



Board Report

File #: 2022-0557, **File Type:** Minutes

Agenda Number: 2.

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING
AUGUST 25, 2022**

SUBJECT: MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting held June 23, 2022, and the Special Board Meeting held July 20, 2022.

June 2022 EMC Public Comments

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:54 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

My name is [REDACTED] and I am a transit rider, PSAC member and with ACT-LA. I depend on the Orange line and Red line to get to work.

I want to congratulate Metro, Metro board and PSAC for this monumental moment. Transit ambassadors are essential to a care first approach and a big step towards real safety on Metro. We thank you for the investment that has gone into this pilot. We want to urge you to ensure that the ambassadors program is set up to succeed by -having ambassadors cover the bus system, that cultural competence is taken into account and that there is a plan to transition ambassadors to in agency union jobs.

We do want to flag that RMI is also one of Metros security contractors. How can the public be sure the security tasks and ambassador tasks are not done by the same people?

We look forward to answers to these questions through regular updates and transparency on the pilot. Thank you.

--

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:56 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:57 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:07 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:14 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am a longtime transit rider and today I write in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work with transit riders and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:22 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

[REDACTED]

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

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:22 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you.

Best,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:25 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:34 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Cc: contact@act-la.org
Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations? Finally, how will program evaluation criteria measure and course correct as needed for proper cultural competence and dispatch?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:39 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations? Finally, how will program evaluation criteria measure and course correct as needed for proper cultural competence and dispatch?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:41 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

To the Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing to celebrate Metro for beginning the process of implementing the Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. These transit ambassadors will be critical in a care-first approach for transit riders like myself.

I hope that Metro in the near future will provide clarity about what criteria will be used to evaluate the program once it begins, and course correct as needed. The introduction of transit ambassadors is an exciting step for Metro, and will certainly require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:44 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]

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

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:47 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: SUPPORT and Questions Around Item #39 - Transit Ambassador Contract

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of awarding a contract for a Transit Ambassador pilot on Metro. The role of the transit ambassadors is critical in a care-first approach for transit riders, including myself.

However, I ask for Metro's consideration and clarity on the issue of security overlap, cultural competence, and robust assessment. In the event that Metro's current security contractor, RMI, is awarded the contract, how can the public be assured that ambassador and security enforcement responsibilities are not conducted by the same individuals?

How will cultural competence be measured and implemented among dispatched ambassadors, to ensure they can correctly serve the public? Additionally, what criteria will decision-makers use to dispatch ambassadors on buses and trains, versus bus stops and stations?

The introduction of transit ambassadors is the right step for Metro, but will require work and assessment at multiple points to ensure that it will serve its ridership well.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

June 2022 OPS Public Comments

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:41 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Public Comment for Item 30: Operations, Safety and Customer Experience Committee

Dear Metro Board and Operations Committee,

I am concerned with the staff recommendation to dissolving the existing Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) and reconstituting it with new members. In my 10+ years working in transportation advocacy in Los Angeles, I have never seen Metro dissolve an advisory committee this fast. If the motivation for doing that is because staff are frustrated the committee is moving slower than Metro staff want, or because the committee has chosen not to have a chair, then that does not seem to warrant disbanding this important group entirely.

While adding new members is one thing, dissolving the existing work that has been built since April 2021 is a mistake. The amount of work and commitment into Metro's PSAC, is in my experience, unprecedented with over 93 meetings in less than 2 years. The committee has established rapport with each other, become increasingly knowledgeable on the challenges and constraints Metro faces and are poised to recommend ideas that prioritize transit riders and operators.

The existing committee members brought their professional and lived experiences to this critical space, and in a way that shifted the parameters of the discussion.

We encourage you to:

- (1) allow members to choose whether or not they'd like to extend their term on the PSAC,
- (2) define criteria for expanded membership and the specific viewpoints Metro would like to see represented, and
- (3) articulate a transparent process for how PSAC membership will evolve in the future.

My best,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:55 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: CONCERNS on Item #30 - Public Safety Advisory Committee Evaluation

My name is [REDACTED] and I am a transit rider, PSAC member and with ACT-LA. I depend on the red line and orange line. I

The reports author as a law enforcement affiliate does not analyze the deep direct democratic governance processes that PSAC members rightfully took the time to complete in the formation of this council by suggesting the first several months were “spent” on administrative matters. The author’s approach was unfair to the service of community members who first defined and applied their trusted processes for decision making.

PSAC directive

- PSAC was tasked with giving recommendations on the pilot program, other safety alternatives and auditing the policing contract.
- PSAC recommended that Metro move to a non contractual relationship with law enforcement and instead began rolling out alternatives such as the ambassador program. This recommendation is in line with the directive for the advisory committee to recommend how Metro should move forward with the contracts.

Expertise

- PSAC body represents the diversity of transit riders. They were chosen to bring the transit riders perspective.
- Contrary to the report’s findings, many PSAC members have significant experience working on issues like police practices and represent other important constituencies - such as disability rights, work closely with LGBTQ communities, and are survivors of violence.
- Metro appears to be using the report as a means to change PSAC’s membership to get more members that will do what Metro wants them to do - and say what Metro wants them to say – rather than speak up and advocate on behalf of Los Angeles’ marginalized communities.

Report tone

- The report's tone is overall disrespectful to PSAC’s members and the life experience and dedication they bring to the committee. Quoting members' responses and comparing them to METRO staff uniformed responses. PSAC members are diverse and have varying experiences on the system and that is the value they bring to the committee.

Thank you

--

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:58 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: CONCERNS on Item #30 - Public Safety Advisory Committee Evaluation

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing with concerns around Metro's Impact Evaluation Report related to the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC).

The author of the report, a law enforcement affiliate, does not take into account the deep and direct democratic governance processes that PSAC members created during the formation of this council when the authors suggest the first several months were "spent" on administrative matters. The author's approach was unfair to the service of community members who intentionally defined and then applied their trusted processes for decision making on PSAC.

Additional concerns include:

- That it dismisses the significant expertise and experience held by members of the Committee. For example, members of PSAC have particular expertise working on issues of policing practices, disability rights, LGBT rights, or are survivors of violence themselves. The diverse and relevant lived experience of the committee members informed their work and strong policy recommendations.
- The overall tone throughout which was used to dismiss the committee members and the work they contributed to. PSAC took on a monumental task of assessing policing and safety practices at Metro, and put ample time into crafting specific policy recommendations based on that work.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:01 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: CONCERNS on Item #30 - Public Safety Advisory Committee Evaluation

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing with concerns around Metro's Impact Evaluation Report related to the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC).

I'm concerned that the overall tone throughout the report is dismissive of the committee members and the important work they contributed to. PSAC took on a monumental task of assessing policing and safety practices at Metro, and put ample time into crafting specific policy recommendations based on that work. The evaluation reads as if Metro did not agree with the PSAC recommendations and is therefore moving to dissolve the committee, rather than grapple with its recommendations.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:23 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: CONCERNS on Item #30 - Public Safety Advisory Committee Evaluation

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing with concerns around Metro's Impact Evaluation Report related to the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC).

The author of the report, a law enforcement affiliate, does not take into account the deep and direct democratic governance processes that PSAC members created during the formation of this council when the authors suggest the first several months were "spent" on administrative matters. The author's approach was unfair to the service of community members who intentionally defined and then applied their trusted processes for decision making on PSAC.

Other concerns I have in regards to this report include that it dismisses the significant expertise and experience held by members of the Committee. For example, members of PSAC have particular expertise working on issues of policing practices, disability rights, LGBT rights, or are survivors of violence themselves. The diverse and relevant lived experience of the committee members informed their work and strong policy recommendations.

The overall tone throughout the report was dismissive of the committee members and the work they contribute towards an equitable vision of safety for all transit riders. The Public Safety Advisory Committee has taken on the monumental task of assessing policing and safety practices at Metro, and put ample time into crafting specific policy recommendations based on that work.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:24 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: CONCERNS on Item #30 - Public Safety Advisory Committee Evaluation

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am [REDACTED], a longtime bus rider and advocate, writing today with concerns around Metro's Impact Evaluation Report related to the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC).

I am concerned that the author of the report, a law enforcement affiliate, does not take into account the deep and direct democratic governance processes that PSAC members created during the formation of this council when the authors suggest the first several months were "spent" on administrative matters. The author's approach disregards the service of community members who intentionally defined and then applied their trusted processes for decision making on PSAC.

I am also concerned that this report dismisses the significant expertise and experience held by members of the Committee. PSAC members have particular expertise working on issues of policing practices, disability rights, LGBT rights, or are survivors of violence themselves. The diverse and relevant lived experience of the committee members informed their work and strong policy recommendations.

The overall tone throughout the report is dismissive of committee members and their contributions towards an equitable vision of safety for all transit riders. The Public Safety Advisory Committee has taken on the monumental task of assessing policing and safety practices at Metro, and put ample time into crafting specific policy recommendations based on that work.

I do hope you consider these concerns prior to any decision making regarding this evaluation.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 4:41 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: CONCERNS on Item #30 - Public Safety Advisory Committee Evaluation

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing with concerns around Metro's Impact Evaluation Report related to the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC).

The author of the report, a law enforcement affiliate, does not take into account the deep and direct democratic governance processes that PSAC members created during the formation of this council when the authors suggest the first several months were "spent" on administrative matters. The author's approach was unfair to the service of community members who intentionally defined and then applied their trusted processes for decision making on PSAC.

Other concerns I have in regards to this report include that it dismisses the significant expertise and experience held by members of the Committee. For example, members of PSAC have particular expertise working on issues of policing practices, disability rights, LGBT rights, or are survivors of violence themselves. The diverse and relevant lived experience of the committee members informed their work and strong policy recommendations.

The overall tone throughout the report was dismissive of the committee members and the work they contribute towards an equitable vision of safety for all transit riders. The Public Safety Advisory Committee has taken on the monumental task of assessing policing and safety practices at Metro, and put ample time into crafting specific policy recommendations based on that work.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 11:19 AM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Public Comment on this morning's Operations meeting

Hi Board Clerk/staff:

Hope your day is well; sure you've got plenty ahead of you today with the upcoming committee meetings.

I'm just commenting because I accidentally misspoke when trying to give verbal comment on today's agenda; during consideration of two items at once (at least that's what I thought was happening), I raised my hand before a director had a comment on item 31--and then got called on public comment for that item. I said "oh sorry I wanted to comment on item 30"--when in reality, the other item was **32**. Apologies, I made a simple mistake! But then, I wasn't allowed to comment on 32, when the time came for that. Apologies for the confusion there--but I do feel it's important to say what I do say, and to stick around for the meetings that I do, so I hope my time can be respected as I'm trying to respect that y'all are trying to do your job as well.

So, I hope you can forwards on to the BoD at that meeting that I'm really displeased to see, as always, the Metro arrest records are very high for the black ridership; while they're lower than 50% for a rare occasion, I can't help but notice that it comes with Black Ridership also falling by 3% from what I'm familiar with it being (sliding from 18% to 15%, definitely something to correct for), and also I was going to point out that in the satisfaction part of the report, Black Folks are also scoring safety on Metro lower than any other group--and yet, they're the most likely to be arrested. While I can't prove anything with two data points, it does match my own experience that a lot of black folks don't feel safe on the bus-- And really underscores why I've been organizing with the Bus Riders Union to ask y'all to stop fare enforcement and other anti-black policies, and get cops off the bus!

Anyhow, hope y'all have a good rest of your day.

Best,

[REDACTED]

June 2022 P&P Public Comments

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 10:32 AM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: AGAINST Item #12 Green Line Extension to Torrance

Attention Metro:

I am writing you this email on behalf of MANY local Residents and Business owners in Redondo Beach as well as Torrance, California who are AGAINST the Green Line, Item #12!! We have had many meetings with homeowners, business owners, local city government officials, and attorneys, etc discussing the dangers, and problems regarding the idea of green line being located here in the residential neighborhoods just feet away from where babies and children play and run around near train tracks. also dogs and pets run around, and long time endangered birds are located.

It is unsafe in many ways. There are multiple pipelines in the area, as well as other reasons that this is a Dangerous location for a green line. There are homes valued at over \$1 million dollars with families, children that reside in this safe neighborhood. We plan on keeping it safe, quiet. Green line is not needed nor desired in this area. People drive and take the Metro bus system. The bus system needs improvement. That is where you need to put the money into rather than the green line in this area.

Statically, Residents in this area don't use light rail locally. You can see these stats on the recent survey done in the area.

Besides issues with being dangerous and causing derailments like recently in Colton, California. Sound, light, crime increase, loss of endangered birds from this area, increase of traffic causing our Police, Firefighters, Ambulances getting stuck waiting for trains to pass and not being able to get to calls on time for both emergencies and to save lives at both businesses, and residences, etc.

Crime has increased in Santa Monica, California more than ever since the light rail has been there.

There are multi million dollar homes in Santa Monica that are being burglarized, robbed. Santa Monica NEVER had crime like it does now due to the light rail which is called the "CRIME TRAIN" in Santa Monica by Business Owners, and residents living there for over 50 years!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

We are not going to put up with a crime increase or anything else since it is proven to be dangerous to have any additional trains on our tracks next to our homes that are used for freight ONLY.

This is COMMON SENSE!!!!!!

You can't have 1 train that carries explosive freight materials with another train carrying human beings at the same time and not have issues with SAFETY, DERAILMENTS, FIRE, CRIME INCREASE, TRAFFIC INCREASE, ETC!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

My husband is a local Firefighter, and Paramedic and was called out on 911 call for the recent train derailment in Colton, California. This was Absolutely an example of how easy derailments happen.

Especially with more than 1 train on the tracks. Especially next to the freight trains going by. These tracks are just FEET away from children playing in our backyards. Therefore, we are all against the idea of any additional trains on our current tracks that are used for Freight Only!!

Obviously, Freight trains are needed, not light rail trains holding human beings at the same time on the same tracks. Obviously, there is Too much danger with the MULTIPLE PIPELINES LOCATED NEXT TO THE TRAIN TRACKS.

There are also issues with illegally intruding on homeowners rights to Peace and Quiet on our properties!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

The board should be aware of this issue because with all the executives positions approved for Ms. Wiggins, she's still unaware of most of what the day-to-day entails for Metro's employees.

The union is not going to complain about it's members getting more money and in this case neither did metro. Whatever happened to saving that carrot for negotiations.

Here's the issue: metro agreed to give AFSCME instructors at OCI only an increase of over 14,000 a year excluding overtime to their salary. Metro agreed to add an extra hour of pay everyday for time not worked, just giving an extra hour of pay each day as routine.

How does that look if someone else is accused of getting paid an hour in which they never worked. Excluding other AFSCME supervisors in the same band is deem discriminatory and favoring one over the other.

The issue hereis, is it legal to pay any employee for work not done?

Is it legal to favor one particular classification?

Can this decision be looked at as wasting tax payers money or is it fraud?

Metro don't hold wrongdoing accountable and this is wrong in the eyes of any reasonable person and should be addressed.

LA's Expo Line Off the Rails - From Santa Monica to 7th Street in Downtown LA and back, a Ride into Hell

June 2022

[Click here to see video](#)

I would not be able to enter any sports stadium, airport, or government building, with the weapons many passengers now openly carry on the LA Expo, Metro transit system and Santa Monica's Big Blue Buses. This was only one of many unpleasant details I discovered during three-and-a-half weeks spent riding area public transportation in a fact-finding mission.

As a business and property owner in Santa Monica, I became concerned for the safety of my employees and those of neighboring business in the once-chic downtown and Third Street Promenade as they spoke about the one fear and anxiety they all shared: using public transportation. Dishwashers, janitors, waiters, and shop clerks, of different ages, races, and physical builds all felt the same way, and yet they depended on public transit to travel from their homes to their jobs in Santa Monica.

The graphic and sordid visuals employees described to me on public transit seemed unreal. At the same time, I had heard LA County Sheriff Villanueva claim there are an estimated 5,700 homeless individuals who use the trains as their main shelter.

I decided to conduct my own investigation. I gathered two assistants, and we dressed in worn clothes with hoodies and carried large backpacks with dirty tee shirts hanging from the top. Our original plan was to see what occurred over a weekend. What we saw was so 'off the rails' that we thought it must have been an unusual set of circumstances. I extended the experiment another three weeks, but the result was even worse.

The most immediate and obvious reality was that the Expo line running from Santa Monica to downtown Los Angeles is serving as the county's "hospital on wheels without doctors." Many motionless riders were covered in blankets, asleep, and surrounded by their own urine. By design, there are no restrooms at or near any of the Expo stops. The

train is also a crucible of crime as other travellers were organized, fully alert and walking from train to train looking for their next prey.

Each of us saw either a drug deal or the mixing of weed and crack by males seated on the stained cloth train seats. We saw several individuals bartering for narcotics dressed in the same lime green colored vests with orange stripes as the drivers wear. The ersatz uniform provided an authoritative "cover" for them to complete their drug deals without outside interference. On one occasion, I could see an argument inside a car between several men surrounding a small tray of off-colored white powder, likely meth. They had a guard of their own blocking entry to the car.

And thus there were the weapons. Brass knuckles, 9 mm semiautomatic pistols, small semiautomatic handguns (most likely homemade because they appeared sawed off), 6-inch knives, sawed-off 12-inch cast iron pipes, sawed-off fishing rods, two-foot hardened steel industrial chain.....much of it worn and carried, or hanging from openings in the side of baggy pants or from pockets and backpacks. The less sophisticated, sleeping off the effects of whatever drug they had ingested, carried simple wooden sticks.

It was this last group of people we saw covered and motionless on the same trip and sometimes on the same train, all day. At night they were quiet except for loud snoring, people very sick coughing and wheezing, and the sounds of paper or plastic bags opening to scrape up and place their feces. Urine remained on the floors until it was walked over or dried up. One couple completely covered in a yellow stained blanket were engaged in sex and moaning.

Although the train platforms and rails get a power washing that leaves behind an repelling aroma of cheap bleach and urine, we never saw anyone cleaning the interior of any cab.

A few of the perennial homeless travellers locked eyes with me. Some spoke because there was someone other than themselves to speak to. I could only make sense of about 15% of their words, but they told me about liver disease or, shivering, said they had untreated herpes and HIV.

One common fact stood out -- none had been in California for more than 3 months. All were transplants.

Currently, patrol and law enforcement are shared among Metro "guards and ambassadors," and the Long Beach and LA Police Departments. But we saw no Metro police on the train until we arrived

at the final stop at 7th Street in Downtown LA. The only other law enforcement present was the LA County Sheriff's Department, who faithfully fulfill their contracted duty of keeping order at the terminus in Santa Monica. Comically, there is a loudspeaker announcement advising riders if they "see something, say something", with a phone number. No one will come. Once you are inside the train car, you are dead meat.

I reached out to several members of the Expo Board of Directors, to County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, who lives in Santa Monica, and Mayor Eric Garcetti. I would like to ride the entire 15.2 mile Expo line with each of them starting in Santa Monica, where they will park inside of one of Santa Monica's seedy garages, without being dropped of by their personal driver, step past puddles of urine, motionless but living bodies here or there, tagged walls, and then past several tented encampments on 4th Street or along Colorado. Then we will wait on the platform for a train, take a deep breath, step in and sit down, watch the doors shut, and see what it's like for the working class of LA. on a daily basis.





Eco-Rapid Transit, formerly known as the Orangeline Development Authority, is a joint powers authority (JPA) created to pursue development of a transit system that moves as rapidly as possible, uses grade separation as appropriate, and is environmentally friendly and energy efficient. The system is designed to enhance and increase transportation options for riders of this region utilizing safe, advanced transit technology to expand economic growth that maximizes ridership in Southern California. The Authority is composed of the following public agencies:

June 20, 2022

Hilda Solis
 Chair
 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
 One Gateway Plaza
 Los Angeles CA 90012

Re: Letter of Support - Metro Motion - **Norman Y. Mineta Station Dedication**

Supervisor Solis,

Eco-Rapid Transit supports the motion by you and Metro Director Garcetti to dedicate the Little Tokyo/Arts District Station to Secretary Norman Yoshio Mineta in honor of his contributions to the Los Angeles' transit system, the Japanese American community, the Little Tokyo community, and his career as a public servant.

Secretary Mineta service as the former United States Secretary of Transportation and as a primary author of the American Disabilities Act and Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) was vital for the country. He has left a legacy in local government and transportation. He has been an important contributor in our community from the formation of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments to working with all of us on the West Santa Ana Branch.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Kodama
 Executive Director

Cc: The Honorable Janice Hahn, Los Angeles County Supervisor and Metro Board Member
 The Honorable Eric Garcetti, City of Los Angeles Mayor and Metro Board Member
 The Honorable Fernando Dutra, City of Whittier Councilmember and Metro Board Member
 The Honorable Ali Sajajd Taj, City of Artesia Councilmember and Chair, Eco-Rapid Transit
 Eco-Rapid Transit Board of Directors
 Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

- City of Artesia
- City of Bell
- City of Bell Gardens
- City of Cerritos
- City of Cudahy
- City of Downey
- City of Glendale
- City of Huntington Park
- City of Maywood
- City of Paramount
- City of South Gate
- Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority

Chair

Ali Sajjad Taj
 Council Member
 City of Artesia

Vice-Chair

Vrej Agajanian
 Councilmember
 City of Glendale

Secretary

Jose R. Gonzalez
 Vice Mayor
 City of Cudahy

Treasurer/Internal Auditor

Alejandra Cortez
 Councilmember
 City of Bell Gardens

Executive Director

Michael R. Kodama

General Counsel

Matthew T. Summers

Ex-Officio

Ricardo Reyes
 City Manager Representative

June 22, 2022

The Honorable Hilda L. Solis
Chair, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors
Los Angeles County Supervisor, First District
Transmitted by email

Re: Motion to Dedicate Little Tokyo/Arts District Station in Honor of Norman Y. Mineta

Dear Supervisor Solis:

Few Americans have served their country with more dignity or had a greater impact on modern transportation than former United States Secretary of Transportation Norman Y. Mineta. In recognition of his 35 years of public service and his willingness to lend advice during the development of the Regional Connector and West Santa Ana Branch projects, the seven undersigned community-based organizations wholeheartedly support the motion by Metro Board President and County Supervisor Hilda Solis and Mayor Eric Garcetti to dedicate the Little Tokyo Arts District Station in Secretary Mineta's memory.

As a Congressional representative and the first Asian American to serve on a Presidential Cabinet, Secretary Mineta's service included 20 years as a member of the United States Congress during which he led the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation. He worked to include transportation protections in the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and introduced the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, a revolutionary law that gave state and local governments more control over the roadways in their districts and went on to chair the Public Works and Transportation Committee, largest in the House of Representatives.

A lifelong advocate for human rights, he became the driving force behind the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, a law that officially apologized for and redressed the injustices endured by Japanese Americans during World War II. As chair of the Board of Trustees for the Japanese American National Museum, located adjacent to the new Regional Connector station, he helped ensure that the lessons embodied in that wartime experience continue to promote greater understanding among all people.

We, therefore, urge the Metro board of directors to vote in favor of the motion to dedicate the Regional Connector Station as the *Norman Y. Mineta Little Tokyo/Arts District Station*.

Japanese American Citizens League, Downtown Los Angeles Chapter
Japanese American National Museum
Chinese American Museum
Japanese Chamber of Commerce of Southern California
Little Tokyo Business Association
Little Tokyo Community Council
Little Tokyo Legacy Foundation



Little Tokyo Legacy Foundation
Let's Make it Better



cc: Mayor Eric Garcetti



MINUTES

Thursday, June 23, 2022

10:00 AM

Board of Directors - Regular Board Meeting

DIRECTORS PRESENT:

Hilda L. Solis, Chair
Ara Najarian, 1st Vice Chair
Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, 2nd Vice Chair
Kathryn Barger
Mike Bonin
James Butts
Fernando Dutra
Eric Garcetti
Janice Hahn
Paul Krekorian
Sheila Kuehl
Holly Mitchell
Tim Sandoval
Gloria Roberts, 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, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 46.

Consent Calendar items were approved by one vote unless held by a Director for discussion and/or separate action.

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

2. **SUBJECT: MINUTES** **2022-0418**
 APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting held May 26, 2022.

3. **SUBJECT: REMARKS BY THE CHAIR** **2022-0377**
 RECEIVED remarks by the Chair.

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

4. **SUBJECT: REPORT BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER** **2022-0378**
 RECEIVED report by the Chief Executive Officer.

AN	JDW	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	JH	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS
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	AN = A. 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: MEASURE R MULTI-MODAL HIGHWAY SUBREGIONAL PROGRAMS SEMI-ANNUAL UPDATE 2022-0293

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. \$37,227,000 in additional programming within the capacity of the Measure R Multi-Modal Highway Subregional Programs and funding changes via the updated project list for:
- Arroyo Verdugo Operational Improvements
 - I-405, I-110, I-105, & SR-91 Improvements (South Bay)
 - I-605 Corridor "Hot-Spots" Interchange Improvements in Gateway Cities
 - I-710 South Local Streets Early Action projects in Gateway Cities
- B. APPROVING deobligation of \$1,850,000 of previously approved Measure R Highway Subregional Program funds for re-allocation to the other existing Board approved Measure R projects; and
- C. AUTHORIZING the CEO or designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements for the Board-approved projects.

6. SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM UPDATE - GATEWAY CITIES SUBREGION 2022-0339

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. PROGRAMMING an additional \$21,011,308 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements Multi-Modal Program;
- B. REPROGRAMMING of projects previously approved to meet environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction time frames; and
- C. 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 revised project schedule, and
- D. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements for approved projects.

7. SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM - 2022-0343
CENTRAL CITY SUBREGION

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. PROGRAMMING of \$18,623,792 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Active Transportation, First/Last Mile and Mobility Hubs Program;
- 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.

8. SUBJECT: CHAVEZ/FICKETT L (GOLD) LINE STATION JOINT DEVELOPMENT 2022-0256

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute an amendment to the Exclusive Negotiations and Planning Agreement (ENA) with Abode Communities 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 Cesar E. Chavez Avenue and Fickett Street in Boyle Heights with up to 110 affordable housing units, an on-site community garden and small-format food retail.

9. SUBJECT: METRO OBJECTIVES FOR MULTIMODAL HIGHWAY INVESTMENT 2022-0302

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. ADOPTING the proposed Metro Objectives for Multimodal Highway Investment; and
- B. RECEIVING AND FILING the report back on FY23 Budgeted Multimodal Highway Investments.

(continued on next page)

(Item 9 – continued from previous page)

**SOLIS & DUPONT WALKER AMENDMENT TO ATTACHMENT A,
OBJECTIVE 2:** Recognizing LA County’s history of inequitable highway investment policies and construction, work with local communities to reduce disparities caused by the existing highway system and develop holistic, positive approaches to maintain and improve the integrity and quality of life of those communities with minimal or no displacement during the implementation of highway improvements.

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

**10. SUBJECT: AMEND THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH 2022-0314
THE SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COUNCIL OF
GOVERNMENTS FOR THE SAN GABRIEL VALLEY
TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to amend the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated February 1, 2021, with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) for the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study (Study), authorizing the SGVCOG to proceed with next steps of the study with a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,800,000, bringing the total funding to \$3,300,000.

**11. SUBJECT: TRANSFER OF PROPERTIES TO CITY OF LOS ANGELES 2022-0388
FOR DESTINATION CRENSHAW**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. DECLARING that 3417 W. Slauson Ave, 5759 11th Ave & 3309 W. Slauson Ave (the Properties, as depicted in Attachment A) are not necessary for use by Metro and are “exempt surplus land” as defined in Section 54221(f)(1) of the California Surplus Land Act, as amended; and
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute any necessary documents to transfer the Properties to the City of Los Angeles (City) in support of Destination Crenshaw, with land value waived, contingent on the following:
 - 1. City or Destination Crenshaw providing an alternative location for the bicycle parking infrastructure originally planned for the IAM Park site, including securing approved plans and permits and installing.
 - 2. Mutual agreement of responsibilities and use restrictions regarding the environmental mitigation program at Slauson Park.
 - 3. Mutual agreement regarding Metro’s obligation to replant trees under Permit No. 31392

**13. SUBJECT: LOCAL RETURN PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION C,
MEASURE R AND MEASURE M CAPITAL RESERVE**

2022-0225

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements between Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) and the Cities for their Capital Reserve Account as approved; and
- B. ESTABLISHING new Local Return funded Capital Reserve Accounts for the Cities of La Puente (Proposition C), Montebello (Proposition A), San Marino (Proposition A) and Rolling Hills (Measure R and Measure M).

14. SUBJECT: EXCESS LIABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM

2022-0194

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and purchase Public Entity excess liability policies with up to \$300 million in limits at a cost not to exceed \$23 million for the 12-month period effective August 1, 2022, to August 1, 2023.

15. SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 8 FUND PROGRAM

2022-0318

ADOPTED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. Findings and Recommendations (Attachment A) for allocating fiscal year (FY) 2022-23 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds estimated at \$37,668,206 as follows:
 - In the City of Avalon there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, therefore TDA Article 8 funds (Attachment B) in the amount of \$220,402 may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects, as described in Attachment A;
 - In the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North County transit needs can be met through using other existing funding sources. Therefore, the TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$8,952,102 and \$8,658,196 (Lancaster and Palmdale, respectively) may be used for street and road purposes and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met;
 - In the City of Santa Clarita, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; in the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, existing transit needs can be met through the recommended actions using other funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$12,291,694 for the City of Santa Clarita may be used for street and road and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met;

(continued on next page)

(Item 15 – continued from previous page)

- In the Los Angeles County Unincorporated areas of North County, the areas encompassing both the Antelope Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley, transit needs are met with other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$7,545,812 may be used for street and road purposes and/or transit, as long as their transit needs continue to be met; and
- B. A resolution making a determination of unmet public transportation needs in the areas of Los Angeles County outside the Metro service area.

16. SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2022-23 TRANSIT FUND ALLOCATIONS 2022-0313

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. \$2.9 billion in FY 2022-23 (FY23) Transit Fund Allocations for Los Angeles County jurisdictions, transit operators and Metro operations as shown in Attachment A. These allocations comply with federal, state, and local regulations and LACMTA Board approved policies and guidelines;
- B. fund exchanges in the estimated amount of \$3,323,653 of Metro's TDA Article 4 allocation with Municipal Operators' shares of Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. Funding will be adjusted based on LCTOP actual allocations;
- C. fund exchanges in the estimated amount of \$975,482 of Metro's Prop C 40% allocation with Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita, Burbank and Pasadena's shares of Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. Funding will be adjusted based on LCTOP actual allocations;
- D. fund exchange in the amount of \$ 170,195 of Metro's TDA Article 4 allocations with La Mirada Transit's share of FY17 Federal Section 5307 and \$199,062 of Metro's TDA Article 4 allocations with Arcadia Transit's share of FY17 Federal Section 5307;
- E. Two-year lag funding for \$842,476 to Torrance Transit, Commerce Transit, and Long Beach Transit for the transitioned services from Metro as follows:
1. The transfer of Metro Line 256 to City of Commerce Municipal Bus Lines consisting of 102,930 Revenue Miles and corresponding fundings in the amount of \$184,608;

(continued on next page)

(Item 16 – continued from previous page)

2. The transfer of a portion of Metro Line 130 to Torrance Transit consisting of 231,006 Revenue Miles and corresponding funding in the amount of \$414,163;
 3. The transfer of the eastern segment of Metro line 130 to Long Beach Transit consisting of 135,893 Revenue Miles and corresponding funding in the amount of \$243,705;
- F. base funding increase from \$6.0 million to \$7.4 million in FY23 for Tier 2 Operators to accommodate local fund exchanges of American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) Funding as approved by the LACMTA Board of Directors;
- G. the execution of \$9.2 million local fund exchanges as appropriate to implement the Board approved ARPA allocations;
- H. fund exchange of Federal Section 5307 discretionary fund awarded to the Southern California Regional Transit Training Consortium (SCR TTC) through Long Beach Transit in the amount of \$360,000 with Metro's TDA Article 4 allocation;
- I. fund exchanges in the amount totaling \$17.1 million of Metro's Federal Section 5307 share with Municipal Operators' shares of Federal Sections 5337 and 5339;
- J. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to adjust FY23 Federal Section 5307 (Urbanized Formula), Section 5339 (Bus and Bus Facilities) and Section 5337 (State of Good Repair) allocations upon receipt of final apportionments from the Federal Transit Authority and amend FY23 budget as necessary to reflect the adjustment;
- K. AUTHORIZING a \$1.26 million allocation to LIFE Program Administrators, FAME Assistance Corporation (FAME) and the International Institute of Los Angeles (IILA) to fund the FY23 Taxi Voucher component of the LIFE Program;
- L. a resolution designating Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) fund allocations are in compliance with the terms and conditions of the allocations;
- M. the reallocation of \$10 million in greater than anticipated FY22 Federal Section 5307 funds, plus additional allocations of \$5 million in FY24 and \$5 million in FY26 Federal Section 5307 funds in support of Local Operators Capital Requirements;

(continued on next page)

(Item 16 – continued from previous page)

- N. fund exchange of FY22 Federal Section 5307 funds in the amount of \$10 million allocated to Local Operators with other local funds as appropriate to accelerate grant approval and disbursement of funds by the Federal Transit Administration; and
- O. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements to implement the above funding programs.

17. SUBJECT: ACCESS SERVICES PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2023 BUDGET **2022-0341**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. local funding request for Access Services (Access) in an amount not to exceed \$156,094,281 for FY23. This amount includes:
 - 1. Local funds for operating and capital expenses in the amount of \$153,651,022;
 - 2. Local funds paid directly to Metrolink for its participation in Access' Free Fare Program in the amount of \$2,443,259; and
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements to implement the above funding programs.

18. SUBJECT: FY 2022-23 METROLINK ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM BUDGET **2022-0255**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. programming the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's ("Metro") share of the Southern California Regional Rail Authority's (SCRRA) FY 2022-23 Operating, Rehabilitation, and Capital Budget in the amount of \$171,180,124;
- B. EXTENDING the lapsing dates for funds previously allocated to Metrolink for the Rehabilitation and Renovation Program and Capital projects as follows:
 - FY 2014-15 extended from June 30, 2023 to June 30, 2024 - \$3,423
 - FY 2016-17 extended from June 30, 2023 to June 30, 2024 - \$286,000
 - FY 2018-19 extended from June 30, 2023 to June 30, 2025 - \$1,651,187
 - 94SCRALINK extended from June 30, 2023 to June 30, 2024 - \$245,242

(continued on next page)

(Item 18 – continued from previous page)

- 94-DORANSCRRRA extended from June 30, 2022 to June 30, 2023 - \$137,029
- 94SCRRAMRLUS extended from June 30, 2022 to June 30, 2023 - \$69,725
- MRBRIGHTRX extended from June 30, 2022 to June 30, 2023 - \$226,990;

C. the FY23 Transfers to Other Operators' payment rate of \$1.10 per boarding to Metro and an EZ Pass reimbursement cap to Metro of \$5,592,000; and

D. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements between Metro and the SCRRRA for the approved funding.

19. SUBJECT: NETWORK VIDEO RECORDER KITS

2022-0253

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to award a two-year, Indefinite Delivery / Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract No. MA85485000 to Peacock Systems, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for Network Video Recorder Kits. The contract includes a one-year base amount of \$2,162,471 inclusive of sales tax, and a one-year option in the amount of \$2,229,880, inclusive of sales tax, for a total contract amount of \$4,392,351, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any.

20. SUBJECT: REFURBISHMENT OF SEAT INSERTS WITH VINYL MATERIAL

2022-0264

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to award a two-year, firm fixed unit rate Contract No. RR82767000 to Molina Manufacturing, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, to refurbish vinyl seat inserts. The Contract is for a one-year base amount in the amount of \$1,785,652, inclusive of sales tax, and a one-year option in the amount of \$1,587,413, inclusive of sales tax, for a total contract amount of \$3,373,065, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any.

21. SUBJECT: TECHNICAL AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES FOR LACMTA HRV OVERHAUL AND CRITICAL COMPONENT REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

2022-0266

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 14 to Contract No. OP30433488 with LTK Engineering Services for Technical and Program Management support services for LACMTA A650 Heavy Rail Vehicle Overhaul and Critical Component Replacement Program (OCCRP) to extend the Period of Performance through March 5, 2025 and increase the Not-to-Exceed Total Contract Price by \$3,126,944, from \$5,488,530 to \$8,615,474.

22. SUBJECT: POWER SWEEPING SERVICES **2022-0282**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 11 to Contract No. OP962800003367 with Nationwide Environmental Services, a Division of Joe's Sweeping Services, Inc., to provide power sweeping services for Metro's facilities in the amount of \$995,000, increasing the contract authority from \$5,846,346 to \$6,841,346 and extending the period of performance from September 1, 2022, through March 31, 2023.

23. SUBJECT: A650 HEAVY RAIL VEHICLE FLEET FRICTION BRAKE OVERHAUL **2022-0303**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 9 to Contract No. MA6274900, Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Wabtec Passenger Transit (Wabtec) for A650 Heavy Rail Fleet Friction Brake Overhaul to extend the Period of Performance through June 30, 2024, and increase the Not-to-Exceed Total Contract Price by \$531,631.00 from \$3,727,827.00 to \$4,259,458.00.

24. SUBJECT: CONVENIENCE COPYING SERVICES **2022-0306**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 5 to Contract No. PS3825500 with Xerox Corporation to continue to provide the lease and maintenance of multi-function convenience copiers at various Metro locations, increasing the total not-to-exceed contract value by \$454,045 from \$4,132,773 to \$4,586,818, and extend the period of performance from September 1, 2022, through February 28, 2023.

25. SUBJECT: METRO EXPRESSLANES CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL (CHP) ENFORCEMENT AGREEMENT **2022-0179**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute a three (3) year funding agreement with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to provide enforcement services on the I-10 and I-110 ExpressLanes from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2025 in the not-to-exceed amount of \$12,376,790.

26. SUBJECT: MEMBERSHIP ON METRO'S REGIONAL SERVICE COUNCILS **2022-0196**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR nominees for membership on Metro's Gateway Cities, San Fernando Valley, San Gabriel Valley, South Bay Cities and Westside Central Service Councils.

30. SUBJECT: PUBLIC SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE EVALUATION **2022-0319**

BONIN AMENDMENT: Extend current Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) membership term to September 1, 2022 to allow Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to return with more specifics and refinement to the recommendation.

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

33. SUBJECT: CRENSHAW/LAX CLOSE-OUT PROJECT **2022-0337**

AMENDED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Life-of-Project (LOP) budget by \$17,000,000 for the Crenshaw/LAX Close-Out Project (CP 869512) from \$30,000,000 to \$47,000,000.

34. SUBJECT: SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND SUPPORT SERVICES CONTRACT **2022-0296**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. an increase in total authorized funding for Contract No. AE47810E0128 with SECOTrans (Joint Venture of LTK Engineering Services, NBA Engineering Inc., Pacific Railway Enterprises Inc., and Ramos Consulting Services, Inc), for pending and future Task Orders to provide systems engineering and support services for Metro Rail and Bus Transit projects, in the amount of \$28,850,000 increasing the total contract authorized funding from a not-to-exceed amount of \$66,432,000 to a not-to-exceed amount of \$95,282,000 through Fiscal Year 2024; and
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to execute individual Task Orders and Contract Modifications within the Board approved contract funding amount.

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

36. SUBJECT: FY23 ANNUAL PROGRAM EVALUATION FOLLOW UP **2022-0361**

RECEIVED AND FILED status report on the FY23 Annual Program Evaluation Follow-Up.

APPROVED:

SANDOVAL AMENDMENT: Direct the CEO to develop an Early Intervention Project Team comprised of Metro's finest and the best staff from planning, program management, operations, government relations, OMB, and vendor/contract management to design a list of a comprehensive checklist of criteria on successful project delivery addressing such as (1) funding strategy (either it is local or federal project), (2) project delivery method and why the project is being recommended for such delivery method for all Measure M Expenditure Plan Projects.

DUPONT-WALKER AMENDMENT:

1. As part of the next report on the cost management action plan, direct the CEO to include metrics to help evaluate the success and progress of cost control efforts; and
2. In the monthly Countywide Planning Major Project Status Report, direct the CEO to include a cost estimate range and design level for all projects.

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

38. SUBJECT: MYSTERY RIDER PROGRAM (ADA/LEP) **2022-0304**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to award a five-year firm-fixed unit rate Contract No. PS43587000 with Mobility Advancement Group to provide mystery rider observations for an amount not-to-exceed \$835,992 for the three-year base term, \$306,984 for the first option year, and \$322,332 for the second option year, for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$1,465,308, effective August 1, 2022, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any.

39. SUBJECT: METRO TRANSIT AMBASSADOR PILOT PROGRAM SERVICES

2022-0399

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and award firm fixed unit rate contracts to Strive Well-Being Inc. (Contract No. PS88001001) and RMI International Inc. (Contract No. PS88001000) to provide a pilot Transit Ambassador Services Program, subject to the resolution of protest(s) if any. Strive Well-Being's contract not to exceed amount is \$15,878,421 for the three-year base pilot and \$11,879,023 for the additional two, one-year options, for a total not to exceed amount of \$27,757,444. RMI International's contract not to exceed amount is \$55,400,768 for the three-year base pilot and \$39,690,212 for the additional two, one-year options, for a total not to exceed amount of \$95,090,980. The combined total not to exceed amount for both firms over the five-year pilot is \$122,848,424; and
- B. DELEGATING authority to the Chief Executive Officer to execute any future Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with Los Angeles County departments and/or City of Los Angeles partners for supplementary ambassador program services to enhance the Ambassador Program during the pilot period, in an amount not-to-exceed \$20,000,000, inclusive of administrative fees and other pilot initiatives, in support of the annual investments identified for Transit Ambassador Program Services in Board Motion 26.2.

40. SUBJECT: EXPANDING METRO'S EAT SHOP PLAY PROGRAM TO SUPPORT ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND RESTORE RIDERSHIP

2022-0279

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR five pilot transit corridors to expand Metro's Eat Shop Play (ESP) Program and launch the first pilot program in the East Los Angeles Area in response to Motion 40, ESP Expansion.

41. SUBJECT: EXTEND SALE OF PROMOTIONAL HALF-PRICE PASSES AND UPDATE ON FARE CAPPING TIMELINE

2022-0351

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. the Chief Executive Officer to extend the sale of promotional passes at 50% of the cost of full price passes through December 2022 as a continuation of Motion 36: Emergency Relief; and
- B. RECEIVING AND FILING this report on the timeline and plan for Metro fare capping.

42. **SUBJECT: METRO STREET SAFETY, DATA SHARING AND COLLABORATION POLICY** 2022-0340

ADOPTED ON CONSENT CALENDAR Metro Street Safety, Data Sharing and Collaboration Policy.

43. **SUBJECT: REVIEW AND ADOPT A RAIL STATION NAME FOR AIRPORT METRO CONNECTOR/96TH ST AVIATION STATION** 2022-0398

ADOPTED ON CONSENT CALENDAR an Official and Operational name for the Airport Metro Connector/96th St Aviation Station:

<u>Official Station Name</u>	<u>Operational Station Name</u>
LAX/Metro Transit Center	LAX/Metro Transit Center

44. **SUBJECT: ELECTRIC VEHICLE PARKING STRATEGIC PLAN** 2022-0002

ADOPTED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Electric Vehicle Parking Strategic Plan (EVPSP).

46. **SUBJECT: FINDINGS REQUIRED TO CONTINUE TO MEET VIA TELECONFERENCE IN COMPLIANCE WITH AB 361 WHILE UNDER A STATE OF EMERGENCY AND WHILE STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS CONTINUE TO PROMOTE SOCIAL DISTANCING** 2022-0379

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR 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:

- 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.

47. SUBJECT: I-710 SOUTH CORRIDOR TASK FORCE

2022-0336

APPROVED:

- A. RECEIVING AND FILING report on the I-710 South Clean Truck Program (I-710 South Corridor Zero Emission Truck Program) in response to Board Motion 16; and
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 28 to Contract No. PS4340-1939, I-710 South Corridor Project EIR/EIS, with URS Corporation (an AECOM Entity) to fund the close out of the EIR/EIS and the new 710 South Corridor Investment Plan in the not-to-exceed (NTE) amount of \$6,276,216.18, increasing the total contract value from \$58,173,718 to \$64,449,934.18.

AN	JDW	KB	MB	JB	FD	EG	JH	PK	SK	HJM	TS	HS
Y	Y	C	Y	A/C	Y	A/C	Y	Y	Y	C	Y	Y

48. SUBJECT: NORMAN Y. MINETA STATION DEDICATION MOTION

2022-0421

APPROVED Motion by Directors Solis and Garcetti that the Board directs the CEO to:

- A. Prepare a plan dedicating the Little Tokyo/ Arts District Station in honor of the late Secretary Mineta; and
- B. Report back on the above at the Executive Management Committee meeting in September 2022.

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

49. SUBJECT: LAND BANK PILOT PARTNERSHIP WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY MOTION

2022-0422

APPROVED Motion by Directors Solis, Najarian, Kuehl, and Mitchell directing the Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. Collaborate with the Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office, other County Departments and outside community partners to explore opportunities to partner on the Land Bank Pilot;

(continued on next page)

(Item 49 – continued from previous page)

- B. Identify specific roles that Metro can take on as part of the Land Bank Pilot and associated duties that align with Metro’s role as a transit operator and transportation planner for the region. Metro should consider a scenario in which the County leads property acquisitions where a nexus to Metro exists and Metro takes on holding and developing the properties;
- C. Explore additional ways to partner with the County leveraging the work of Metro’s Housing Lab, including participating in the County’s Community Land Trust Partnership Pilot Program; and
- D. Report back on all directives above in October 2022.

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

50. SUBJECT: BOARD OFFICERS

2022-0380

ELECTED Director Hahn as 2nd Vice Chair.

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

51. SUBJECT: CLOSED SESSION

2022-0417

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

1. Tradon Pham Cube v. LACMTA, Case No. 19STCV44312

AUTHORIZED settlement of the remaining balance of \$8,000,000.

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

2. Jasmine Grace v. LACMTA, Case No. 19STCV33495

AUTHORIZED settlement of \$1,600,000.

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

(continued on next page)

(Item 51 – continued from previous page)

3. Kathleen Marazoni v. LACMTA, Case No. 18STCV01505

AUTHORIZED settlement of \$245,000.

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

4. Juan Padilla, et al. v. LACMTA, Case No. 21STCV08331

AUTHORIZED settlement of \$2,000,000.

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

B. Conference with Legal Counsel-Anticipated Litigation-G.C. 54956.9(d)(4)
Significant Exposure to Litigation (Three Cases)

AUTHORIZED initiation of litigation.

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

C. Conference with Labor Negotiator - G.C. 54957.6

Agency Designated Representative: Robert Bonner and Cristian Leiva, or designees.

Employee Organization: SMART

No Report.

ADJOURNED AT 3:41 P.M.

Prepared by: Jessica Vasquez Gamez
Administrative Analyst, Board Administration

Collette Langston, Board Clerk



MINUTES

Wednesday, July 20, 2022

10:00 AM

Board of Directors - Special Board Meeting

DIRECTORS PRESENT:

Ara Najarian, Chair
Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, 1st Vice Chair
Kathryn Barger
James Butts
Fernando Dutra
Paul Krekorian
Sheila Kuehl
Tim Sandoval
Gloria Roberts, non-voting member

CALLED TO ORDER: 10:01 A.M.

ROLL CALL

2022-0493

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

RECOMMENDATION

FOUND the following:

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:

- 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.

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

ADJOURNED AT 10:07 A.M.

Prepared by: Mandy Cheung
Administrative Analyst, Board Administration



Collette Langston Board Clerk

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	AN = A. Najarian	
JDW = J. Dupont Walker	PK = P. Krekorian	TS = T. Sandoval	

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