



Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) Meeting Agenda Thursday, February 1, 2024

1. Call to Order • Take membership attendance and establish quorum. • Announcements. • Approval of 2/1/24 agenda. • Approval of 1/4/24 meeting minutes.	10 minutes
2. Personnel Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations • Committee Spokesperson to provide recommendations.	25 minutes
3. Job Duties Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations • Committee Spokesperson to provide recommendations.	25 minutes
4. Oversight Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations • Committee Spokesperson to provide recommendations.	25 minutes
5. General Public Comment & Adjournment (Up to 1 minute per person)	5 minutes

PSAC Meetings will be at 6pm the first Thursday of each month.

The next meeting will be Thursday, March 07, 2024.

Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC)

General Committee Meeting #2

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 1, 2024

6:00pm-7:30pm

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 6:04pm by Chair Oliver-Ronceros.

Virtual Meeting Protocols

Yvette Rapose, Chief Customer Experience Officer, LA Metro, read virtual meeting protocols. Attendees can join via Zoom Webinar format with the Zoom link posted on the published PSAC Agenda. Attendee cameras are off and microphones are muted. During the meeting, we will invite your feedback during our public comment period after each agenda item.

During the public comment period, use the 'raise hand' icon or submit your comment using the 'Q&A' feature in the chat section. The meeting will be recorded and posted on the Metro PSAC website for future reference.

Roll Call

Voting Members Present: David Sanchez, Troy Pierce, Misty Wilks, Estar Park, Darryl Goodus, Delia Arriaga, John Curley, Jeremy Oliver-Ronceros, Candis Welch (virtual), Catherine Baltazar (Late), Florence Annang (late), Brandon Cheng (late), Esthar Park

Alternates Present: Edward Duong (virtual)

Ex-Officios Present: Daniel De La Cruz

Absent Voting Members: Mariana Estrada, Mary Rose Fissinger, Olga Lexell

Note: Florence Annang arrives at 6:07pm

Note: Brandon Cheng arrives at 6:09pm

Work Plan Objectives

Following roll call, Chair Oliver-Ronceros read aloud the PSAC's five work plan

objectives:

- 1) To enhance the customer experience by addressing the perceptions of safety for riders and employees through infrastructure.
- 2) To enhance the customer experience by addressing the perceptions of safety for riders and employees through transparency, the use of data, and technology.
- 3) To enhance the customer experience tied to safety for people of disabilities and who are aging.
- 4) To monitor strategies to address unhoused people sheltering on the system.
- 5) To monitor strategies that provide alternatives to law enforcement on the system.

Approval of Meeting Agenda & Minutes

Sanchez motioned to vote on approving the 2/1/24 meeting agenda, with Pierce seconding. Following this, the agenda was unanimously approved.

Wilks motioned to vote on approving the 1/4/24 meeting minutes, with Park seconding. Following this, the minutes were unanimously approved.

Announcements

-Chair Oliver-Ronceros updated the committee regarding ride-along shift details initiated during Metro's Crisis Response presentation in November 2023. Sign-up forms were sent to the PSAC prior to this meeting.

Committee Comments and Questions

None.

General Public Comment

None.

Motions Approved Under Agenda Item #1

- Motion to approve meeting agenda.
- Motion to approve meeting minutes.

2. Personnel Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations (6:11pm)

Presenter: Misty Wilks, PSAC Vice-Chair.

Vice-Chair Wilks presented the following four recommendations from the Personnel Ad Hoc Committee:

Metro safeguards the transit community by taking a holistic, equitable, and welcoming approach to public safety. Metro recognizes that everyone is entitled to a safe, dignified, and human experience. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department will be holistic, equitable, and justice-minded, respecting the humanity of all people. To that end, we seek to identify professionally qualified candidates who are culturally aligned with the new department.

1. Each candidate will undergo a holistic review, background check, and psychological analysis and/or evaluation as part of the application process.
2. To ensure effective service to diverse communities, we shall seek personnel:
 - a. Whose language proficiency reflects the transit riders they serve, including ASL and other LA County threshold languages.
 - b. Experienced working with diverse communities.
 - c. Experienced working with interdisciplinary teams, including mental health professionals, crisis teams, de-escalation training, and/or sensitivity training.
3. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department should prioritize candidates who have demonstrated a commitment to serving the population that Metro serves; this commitment may have been demonstrated through background or training and/or experience that includes but is not limited to social work, military background, community outreach and/or mental health.
4. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department officers should have demonstrated an ability to show sensitivity and responsiveness to the diverse needs of Metro riders. They are trained to respect riders' privacy, check assumptions or prejudgments, and respond to situations with empathy and compassion.

Committee Comments and Questions

Cheng: Stated regarding item #3, they want to advocate for adding prior officer training, including POST certification, as a quality to prioritize for candidates.

Wilks: Clarified that the POST recommendation was not made by the committee, it was made by Metro Staff. Following discussion, PSAC members voted against it.

Annang: Asked for further clarification regarding this topic?

Curley: Replied POST is Peace Officer training for the state of California, which is on the cutting edge of 21st century police training. It's standardized training, and includes all of the legislative changes from the state. Recognizes the proposed Transit Community Safety Department is not called a policing agency, yet that will be the primary function of the agency. Thinks we should embrace the term policing, instead of hiding it. Regardless, completing POST is a requirement from the state prior to officers taking oath.

Wilks: Stated the committee was tasked to stay away from duties, and thus remained focused on the candidates' background. Regarding POST training, completing POST is not a requirement for the application process. The committee did not want to staff the entire force with former police officers.

Oliver-Ronceros: Stated that he wanted clarification regarding item #3. It sounds like this recommendation was written in regards to candidates prior to being hired, and POST is something that can or will be completed post-hiring?

Wilks: Affirmed, and added this was confirmed via the CEO.

Oliver-Ronceros: Asked Cheng if this changed his views regarding POST training language in the personnel recommendations?

Cheng: Explained his position that POST certification should be included as a prioritized skill set for applicants, as this agency is enforcing the law.

Annang: Stated that the language should remain as is. Prioritizing POST training may discourage candidates who do not have it. We're looking for a different mindset, and not necessarily lateral police agency recruitment.

Oliver-Ronceros: Asked if POST training is solely for police officers, or can it be training for additional types of security employment?

Curley: Replied that POST is specifically for police officers in California. There is a crisis right now with officer recruitment. Do we want to attract pre-service or lateral candidates for this new agency? Hopefully, we want to attract both.

Sanchez: Reiterated this was a big discussion in the sub committee. Asked for clarification regarding if these are going to be provided as a package, or as separate recommendations?

Rapose: Replied each ad hoc committee will submit these as a set of recommendations to the CEO, who will review them as individual recommendations in consideration for adopting.

Note: Duong, Baltazar, and Welch joined the meeting virtually during this agenda item; the exact time each member joined is indeterminate.

Cheng: Stated that he thinks military background has a similar function, but for some reason, that has stayed. Agencies usually employ veteran law enforcement professionals. These are just suggestions, not prerequisites.

Oliver-Ronceros: Asked if Cheng would like to make a motion regarding this item?

Cheng motioned to vote on adding POST training to item #3. Sanchez seconded.

Annang: Interjected she doesn't understand how this gets a motion, as it's not under this ad hoc committee.

Wilks: Stated this was the result of a compromise, and Member Cheng was not present during the first two ad hoc meetings when this was discussed. This feels redundant.

Sanchez: Added the subcommittee did vote to keep the language as is.

Curley: Replied that In order to work in this agency, they are going to have to obtain POST certification. It's a moot point.

Goodus: Stated it doesn't seem feasible for Metro to only prioritize pre-service candidates, especially considering POST training is done externally offsite. Thinks they should consider recruiting from a diverse pool of pre-service and lateral candidates. Encourages the PSAC to think about both sides of it.

A vote was then conducted, with two in favor and nine opposed. Thus, the motion did not pass. Breakdown of votes below:

Cheng Y

Welch: Y

Baltazar: N

Goodus: N

Sanchez: N

Arriaga: N

Park: N

Annang: N

Curley: N

Wilks: N

Pierce: N

Note: From 00:35:58 to 00:41:59 there was some confusion about how voting on potentially passing the personnel recommendations would be conducted. For clarity purposes, this has not been included in the official minutes. Please refer to this portion of the recording if needed.

Sanchez motioned to vote on approving the four personnel recommendations. Arriaga seconded.

A vote was then conducted, with seven in favor and four opposed. Thus, the motion passed. Breakdown of votes below:

Cheng N

Welch: N

Baltazar: Y
Goodus: N
Sanchez: Y
Arriaga: Y
Park: Y
Annang: Y
Curley: N
Wilks: Y
Pierce: Y

General Public Comment

None.

Motions Approved Under Agenda Item #2

- Motion to cancel the initial personnel vote.
- Motion to approve the personnel recommendations.

3. Job Duties Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations (6:38pm)

Presenter: Jeremy Oliver-Ronceros, PSAC Chair.

Chair Oliver-Ronceros presented the following nine recommendations from the Job Duties Ad Hoc Committee:

Note: Italicized text indicates changes or rewording made via a motion during the discussion.

1. *Metro's Transit Community Safety Department is a law enforcement agency whose top priority shall be securing rider, employee, and partner safety while engaged with Metro.*
2. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department officers shall have the authority to enforce Metro's Code of Conduct.
3. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department officers shall engage with the community professionally and proactively on buses, train cars, platforms, and mezzanines at community and station activations and other Metro locations and events.

4. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department officers shall serve as active members of the Metro system operations community, building trust among and coordinating with the

appropriate various units in the multi-layered approach to safety, including but not limited to:

- a. Metro bus and rail operators
- b. Cleaning and maintenance staff
- c. Metro Ambassadors
- d. Mental health service providers
- e. Homeless service providers
- f. Community-based organizations
- g. Law enforcement partners

5. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department officers shall have working knowledge of the Metro system, assist with wayfinding, and be able to aid passengers in the event of service interruptions and major delays.

6. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department officers shall undergo routine training beyond federal, state, and local-required mandates on the following topics:

- a. De-escalation (every year)
- b. CPR (every two years)
- c. Unconscious bias (every two years)
- d. Emergency narcotic overdose treatments
- e. Evolution of best practices in community safety
- f. Hate crime awareness and prevention
- g. Engaging people with intellectual and developmental disabilities

7. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department shall host a monthly *internal* review of SSLE's monthly safety report and schedule a weekly huddle to address de-escalation and on-the-spot problem resolution.

8. *Metro's Transit Community Safety Department will have access to technology that would help foster trust and transparency. At a minimum, they would have body worn cameras and communication devices that are seamless across the safety ecosystem, and throughout the Metro system.*

9. Metro's Transit Community Safety Department officers shall have the authority to enforce fares in a way that is equitable and does not target any particular rider group.

Committee Comments and Questions

Rapose: Asked for clarification on a few points. Regarding item #3, asked the committee to consider editing the recommendation to read 'rider safety on Metro property.' Regarding item #7, is what you're looking at an internal review? Item #8 is written agnostic to the technology's aims. Should the committee consider recommending technology use that is aligned with the TCSD's goals to foster trust and transparency?

Arriaga: Asked for clarification on unconscious bias training?

Oliver-Roncero: Replied it deals with the unconscious biases we may have been exposed to, or raised with. This is something they would want all TCSD officers to be aware of, and reminded of.

Cheng: Stated that a lot of this sounds like the work of the Ambassadors. It sounds like there has to be clearer delineation of duties.

Curley: Added that there is very little in these about policing. Not using the word policing is an epic failure, in my opinion.

Sanchez: Stated that since this organization is supposed to replace the LAPD and other contracted security on the system - we need to make sure we are aligning with what that encompasses. The recommendations should be meaningful.

Annang: Replied that Metro had a police department years ago, and it failed for many reasons. But mostly, it failed because it was too enforcement based for our community. It crashed against a lot of what people think of and see with police officers. We want a different kind of police officer on the Metro, and to reimagine what that is.

Cheng: Added they are concerned that this doesn't feel like it fulfills the integral duties of a reimagined police officer. Seven to one of surveyed riders want more security, and armed security.

Curley: Stated that transit is a critical infrastructure. Agrees with the above concerns about transparency, legitimacy, and trust. Enforcement shouldn't be a four-letter word. It's a necessity. The majority of riders want 21st century policing. We have to give those

officers the ability to do their job. Of course, some people don't want any type of policing, and that's led to money being re-routed from the police, and towards programs like Metro Ambassadors.

De La Cruz: Added that these ad hocs are supposed to provide suggestions, not encompass the whole of requirements and specifications. As a Metro employee, we have had to go out and protect the people we work with. We've had to respond to operators and riders being assaulted. I don't feel that's my job. This is occurring day in and day out. Riders want and need law enforcement. They need people to protect the system, and the employees. This is an enhancement for what's required.

Sanchez: Replied we need a harmonized version that reflects the two sides a bit more. It needs to reflect this is a new type of police officer, who still handles the necessary duties.

Goodus: Stated that what De La Cruz said is key; wonders how we can add it to these recommendations? Thinks alphabetizing some of the recommendation listings would help to give the impression of equal weight and importance.

Wilks: Stated that some of the statistics are concerning, and seem to contradict. Wants to ascertain what the actual statistics are. Suggested adding language regarding item #2, 'Metro's Transit Community Safety Department is a law enforcement agency whose job is to secure the public and Metro while engaged with Metro on Metro's property, and also has the ability to enforce Metro's Code of Conduct.' Would that massage these concerns?

Oliver-Roncero: Asked if she wanted to make the motion to amend item #2 with, 'Metro's Transit Community Safety Department is a law enforcement agency whose top priority would be securing the rider's safety, and the safety of Metro employees and partners.'

Wilks: Stated if that resolves our largest concerns, I will absolutely make the motion. Are there any other concerns first?

Rapose: Replied there are more comments. In regards to the data question; in addition to the PSAC outreach conducted over the 2023 term, a year's worth of social media data and internal system data was included in the information provided to the committee. 7 to 1 riders are in favor of a uniformed police presence according to that data. We'll resend so you have it.

Wilks: Asked for further clarification that this data included the comment cards, public commenters, and virtual commenters?

Rapose: Affirmed.

Baltazar: Stated they agreed with law enforcement terminology being added, but also

want language included about using holistic approaches and care-based solutions. Many folks, especially folks of color, don't feel safe around police officers.

De La Cruz: Stated the majority of the public has requested an armed law enforcement presence. Recently, a young man was stabbed on the platform and lost his life. Armed law enforcement could have possibly prevented this.

Annang: Stated she went to a lot of the listening sessions. You're hearing that people want police presence, but they don't want a moving police presence. Metro is trying to create its own community. We need officers who understand the humanity behind this. It could be beautiful if it's done right.

Cheng: Wanted to clarify that he never said he disliked all of these things. My comments are only in regards to what I see to be possible improvements.

Curley: Added unconscious bias training has been required at the state's police academies for the past few years.

Following some semantic discussion, Wilks motioned to vote on altering item #1 to read, 'Metro's Transit Community Safety Department is a law enforcement agency whose top priority shall be securing rider, employee, and partner safety while engaged with Metro.' Sanchez seconded.

Sanchez: Asked if this wording was okay with the subcommittee?

Oliver-Roncero: Affirmed.

De La Cruz: Stated the committee's aim was to make sure their enhanced recommendations would be considered.

A vote was then conducted, with ten in favor and one opposed. Thus, the motion passed.
Breakdown of votes below:

Cheng Y

Welch: Y

Baltazar: Y

Goodus: Y

Sanchez: Y

Arriaga: Y

Park: Y

Annang: Y

Curley: N

Wilks: Y

Pierce: Y

Oliver-Ronceros motioned to vote on altering item #7 to add the word internal to the review and weekly huddle to specify they are not open to the public. De La Cruz seconded.

Sanchez: Asked if you make it internal, then would the transparency to the community be routed through the oversight committee?

Oliver-Ronceros: Replied the information provided in the internal meetings is also available to the public.

A vote was then conducted, with ten in favor and one opposed. Thus, the motion passed.
Breakdown of votes below:

Cheng Y

Welch: Y

Baltazar: Y

Goodus: Y

Sanchez: Y

Arriaga: Y

Park: Y

Annang: Y

Curley: N

Wilks: Y

Pierce: Y

Wilks: Stated the CEO said that the proposed TCSD will be Metro employees. This isn't internal versus external. Metro has the ability to hire, fire, etc.

Annang: Stated that you can't fire a police officer as easily as that. They have the police bill of rights.

Wilks: Replied this conversation occurred when we were discussing subpoena powers, so I may have taken that further than intended. I'm sure we'll be discussing this in the next section.

Rapose: Added for context that the conversation occurred within the context of the oversight committee having subpoena power, their own staff, etc. What the CEO was clarifying, is that we already have an Office of the Inspector General, which is an independent entity. So any oversight committee would likely ladder up to the OIG.

Oliver-Ronceros: Stated that the wording on item #8 is a little vague.

Oliver-Ronceros motioned to vote on altering item #8 to read, 'Metro's Transit Community Safety Department will have access to technology that would help foster trust and transparency. At a minimum, they would have body worn cameras and communication devices that are seamless across the safety ecosystem, and throughout the Metro system.' Curley seconded.

A vote was then conducted, with the motion unanimously passing.

Wilks made the motion to vote on approving the nine job duties recommendations with the added amendments. Arriaga seconded.

A vote was then conducted, with nine in favor and two opposed. Thus, the motion passed. Breakdown of votes below:

Cheng N

Welch: Y

Baltazar: Y

Goodus: Y

Sanchez: Y

Arriaga: Y

Park: Y

Annang: Y

Curley: N

Wilks: Y

Pierce: Y

General Public Comment

Brenda Jackson. I'm a community organizer with Community Power Collective, which is a member of Act LA. We represent transit riders in Boyle Heights and East LA. We oppose Metro creating an in-house police department, and police on the Metro system in any form. Metro tried having a police department before, and it failed. It was a big waste of money. I want to correct the PSAC member who stated money was rerouted from the police department to Metro Ambassadors, as no money was divested from the police budget for the Ambassador program.

Sophia Salazar: I'm a transit rider and community organizer with Community Power Collective. I'm a bit confused by this meeting. Everyone is acting like the Metro in-house police department has been approved, when it hasn't even been voted on. We are opposed to an in-house police department, and want Metro to cancel their contracts with all police agencies. The communities we represent with black, brown, and indigenous riders don't feel safe with police presence. They can't participate in these meetings because all of the information is in English.

Glenn Bailey: I think Metro needs to do a better job of outreach to the neighborhood councils of LA. My specific rider comment is that on the orange line folks are playing loud music, and this goes on for most of the route.

Lionel Mares: I'm a transit rider who takes the red line. I appreciate the Metro Ambassadors. I hope Metro will provide mental health counseling training to the Ambassadors. Sometimes I see people get violent.

Cheng: Stated the PSAC received 131 comment cards in Spanish, and that material is not solely provided in English. The PSAC is doing its due diligence in outreach.

Annang: Wanted to address the Community Power Collective organizers; the PSAC understands the Transit Community Safety Department being implemented is not a given, but were tasked to give recommendations in these specific areas.

Motions Approved Under Agenda Item #3

- Motion to reword recommendation #1.
- Motion to reword recommendation #7.
- Motion to reword recommendation #8.
- Motion to approve the job duties recommendations.

4. Oversight Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations (7:50pm)

Presenter: Darryl Goodus, PSAC Secretary.

Secretary Goodus presented the initial eleven recommendations from the Oversight Ad Hoc Committee, which during the meeting was condensed into ten:

Note: Italicized text indicates changes or rewording made via a motion during the discussion.

1. LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) shall implement an oversight commission with the power to investigate issues and complaints against the Transit Community Safety Department (TCSD).

2. *The Oversight Commission shall work with the Office of the Inspector General to subpoena officers and documents, provide staff and research support, and investigate incidents on the Metro system.*

3. The oversight commission shall have the authority to implement recommendations that align with Metro's safety vision and mission.

4. The oversight commission shall be established with at least 15 members.

5. The oversight commission membership selection process shall not be influenced by elected officials.

6. The oversight commission membership selection shall include a county-wide outreach and recruitment process to ensure equitable geographic and demographic representation from throughout LA County, including people with disabilities and seniors.

7. The oversight commission shall include no more than one member who is a retired law enforcement officer. No member of the oversight commission shall be a police officer or military personnel on active duty.

8. Oversight commission membership shall include representation of Metro riders, inclusive of transit-dependent riders and choice riders.

9. The oversight commission shall include a balance of professionals in the field of safety and security, the field of mental health, civil rights law/social justice, and members of the community.

10. Members of the oversight commission shall be members of the National Association

for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACO) and undergo training in best practices for effective and transparent policing.

Committee Comments and Questions

Rapose: Reiterated Metro already has an independent Office of the Inspector General, with several of the recommended powers suggested, such as the power of subpoena.

Curley: Stated this reads a lot like the PSAC in some areas. Thinks they should look at the oversight the sheriff's department currently has.

Pierce: Asked if items #2 and #4 would be aligned with Rapose's comment about the OIG?

Rapose: Affirmed if the oversight commission was established, they would likely be able to utilize the powers of the OIG under that umbrella.

Annang: Asked if the OIG would replace the independent auditor and provide staff?

Rapose: Affirmed.

Wilks: Asked if this would be similar to the way Metro also facilitates PSAC?

Rapose: Replied they would imagine so, but doesn't want to commit anyone's staff to anything.

Oliver-Roncero: Asked if #2 and #4 are redundant, should we craft a statement they would work with the OIG?

Wilks: Asked if the oversight commission should have the authority to summon officers and receive documentation, would that fix it? I don't know that it clearly states the mission. Is there something specific this oversight commission is looking for?

Annang: Stated the ad hoc committee wanted to ensure that these stated areas of people would really want to get onto the oversight committee. Maybe it can be worded differently. We want a balance of professionals. However, anybody can apply.

Curley: Replied these oversight commissions investigate police misconduct. You do want someone with technical competence to investigate these, and someone who understands the police officer's bill of rights.

Annang: Added lots of the groundwork is building the foundation for this commission. It needs to be a place of transparency, accountability, etc. We're not here to beat the police. It's here to be a bridge builder for the police and community.

Wilks: Asked if how these complaints come to the oversight committee was a part of this discussion?

Annang: Replied no. That's getting into the weeds.

Rapose: Stated there's an opportunity here. Do you want to be a part of the discussion to set that criteria?

Wilks: Stated it seems like a possibility they never get any assignments.

Cheng: Asked if the Sheriff's Oversight Commission could oversee it?

Curley: Replied whether they use that as a model, or as their oversight, either way it will be a discussion. It will all be by charter and approved by the Metro Board. In my opinion, you don't need fifteen members. It's probably more like eight. You can look at a model that already exists and is the best fit for LA Metro.

De La Cruz: Replied in regards to Wilks's comments, currently with Metro riders we deal with complaints via a central system. It's then routed to the correct department. There's always follow ups and checks and balances.

Sanchez: Stated they see these recommendations as more of setting up an infrastructure. Strongly encourages Metro to come back to PSAC as it's developing policies.

Oliver-Ronceros made the motion to replace items #2 and #4 with, 'The Oversight Commission shall work with the Office of the Inspector General to subpoena officers and documents, provide staff and research support, and investigate incidents on the Metro system.' Pierce seconded.

A vote was then conducted, with nine in favor and two opposed. Thus, the motion passed. Breakdown of votes below:

Cheng: N

Welch: Y

Baltazar: Y
Goodus: Y
Sanchez: Y
Arriaga: Y
Park: Y
Annang: Y
Curley: N
Wilks: Y
Pierce: Y

Oliver-Roncero: Asked why item #7 (previously #8) included no more than one retired officer?

Annang: Replied there's no active police officers on the oversight commission. We went back and forth, and in the spirit of compromise, decided on one voice.

Sanchez: Asked if they could switch items nine and ten to prioritize Metro riders?

Sanchez motioned to switch items #8 and #9. (Previously, items #9 and #10) Pierce seconded.

A vote was then conducted, with the motion unanimously passing.

Baltazar made the motion to vote on approving the ten oversight recommendations with the added amendments. Sanchez seconded.

A vote was then conducted, with nine in favor and two opposed. Thus, the motion passed. Breakdown of votes below:

Cheng: N
Welch: Y
Baltazar: Y
Goodus: Y

Sanchez: Y

Arriaga: Y

Park: Y

Annang: Y

Curley: N

Wilks: Y

Pierce: Y

General Public Comment

Sophia Salazar: Thanked Member Annang for her clarification. Asked the PSAC for more language justice in their meetings. Just because someone is from Latin America does not mean they speak Spanish. They are in a coalition with 44 other organizations who speak a variety of languages. They would welcome any comment cards they can distribute and then bring back to the PSAC.

Cheng: Stated the PSAC should be judicious with the comment cards. Would rather them go to a government agency or a neighborhood council than a group with a predetermined opinion on the issue.

Annang: Stated she believes it's good to give cards to coalitions and spaces. They can get to riders we can't get to, and build a bridge. Doesn't believe these groups have an agenda. The only agenda is to make sure Metro is safe for everybody.

Sanchez: Asked about the virtual comment cards? Wants to make sure people have access to them online, and they are available in a variety of languages.

Curley: Encouraged the PSAC to listen to the public's concerns, and avoid making rebuttal commentary.

Motions Approved Under Agenda Item #4

-Motion to combine and reword recommendations #2 and #4.

-Motion to switch the order of recommendations #8 and #9.

-Motion to approve the oversight recommendations.

5. General Public Comment & Adjournment (8:31pm)

Lionel Mares: There's no link or attachments on what was voted on today. Speaking as an individual, I would like to see Metro do more outreach to the San Fernando Valley neighborhood council, and all neighborhood councils. Glenn Bailey is a great resource.

Glenn Bailey: I'm a neighborhood council president. We don't receive anything from this committee. I looked at your minutes, but there was no outreach to the San Fernando Valley. The Brown Act does allow members to ask brief clarifying questions on public comment, but does not allow commentary on the comment itself.

Wilks motioned to adjourn, which Curley seconded. This unanimously passed.

Meeting adjourned 8:34pm.