. We need to speed those lines up significantly.

Communication from Public

Name: Daniel Bingham
Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 12:50 PM
Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of full, unconditional signal preemption for light rail in Los Angeles. The current practice of requiring trains carrying hundreds of riders to wait at red lights so a small number of private vehicles can pass is not a technical oversight. It is a policy choice. That choice prioritizes automobile throughput over transit reliability and undermines the billions of dollars voters approved through Measure M and Measure R to expand and improve rail service. Partial measures and brief signal extensions do not constitute meaningful preemption. If Los Angeles is serious about reliability, climate commitments, and equitable mobility, trains must receive true priority at intersections. Anything less devalues the time of commuters, essential workers, students, and visitors who rely on the A and E Lines and reinforces continued dependence on single-occupancy vehicles. The City cannot credibly claim to support transit while operationally subordinating it to automobile flow. Full preemption should be implemented as a system-wide standard, not deferred as a future enhancement.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 12:00 PM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: Signal preemption is a no-brainer. We need to prioritize alternative modes of transportation. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Tyler Peters

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 02:49 PM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: Please install signal priority along the entire Eline. It's unacceptable that a train full of hundreds of people will wait for one car to make a left or an entire light cycle. Sometime on my commute we hit every light and it can add upwards of 20 mins to the journey.

Communication from Public

Name: Joseph Collins

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 12:26 AM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: Please prioritize signal preemption for A, E, and K line grade crossings

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 03:32 AM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: I want the train go non-stop! It will save so much time and make transit great again!

Communication from Public

Name: Kyle
Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 09:06 AM
Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: This LADOT report does NOT meet the requirements of this motion passed by city council. It does not outline a "draft policy and implementation plan and timeline to modify signal timing citywide to operate traffic signals with dwell recall, Transit Signal Priority, or preemption along at-grade rail lines, Bus Rapid Transit lines, fulltime transit lanes, and part-time transit lanes, with the goal of reducing signal delay to transit vehicles and reducing transit end-to-end travel times to the greatest extent possible." Nowhere in the report did they outline their plans to reduce delay on light rail beyond the efforts to date on dwell recall. They explain that "limited preemption" is being tested on the G line, but make no mention of any intent or plans to do the same on light rail lines. I don't see any "adopted goal of reducing signal delay to transit vehicles and reducing transit end-to-end travel times as much as possible above all other considerations, excepting safety." I urge you to hold LADOT accountable. LADOT should return with a report outlining how and when they plan to implement the mentioned "limited preemption" to all street running light rail, not just the G line.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 09:32 AM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: Anything less than full preemption for our street-level rail lines is, frankly, unacceptable. Mass transit needs to be as preferable to driving as possible, and it's ridiculous to make a train full of people wait for far fewer people in individual vehicles

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 11:03 AM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: I support all transit signal preemption. Trains should not wait for cars.

Communication from Public

Name: Usman Sohail

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 11:14 AM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: Please give metro rail signal priority. The metro system could be so much better. Given how much has already been invested, this seems like a no brainer.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 11:52 AM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: LADOT should prioritize building full signal preemption priority for our light rail! This should have been done on Day 1. Transit riders should no longer be treated as second class citizen, when they are the ones helping decongest a car-clogged traffic jam nightmare of a city.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 11:55 AM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: Position: Support As a Lincoln Heights resident, I see that it is important to support Transit Signal Priority (TSP) because this improves travel times, allow a mode shift from private cars to public transit, and this would reduce wait times for the bus and light rail. This would also increase the frequency of the transit system overall. This would be a nice compliant to the D line extension as well to build a better LA Metro. For example, the first time I look the G line in January 2026, we had to wait for a few cars for a green light cycle while a bus with very few unoccupied seats have to wait a couple minutes in the morning. Adding TSP would allow more transit frequency as well, since this would reduce travel times, and many other places are doing this with success.

Communication from Public

Name: Andrew

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 11:51 PM

Council File No: 24-1222

Comments for Public Posting: I live near the E line, but I don't ride it because it's far too slow compared to a car. I urge LADOT and the City Transportation Committee to prioritize completing signal preemption for rail. Having a faster and more convenient rail system is one of the best ways to increase ridership on the LA Metro network. And increasing ridership cascades into a bunch of positive impacts for our city. * It decreases fossil fuel emissions, improving the health of our people, reducing healthcare costs, and makes our lives more affordable * It reduces traffic, decreasing traffic accidents, giving us savings on auto repair costs, auto insurance, healthcare costs, and it saves lives. Increasing ridership makes life easier, more affordable, and safer for people. So please help increase ridership by giving us faster transit with signal preemption for rail. Please help save lives.