



Board Report

File #: 2022-0088, **File Type:** Informational Report

Agenda Number: 23.

**OPERATIONS, SAFETY AND CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE
MARCH 17, 2022**

SUBJECT: PUBLIC SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PSAC) QUARTERLY UPDATE

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) quarterly update.

ISSUE

This report reflects a quarterly update of progress in convening an advisory committee that will provide recommendations on how Metro can reimagine public safety on its system.

BACKGROUND

In the June 2020 Regular Board Meeting, the Board of Directors approved motions 37 and 37.1 for Metro staff to form an advisory committee and, in partnership, develop a community-based approach to public safety on the transit system. Staff is to report back quarterly.

DISCUSSION

General PSAC Meeting Highlights

From November through February, we've had eight (8) general PSAC meetings. In these meetings, the following items were discussed:

- Approval of the mission and values statements for public safety on Metro, Discussed and approved the recommendations for the contract extensions for the multi-agency policing contracts,
- Approved the forthcoming infrastructure protection services and law enforcement services scope of work recommendations,
- Approved the recommendations on a pilot Transit Ambassador program, Discussed the results of Metro's Public Safety Survey,
- Approved the Home at Last (HAL) Short-term Shelter Program recommendations,
- Received a FY22 public safety budget and FY23 budget presentation from the Metro Office of Management and Budget,

Received a Metro's Budget Equity Assessment tool (MBEAT) presentation, and
Received an update on the initiatives related to Motion 26.2.

Ad-Hoc Subcommittee Meetings

From November through February, we've had four (4) Infrastructure Protection Services meetings, five (5) Policing Practices meetings, seven (7) Non-Law Enforcement Alternatives meetings, and five (5) Community Engagement meetings. Each ad-hoc subcommittee was very involved and engaged in the approval of each recommendation item presented during the general PSAC meetings from November through February.

The Infrastructure Protection Services ad-hoc subcommittee concluded at the end of December, followed by the Policing Practices ad-hoc subcommittee in February. The remaining two ad-hoc subcommittees, Non-Law Enforcement Alternatives and Community Engagement will continue to meet and focus on providing feedback on the following items: place-based implementation strategy, enhanced homeless outreach teams, and pilot homelessness strategies.

EQUITY PLATFORM

PSAC creates an inclusive space for members of the public to express their ideas, feelings, and experiences about public safety and propose alternatives to existing models. PSAC members who represent people with disabilities or bus operators have been able to voice their unique safety concerns and raise recommendations for their colleagues' consideration.

NEXT STEPS

We will continue to provide PSAC updates in the monthly Transit Safety and Security Performance report.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - November 3, 2021 PSAC Meeting Minutes
Attachment B - November 17, 2021 PSAC Meeting Minutes
Attachment C - November 29, 2021 PSAC Meeting Minutes
Attachment D - December 15, 2021 PSAC Meeting Minutes
Attachment E - January 5, 2022 PSAC Meeting Minutes
Attachment F - January 19, 2022 PSAC Meeting Minutes
Attachment G - February 2, 2022 PSAC Meeting Minutes
Attachment H - February 16, 2022 PSAC Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Judy Gerhardt, Deputy Chief System Security and Law Enforcement Officer, (213) 922-2711

Reviewed by: Gina Osborn, Chief Safety Officer, (213) 922-3055



Stephanie N. Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer

Metro Public Safety Advisory Committee General Committee Meeting #14

MINUTES

Wednesday, November 3, 2021

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

A. Zoom Meeting Protocols

Facilitator Richard France called the meeting to order. Facilitator Thomson Dryjanski announced Spanish and American Sign Language interpreter services would be available throughout the meeting.

B. Agenda

Facilitator France reviewed the agenda for the meeting. .

C. Roll Call

Present: Ashley Ajayi, Carrie Madden, Chauncey Smith, Clarence Davis, Constance Strickland, Darryl Goodus, Esteban Garcia, Fabian Gallardo, Florence Annang, Glenda Murrell, James Wen, Jose Raigoza, Maricela De Rivera, Mohammad Tajsar, Dr. Sabrina Howard, Scarlett de Leon

Absent: Jessica Kellogg, Ma'ayan Dembo, Raul Gomez

D. Approval of Meeting Minutes for 10/20/21

Committee members voted to approve the meeting minutes for the October 20, 2021 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. The following comments were shared:

- A. Commentor with the Advancement Project California expressed support for the cancellation of policing contracts and the reinvestment of funds into community safety alternatives.
- B. Commentor alleged that they were wrongfully terminated from their job as a security contractor with American Eagle Protection Services, a subcontractor of RMI (who provides Metro's infrastructure protection services) for reporting alleged illegal activities of other private security personnel. They requested for the owner of RMI to speak to PSAC regarding alleged "illegal activities and arrests."
 - a. Member Florence Annang commented she would like to learn more about these allegations.
- C. Commentor Dr. Chris B. Liban from the Metro Asian American Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) Steering Committee highlighted that they are considering training and recognition of the Asian American community as part of their policy platform. They also submitted written statement that was distributed to PSAC.

III. Discussion

A. Proposal to Approve the Mission & Values Statements

Facilitator France reviewed [final draft of the PSAC Public Safety Mission & Values statements](#) and requested feedback from the committee.

- a. **Context & process:** France detailed the recent efforts to provide edits on the statements. In advance of this meeting, a small working group of members met to make any wordsmithing changes and finalized the mission and values statements.

- b. **Request for agenda modification:** Member Ajayi proposed for committee members to move the mission and values to later in the agenda, in order to approve the other agenda items first and have an extended discussion on modifications to the statements.
 - i. Member Annang stressed that today's meeting already has a full agenda and would like to not shift the agenda order.
 - ii. Member Wen shared it's important to finalize the mission and values statements set to use as a guiding system for future PSAC decision-making.
 - iii. The agenda was not restructured.
- c. **Proposal to edit mission and value statements:** Member Ajayi proposed edits to the statements. These edits proposed adding Metro's actions on dependable transit service to the "Emphasizing Compassion and a Culture of Care" statement and removing "human centered" from the "Implementing a Human-Centered Approach" value.
 - i. Member Wen agreed to adding dependability but not the "human-centered" change.
 - ii. Member Annang shared they are in support of adding dependability if it does not replace "fair treatment."
 - iii. Facilitator proposed suggested adding dependability as a fourth pillar.
 - 1. Member De Rivera responded they do strongly support adding the term "dependability."
- d. **Public Comment**
 - i. Commentor responded to a committee member and stated that dependability is definitely the responsibility of MTA.
- e. **Test for consensus:** Facilitator France proposed approving the mission and values statements, with the addition of dependability to the "Emphasizing Compassion and a Culture of Care" statement.
 - i. Members Ajayi and Davis seconded moving forward with the dependability addition. There were no concerns from other members.
- f. **Vote to approve modified Mission and Values statements**
 - i. Yes: 14 No: 0 Abstain: 0
 - ii. The item was approved.

B. Proposal to Approve Metro Staff Recommendations for the Infrastructure Protection Services Contract Extension

Committee members discussed endorsing Metro staff recommendations that would modify the contract provisions for the Infrastructure Protection Services contract.

- a. **Body worn camera alternatives:** Metro staff Judy Gerhardt clarified that Metro does not explicitly recommend the vendor mentioned in the recommendations and only included it as an example.
- b. **Timeline and alternative financing:** Member Wen asked if the committee will be able to be vote on the recommendations again in six months if they are not approved today. He also inquired if alternative forms of financing were considered to fund body worn cameras.
 - i. Facilitator France responded that if PSAC decides to not vote on IPS recommendations, Metro will present their staff recommendations without PSAC's comment.
 - 1. Additionally, recommendations from the IPS ad hoc committee will be brought to the full PSAC committee in early 2022.
 - ii. Metro staff Judy Gerhardt shared that for this extension, alternative forms of financing were not something that could be considered but Metro may consider alternatives in the future.
- c. **Proposal to move forward:** Facilitator France proposed that the committee voted on approving Metro staff recommendations, with the exclusion of the body worn camera recommendations. This exclusion was due to a lack of consensus around this topic.
 - i. Members Ajayi, Smith, and Davis agreed with advancing this proposal.
- d. **Public comment period:** There were no public comments on this item.
- e. **Test for consensus:** Members agreed to vote upon approving Metro staff recommendations,

with the exclusion of supporting the body worn camera alternatives recommendations.

- i. In advance of the vote, Member Wen asked if the contract extension is for six months totaling \$19M with RMI as the contractor.
 1. Metro Staff Imelda Hernandez confirmed this is correct.
- f. **Vote to approve modified recommendations from Metro staff on the IPS contract extension.**
 - i. Yes: 3 No: 9 Abstain: 2
 - ii. The item was not approved.
- g. **Next steps:** The facilitation team will draft a memo to communicate PSAC's decision to the Metro Board.

C. Proposal to Approve Policing Practices Ad Hoc Committee Response to Metro Staff Recommendations for the Multi-Agency Law Enforcement Contract Extensions

The sub-committee presented their recommendations which responded to Metro staff's recommendations for amendments to the contract and received feedback from the larger committee.

- a. **Response Overview:** Member Scarlett de Leon shared the proposed position to not support a six-month extension. Member Chauncey Smith presented the committee's suggested recommendations for alternative public safety strategies that should receive the contract extension's allocated funding
- b. **Questions and Feedback from PSAC**
 - i. **Previous policing models:** Member Carrie Madden asked why Metro reverted from a non-contracted policing model in 2009.
 1. Member Smith indicated that public demands for policing affected the agency's decision.
 2. Metro Staff Member Gerhardt shared a [document detailing the history of Metro policing](#). She clarified that Metro never had a non-contracted policing model.
 - ii. **Metro's decision-making process:** Member Wen asked what Metro would do if PSAC votes to not support the extension.
 1. Member de Leon responded that the final decision lies with the Metro board, but they should consider PSAC's opinion when making that decision.
 - iii. **Public opinion:** Member De Rivera called out the public comments that call for increased presence of police as being important in this decision. She shared that the survey conducted by Metro demonstrated support on both sides, with respondents wanting more or fewer police equally.
 - iv. **Funding allocations:** Member Tajsar expressed his support for the recommendations and highlighted that Metro's reallocation for public health services was for less than \$2.5 million. He felt this funding should be dramatically increased.
 - v. **Support for law enforcement:** Member Garcia shared his personal positive experiences with law enforcement and how he struggles with the need for their continued presence.
 1. Member Strickland shared her experiences from a ride-along with LASD where the officers advocated for increased public health services, because they are not trained to provide them. She also emphasized that community efforts around public health need to be foregrounded in this new funding allocation.
 2. Member Smith clarified that quality-of-life issues can be addressed by providing the correct services to the appropriate situations, rather than allocating those tasks to law enforcement.
 - a. Smith also clarified that the proposal is not to eradicate the police, but rather to have Metro not pay for a special contract. Instead, responding to issues on the Metro system would be the responsibility of the individual municipal police departments as part of their standard tasks.
- c. **Public Comment:**
 - i. Commentor expressed disappointment with the committee's stance on ending the contract with law enforcement without first putting in place any public safety alternatives.

- d. **Additional questions and feedback:**
 - i. **Phasing decreased funding:** Member Wen asked for an amendment to the recommendations that would take a stepped phasing process to decrease funding for Metro law enforcement partners.
 - 1. Facilitator France clarified that these recommendations are only for the six-month extension and this recommendation might be better suited for a longer-term proposal.
 - ii. **Police scope:** Member De Rivera stated that they are not anti-police, instead they feel that law enforcement is asked to do take on tasks (mental health, homeless services, etc.) that are not their job.
 - iii. **Transit ambassadors:** Member Madden recommended to replace officers with the forthcoming Transit Ambassadors to continue having a public safety presence on the system.
 - iv. **Communicating this decision:** Member Wen asked Metro to share how they will be sharing the results of Metro Board's vote on this topic with the public.
 - 1. Metro Staff Gerhardt responded that Metro has a communications department that will inform the public and riders of the Metro Board's decision.
- e. **Vote:**
 - i. Yes: 14 No: 0 Abstain: 0
 - ii. The item was approved.

IV. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. The following comments were shared:

- A. Commentor stated that they disagree with PSAC's decision to not support a contract extension. They stated that police are needed to deter violent crimes on the system.

V. Adjournment

- A. Meeting adjourned at 7:07 PM

VI. Next Steps

- A. The committee will reconvene on November 17, 2021.

Metro Public Safety Advisory Committee General Committee Meeting #15

MINUTES

Wednesday, November 17th, 2021

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

A. Zoom Meeting Protocols

Facilitator Richard France called the meeting to order. Facilitator Thomson Dryjanski announced Spanish and American Sign Language interpreter services would be available throughout the meeting.

B. Agenda

Facilitator France reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

C. Roll Call

Present: Andrea Urmanita, Ashley Ajayi, Carrie Madden, Charles Hammerstein, Chauncey Smith, Clarence Davis, Constance Strickland, Darryl Goodus, Esteban Garcia, Fabian Gallardo, Florence Annang, Glenda Murrell, James Wen, Jessica Kellogg, Jose Raigoza, Ma'ayan Dembo, Maricela De Rivera, Mohammad Tajsar, Dr. Sabrina Howard, Scarlett de Leon

Absent: Raul Gomez

D. Approval of Meeting Minutes for 11/03/21

Committee members voted to approve the meeting minutes for the November 3rd, 2021 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

E. New Co-Facilitator Introduction

The facilitation team introduced their new co-facilitator, Asma Mahdi, Senior Policy Director of Better World Group, who will be co-facilitating the PSAC General Committee meetings with Facilitator France.

II. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. The following comments were shared:

- A. Commentor from the Labor Community Strategy Center praised the action PSAC took at the previous meeting, where they approved a memorandum to not support the extension of the multi-agency policing contracts.
- B. Commentor phoned in on behalf of the union that represents Metro's maintenance workers to indicate he did not support PSAC's action to not support the extension of the multi-agency policing contracts, citing lack of police responsiveness. Additionally, he indicated the new position of Transit Ambassadors must be union positions.
- C. Commentor requested additional surveillance cameras in and around elevators at transit stations.
- D. Commentor indicated that he is a frequent rail rider and has not seen police officers enforcing the code of conduct on transit.
- E. Commentor indicated that the removal of police officers does not ensure the safety of riders, particularly for female riders.

III. Discussion

A. **Discussion and Approval of the Non-Law Enforcement Ad hoc Committee's Recommendations on a Forthcoming Transit Ambassador Program**

The committee discussed and then approved the recommendations from the Non-Law Enforcement ad hoc committee (NLEA AHC) pertaining to the goals, objectives, roles, and responsibilities of a Transit Ambassador program.

- a. **Context-setting:** Facilitator Mahdi indicated that these recommendations are high-level and will require further consultation between the NLEA AHC and Metro staff. Additionally, she encouraged members to provide feedback at the appropriate level, with more detailed feedback coming at a later phase of the process.
- b. **Presentation from NLEA AHC representatives:** Members Raigoza and Wen provided an overview presentation on the recommendations, sharing the objectives and reasoning behind each recommendation.
- c. **Objective:** Member Raigoza described Transit Ambassadors as community-facing unarmed individuals who would help welcome and support riders on the transit system. He described the recommendations as a high-level framework that describes a mature program.
- d. **Deployment:** Member de Rivera shared the importance of deploying transit ambassadors in high need areas.
 - i. Member de Leon shared that these are ideal recommendations and there will be discussions about deployment at a future phase.
- e. **Ambassadors as Metro employees:** Member Ajayi shared her concerns that Ambassadors would not have a vested interest in the program's success if they were contracted employees.
 - i. Member Raigoza replied that the AHC had discussed this topic and at a future phase would discuss a system of performance standards for this role.
 - ii. Member de Rivera indicated that she feels this position should begin as Metro employees, despite the possible extended timeline and difficulties of standing up this program.
- f. **Use of de-escalation techniques:** Member Strickland felt there should be multiple categories of Ambassadors, where one group focuses on customer service but does not intervene in situations, and another group that is focused on de-escalating situations.
 - i. Member de Leon shared that the AHC agrees with this concept, and they had envisioned multiple levels of Ambassadors with different levels of training and responsibilities.
 - ii. Facilitator France proposed to amend recommendation #4 to specify that certain classes of Ambassadors will engage in de-escalation and other classes of Ambassadors will not engage in this activity.
- g. **Edit to recommendation #10:** Member de Leon proposed to add an additional amendment to this recommendation that specified the different classes of Ambassadors, to better align recommendation #10 with the amendment to recommendation #4.
- h. **Ad hoc committee response to Metro staff recommendations:** Members Wen and Raigoza laid out the committee's response to Metro's recommendation that this program should initially be staffed by an outside contractor during the pilot phase. They shared a series of questions and next steps that Metro staff must address. This includes:
 - i. Questions:
 1. How will Metro ensure that contracted staff have access to professional development opportunities?
 2. How will Metro ensure that the selected contractors have diverse leadership/management overseeing the scope of work?
 3. Will the contract require bilingual pay differentials?
 4. Will contracted staff have access to health care?
 - ii. Next Steps for the AHC to consider:
 1. Determining a deployment strategy for the pilot Transit Ambassador program
 2. Working with Metro to define contracting and/or hiring parameters for the pilot program launch

3. Identifying evaluation metrics and recommendations for accountability measures
 4. Defining training requirements and providing input on a job description
 5. Further defining the supportive ecosystem (e.g., additional service providers) for Ambassadors
- i. **Metro's response to this proposal:** Metro Chief of Staff Englund shared the process that would occur following this vote. She indicated that all recommendations from the ad hoc committee would be provided in tandem with Metro staff recommendations to the Metro Board.
 - i. Member de Rivera wanted to ensure that there was a clear distinction between PSAC memorandums and Metro staff memorandums in the documents shared with the Metro Board.
 - ii. Member de Rivera also requested that for future reports to the Board PSAC recommendations are presented to the Board before Metro staff recommendations, in the order they are attached to the Board report.
 - j. **General Committee response to the ad hoc committee's response:** Members responded to the proposal of questions and next steps from the ad hoc committee to Metro staff.
 - i. Member de Rivera indicated that this job must support PSAC's values of uplifting and investing in BIPOC communities.
 - ii. Member Tasjar echoed Member de Rivera's comment. He also recommended removing the words "access to" from recommendation #13.
 1. The committee agreed to remove these words from the recommendation.
 - iii. Member Goodus indicated that he wanted the committee to be rolled out in a timely fashion.
 - k. **Language Barriers:** Member Davis indicated the importance of hiring Ambassadors with language competencies.
 - l. **Timeline:** Member Ajayi asked if Metro had an idea of the timeline required to begin this program.
 - i. Metro Chief of Staff Englund indicated that there are several variables, such as whether they will be working directly with one community-based organization or several providers.
 - m. **Modifications to the recommendations:** Facilitator France proposed the following modifications to the recommendations that the committee would be voting on. He laid out the following:
 - i. Amend recommendation #4 to describe different job classifications for ambassadors;
 - ii. Amend recommendation #10 to align with recommendation #4 by describing a system of advancement through job positions;
 - iii. And remove the words "access to" from recommendation #13.
 - iv. The committee agreed with these amendments.
 - n. **Public Comment**
 - i. Commentor from the Labor Community Strategy Center supported the committee's decision to recommend the Ambassador positions are union jobs. They also expressed concerns that Metro staff is sharing their own recommendations that differ from the committee.
 - ii. Member representing Metro's maintenance worker unions indicated that the timeline for setting up a program with union jobs is not as time-intensive as Metro claimed during the meeting. He used the Metro microtransit program as an example. He supported setting up the ambassador program with union jobs.
 - o. **Test for consensus:** Facilitator France proposed approving the ad hoc committee's recommendations with the modifications.
 - i. The committee agreed with this proposal.
 - p. **Vote to approve modified Non-Law Enforcement Alternatives ad hoc committee recommendations**
 - i. Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0
 - ii. The item was approved.

IV. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. The following comments were shared:

- A. Commentor shared their dissatisfaction with the current state of public safety on the Metro system.
- B. Commentor shared the importance of having police officers walking up and down transit vehicles to enforce the code of conduct.

V. Adjournment

- A. Meeting adjourned at 7:02 PM

VI. Next Steps

- A. The committee will reconvene on November 29th, 2021.

Metro Public Safety Advisory Committee

General Committee Meeting #16

MINUTES

Monday, November 29th, 2021

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

A. Zoom Meeting Protocols

Facilitator Richard France called the meeting to order. Facilitator Thomson Dryjanski announced Spanish and American Sign Language interpreter services would be available throughout the meeting.

B. Agenda

Facilitator France reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

C. Roll Call

Present: Andrea Urmanita, Carrie Madden, Chauncey Smith, Clarence Davis, Constance Strickland, Darryl Goodus, Esteban Garcia, Fabian Gallardo, Florence Annang, Glenda Murrell, James Wen, Jose Raigoza, Ma'ayan Dembo, Maricela De Rivera, Dr. Sabrina Howard, Scarlett de Leon

Absent: Raul Gomez, Scarlett de Leon, Mohammad Tajsar, Jessica Kellogg, Charles Hammerstein, Ashley Ajayi

D. Approval of Meeting Minutes for 11/17/21

Committee members voted to approve the meeting minutes for the November 17th, 2021 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. No public comments were shared.

III. Discussion

A. Presentation & Discussion of Public Safety Survey Results

The committee received a presentation of public safety survey results and provided questions and comments to the consultant team. [That presentation can be found here.](#)

- a. **Context-setting:** Facilitator Mahdi reminded members that the survey was not a PSAC approved work product and was largely developed by Metro before PSAC was underway.
- b. **Presentation from the Public Safety Survey representatives:** Aaron Weinstein, Dr. Richard Bernard, and Shikari Byerly presented results from surveys conducted of Metro riders, people experiencing homelessness, and staff.
- c. **Survey Methodology:** Dr. Bernard shared that the surveys were conducted online or by phone and were offered in multiple languages. The consultant team modified the survey to include more than fifteen of PSAC Public Safety Survey ad hoc committee's edits.
- d. **Key Survey results:** Consultant Byerly summarized that most riders usually feel safe on Metro except at night. Overall, riders want to increase lighting, unarmed security staff, and

transit ambassadors, whereas a smaller portion of riders would like more law enforcement. She shared that the survey showed mixed sentiments around safety concerns related to unhoused riders.

- i. Byerly also shared results from the survey of unhoused riders – notably that fewer than half of the respondents experiencing homelessness reported that they were not treated well by Metro operators and security; these riders would also like to see improvements to safety and physical environment, including adding restrooms, additional staff to assist people with disabilities, and transit ambassadors.
 - ii. The internal survey of Metro staff showed their primary concerns were around providing resources to better ensure their personal safety.
- e. **Q&A**
- i. Member Davis asked if the staff survey disaggregated responses by demographic characteristics, including gender, race, and ethnicity.
 1. Staff member Weinstein responded that these variables were included in the survey and would follow up with additional information for the committee.
 - ii. Member Smith commented that based on survey results, PSAC recommendations are in line with what most Metro riders would like to see regarding public safety.
 - iii. Member Dembo asked for more information about the breakdown between infrequent and current riders.
 1. Dr. Bernard responded that current riders made up 70% of responses. The survey had questions that asked about riding frequency that allowed survey analysts to distinguish between current and infrequent Metro riders.
 - iv. Member Wen responded to the finding regarding Metro operators' perspectives on the agency's approach to unhoused riders. He indicated that he feels Metro operators are not necessarily uncompassionate but stressed and performing too many job duties. He asked if it would be possible to add a question regarding operator's mental health in a follow up survey.
 1. Staff member Weinstein responded that they can certainly incorporate this question if there is a follow up survey.
 2. Member Murrell shared her experience as an African American female train operator and her safety concerns with unhoused riders.
 3. Member Raigoza also shared his safety concerns as a Metro operator and previous negative experiences with violent riders.
 - v. Member Davis shared concern for accessibility issues for riders with disabilities – specifically vision impairments.
 1. Dr. Bernard responded that 17% of survey takers reported having a disability and 13% of them experience low-vision or blindness.
 2. Member Goodus asked for surveys to be made more accessible to capture more responses from riders with disabilities.

B. Discussion of Committee Work to Date & Next Steps

- a. **Context-setting:** Facilitator France reviewed PSAC's timeline through the beginning of 2022 and potential discussion items for tonight.
 - i. Member Dembo suggested moving up the CAHOOTS guest speaker presentation to before recommendations.
- b. **Infrastructure Protection Services:** Member Madden asked for direction from committee members regarding recommendations from the IPS ad hoc committee, specifically why the previous set of recommendations were not approved.
 - i. Facilitator France summarized the ad hoc committee's recommendation to approve Metro staff recommendations to amend the IPS contract during the extension period were voted down during a previous general committee meeting.
 - ii. Member Wen shared his concern with the contract extension for the specific contractor (RMI) and cited a lack of clarity with the recommendation's wording that impacted his decision to vote no.
 - iii. Member Murrell asked for clarification as to why there are subcontractors listed under RMI in the contract and expressed her personal frustration with contracted security being distracted on their cell phones while working.
 1. Staff member Dickerson clarified that subcontractors are needed to ensure coverage throughout the Metro system and encouraged Member Murrell to contact the security operations center to report these cell phone incidents.

- c. **Media Coverage of PSAC:** Committee members discussed recent media coverage of the committee.
 - i. Links to media coverage:
 - 1. [LA Times](#)
 - 2. [Sheriff's Press Conference](#)
 - ii. Member de Rivera provided an overview of the Sheriff's press conference and indicated that the Sheriff gave an oversimplified and disingenuous overview of PSAC.
 - 1. Member Annang asked if the committee can draft a response in the press to the Sheriff's comments and clarify the committee's goals.
 - a. Metro Chief of Staff Englund responded that individual members can respond as an op-ed but is unsure of the impact it will have on the Sheriff.
 - 2. Member de Rivera shared that in response to the press conference, Metro board members were vocal in their support of PSAC.

IV. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. The following comments were shared:

- A. Commentor shared their apprehension with the transit ambassador program.
- B. Commentor indicated they are a bus operator and shared their negative experiences that could have benefited from law enforcement.
- C. Commentor expressed their dissatisfaction with the committee's stance on armed security.
- D. Commentor listed their difficulties riding Metro, including lack of Wi-Fi and unreliable services.
- E. Commentor apologized for the comments from the Sheriff.
- F. Commentor shared their distrust with the Sheriff's department and expressed their support for PSAC.

V. Adjournment

- A. Meeting adjourned at 7:09 PM

VI. Next Steps

- A. The committee will reconvene on December 15th, 2021.

Metro Public Safety Advisory Committee

General Committee Meeting #17

MINUTES

Wednesday, December 15th, 2021

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

A. Zoom Meeting Protocols

Facilitator Richard France called the meeting to order. Facilitator Thomson Dryjanski announced Spanish and American Sign Language interpretation services would be available during the meeting.

B. Agenda

Facilitator France reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

C. Roll Call

Present: Andrea Urmanita, Ashley Ajayi, Carrie Madden, Chauncey Smith, Clarence Davis, Constance Strickland, Darryl Goodus, Esteban Garcia, Fabian Gallardo, Florence Annang, Glenda Murrell, James Wen, Jose Raigoza, Ma'ayan Dembo, Maricela De Rivera, Mohammad Tajsar, Dr. Sabrina Howard, Scarlett de Leon, Jessica Kellogg

Absent: Raul Gomez

D. Approval of Meeting Minutes for 11/29/21

Committee members voted to approve the meeting minutes for the November 29th, 2021 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants.

- A. Commentor from the Labor Community Strategy Center apologized for the attacks PSAC has been receiving from the LA County Sheriff's office and shared he is grateful to have had a chance to speak to the ad committee.
- B. Commentor also stated that the Sheriff's office has made some unfair statements regarding PSAC and added that they hope Metro's long-standing security system issue finds a solution soon.
- C. Commentor shared that as a wheelchair user with a significant disability, they feel that it's necessary for Metro to keep the private security currently in place.
- D. As a follow-up comment, Member de Rivera requested additional accessibility updates for PSAC meeting including translating comments in the chat, spoken descriptions of visuals on slides, and having interpretation available in more languages.

III. Discussion

Committee members had an open discussion with Metro CEO Stephanie Wiggins and an external facilitation team on PSAC's current progress and working methods.

A. 6 Month Reflection Process – Conversation with the CEO

- a. **Context-setting:** Facilitator France reviewed PSAC's decision making process and

commitment to having a reflection period following any action by Metro's Board of Directors on PSAC recommendations.

- b. **CEO Wiggins:** The CEO thanked committee members for their work to ensure Metro is meeting its safety needs, emphasized Metro's commitment to partnership with community, and summarized the committee's next steps.
 - c. **Communication tools for partnership:** LaShanya Aikerson and Chrystina Katz facilitated a workshop on communication tools and meeting structures that can be used for actionable change. They stressed the importance of communication styles, reviewed the four dominant personality types, and shared some tools to facilitate difficult conversations.
 - i. Members Tajsar and Gallardo asked for clarity around the purpose of tonight's workshop.
 - 1. Facilitator Aikerson shared that the goal for tonight was to offer more tools for collaboration.
 - ii. Member Annang shared that the tools mentioned were already in use during committee meetings and the hurdles for PSAC are based on the recommendation's substance, not the process.
 - iii. Member Smith shared appreciation for the intention of the workshop but commented that the conversation feels unnecessary. He also expressed appreciation for Facilitator France.
 - 1. Various members echoed their appreciation for the facilitation team.
 - iv. Member de Rivera thanked CEO Wiggins for taking the time to join PSAC's meeting and expressed her support for bolder policies.
 - 1. Member Annang echoed Member de Rivera's comment, stated that the conversation with the CEO was a great learning opportunity. She also mentioned that in-person meeting opportunities could be beneficial to the process of building trust within the committee.
 - d. **Budget:** Member Dembo shared that Metro needs to have a larger budget for policing alternatives.
 - i. CEO Wiggins replied that they are currently working on finalizing concepts for alternatives to be included in FY23 budget development – going to the Metro Board in May – to have a better idea of the budget for policing alternatives.
 - e. **Bus and Rail Operators:** Member Ajayi shared that a missing component from the public safety discussion is the need for reliable transit service. She also added that PSAC should make space to hear from operators.
 - i. CEO Wiggins stressed that the operators' primary concern is safety and Metro is constantly working towards improving their wellbeing.
 - f. **Green Spaces:** Member Davis shared his experience with a lack of green/open spaces to highlight a need to include facilities for rest and recreation near public transportation.
- B. **January Meeting Schedule:** Facilitator Mahdi reviewed the topics for the two General Committee meetings in January – January 5th (Infrastructure Protection Services and Home at Last short-term shelter program recommendations) and January 15th (Policing Practices ad hoc committee recommendations and guest speaker).

IV. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. The following comments were shared:

- A. Commentor stated that there has been a lack of visible Metro security on trains and platforms in Long Beach for years.
- B. Commentor thanked PSAC members for the conversation and echoed comments that the problem is collaboration with Metro Board, not communication within the committee. They also recommended that PSAC bring in speakers already working on security alternatives.
- C. Commentor recommended the committee work on finding more practical solutions to slowly shift away from police instead of calling for defunding. They also recommended inviting people opposing PSAC's

recommendations, including the Sherriff, to join one of the General Committee meetings.

- D. Commentor shared their disagreement with moving away from armed law enforcement on Metro. They shared their negative experience of being physically assaulted by a homeless individual while riding the Metro Gold Line.
- E. Commentor stated that the proposal to replace LASD with Metro Transit Ambassadors is dangerous because of the excessive amount of violence and public health issues.
- F. Commentor shared their negative experience with homeless individuals and public health issues while riding the Expo Line to work.

V. Adjournment

- A. Meeting adjourned at 7:11 PM

VI. Next Steps

- A. The committee will reconvene on January 5, 2022.

Metro Public Safety Advisory Committee

General Committee Meeting #18

MINUTES

Wednesday, January 5th, 2022

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

A. Zoom Meeting Protocols

Facilitator Richard France called the meeting to order. Facilitator Thomson Dryjanski announced Spanish and American Sign Language interpretation services would be available during the meeting.

B. Agenda

Facilitator France reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

C. Roll Call

Present: Andrea Urmanita, Ashley Ajayi, Carrie Madden, Chauncey Smith, Constance Strickland, Darryl Goodus, Esteban Garcia, Florence Annang, Glenda Murrell, James Wen, Jose Raigoza, Ma'ayan Dembo, Maricela De Rivera, Dr. Sabrina Howard, Scarlett de Leon

Absent: Clarence Davis, Fabian Gallardo, Jessica Kellogg, Mohammad Tajsar, Raul Gomez

D. Approval of Meeting Minutes for 12/15/21

Committee members voted to approve the meeting minutes for the December 15th, 2021 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. No comments were received.

III. Discussion

A. Discussion of Infrastructure Protection Services (IPS) Recommendations

The IPS ad hoc committee provided final recommendations and asked the Committee to provide feedback on the firearms recommendations. This recommendation was presented for discussion as members of the ad hoc committee were unable to reach consensus and wanted the General Committee to weigh in.

- a. **Offering two recommendations:** Members Madden and Strickland represented the IPS ad hoc committee and presented the two options for weapons recommendations—reducing the provision of firearms to IPS personnel gradually (option one) or eliminating the provision of firearms to IPS personnel immediately (option two).

- i. Member Strickland emphasized that these recommendations would not take place for the current IPS contract but as a recommendation for future contracts. Additionally, she noted this only applied to IPS personnel, not officers from LAPD or the Sheriff's Department.
 - ii. Facilitator France added that Metro supports the option to reduce 10% of armed personnel.
 - b. **IPS Scope:** Member Dembo asked for clarification on what the IPS scope covers in comparison to the contracted law enforcement contract.
 - i. Member Smith responded that IPS serves brick-and-mortar operations facilities and has some limited engagement with members of the public.
 - c. **Data Concerns:** Members shared their concern with not having enough data on outcomes before choosing a recommendation option.
 - i. Member Goodus shared his worry about the number of calls IPS personnel respond to regarding trespassers. He also noted that there is a lack of data to support the benefits of removing firearms. Those considerations informed his decision to support only a small reduction in armed personnel.
 - 1. Member Murrell echoed her support for option one because, as a Metro operator, she sees having armed security as a deterrent for intruders.
 - a. Member Garcia emphasized Member Murrell's experience as a Metro worker and shared his support for option one.
 - ii. Member Ajayi asked if an IPS contractor will allocate resources to gather data on outcomes.
 - 1. Metro Staff Gerhardt responded that part of the revised IPS scope of work asked for specific data collection and accountability measures, which includes data on the use of force and firearms. She added that option one of the recommendations would include a deep analysis on the impact of weapons reductions.
 - iii. Member Howard asked if data exists on whether deterrents are a result of the presence of armed security or just increased security in general.
 - 1. Member Annang also asked for information on the impact of armed security versus unarmed security.
 - 2. Member Murrell shared that the most important piece for her is having security presence, whether armed with firearms or not.
 - iv. Members Strickland and Madden also shared their support for more detailed and consistent data.
 - d. **Support for Reducing Armed IPS Personnel Gradually**
 - i. Member and Metro operator Raigoza expressed his support for this option because of the positive impact contracted security has had, notably reducing trespassers and providing increased security for employees working at night.
 - ii. Member de Rivera shared that her support of an option ultimately relies on results from data. At the moment, she is leaning towards option one if Metro workers feel it is necessary for a gradual reduction in armed security.
 - e. **Test for consensus for moving forward with option one**
 - i. Facilitator France proposed the committee move forward with a recommendation to support option one.
 - ii. Members Dembo and Smith shared that they would not be able to support the recommendations if option one is selected.
 - f. **Public Comment**
 - i. Commentor expressed their support for option one because it is a more responsible

and reasonable selection.

g. Test for consensus to vote to approve IPS recommendations absent a recommendation for weapons.

- i. Facilitator France proposed the committee table the weapons recommendation and vote to approve the other remaining recommendations. The weapons recommendation will be a topic for discussion at the 01/19/22 General Committee meeting.
- ii. Member Wen shared that he prefers committee members vote for an option for weapons tonight.
- iii. Metro Chief of Staff Englund suggested that the committee and Metro find a compromise, such as a reduction greater than 10%.
 1. Member Wen suggested a 25% reduction.
- iv. Member Smith requested a note be added to recommendations that explains why the committee did not provide a weapons suggestion.
- v. Facilitator France indicated the committee would return to the weapons conversation during the next committee meeting.
 1. Member Smith requested transparency around the voting process when the time comes.

h. Vote to approve IPS recommendations absent a weapons recommendation

- i. Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain:1
- ii. The item was approved.

B. Discussion of Home at Last (HAL) Short-term Shelter Program Recommendations

The committee discussed and then approved the recommendations for the HAL Short-term Shelter Program.

a. Context-setting:

Ad Hoc committee members Strickland and Annang provided an overview of recommendations to endorse the program, provide programmatic amendments, and additional recommendations for Metro.

b. Questions and Comments

- i. Member Garcia asked where the facility is located.
 1. Metro Staff indicated the shelter is located near Western and Manchester.
- ii. Member Wen requested adding “implement” to recommendation four to read “Explore and implement special accommodations.”
 1. Facilitator France commented that because Metro is not operating the shelter, only funding it, the main recommendation from the committee is to continue funding the program. Additional recommendations from the committee are only advisory.
- iii. Member Ajayi asked for ad hoc committee members' general sentiment regarding the facility.
 1. Member Annang shared that visiting the shelter was a positive experience and the environment was welcoming and provided many amenities.
 2. Member Strickland added that the shelter team cared about their work, provided services many others cannot, and that she heard positive feedback from people staying at the center. She mentioned that it could benefit from more cleaning services.
- iv. Member Goodus shared his support for continuing to endorse the program and praised Metro for diving into this issue.
- v. Member de Rivera expressed her gratitude for the center being open during the COVID-19 pandemic and storms.

- c. **Vote to approve ad hoc committee recommendations for the Home at Last program**
 - i. Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain:0
 - ii. The item was approved.

- d. **Next steps:** Facilitator Mahdi announced that the facilitation team will draft and circulate a PSAC memo to be included alongside Metro's recommendations.
 - i. Facilitator France added that the team will also be drafting a process to vote on the options regarding firearms.

IV. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. The following comments were shared:

- A. Commentor shared that they are not in support of reducing security and suggested committee members ride on one of Metro's lines before the next meeting.

V. Adjournment

- A. Meeting adjourned at 6:50 PM

VI. Next Steps

- A. The committee will reconvene on January 19, 2022.

Metro Public Safety Advisory Committee

General Committee Meeting #19

MINUTES

Wednesday, January 19th, 2022

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

A. **Zoom Meeting Protocols**

Facilitator Richard France called the meeting to order. Facilitator Thomson Dryjanski announced Spanish and American Sign Language interpretation services would be available during the meeting.

B. **Agenda**

Facilitator France reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

C. **Roll Call**

Present: Andrea Urmanita, Ashley Ajayi, Carrie Madden, Chauncey Smith, Clarence Davis, Constance Strickland, Darryl Goodus, Esteban Garcia, Florence Annang, Fabian Gallardo, Glenda Murrell, James Wen, Jessica Kellogg, Jose Raigoza, Ma'ayan Dembo, Maricela De Rivera, Scarlett de Leon

Absent: Mohammad Tajsar, Raul Gomez, Dr. Sabrina Howard

D. **Approval of Meeting Minutes for 01/05/22**

Committee members voted to approve the meeting minutes for the January 5th, 2022 meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants.

- A. Commentor shared his negative experience with dirty and unsafe Metro trains/buses.

III. Discussion

A. **Discussion of Infrastructure Protection Services**

The Committee discussed and voted on the IPS weapons recommendation that was tabled during the previous general committee meeting.

- a. **Context setting:** Prior to the meeting, members completed a survey to get a sense of which option members prefer.
- b. **Survey results:** ~53% of members preferred the gradual reduction of armed IPS personnel (option #1), compared to ~46% who preferred an immediate disarmament (option #2). All

members were willing to stand aside if their preferred option was not the consensus option.

- c. **Proposal to move to a vote:** Facilitator France proposed that the committee modify its decision-making process. Instead of for one option, the committee would choose either “option 1,” “option 2,” or abstain from the vote. Whichever outcome achieved a majority (eight votes) would be the committee’s recommendation. Endorsers of the losing option would have the opportunity to write a dissenting opinion.

- i. Members agreed to this proposal and the item moved to a vote.

- d. **Public Comment:**

- i. Commentor shared that as a rider with a disability, they support a gradual reduction.

- e. **Vote to approve IPS recommendations absent a weapons recommendation**

- i. Option #1: 6 Obtain #2: 6 Abstain: 1 Absent: 2

- ii. Neither option achieved a simple majority, therefore the committee did not endorse either option.

B. Discussion of Policing Practices Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation on the Multi-Agency Policing Contact Scope of Work

The committee discussed and then approved the ad hoc committee policing contract recommendations.

- a. **Context-setting:** The policing practices committee recommended that Metro phase out the contracted law enforcement model, with the understanding that a forthcoming policing contract would be an interim measure that would allow the agency to implement an alternative model. The recommendations under review are specifically related to the forthcoming policing contact. The recommendation regarding an alternative law enforcement model would require additional discussion with Metro.

- b. **Riders with disabilities:** Member Davis shared his concern with Metro staff’s response to recommendation #8 and stressed the importance of not requiring individuals to be placed in specific body positions during arrest procedures.

- c. **General comments on recommendations:**

- i. Member Goodus shared that he disagreed with several of the recommendations. He also supports funding mental health services but not at the expense of cutting current policing services.

- d. **Funding and resources:**

- i. Member Dembo asked Metro to speak to how reimbursement for police services at special events is structured.

- 1. Metro Staff Gerhardt shared that, in the current contract, expenditures from special events were part of the overall contract value and were approved by Metro Board. Additional funding was required last year because there was not enough funding within the contact value for the total approved events.

- ii. Member Raigoza asked budget can go towards overtime for security services during

unexpected events. This would help to minimize disruptions and improve the overall customer experience.

1. Metro Staff Gerhardt responded that there is some flexibility in expenditures, but beyond the requested budget, additional expenditures must first be approved by Metro.
 2. Member Davis shared his support for more transit ambassadors to assist at unexpected events.
 - a. Member de Rivera echoed support for unarmed security.
- iii. Member Smith clarified that the recommendations are not proposing a removal of the role of law enforcement but rather phasing out of contracted services paid for by Metro.
1. Metro Staff Gerhardt responded that currently Metro has 600 law enforcement officers ready to respond to emergency calls. If they were not contracted, they would no longer be available.
 - a. Member Davis recommended calling for a reduction in contracted law enforcement officers instead of a complete removal.
 - b. Member de Rivera commented that crowd control techniques are often racialized and asked Metro to consider how law enforcement responds during events.

e. Oversight and tracking:

- i. Member Ajayi asked Metro what kinds of additional resources will be employed to ensure Metro has additional oversight.
 1. Metro Staff Gerhardt shared that internally, Metro had the Office of Civil Rights, Office of Ethics, the Office of the Inspector General, and the CEO who all have oversight powers.
 2. Member Smith stressed the importance of community oversight adding to what Metro already has in place.
 3. He added that racial disparities in citations demonstrate that the current overall system needs improvement.
- ii. Member Goodus shared concern about continuity of service and response time improvements if Metro moves away from contracted services. He added that the committee and Metro must continue working together to ensure the safety of all riders.
- iii. Member Annang recommended Metro connect with other city transit systems, including the Bay Area's BART oversight commission. She called for more research about efforts on transit systems around the country.
 1. Metro Staff Gerhardt responded that Metro requires all agencies to develop an oversight commission as part of their contract obligations.

f. Metro Policies:

- i. Member Garcia asked for clarification on the reasoning for recommendation #22 (engaging in anti-terrorism operations) and process for making recommendations that conflict with Metro.
 - 1. Member Dembo responded that the subcommittee felt that anti-terrorism can be addressed by alternatives to law-enforcement.
 - 2. Facilitator France added that recommendations first go to the CEO for consideration, then they are presented to the Metro Board.

g. Vote to approve ad hoc committee's policing contract recommendations

- i. Yes: 10 No: 3 Abstain:0 Absent: 2
- ii. The item was approved.

h. Next Steps: Facilitator France announced that the facilitation team will draft an outcomes memo for the CEO to present to the Metro Board.

IV. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants. The following comments were shared:

- A. Commentor shared his experience as a rider with increased violence on Metro.
- B. Commentor shared that she has not seen statements from Metro when violent incidents occur and asked for the appropriate allocation of law enforcement on trains and buses.

V. Adjournment

- A. Meeting adjourned at 7:05 PM

VI. Next Steps

- A. The committee will reconvene on February 2, 2022.

Metro Public Safety Advisory Committee

General Committee Meeting

Meeting Summary

Wednesday, February 2, 2022

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

a. **Zoom Meeting Protocols**

- i. Facilitator Richard France called the meeting to order. Facilitator Thomson Dryjanski announced Spanish and American Sign Language interpretation services would be available during the meeting.

b. **Agenda**

- i. Facilitator France reviewed the agenda for the meeting

c. **Roll Call**

Present: Ashley Ajayi, Florence Annang, Clarence Davis, Ma'ayan Dembo, Esteban Gallardo, Darryl Goodus, Charles Hammerstein, Sabrina Howard, Jessica Kellogg, Scarlett de Leon, Carrie Madden, Glenda Murrell, Jose Raigoza, Maricela de Rivera, Chauncey Smith, Constance Strickland,

Absent: Andrea Urmanita, James Wen, Mohammad Tajsar

d. **Approval of Meeting Minutes for 02/02/22**

- i. Committee members voted to approve the meeting minutes for the February 2nd, 2022, meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants.

- a. There were no requests for public comment.

III. Discussion

Presentation from Ben Adam Climer, Crisis Consulting

Ben Adam Climer of Crisis Consulting, and formerly of CAHOOTS in Eugene, OR shared a presentation on the CAHOOTS model of non-emergency first response.

- a. CAHOOTS is a non-emergency first response model, which pairs an EMT and crisis counselor to respond to calls for incidents.
- b. The model is designed to alleviate the burden on police, fire, and EMS, while providing the appropriate response to crisis derived from emotional distress, substance abuse, and homelessness.
- c. CAHOOTS can be dispatched through 911 or another non-emergency number; the dispatch determines the appropriate response for an incident and dispatches the appropriate service.

- d. **Member Q&A:** PSAC members asked Climer questions about the model, its implementation challenges, and potential application to Metro.
 - i. Member Smith asked how the presence of law enforcement effects the outcomes of incidents, citing concerns from racial justice and disability advocates.
 - 1. Climer emphasized that the CAHOOTS model doesn't utilize law enforcement unless absolutely necessary; approximately 10-15% of calls for CAHOOTS will involve law enforcement. Instead, he indicated that the CAHOOTS model is designed to relieve the burden from law enforcement. He also emphasized the need for extensive training of dispatchers.
 - ii. Member Howard asked how CAHOOTS worked to make community members aware of their model.
 - 1. Climer responded that they had done significant community outreach over the course of 30 years. Additionally, they engaged in trainings with social services staff.

Metro Presentation on the FY2022 Budget Process

Metro staff Melissa Wang and Irene Fine presented an overview of Metro's FY22 budget process. After this overview presentation, PSAC members asked questions of Metro staff.

- a. **Federal Funding:** Member Raigoza asked about how current federal funding allocations will affect the budget for the coming year.
 - i. Wang answered that most of that specific funding is for capital projects. Currently, they are projecting limited funding increases for the operation and maintenance of transit services. The agency is drafting their proposal to compete for their fair share of federal funding.
- b. **Resumption of Fares:** Member Ajayi asked how the resumption of fare collection on Metro transit has changed the budget and asked if there were plans for fareless transit in the future.
 - i. Wang responded that Metro is focused on building the LIFE and student fare programs. They will also be pursuing federal funding dedicated to fareless transit.
 - ii. Member de Leon asked what level of enrollment the LIFE program was at.
 - iii. Wang answered that the program has enrolled between 30-50% of its target number of participants.
- c. **Surveillance Budget:** Member Annang asked how Metro had allocated funding for surveillance in the past year.
 - i. Metro staff responded that they would follow up on this item.
- d. **Revenue Pathways:** Member de Leon asked if the revenue from fare collection is then used to fund fare enforcement.
 - i. Wang responded that once revenue is received, it does not have a

specified destination.

Summary of PSAC Work to Date

Facilitator France gave a summary of the recommendations passed by the PSAC General Committee. This includes the following:

- New Mission & Values statement for public safety on Metro
- Recommendations on the interim and forthcoming multi-agency policing contracts
- Recommendations on the forthcoming Infrastructure Protection Services (IPS) contract
- Recommendations for a Transit Ambassador program framework
- Recommendations on the Home At Last (HAL) short-term shelter program for unhoused riders

IV. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants.

- a. There was one request for public comment, but participants were unable to hear the commentor's audio after several attempts.

V. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

VI. Next Steps

- a. The committee will reconvene on 02/16/22.

Metro Public Safety Advisory Committee General Committee Meeting #21

Meeting Summary

Wednesday, February 16, 2022

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

a. Zoom Meeting Protocols

- i. Facilitator Richard France called the meeting to order. Facilitator Thomson Dryjanski announced Spanish and American Sign Language interpretation services would be available during the meeting.

b. Agenda

- i. Facilitator France reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

c. Roll Call

Present: Andrea Urmanita, Ashley Ajayi, Clarence Davis, Ma'ayan Dembo, Esteban Gallardo, Darryl Goodus, Charles Hammerstein, Sabrina Howard, Jessica Kellogg, Glenda Murrell, James Wen, Jose Raigoza, Maricela de Rivera, Chauncey Smith, Constance Strickland, Mohammad Tajsar

Absent: Carrie Madden, Florence Annang, Scarlett de Leon, Raul Gomez

d. Approval of Meeting Minutes for 02/02/22

- i. Committee members voted to approve the meeting minutes for the February 2nd, 2022, meeting.
- ii. Yes: 11 Abstain:1 No:0
- iii. Meeting minutes were approved

e. New Metro Staff Introduction

- i. Metro staff introduced Gina Osbourne as the new Metro Chief Safety Officer who will oversee SSLE and risk safety asset management.

II. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants.

- a. There were no requests for public comment.

III. Discussion

PSAC Work-to-date

Committee members reflected on the committee's work-to-date and shared feedback on outstanding items that the committee should or will include in its workplan.

- a. **Context setting:** Facilitator France provided a summary of the recommendations passed by the committee, new roles that have been developed, alternatives advanced, and data produced. He also reviewed next steps and asked for feedback.

- b. **Member feedback:**
 - i. Member Ajayi asked what the plan was for outstanding items that are not addressed before June.
 - 1. Metro staff replied that they are currently finishing up the procurement to employ a consultant to complete the evaluation of PSAC. The goal is to complete the evaluation by May to chart next steps before the committee term ends.

Update on Initiatives Related to Motion 26.2 & Motion 37 Amendment

Metro staff Nicole Englund, Judy Gerhardt, and Deserae Jones provided an update on the agency's various safety initiatives including security blue light boxes, right-of-way intrusion prevention, the transit ambassador program, elevator attendants, operator security, flexible dispatch, and outreach program improvements.

- a. **Next steps:** Metro staff shared that they will present a more comprehensive version of tonight's updates at the next Metro Board meeting.

- b. **Flexible Dispatch Initiative:** Member Tajsar asked for more information on intelligence sharing and communication between bus operators and law enforcement.
 - i. Metro staff replied that there will be recommendations coming to the general PSAC committee on the Flexible Dispatch program in April. The initiative will put LAPD dispatchers in the Bus Operations Center so a dispatcher can quickly respond with the most appropriate responder.
 - ii. Member Smith responded that although the idea of putting police dispatchers into Metro's dispatch system to listen and decrease response times may seem like a good idea for community safety, but that there is research showing that it puts people of color at a higher risk for over-policing. He shared a [link](#) to an article that provides more information.

- c. **Funding:** Member Ajayi asked for more information regarding allocated funding for the initiatives mentioned.
 - i. Metro staff responded that funding came out of the motion 26.2, which allocated funding available in the current fiscal year, and has already been approved by the Board.

- d. **Operator Safety and Right-of-Way Intrusion Prevention:** Member Murrell asked for clarification on the button mentioned for operator safety.

- i. Metro staff responded that the panic button alarms are in a conceptual stage and would enhance, rather than supplant, the current systems in place.

Metro Budget Equity Assessment Tool: Metro Office of Equity and Race

Executive Officer KeAndra Dodds presented an update on how the Office of Equity and Race is working with Metro staff to measure equity in their annual budget process.

a. Questions and Comments:

- i. Member Ajayi asked if the MBEAT assessment has been applied to the most recent bus service changes.
 - 1. Dodds clarified that the MBEAT is not applied to service changes and is instead applied only during the budget process when making funding requests.
- ii. Member Davis asked work the office has accomplished so far and what projects are currently in progress.
 - 1. Dodds replied that the budget equity assessment has grown in use and is now being applied to budget requests agency-wide, resulting in a general cultural change. They added that additionally the office is ensuring equity is considered in every step of a project's process, are training equity liaisons, and they developed a compensation policy for members of advisory bodies.
- iii. Member Tajsar asked what the biggest challenge to implementing new approaches to budgeting has been.
 - 1. Dodds shared that training staff and making sure the tool is comprehensive of Metro's scope are the most difficult.

Budget Allocation Exercise

Facilitators Mahdi and Dryjanski lead a discussion and exercise around Metro's public safety budget allocation.

- a. **Context setting:** Facilitator Mahdi summarized reviewed the major spending categories from last year's public safety budget. She emphasized that this exercise is solely for public safety and not inclusive of Metro's full operating budget.
 - i. Member Ajayi asked how the process of categorizing and ranking different potential funding streams is equitable.
 - 1. Facilitator France shared that by April, the committee must provide input on Metro's budgeting process for public safety and this is a mechanism to reach consensus with the group.
 - 2. He added that after listening to the previous presentation on Metro's budget equity process, the facilitation team has some possible next steps and questions for the committee.
 - 3. He added that the budgeting process will inherently require tradeoffs and prioritization.
- b. **Mentimeter Exercise:** Facilitator Dryjanski led the committee through a polling exercise to gather initial data on the committee's preferences for how Metro allocates its public safety budget. [The results of the polling can be found here.](#) The following section details questions and clarifications asked during this discussion item.
 - i. **Creating Safe Environment:** Member Tajsar suggested expanding on the projects

that fall under this category to achieve the vision for a safe environment that the committee has discussed.

1. Facilitator Dryjanski shared that the categories are based on how Metro has grouped things together, but the facilitation team will follow up with a more detailed survey. He also clarified that the purpose of today's exercise is to set a baseline for future conversations.
 - ii. **Emergency Response:** Metro staff shared that emergency operations are the high-level coordination and collaboration with other transit agencies/partners for planned and unplanned emergencies or other large public events.
 1. Member Dembo asked if Metro is acting solely as a transit agency or more as a countywide convener.
 - a. Metro staff responded that during such instances, they have representation in their Emergency Operations Center (EOC) that represents the agency's needs. While all other entities have their priorities, they work to find balance within a unified command system. Within their EOC, they have representatives from the Sheriff's Department, City Emergency Planning, and the Fire Department.
 2. Member Wen asked if there are any remaining funds from the previous fiscal year in the emergency response budget.
 - a. Metro staff were unsure if there was a remaining budget but shared that funds do not roll over. Funds for the EOC primarily come from grantmaking.
 - iii. **Homeless Outreach:** Member Davis asked if the 11 million dedicated to homeless outreach includes future funding from a built-in ecosystem like recycling programs.
 1. Facilitator Dryjanski responded that this is not something that would likely fall under the homeless outreach budget. However, he noted that this is something that can be suggested as a possible alternative/initiative in a future discussion the committee will have.
 - iv. **Investments in Technology:** Member Howard shared that they voted to keep the budget for this item about the same because it is not clear to them that investing in it would improve the rider experience or safety.
 1. Member Murrell shared that they support increasing funding for this item, especially to improve the effectiveness of the camera system.
 - v. **Law enforcement:** Member Tajsar noted that having more than half the total budget dedicated to law enforcement seems fundamentally at odds with what the Board and the public want.
 1. Member Davis shared that it does not seem that law enforcement will be removed, but the budget should gradually be reduced.
 - vi. **Safety and Security Initiatives Support:** Metro staff shared that this item is for labor costs which includes benefits, workers compensation, and other standard fringe benefits for Metro's Security Department.
- c. **Next Steps:** Facilitator Dryjanski announced that the facilitation team will follow up with a survey that includes detailed line items.

IV. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken from meeting participants.

- a. There were no requests for public comment.

V. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 7:01 p.m.

VI. Next Steps

- a. The committee will reconvene on 03/02/22.



Public Safety Advisory Committee Quarterly Update

OPERATIONS, SAFETY, AND CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

MARCH 17, 2022

April – February PSAC Meetings

General PSAC
Meetings

22

Non-Law
Enforcement
Alternatives
Ad-hoc Meetings

19

Policing Practices
Ad-hoc Meetings

15

Infrastructure
Protection Services
Ad-hoc Meetings

14

Community
Engagement
Ad-hoc Meetings

10

Public Safety Survey
Ad-hoc Meetings

3

84 Meetings Total

November – February Meeting Highlights

> Approve the Mission & Values Statements
> Transit Ambassador Program Framework Recommendations

> Forthcoming infrastructure protection services and law enforcement contract recommendations
> Home at Last Short-term Shelter Program recommendations

December

February

November

January

> Year-end Workplan Reflection

> Guest Speaker: Ben Adam Climer, CRISIS Consulting
> FY22 Public Safety Budget Overview and FY23 Budget Process Briefing

Look Ahead



FY23 PUBLIC SAFETY
BUDGET



CODE OF CONDUCT



PLACE-BASED
IMPLEMENTATION
STRATEGY