



Board Report

File #: 2023-0467, **File Type:** Minutes

Agenda Number: 2.

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING
JULY 27, 2023**

SUBJECT: MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting held June 22, 2023.

June 2023 RBM Public Comment – Item 19

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:27 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Regular Board of Directors meeting 6/22/2023 agenda item number 19

(Note: please send all of my comments to all Board members and staff as well as reading my entire comments if possible)

So I just want to know if the LAC+USC Medical Center Metrolink Station is going to be happening? Is the station located next to the El Monte Busway and will the current bridge connect to the new Metrolink platform?

Please address these issues as soon as possible

Thank you

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)



June 21, 2023

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California, 90012-2952
Via Email To Boardclerk@Metro.Net

Re: Oppose Item #21, Metro’s Proposed In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

We, the below signed organizations, write in opposition to Metro’s efforts to create an in-house police department. Metro’s riders are overwhelmingly people from lower-income households. More than 6 in 10 Metro riders earn under \$25,000 a year, and many are riding Metro as their only means to access the resources and services they need to live. Metro’s riders are also overwhelmingly people of color. Black riders, in particular, have been consistently, disproportionately, and negatively impacted by police on Metro. Every year for at least the last three years under the Metro police contract, 50% of Metro citations and arrests have gone to Black riders, despite Black riders comprising under 20% of Metro ridership. This is unjust.

We call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and invest instead in care-based safety strategies, faster buses, and a universal fareless Metro, NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As

Oppose Item 21

June 21, 2023

Page 2

Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then, and often are, the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro. It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. We urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Community Transit - Los Angeles (ACT-LA)

ACLU - Southern California

Alliance for Boys and Men of Color

Black Lives Matter - Los Angeles

Community Power Collective

Esperanza Community Housing Corporation

Jobs to Move America

Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance (KIWA)

Los Angeles Black Workers Center

Los Angeles Walks

Strategic Action for a Just Economy (SAJE)

June 2023 RBM Public Comment – Item 21

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 5:45 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

As a carless angeleno, I'm begging you to use those funds to increase lighting at Metro stations, provide maintenance to prevent breakdowns, increase bus services, increase metro frequency, or even invest in more metro stations in the future. That's what makes me feel safest riding metro.

Thank you.

--

██████████

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 5:55 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 6:24 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@BOS.LACounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

██████████

██████████

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 7:49 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 7:52 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Council Member Krekorian <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

On behalf of Esperanza Community Housing (Esperanza), I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. Metro should NOT be investing in police expansion. Esperanza calls on Metro, rather, to do better for its transit riders and invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and in 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and most appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. We urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 9:59 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahag.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 10:11 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 8:12 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

--

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 8:30 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; Karen.Bass@lacity.org; Kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; O'Brien, Lilly <LOBrien@bos.lacounty.gov>; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; dperry@lacos.org; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; mperez@gatewaycog.org; randall.winston@lacity.org; saha.yedalian@lacity.org; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in STRONG opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. **As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols.** Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you

--

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 9:18 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; Sahag Yedalian <sahag.yedalian@lacity.org>; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and Instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 9:21 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: karen.bass@lacity.org; thirddistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; mayorbutts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; lklipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; kshamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; lbrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; hollyjmitchell@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 9:21 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahag.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 9:54 AM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>
Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response. Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 10:42 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

--

[Redacted signature block]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 10:50 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

--

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 11:16 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 11:19 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; O'Brien, Lilly <Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov>; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; Shamdasani, Karishma <KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov>; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 11:46 AM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 12:21 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

[Redacted signature block]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 12:42 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; Karen.Bass@lacity.org; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; dperry@lacbos.org; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; mperez@gatewaycog.org; randall.winston@lacity.org; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you. Best,

██████████

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 1:36 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

██████████

██████████

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 1:47 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@BOS.LACounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 1:52 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in strong opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

--

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 1:52 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:02 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:13 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Please Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am writing in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I believe Metro can do much better for its transit riders (and our entire community!) by instead investing in care-based safety strategies, faster/reliable bus schedules and universal fareless Metro (which will encourage more people to use transit at all hours, thus enabling more community safety)—NOT police expansion.

Studies show that Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have not only the right, but the responsibility, to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It's a waste of public resources to spend more money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol -- and that money could be better spent on making our Metro a higher-quality experience for riders, thus popularizing public transit use in LA. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts. In a shared service model of emergency response, two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach -- so why not apply this same model to law enforcement?

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems (such as social services outreach teams, transit ambassadors, mental health workers, elevator attendants, lighting for bus stops at night, etc.) and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources, as it already does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you,

██████████

██████████████████

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:18 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahag.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I'm a transit rider and resident of Supervisor Solis' district. I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical

incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:21 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@BOS.LACounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:31 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; Karen.Bass@lacity.org; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; LOBrien@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; dperry@lacbos.org; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; lklipp@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; mperez@gatewaycog.org; randall.winston@lacity.org; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. In fact, police make me feel unsafe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

I would rather have faster service than pay to feel unsafe with police surveillance.

Thank you.

██████████

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:32 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahag.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department.

I feel safest on Metro when there are *riders* on Metro, not police. Community participation and fareless trains would do more to encourage me to ride and help me feel seen and cared for than cops would. For example, I take Metro to dodgers games and never feel unsafe because of the increased ridership and community presence. I live near the new Little Tokyo station and would love to see more investment in infrastructure and route updates and accessibility than more heavily policing the few people who regularly ride (and need!!!) transit.

I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion. Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:56 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

Best,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:27 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:39 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. With 100% seriousness, this is a highly transphobic investment.

I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency


serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro jeopardizes ridership with a contract like this and puts Transgender and Diverse Gender Expressive community members at risk, as historically our communities use public transportation more and are targeted and harassed- but do not reach out to police because they are profiled for things like prostitution.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

--



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



-
- [\(833\) 847-2331](tel:(833)847-2331)
 - acea@translatinacoalition.org
 - www.translatinacoalition.org
 - [3055 Wilshire Blvd., Ste 350, Los Angeles, CA 90010](https://www.google.com/maps/place/3055+Wilshire+Blvd,+Ste+350,+Los+Angeles,+CA+90010)

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:51 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; Karen.Bass@lacity.org; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; dperry@lacbos.org; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; mperez@gatewaycog.org; randall.winston@lacity.org; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.


A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory

Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.


--



[Redacted line of text]

[Redacted line of text]

[Redacted line of text]



[Redacted line of text]

[Redacted line of text]

[Redacted line of text]

[Redacted line of text]

[Redacted line of text]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:54 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahag.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response. Thank you, Anjali Narula

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:04 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@BOS.LACounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro’s own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you,

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



We acknowledge that we live, work, and learn on the territory of the Tongva/Gabrielino peoples who are the traditional land caretakers of Tovaangar (Los Angeles basin, So. Channel Islands).

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:11 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. Better service means more riders, and more riders would make public transit safer, and would make it feel safer. Empty bus stops in isolated places where a person might have to wait alone for a long time would only seem less welcoming with added police presence.

To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.
Kathleen

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:16 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahag.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies and explore the shared services model that works for other emergency response.

Thank you

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:28 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you,

PZ

A thick black horizontal bar used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:33 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; Karen.Bass@lacity.org; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; dperry@lacbos.org; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; mperez@gatewaycog.org; randall.winston@lacity.org; sahay.yedalian@lacity.org; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in STRONG opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. Metro can do better for its transit riders by instead investing in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is an ENORMOUS WASTE of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in

improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:37 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts. Attachment B to the report that supplements this agenda item even concedes that the Metro and its current security forces are unequipped to handle the crisis facing the unhoused people who use the Metro's services.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:48 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@BOS.LACounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

As a resident in Council District 1 of the City of Los Angeles and of Supervisorial District 1, I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you,

██████████

██████████

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:58 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahad.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>

Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; and instead use a Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

As a resident in Council District 1 of the City of Los Angeles and of Supervisorial District 1, I write in opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you,

██████████

██████████

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:59 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Cc: Karen.Bass@lacity.org; ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; MayorButts@cityofinglewood.org; kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov; jdupontw@aol.com; tim_sandoval@ci.pomona.ca.us; dutra4whittier@gmail.com; fourthdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; anajarian@glendaleca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; gloria.roberts@dot.ca.gov; Wiggins, Stephanie <WIGGINSS@metro.net>; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>; randall.winston@lacity.org; jorenstein@bos.lacounty.gov; mbohlke@sbcglobal.net; dperry@lacbos.org; ygharabedian@sgvcog.org; mperez@gatewaycog.org; LKlipp@bos.lacounty.gov; sahag.yedalian@lacity.org; Micheline, Maureen <MichelineM@metro.net>; Lobrien@bos.lacounty.gov; kmacias@bos.lacounty.gov; Daniel Rodman <daniel.rodman@lacity.org>; mmoore@bos.lacounty.gov; lantzsh10@gmail.com; sdelong@cityofwhittier.org; vgomez@bos.lacounty.gov; KShamdasani@bos.lacounty.gov; LBrisco@bos.lacounty.gov; Englund, Nicole <EnglundN@metro.net>
Subject: Oppose Item #21, Metro In-House Police Department; but Explore the Shared Services Model of Emergency Response

Dear Metro Board of Directors,

I am born and raised in Los Angeles and have used the busses and trains everyday since 2006. I have relied on public transportation for the last 17 years to attend public school, to attend community college classes, to travel to work, and to see my family who have lived in Los Angeles since the 1940s.

I write in strong opposition to Metro's efforts to create an in-house police department. I call on Metro to do better for its transit riders and instead invest in care-based safety strategies, faster and more reliable buses, and a universal fareless Metro—NOT police expansion.

Metro does not need police contracts or an in-house police department to keep riders safe. As Metro's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported in 2016 and 2022, local law enforcement departments have a responsibility to conduct a variety of operations on Metro property, including 911 response, criminal investigations, accident investigations, major incident response, and police patrols. Indeed, tragic incidents like the recent bus operator attack in Woodland Hills show that non-contracted emergency responders were then—and often are—the closest and appropriate personnel to respond to tragic incidents on Metro.

It is a waste of public resources to spend money on police response that is already covered by local neighborhood patrol. I urge Metro to complete a feasibility study and implementation plan for a shared services model of emergency response to law enforcement as an alternative option to both an in-house police department and contracts.

A shared service model of emergency response is when two public agencies draw on a pool of resources paid for by one of the two public agencies, not both. In this model, each public agency serves the public without inter-agency contracts or in-house departments with duplicative geographic coverage. Metro already coordinates emergency fire and medical services using a shared services approach and can apply this same model to law enforcement.

Metro should re-invest its large public safety resources into proven, unarmed safety systems and in improving bus service, as recommended by Metro's own Public Safety Advisory Committee and community groups like ACT-LA. To the extent Metro or its riders seek police responses to critical incidents, Metro should explore the feasibility of coordinating existing law enforcement resources like it does with emergency medical and fire response.

Thank you,

██████████



SOUTH BAY CITIES
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

2355 Crenshaw Blvd., #125
Torrance, CA 90501
(310) 371-7222
sbccog@southbaycities.org
www.southbaycities.org

June 14, 2023

Hon. Ara Najarian, Chair
Members of the Board of Directors
LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: C Line/K Line Operating Plan

Dear Chair Najarian and Members of the Board:

On behalf of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG), we formally support Metro staff's recommendation of "Option 2" for the C Line/K Line operating plan.

In 2018, the SBCCOG supported Motion 28.1 by Supervisor Hahn that approved a 1 year pilot of "Alternative C-3". The SBCCOG recognizes that there is no longer an opportunity to implement that pilot proposal. Based on Metro staff analysis and public input, the SBCCOG now supports Option 2.

Option 2 creates a K Line that runs from the Expo Line to Redondo Beach and a C Line that operates from Norwalk to the LAX/Metro Transit Center. This newly created north-south corridor not only operates in line with travel patterns in the region, but also supports future planned extensions to Torrance and Hollywood. Option 2 offers a simple routing and continues to provide a one-seat ride to LAX from all C and K Line stations.

For these reasons, the SBCCOG urges the Metro Board of Directors to adopt C Line/K Line operating plan Option 2. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact SBCCOG Executive Director Jacki Bacharach at (310) 371-7222.

Sincerely,

John Cruikshank, Chair
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Mayor Pro Tem, City of Rancho Palos Verdes

c.c.: Metro Operations, Safety, and Customer Experience Committee

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ACTION

Carson El Segundo Gardena Hawthorne Hermosa Beach Inglewood Lawndale Lomita
Manhattan Beach Palos Verdes Estates Rancho Palos Verdes Redondo Beach Rolling Hills
Rolling Hills Estates Torrance Los Angeles District #15 Los Angeles County



**City of
Rolling Hills Estates**

Britt Huff
Mayor

Velveth Schmitz
Mayor Pro Tem

Debby Stegura
Council Member

Frank V. Zerunyan
Council Member

Pam Brown Schachter
Council Member

June 21, 2023

Hon. Ara Najarian, Chair
Members of the Board of Directors
LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: C Line/K Line Operating Plan

Dear Chair Najarian and Members of the Board:

On behalf of the City of Rolling Hills Estates, I would like to express our support for Metro staff's recommendation of "Option 2" for the C Line/K Line operating plan.


In 2018, the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) supported Motion 28.1 by Supervisor Hahn that approved a one-year pilot of "Alternative C-3." Our region recognizes that there is no longer an opportunity to implement that pilot proposal. Based on Metro staff analysis and public input, the SBCCOG now supports Option 2.

Option 2 creates a K Line that runs from the Expo Line to Redondo Beach and a C Line that operates from Norwalk to the LAX/Metro Transit Center. This newly created north-south corridor not only operates in line with travel patterns in the region, but also supports future planned extensions to Torrance and Hollywood. Option 2 offers a simple routing and continues to provide a one-seat ride to LAX from all C and K Line stations.

For these reasons, we urge the Metro Board of Directors to adopt C Line/K Line operating plan Option 2.

Sincerely,

Britt Huff
Mayor



June 21, 2023

Honorable Ara Najarian, Chair
Members of the Board of Directors
LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: C Line/K Line Operating Plan

Dear Chair Najarian and Members of the Board:

On behalf of the City of Carson, I formally support Metro staff's recommendation of "Option 2" for the C Line/K Line operating plan.

In 2018, the South Bay Cities Council of Governments supported Motion 28.1 by Supervisor Hahn that approved a 1 year pilot of "Alternative C-3". Our region recognizes that there is no longer an opportunity to implement that pilot proposal. Based on Metro staff analysis and public input, we now support Option 2.

Option 2 creates a K Line that runs from the Expo Line to Redondo Beach and a C Line that operates from Norwalk to the LAX/Metro Transit Center. This newly created north-south corridor not only operates in line with travel patterns in the region, but also supports future planned extensions to Torrance and Hollywood. Option 2 offers a simple routing and continues to provide a one-seat ride to LAX from all C and K Line stations.

For these reasons, I urge the Metro Board of Directors to adopt C Line/K Line operating plan Option 2. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (310) 952-1706.

Sincerely,

Lula Davis-Holmes
Mayor



GATEWAY CITIES
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Artesia

Avalon

Bell

Bellflower

Bell Gardens

Cerritos

Commerce

Compton

Cudahy

Downey

June 21, 2023

The Honorable Ara Najarian, Chair
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Chair Najarian and the Metro Board of Directors:

Hawaiian Gardens

Item 37 C&K Line: AGAINST STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Huntington Park

Industry

La Mirada

Lakewood

Long Beach

Lynwood

Maywood

Montebello

Norwalk

Paramount

On behalf of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, **I write in opposition to the Metro staff-recommended C/K Lines operating plan of “Option 2” and in support of “Option 1”, in Item #37** which would provide a single-seat ride for South and Southeast LA communities to LAX and the Expo Line.

Our COG worked collaboratively with the South Bay Cities COG in 2018, to arrive at a compromise operating plan, which the Metro Board ultimately supported for implementation on a one-year pilot basis. At the time we all thought that the Crenshaw Line would open in 2019. That compromise plan has been considered once again by Metro staff this year as “Option 3.” Many of our residents prefer this option as well, because it would preserve the existing connection to South Bay communities while also providing a single-seat connection to the Expo Line. However, the Gateway Cities COG adopted a formal position in support of Option 1 because we recognize this as the most viable path forward to best serve our transit-dependent riders.

Pico Rivera

Santa Fe Springs

Signal Hill

South Gate

Vernon

Whittier

Option 1 is the most affordable option to operate, saving Metro at least \$3.5 million per year, which will be critically important as this agency faces a “fiscal cliff.” More importantly, it will serve our essential workers, many of whom remained regular users of the Green Line throughout the pandemic, who continue to be required to transfer to north-south lines because no single-seat north-south link exists.

This is also about equity, as our communities face some of the worst air quality and are some of the most transit-dependent anywhere in LA County. The Green Line exists today because it was a required mitigation for the construction of a freeway through the heart of our Southeast LA communities, and the transit service it provides is a lifeline for tens of thousands every day.

County of Los Angeles

Port of Long Beach

The Honorable Ara Najarian, Chair

June 21, 2023

Page 2

The selection of C-1 provides an operational enhancement that will be in place in-time for the 2028 Olympics. C-1 offers spectators a single seat ride from Norwalk to the E Line eliminating a change at the AMC. C-1 will facilitate the Olympic Customer Experience goal for out-of-town spectators by not forcing a change in train at the AMC. A single seat ride will cut down on confusion and remove dwell time.

For all these reasons, the Gateway Cities COG implores the Metro Board of Directors to reject the staff recommendation of "Option 2" and to instead support "Option 1," where we can do the right thing for equity and social justice and also save some money in the process to preserve transit services throughout LA County. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ali Saleh". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ali Saleh, President

Board of Directors, Gateway Cities Council of Governments and
Councilmember, City of Bell

June 2023 RBM Public Comment -- Item 37

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 5:51 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Single Seat Ride Norwalk C Line to K line

Metro Board Member Board Clerk ,

I am writing to express my support for the proposal to extend the single seat ride on the C Line from Norwalk to the K Line. As a resident of the Gateway Cities region, I believe that this proposal will greatly benefit thousands of commuters who rely on the Metro system to get to work, school, and other destinations.

The Norwalk Metro Station is an important transportation link that connects the Gateway Cities and beyond to Downtown Los Angeles, serving thousands of commuters every day. Currently, riders on the C Line have a difficult transfer schedule to reach the Santa Monica Region, which can be time-consuming and inconvenient. I believe that the Norwalk C Line Station to K Line proposal is the best choice for the following reasons:

- (1) It serves a larger population: Norwalk is a major transportation hub, serving several surrounding cities, and extending the single seat ride to Norwalk will benefit a larger number of commuters than the Redondo Beach proposal.
- (2) It has better transfer connections: Norwalk is a major transfer point for several other Metro lines, including the A Line and the C Line, as well as the Metrolink. By extending the single seat ride to Norwalk, riders will have better transfer connections to these other lines, making it easier to travel to other parts of the region.
- (3) It is more cost-effective: The Norwalk to K Line proposal is expected to be more cost-effective than the Redondo Beach proposal, by saving commuter time and reducing traffic on the 105 and 405 freeways.

(4) The MAJORITY of survey responders (those making under \$100,000 and from all underprivileged groups) would like a connection from Norwalk Station C Line to the K line, when combining options 1 and 3 from the Metro survey.

I urge the Metro Board of Directors to approve the Norwalk to K Line proposal and invest in improving the C Line for the benefit of commuters throughout Los Angeles. By eliminating the need for transfers, riders will save time and avoid the hassle of changing trains, making the C Line a more attractive option for commuters.

Thank you for considering my input on this important transportation initiative. I hope that you will support Option 1 (Norwalk to K Line proposal) to improve the Metro system for the most transit dependent users.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:15 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Southeast LA County

Hi, my name is [REDACTED], I'm from Norwalk, and I'm submitting a public comment for agenda item #37 on the C Line and K Line Operating Plan Update. I'm against Option 2, and instead I support Option 1 that would allow for a single-seat connection from the Norwalk (C) Line Station to the E Line. I believe Southeast LA County greatly needs improved light rail service that would connect us directly to LAX, Santa Monica, and other destinations.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 2:21 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Public Comment Line / Agenda Item #37

Hi, my name is [REDACTED], I'm from Norwalk, and I'm submitting a public comment for agenda item #37 on the C Line and K Line Operating Plan Update. I'm against Option 2, and instead I support Option 1 that would allow for a single-seat connection from the Norwalk (C) Line Station to the E Line. I believe Southeast LA County greatly needs improved light rail service that would connect us directly to LAX, Santa Monica, and other destinations

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:14 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Public comment: Metro direct access agenda item 37

Hello,

My name is Lizette Romano, I'm from Norwalk, and I'm submitting a public comment for agenda item #37 on the C Line and K Line Operating Plan Update. I'm against Option 2, and instead I support Option 1 that would allow for a single-seat connection from the Norwalk (C) Line Station to the E Line. I believe Southeast LA County greatly needs improved light rail service that would connect us directly to LAX, Santa Monica, and other destinations.

As someone who commuted to UCLA for two years for school, I can attest that traffic is horrible getting to a lot of these destinations and having this connection would help greatly.

Thank you,

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

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:15 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Public Comment on Agenda Item #37

Hello, my name is [REDACTED] and I'm from the city of Norwalk.

I am submitting a public comment for agenda item #37 on the C Line and K Line Operating Plan Update.

I'm against Option 2, and instead I support Option 1, which would allow for a single-seat connection from the Norwalk (C) Line Station to the E Line. I believe Southeast Los Angeles County greatly needs improved light rail service, and a line that would connect us directly to LAX, Santa Monica, and other destinations is an imperative step towards achieving that.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:32 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Agenda item 37

Hi, my name is [REDACTED], I'm from Norwalk and I'm submitting a public comment for agenda item #37 on the C Line and K Line Operating Plan Update. I'm against Option 2, and instead I support Option 1 that would allow for a single-seat connection from the Norwalk (C) Line Station to the E Line. I believe Southeast LA County greatly needs improved light rail service that would connect us directly to LAX, Santa Monica, and other destinations.

I relied on the Metro C Line throughout my life, to visit family and friends across LA and to complete my undergraduate and graduate studies at UCLA. At a certain point for school though, due to poor light rail and bus service from Norwalk to West LA, I ended up having to drive everyday to school. I woke up at 4am every morning to avoid traffic, affecting my quality of life and outcomes at school.

Predominantly Latino, families, students, and workers from Southeast LA County shouldn't have to experience these challenges to reunite with loved ones and access school and job opportunities for greater mobility. Equity means providing us with greater transit access to West LA, and beyond.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:48 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Agenda Item #37

Hi, my name is [REDACTED], I'm from East Los Angeles, and I'm submitting a public comment for agenda item #37 on the C Line and K Line Operating Plan Update. I'm against Option 2, and instead I support Option 1 that would allow for a single-seat connection from the Norwalk (C) Line Station to the E Line. I believe Southeast LA County greatly needs improved light rail service that would connect us directly to LAX, Santa Monica, and other destinations.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:52 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Public comment

Hi, my name is [REDACTED], I'm from the city of Norwalk, and I'm submitting a public comment for agenda item #37 on the C Line and K Line Operating Plan Update. I'm against Option 2, and instead I support Option 1 that would allow for a single-seat connection from the Norwalk (C) Line Station to the E Line. I believe Southeast LA County greatly needs improved light rail service that would connect us directly to LAX, Santa Monica, and other destinations.

Thank you for your time,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:54 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: Regular Board of Directors meeting 6/22/2023 agenda item number 37


(Note: please send all of my comments to all Board members and staff as well as reading my entire comments if possible)

So, I looked at the presentation of the C and K Line operating plan and I thought Option 3(Alt C-3) would have won but Option 2(Alt C-2) had the most votes based on the survey and I'm not sure what's going to happen next.

In my opinion I really wanted Option 3(Alt C-3) with modifications of the C Line service to continue down to Norwalk Station instead of ending at Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station because my main goal is to keep the C Line service from Norwalk Station to Redondo Beach Station so that people coming from Torrance and Redondo Beach can have access to A and J Lines going to/from Downtown LA at Willowbrook/Rosa Parks and Harbor Freeway Stations. Under Option 3, when the C Line ends at Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station, the train would have to go to a sliding track to turn around and people forgot to get off the train and catch the K Line to Norwalk. Modifying Option 3 with the C Line to continue down to Norwalk will help people avoid transfers via the K Line to Norwalk at Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station. My suggestion for the plan is to modify option 3 with the C Line service to continue down to Norwalk so that you can keep the current C line service between Norwalk and Redondo Beach and the K Line will still run between Norwalk and Expo/Crenshaw. If Option 2 is picked, then I really don't want people to delay their journey time between Norwalk and Redondo Beach by transferring trains at Aviation/Century Station.

These are all of my comments and thank you very much for your time

Option 3



Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:42 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Agenda item #37

To whom it may concern.

My name is [REDACTED], I am from the city of Downey, and I am submitting a public comment for agenda item #37 on the C Line and K Line Operating Plan Update. I am against Option 2, and am in favor of Option 1, that would allow for single-seat connection from Norwalk C Line Station to the E Line. I believe Southeast LA County greatly needs improved light rail service that would connect us directly to LAX, Santa Monica, and other destinations.

Sincerely [REDACTED]

California State Senate

STANDING COMMITTEES
ENERGY, UTILITIES
AND COMMUNICATIONS
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
HEALTH
JUDICIARY



SELECT COMMITTEE
CHAIR, PORTS AND GOODS
MOVEMENT

SPECIAL COMMITTEE
PANDEMIC EMERGENCY
RESPONSE

SENATOR LENA A. GONZALEZ

THIRTY-THIRD SENATE DISTRICT

SENATE MAJORITY WHIP
CHAIR, SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

June 2, 2023

Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Authority
One Gateway Plaza, MS-99
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Crime on Metro System

Dear Chief Executive Officer Wiggins,

I am writing to express my full support for Supervisor Hahn's call for an assessment of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Authority (Metro) Security. The rise of violent incidents in our rail transit system is extremely alarming and concerning. Given the large amounts of funding, Metro allocates to security and safety, we are unfortunately not seeing results that instill a sense of safety and promote transit ridership in our region. It is essential that we launch a comprehensive evaluation of Metro's security to ensure safe, secure, and reliable transit options for all riders.

On the evening of May 24th, an unfortunate incident occurred where a Metro bus driver was stabbed and currently is fighting for his life. It is disheartening that similar incidents have occurred within my district on the A-line in Downtown Long Beach where a person was killed, and in a separate incident, a woman was tragically kidnapped at gunpoint while waiting for a bus in East LA. The situation becomes acutely problematic when we take into account that 75% of riders are low-income, and a downward trend of female ridership over the past three years signals an erosion of equitable service and public trust.

It is clear that the frequent nature of these incidents fosters a sense of insecurity among Metro customers and fundamentally undermines Metro recovery efforts in a post-pandemic world. Therefore, a thorough examination of existing security measures is not only necessary but also the humane thing to do.

CAPITOL OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 2068
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
TEL (916) 651-4033
FAX (916) 651-4933

LONG BEACH DISTRICT OFFICE
3939 ATLANTIC AVE., SUITE 107
LONG BEACH, CA 90807
TEL (562) 256-7921
FAX (562) 256-9991

HUNTINGTON PARK DISTRICT OFFICE
3355 E. GAGE AVENUE
HUNTINGTON PARK, CA 90255
TEL (323) 277-4560
FAX (323) 277-4528

I remain hopeful that through your leadership and dedicated effort, we can renew, revive, and build a safe metro system that works for everyone. As the Chair of the Senate Transportation Committee, I also look forward to continuing to collaborate and advocate for measures that support our transit systems and the safety of our transit riders. Should you have any questions regarding my letter, please do not hesitate to contact my office at (562) 256-7921.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lena Gonzalez", written in a cursive style.

Lena Gonzalez
Senator, District 33



Raymond B. Whitmer
Secretary-Treasurer



CALIFORNIA TEAMSTERS LOCAL 911

PUBLIC, PROFESSIONAL & MEDICAL EMPLOYEES UNION, THE COUNTIES OF LOS ANGELES,
ORANGE, RIVERSIDE, SAN DIEGO, IMPERIAL, SAN LUIS OBISPO, SAN BERNARDINO, SANTA BARBARA AND VENTURA

9900 FLOWER STREET • BELLFLOWER • CALIFORNIA • 90706

(562) 595-4518 • Fax (562) 427-7298 • teamsters911.com

An Affiliate of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters

VIA E-Mail wiggins@metro.net

June 5, 2023

Stephanie N. Wiggins, Chief Executive Office
1 Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-3-1
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Teamsters Local 911

Dear Ms. Wiggins:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that Strive Well Being, Inc. has continued to tell Ambassadors how to vote and are actively union busting. They confirmed this on June 3, 2023, where they classify their union busting action as providing accurate, unbiased information to the Ambassadors regarding the National Labor Relations Board election and worker rights.

We have statements from Ambassadors confirming the captive audience meetings and anti-Teamsters Local 911 and Union statements made by the ownership/management of Strive Well Being, Inc. Unfortunately, these unfair practices have tilted the field to the point where Ambassadors fear talking to the Union due to the perceived possibility that joining Teamsters Local 911 and the Union can have a negative effect on their jobs.

This anti-Teamsters and Union campaign is fundamentally unacceptable, especially because it is a cynic hypocrisy and a slap to the face of the Los Angeles labor movement and the long-standing labor partnership between the Teamsters Union and LA Metro. The LA Metro transit system and its communities are suffering from a state of emergency and our goal is to ensure that we contribute towards the success of LA Metro and its operations.

It is for this reason that we demand a neutrality labor peace agreement from LA Metro in regards to the Ambassador RMI International, Inc. public-private partnership.

Sincerely,

Carlos I. Rubio
President

c: Board of Directors boardclerk@metro.net
Raymond B. Whitmer, Secretary-Treasurer

June 2023 RBM General Public Comment

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 8:39 AM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Gold line to Claremont

Hi there,

I am a metro rider living in LA county's most eastern city, Claremont. I am hoping you will help us find the funds to extend the Gold Line track to Claremont. The city is making many investments for "car free" lifestyles. Bringing this line a bit further from its current Pomona terminus, would greatly improve our quality of life, and provide better access to the county. Thank you!

Kindly,

[REDACTED]

Claremont resident

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 7:19 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Congestion Traffic Tax

We oppose LA Metro's soon to be proposed "congestion" traffic tax.
Please stop this from happening.
Thank you,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
<edivertogalvez3@gmail.com@mg.gospringboard.io> **On Behalf Of** Ediverto Galvez
Sent: Thursday, June 8, 2023 1:08 PM
To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>
Subject: Keep L.A. Metro Safe: Prioritize Care-First Approaches

Dear L.A. Metro Board of Directors:

I support ACT-LA's call for care-first safety approaches on the Metro: End our unnecessary and harmful reliance on police in public transit and continue to fund more effective and proven safety initiatives such as our transit ambassador program and better infrastructure like improved lighting and more reliable and timely service.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2023 11:00 AM

To: executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov; Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>; Gorman, Karen <GORMANK@metro.net>; InspectorGeneral@oig.lacounty.gov

Subject: BCHD PBike Path

I admit I am truly puzzled by recent events surrounding LA Metro's funding of the bike path to be built by Beach Cities Health District. (FA Project ID#: MM4602.01 Amendment No. 1 FA#: 9200000000M460201)

Plainly, BCHD no longer expects to build the path as originally proposed and funded. Indeed, the current plan would *not* involve the City of Torrance, a huge change in the scope of the plan.

I have written to LA Metro's IG seeking clarification of the project status, but have received no reply to date. This makes me wonder if Metro expects to continue funding the project or if BCHD and Metro will agree to an amendment.

If you need further details to track down this situation, please let me know.

[REDACTED]

Citizen/Taxpayer

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2023 11:33 AM
To: InspectorGeneral@oig.lacounty.gov; Gorman, Karen <GORMANK@metro.net>; Garth Meyer <gmeyer@easyreadernews.com>; tliu@scng.com
Cc: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>; executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: BCHD has been misrepresenting its proposed use of Measure M funds since December 2022

This is notification for the formal record of LA County and Metro Boards and Inspectors General:

According to a Torrance City Councilperson, during mid-December BCHD was informed its request for right-of-way in Torrance was denied. However, BCHD continues to misrepresent that it has ongoing discussions with Torrance.

Plainly, BCHD was granted \$1.8M in measure M funds for 1200-feet of bike path in Torrance (without agreement ex ante from Torrance) and Redondo Beach. Instead, BCHD will spend 2/3rds of the funding on a mere 1/3 of the project. There is apparently NO OVERSIGHT at Metro of Measure M funds, and that is a real problem. BCHD needs to stand down and repatriate ALL FUNDS back to Measure M.

Mark Nelson

Redondo Beach

See note below from Torrance Council

[Update - Clarification and Statement from Councilmember Lewis on Torrance's rejection of BCHD Bike Lane:](#)

I have received this update and would like to clarify some of the information contained regarding the proposed BCHD Bike Path featured in the Daily Breeze Article.

The proposed bike path project was presented to the public in a staff report at the November 7, 2022, Torrance Traffic Commission meeting. This meeting included a staff presentation, followed by public comments. Following the Traffic Commission Meeting and with the concurrence of the city management team, Torrance Public Works decided

to deny the proposed project application based on the significant opposition (68% opposed by email and 82% opposed by speaking). BCHD was formally informed of our decision and we shared this information with the public at the District 2 Community Meeting held on December 12, 2022.

Since the preparation of the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan in 2012, Torrance has added to its network of bike lanes and bike routes. Most notable is the addition of Class II bike lanes on 190th St (Hawthorne Blvd to Madrona Ave); Palos Verdes Blvd (PCH to south City boundary); and Anza Ave (Sepulveda Blvd to Calle Mayor). It is already possible for cyclists and pedestrians to bypass Prospect Ave in Redondo Beach, via the use of Diamond St (Redondo Beach) and Flagler Ln (Torrance). Combined, these two streets (located between Prospect Ave to the south and Beryl St to the north) provide a continuous sidewalk on the east side and a separate, but continuous paved surface throughout.

While the middle portion is narrow, it provides a 10-foot wide pavement surface for cyclists, separate from the sidewalk. It should be noted that the narrow middle portion has no vehicle traffic, as compared to Prospect Ave. Other additions are Class III bike routes in various areas of the City. Torrance continues these efforts when constructing various projects and can add to the network when it is available public right-of-way and funding to do so.

The City of Torrance has **no intention to modify the “Flagler Alley” public right-of-way from its current condition**. Therefore, there is no scope of work, nor related future cost estimate, by Torrance needed to modify this area. If there is future interest by Torrance to modify this area, the scope of work would determine the cost. However, it is highly unlikely we would propose a \$3M project for a project like this. Furthermore, we would seek all available grant funding to pay for any improvement so as to not divert funding from the general fund.

At this time there is no pending, nor deferred, City decision for the proposed bike path project. I along with the city team consider the matter closed. However, if a new project is proposed in Torrance’s public right-of-way of Flagler Lane, the Public Works Department under the leadership of Craig Bilezerian, Public Works Director, will follow the same review process and conduct public outreach and meetings to ensure we meet or exceed our community’s expectations for transparency and information sharing.

If you have any further questions, please contact me or Mr. Bilezerian.

All the best!

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, June 16, 2023 1:50 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: Keep L.A. Metro Safe: Prioritize Care-First Approaches

Dear L.A. Metro Board of Directors:

I support ACT-LA's call for care-first safety approaches on the Metro: End our unnecessary and harmful reliance on police in public transit and continue to fund more effective and proven safety initiatives such as our transit ambassador program and better infrastructure like improved lighting and more reliable and timely service.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, June 16, 2023 1:58 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: Keep L.A. Metro Safe: Prioritize Care-First Approaches

Dear L.A. Metro Board of Directors:

I support ACT-LA's call for care-first safety approaches on the Metro: End our unnecessary and harmful reliance on police in public transit and continue to fund more effective and proven safety initiatives such as our transit ambassador program and better infrastructure like improved lighting and more reliable and timely service.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, June 17, 2023 3:00 PM

To: executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov; Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>; Gorman, Karen <GORMANK@metro.net>; InspectorGeneral@oig.lacounty.gov

Cc: tliu@scng.com; Garth Meyer <gmeyer@easyreadernews.com>; Jane Diehl <jane.diehl@bchd.org>; Vanessa I. Poster <vanessa.poster@bchd.org>; Martha Koo <martha.koo@bchd.org>; Noel Chun <noel.chun@bchd.org>; Michelle Bholat <michelle.bholat@bchd.org>

Subject: BCHD is out of compliance with its Measure M proposal

The LA County Board and Metro are allowing BCHD to continue wasting Measure M funds. Formal complaints have been filed with the Inspector General of Metro. The Inspector General of LA County has been looped in, since LA County has a significant exposure to Metro failures with Measure M funds regarding BCHD.

BCHD proposed a total cost for 1200-feet of \$1.8M and was granted that funding from Metro for a bike path in Torrance and Redondo Beach. That cost exceeds metrics from studies by the UNC Chapel Hill by 30-fold. A clear sign of Metro's failed due diligence prior to funding award.

BCHD has changed the plan scope to only 400-feet. BCHD has further demonstrated a planning cost of over \$1.2M for the 400-feet (\$400,000+ reimbursed by Metro and \$800,000 proposed cost for construction by 3rd parties.) As such, BCHD's bait and switch has now changed to completing only 1/3rd of the project for 2/3rds of the budget.

However, BCHD's estimates were faulty. Based on BCHD's recent received bids, the new cost will be \$1.4M to \$2.2.M for the 400-feet. See attached bid summary.

Metro failed in its due diligence when it awarded to BCHD with determining if BCHD had secured right-of-way from Torrance. BCHD did not and cannot. It has been denied as of December 2022. Both Metro and the Board were provided a statement from the Torrance City Council on that denial.

Metro and the Board need to take action immediately to preserve the taxpayer funds in Measure M including a full recapture of all reimbursements to BCHD.

Mark Nelson

Redondo Beach 3+ Year BCHD Community Working Group Participant

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 4:59 PM

To: Board Clerk <BoardClerk@metro.net>

Subject: Regular Board of Directors meeting 6/22/2023 General Public Comment

(Note: please send all of my comments to all Board members and staff as well as reading my entire comments if possible)

So, I'm here to address the Monterey Pass Road issue because when the NextGen Bus Plan was approved in 2020 it removed the 258-bus service off of Monterey Pass Road and since then people have a hard time walking 10, 20, 30 plus minutes going to Garvey, Floral, or Hellman to access other bus services. The removal of the 258 bus line on Monterey Pass Road also negatively impacted Alhambra residents on Fremont Ave between the 10 freeway and the south city border because there are some apartment buildings that might be owned by CSULA who need public transit to get to CSULA for classes. People who live near or work on Monterey Pass Road need a north south bus line to get around like going to CSULA for the Metrolink train.

My suggestion would have been line 256 extension from CSULA to ELAC via Monterey Pass Road/1st to replace the line 258 segment but the 256 bus segment between Highland Park and CSULA would be replaced by line 665 and Metro Micro on 6/25/2023 and now there's no other solution to have a transit service that can go north and south on Monterey Pass Road(which includes Fremont Ave between the 10 freeway and the south Alhambra border) only to rely on Monterey Park Spirit Bus route 4 which only runs southbound on Monterey Pass Road between Garvey and Davidson that is very inconvenient and unreliable to get around.

So in closing I don't know who should I refer or talk to regarding my comments shown above

Thank you very much for your time

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)



MINUTES

Thursday, June 22, 2023

10:00 AM

Board of Directors - Regular Board Meeting

DIRECTORS PRESENT:

Ara J. Najarian, Chair
Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, 1st Vice Chair
Janice Hahn, 2nd Vice Chair
Kathryn Barger
Karen Bass
James Butts
Fernando Dutra
Lindsey Horvath
Paul Krekorian
Holly J. Mitchell
Tim Sandoval
Hilda Solis
Katy Yaroslavsky
Gloria Roberts (Interim), non-voting member
Stephanie Wiggins, Chief Executive Officer

CALLED TO ORDER: 10:11 A.M.

ROLL CALL

1. APPROVED Consent Calendar Items: 2, ~~8~~, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, ~~36~~, and ~~37~~.

Consent Calendar items were approved by one motion except for Items 8, 36, and 37 which were held by a Director for discussion and/or separate action.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

2. **SUBJECT: MINUTES** **2023-0411**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting held May 25, 2023.

3. **SUBJECT: REMARKS BY THE CHAIR** **2023-0307**

RECEIVED remarks by the Chair.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

4. **SUBJECT: REPORT BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER** **2023-0417**

RECEIVED report by the Chief Executive Officer.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

5. **SUBJECT: BOARD OFFICERS** **2023-0403**

ELECTED Director Bass as Chair and Director Dutra as 2nd Vice Chair for FY24.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

KB = K. Barger	FD = F. Dutra	HJM = H.J. Mitchell	KY = K. Yaroslavsky
KRB = K.R. Bass	JH = J. Hahn	AJN = A.J. Najarian	
JB = J. Butts	LH = L. Horvath	TS = T. Sandoval	
JDW = J. Dupont Walker	PK = P. Krekorian	HS = H. Solis	

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

8. SUBJECT: MEASURE R MULTIMODAL HIGHWAY SUBREGIONAL PROGRAMS UPDATE **2023-0257**

APPROVED:

A. \$25,788,000 in additional programming and funding changes within the capacity of Measure R Multimodal Highway Subregional Programs:

- Arroyo Verdugo Operational Improvements
- Las Virgenes Malibu Operational Improvements
- South Bay I-405, I-110, I-105 & SR-91 Improvements
- Gateway Cities I-605 Corridor “Hot-Spots” Interchange Improvements
- Gateway Cities I-710 South Early Action
- North Los Angeles County SR-138 Safety Enhancements
- North Los Angeles County I-5/SR-14 Safety Enhancements

B. the deobligation of \$21,504,000 of previously approved Measure R Multimodal Highway Subregional Program funds for re-allocation to other existing Board-approved Measure R projects; and

C. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements for the Board-approved projects.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	A	Y

9. SUBJECT: FUNDING AWARD RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5310 GRANT PROGRAM **2023-0284**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. the recommended Section 5310 awards totaling \$13,891,798, available to Metro through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program;
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute pass-through funding agreements with the subrecipient agencies receiving awards;
- C. DELEGATING to the CEO or their designee the authority to administratively approve minor changes to the scope of previously approved Section 5310 funding awards;

(continued on next page)

(Item 9 – continued from previous page)

- D. CERTIFYING that the Section 5310 funds are fairly and equitably allocated to eligible subrecipients and, where feasible, projects are coordinated with transportation services assisted by other federal departments and agencies; and
- E. CERTIFYING that the Section 5310 funding is included in the locally developed 2021-2024 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County (“Coordinated Plan”) that was developed and approved through a process that included participation by seniors and individuals with disabilities, as well as by representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human service providers, and other members of the public.

10. SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM 2023-0330
UPDATE - CENTRAL CITY SUBREGION

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. programming of \$746,646 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Active Transportation, First/Last Mile and Mobility Hubs Program;
- B. REPROGRAMMING of projects previously approved to meet environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction time frames; and
- C. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

12. SUBJECT: LONG BEACH-EAST LOS ANGELES CORRIDOR ZERO 2023-0294
EMISSION TRUCK (ZET) PROGRAM STATUS UPDATE

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to program up to \$3 million of the Board authorized \$50 million seed funding programmed for the LB-ELA Corridor ZET Program as Metro’s contribution to leverage federal and regional funds contingent upon the demonstration of full project funding; and
- B. RECEIVING AND FILING the report on updates for the Long Beach-East Los Angeles (LB-ELA) Corridor Zero Emission Truck (ZET) Program.

13. SUBJECT: MEASURE M 3% LOCAL CONTRIBUTION ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES REVISIONS **2023-0202**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. RECEIVING AND FILING a report back on Motion 10.1;
and
- B. AUTHORIZING for public review and comment the release of the revised Measure M Guidelines, Section VIII - 3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects.

14. SUBJECT: EXCESS LIABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM **2023-0265**

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 not-to-exceed premium of \$27 million for the 12-month period effective August 1, 2023, to August 1, 2024.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	C	Y

15. SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 8 FUND PROGRAM **2023-0344**

ADOPTED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. Findings and Recommendations for allocating fiscal year (FY) 2023-24 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds estimated at \$48,985,266 as follows:
 - 1. In the City of Avalon, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, therefore TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$233,896 may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects;
 - 2. 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 by using other existing funding sources. Therefore, the TDA Article 8 funds in the amount of \$12,071,326 and \$11,536,136 (Lancaster and Palmdale, respectively) may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects, as long as their transit needs continue to be met;
 - 3. In the City of Santa Clarita, there are no unmet transit needs that are

(continued on next page)

(Item 15 – continued from previous page)

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 \$15,770,031 for the City of Santa Clarita may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects, as long as their transit needs continue to be met;

4. 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 \$9,373,877 may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects, as long as their transit needs continue to be met; and

- A. A resolution making a determination of unmet public transportation needs in the areas of Los Angeles County outside the Metro service area.

16. SUBJECT: LOCAL RETURN PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION C, MEASURE R AND MEASURE M CAPITAL RESERVE **2023-0345**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. AUTHORIZING 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 Cudahy (Measure R), Glendora (Proposition C), Lawndale (Proposition A), Lomita (Proposition C), Montebello (Proposition C), South El Monte (Proposition C, Measure R, and Measure M), South Pasadena (Proposition A, Proposition C, and Measure M), Temple City (Proposition C), and amend the existing account for the City of Hidden Hills (Proposition C).

17. SUBJECT: UPGRADE TAP VENDING MACHINES TO MAINTAIN EMV/PCI COMPLIANCE **2023-0139**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 173 to Contract No. OP02461010 with Cubic Transportation Systems, Inc. ("Cubic"), so that the TAP Vending Machines can accept payment from credit and debit cards with chips to remain payment card industry (PCI) compliant. This includes upgrades of computer hardware, the Oracle Database, and a Cubic Payment Application (CPA) in the amount of \$12,364,519, increasing the total contract value from \$389,251,345 to \$401,615,864.

**18. SUBJECT: ACCESS SERVICES PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2024
BUDGET**

2023-0349

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. local funding request for Access Services (Access) in an amount not to exceed \$151,016,402 for FY24. This amount includes:
- Local funds for operating and capital expenses in the amount of \$148,482,499;
 - Local funds paid directly to Metrolink for its participation in Access' Free Fare Program in the amount of \$2,533,903; and
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements to implement the above funding programs.

**19. SUBJECT: METROLINK FY24 ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM AND
REGIONAL RAIL SUPPORTIVE ACTIONS**

2023-0216

APPROVED:

- A. programming the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's ("Metro") share of the Southern California Regional Rail Authority's (SCRRA) FY 2023-24 Operating, Rehabilitation, and Capital Budget in the amount of \$199,400,319;
- B. programming of \$29,290,000 to SCRRA for a Working Capital Long-Term Loan, contingent upon SCRRA Board approval of a loan repayment policy addressing terms and conditions;
- C. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 1 to the Regional Rail Planning and Environmental On-Call Services bench Contract Nos. AE56752000 through AE56752005 to increase the not-to-exceed cumulative contract amount by \$15,000,000 from \$10,000,000 to \$25,000,000 in support of various Board and CEO directed Metrolink station and planning feasibility studies, and 2028 Olympics planning efforts;
- D. the programming of \$500,000 to SCRRA for FY 2023-24 supplemental Right-Of-Way (ROW) maintenance along Metro-owned property;
- E. EXTENDING the lapsing dates for funds previously allocated to SCRRA for

(continued on next page)

(Item 19 – continued from previous page)

State of Good Repair (SOGR) Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) as follows:

- FY 2017-18 SOGR program extended from March 30, 2024 to June 30, 2025
- FY 2018-19 SOGR program extended from June 30, 2023 to June 30, 2025
- FY 2019-20 SOGR program extended from June 30, 2023 to June 30, 2025;

F. the FY 2023-24 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

G. the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements between Metro and SCRRA for the approved funding.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	A/C	A	Y	Y	C	Y	Y	Y	A/C	A/C	Y

20. SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2023-24 TRANSIT FUND ALLOCATIONS 2023-0346

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR:

- A. \$3.3 billion in FY 2023-24 (FY24) Transit Fund Allocations for Los Angeles County jurisdictions, transit operators, and Metro operations. These allocations comply with federal, state, and local regulations and Metro Board approved policies and guidelines;
- B. an adjustment to Tier 2 Operator funding for the Cities of Burbank, Glendale, Los Angeles, and Pasadena from a capped amount of \$6 million to \$8.2 million for FY24 that will be adjusted annually by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) in subsequent years;
- C. fund exchanges in the estimated amount of \$4,471,049 of Metro’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4 allocation with Municipal Operators’ shares of the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. Funding will be adjusted based on LCTOP actual allocations;
- D. fund exchanges in the estimated amount of \$984,952 of Metro’s Proposition (Prop) C 40% allocation with Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita, Burbank, and Glendale’s shares of the Low Carbon Transit

(continued on next page)

(Item 20 – continued from previous page)

Operations Program. Funding will be adjusted based on LCTOP actual allocations;

- E. Two-year lag funding in the amount of \$273,680 for the transfer of the eastern segment of Metro line 130 to Long Beach Transit. The transfer will consist of 132,959 Revenue Miles;
- F. fund exchange in the amount of \$320,133 of Metro's TDA Article 4 allocations with La Mirada Transit's share of FY18 and FY19 Federal Section 5307;
- G. 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;
- H. fund exchanges in the amount totaling \$16.2 million of Metro's Federal Section 5307 share with Municipal Operators' shares of Federal Sections 5337 and 5339;
- I. fund exchange in the amount of \$5 million of Metro's Prop C 40% allocations with the Local Transit Operators' share of federal Section 5307 funds to implement the Local Transit Systems Subcommittee's (LTSS) Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Call for Projects;
- J. project selection and programming of \$13,937,073 for the LTSS ZEV Call for Projects;
- K. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to adjust FY24 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 Administration and amend the FY24 budget as necessary to reflect the adjustments;
- L. ADOPTING 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; and
- M. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and FY24 budget amendments to implement the above funding programs.

21. SUBJECT: IN-HOUSE PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT FEASIBILITY STUDY 2023-0286

RECEIVED AND FILED the In-House Public Safety Department Feasibility Study.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

21.1.SUBJECT: IN-HOUSE PUBLIC SAFETY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN MOTION 2023-0324

APPROVED Motion by Directors Najarian, Sandoval, Butts, Barger, and Bass that the Board direct the CEO to prepare a comprehensive implementation plan for Board consideration to bring public safety in-house and present the plan to the Board in January 2024. The implementation plan should reflect Metro’s commitment to building a new culture of public safety centered on a robust multi-layered approach.

SOLIS AMENDMENT:

- A. The comprehensive implementation plan for Board consideration shall include, but not be limited to, the bulleted list of next steps set forth in the Board File #: 2023-0286.
- B. Report back at the November 2023 Board meeting with a progress report.

HORVATH AMENDMENT:

WE THEREFORE MOVE that the Metro Board direct the Chief Executive Officer to include in the in-house public safety department implementation plan, discussion of:

- A. The anticipated performance-level of the “standard” and “enhanced” deployment models presented in the previously referenced feasibility study, in terms of system-wide coverage and the provision of a visible security and/or customer service presence.
- B. Best practices for system-wide coverage and deployment of law enforcement and non-law enforcement personnel from transit agencies nationally and internationally.
- C. Resources required to deploy a “best practices” model.
- D. Additional improvements in security technology, system hardening, interoperable communications, and deployment strategies currently underway or being contemplated for an in-house public safety department that may off-set the number of SSLE personnel required to effectively staff the system.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	ABS	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

22. SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO THE LETTER OF AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES (DHS) FOR HOMELESS PROGRAM SERVICES **2023-0303**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute Amendment Number 8 to the Letter of Agreement for Multidisciplinary Street-based Engagement Services with the County Department of Health Services (DHS) increasing the amount by \$63,934,200 from \$28,920,000 to a new a total amount of \$92,854,200 for the continuation of homeless program services from September 1, 2023 through June 30, 2027.

24. SUBJECT: STATE ETHICS LEGISLATION MOTION **2023-0399**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR Motion by Director Najarian that the Metro Board direct Metro's Chief Ethics Officer and CEO to work together to incorporate any proposed changes to the 2024 State Legislative Agenda to address any issues with state legal authorities that may impact Metro activities.

28. SUBJECT: WESTSIDE PURPLE LINE EXTENSION SECTION 3 PROJECT **2020-0829**

APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR amending the Life-of-Project (LOP) budget by \$53,000,000 for the Westside Purple Line Extension Section 3 Project (Project) of \$3,223,623,256 to \$3,276,623,256 using the fund sources consistent with the provisions of the Board-adopted Measure R and Measure M Unified Cost Management Policy.

29. SUBJECT: MEMBERSHIP ON METRO'S REGIONAL SERVICE COUNCILS **2023-0088**

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: ULTRA-LOW SULFUR AND RENEWABLE DIESEL FUEL **2023-0267**

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to award a four-year, Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract No. FY98248000 to AAA Oil, Inc. DBA California Fuels and Lubricants, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, for ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel and renewable diesel fuel. The contract three-year base amount is \$2,492,594.68, inclusive of sales tax, and the one-year option amount is \$825,768.17, inclusive of sales tax, for a total contract amount of \$3,318,362.85, subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest(s), if any.

31. SUBJECT: TRASH AND OVERGROWN VEGETATION REMOVAL SERVICES FOR REGIONS 1 THROUGH 3

2023-0290

AUTHORIZED ON CONSENT CALENDAR the Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. AWARD a firm fixed unit rate Contract No. OP911660008370, for Region 1 to Urban Graffiti Enterprises Inc., to provide trash and overgrown vegetation removal services in the not-to-exceed (NTE) amount of \$2,653,488 for the three-year base, and \$1,556,296 for the one, two-year option, for a total combined NTE amount of \$4,209,784, effective August 1, 2023, subject to resolution of timely protest(s), if any;
- B. AWARD a firm fixed unit rate Contract No. OP911660018370, for Regions 2 and 3 to Parkwood Landscape Maintenance, Inc., to provide trash and overgrown vegetation removal services in the NTE amount of \$32,708,116 for the three-year base, and \$21,762,707 for the one, two-year option, for a combined not-to-exceed amount of \$54,470,823, effective August 1, 2023, subject to resolution of timely protest(s), if any; and
- C. EXECUTE individual contract modifications within the Board approved contract modification authority.

36. SUBJECT: INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION SERVICES - NORTH AND SOUTH REGIONS

2022-0869

AUTHORIZED the Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. AWARD a firm fixed unit rate Contract No. PS93158000 to Universal Protection Service LP dba Allied Universal Security Services to provide infrastructure protection services in the North Region of Los Angeles County in an amount not-to-exceed \$111,266,844 for the five-year base term, effective July 1, 2023 to allow for a three-month mobilization period, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any.
- B. AWARD a firm fixed unit rate Contract No. PS93158001 to Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc., to provide infrastructure protection services in the South Region of Los Angeles County in an amount not-to-exceed \$85,972,439 for the five-year base term, effective July 1, 2023, to allow for a three-month mobilization period, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	Y	Y	A	Y

37. SUBJECT: C LINE AND K LINE OPERATING PLAN UPDATE

2023-0299

~~AUTHORIZED the Chief Executive Officer to implement a new recommended Option 2 (C2 Alternative) for the C and K Line Operating Plan based on public outreach and technical background informing the recommendation on Motion 28.1 Crenshaw/LAX Green Line Operating Plan.~~

APPROVED substitute Motion by Director Dutra that the Board authorizes the Chief Executive Officer to implement a new recommended Option 2 (C2 Alternative) for the C and K Line Operating Plan, on the condition that 1) there will be no more than a scheduled 3-minute transfer at the AMC Station from the Norwalk Station to the Expo/Crenshaw Station at all times of day for passengers transferring between trains in each direction and 2) Metro will evaluate rider travel patterns, including transfers and changes in boardings by station, 24-months after the opening of the AMC Station 3) return the authority for rail operations plans to the CEO and 4) report back to the Board on the data and decision support criteria Metro will use to determine rail operations plans moving forward.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

38. SUBJECT: MONTHLY UPDATE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

2023-0363

RECEIVED AND FILED Public Safety Report.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
P	P	A	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	A	P

39. SUBJECT: EXPRESSLANES PAY-AS-YOU-GO PILOT EVALUATION

2023-0382

APPROVED:

- A. RECEIVING AND FILING the ExpressLanes Pay-As-You-Go Pilot evaluation methodology and findings;
- B. AUTHORIZING the Pay-As-You-Go Program permanent, eliminate the \$25 penalty for notice of toll evasion, and adjust the Program’s “processing fee” (which replaces the former penalty amount) from \$4 to \$8 to align processing costs and fees;
- C. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer or their designee to conduct an annual audit to confirm the fee amount and make downward or upward adjustments to the fee as appropriate to keep costs and fees aligned, consistent with the Fee Adjustment Policy; and

(continued on next page)

(Item 39 – continued from previous page)

D. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer or their designee to make the necessary changes to the ExpressLanes Toll Ordinance, as required.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	A	Y

40. SUBJECT: LINK UNION STATION PROJECT

2023-0325

WITHDRAWN:

~~AUTHORIZE The Chief Executive Officer to:~~

~~A. NEGOTIATE, AWARD AND EXECUTE a cost reimbursable fixed fee Contract No. AE83177E0130, to Lockwood, Andrews, & Newman, Inc (LAN), for preconstruction services and construction management support services on the Link US Project, subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest(s);~~

~~B. AUTHORIZE a contract funding amount not to exceed \$16,250,000 through January 2027 to support preconstruction services with an anticipated Annual Work Plan not to exceed \$3,500,000; and~~

~~C. NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE contract modifications within the Board approved contract funding amount.~~

41. SUBJECT: CLOSED SESSION

2023-0428

A. Conference with Legal Counsel - Existing Litigation - G.C. 54956.9(d)(1)
 1. Doris Coleman v. LACMTA, LASC Case No. BC699976

APPROVED a settlement in the sum of \$2,750,000.

JDW	JH	KB	JB	FD	PK	HJM	TS	HS	LH	KY	KRB	AJN
Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A/C	Y

B. Conference with Real Property Negotiators - G.C. 54956.8
 Property: 777 S. Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, CA
 Agency Negotiator: John Beck, Manager, Real Estate and Asset Management
 Negotiating Parties: Maguire Properties - 777 Tower LLC
 Under Negotiations: Price and Terms

NO REPORT.

ADJOURNED AT 3:15 P.M.

Prepared by: Mandy Cheung
Administrative Analyst, Board Administration



Collette Langston, Board Clerk