

Metro

*Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA*



Metro

Agenda - Final Revised

Thursday, June 18, 2015

1:00 PM

**One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012,
3rd Floor, Metro Board Room**

Ad-Hoc Transit Policing Oversight Committee

*James Butts, Chair
Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, Vice Chair
Michael Antonovich
John Fasana
Hilda Solis*

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD RULES (ALSO APPLIES TO BOARD COMMITTEES)

PUBLIC INPUT

A member of the public may address the Board on agenda items, before or during the Board or Committee's consideration of the item for one (1) minute per item, or at the discretion of the Chair. A request to address the Board should be submitted in person at the meeting to the Board Secretary. Individuals requesting to speak on more than three (3) agenda items will be allowed to speak up to a maximum of three (3) minutes per meeting. For individuals requiring translation service, time allowed will be doubled.

The public may also address the Board on non-agenda items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board during the public comment period, which will be held at the beginning and/or end of each meeting. Each person will be allowed to speak for up to three (3) minutes per meeting and may speak no more than once during the Public Comment period. Speakers will be called according to the order in which the speaker request forms are received. Elected officials, not their staff or deputies, may be called out of order and prior to the Board's consideration of the relevant item.

In accordance with State Law (Brown Act), all matters to be acted on by the MTA Board must be posted at least 72 hours prior to the Board meeting. In case of emergency, or when a subject matter arises subsequent to the posting of the agenda, upon making certain findings, the Board may act on an item that is not on the posted agenda.

CONDUCT IN THE BOARD ROOM - The following rules pertain to conduct at Metropolitan Transportation Authority meetings:

REMOVAL FROM THE BOARD ROOM The Chair shall order removed from the Board Room any person who commits the following acts with respect to any meeting of the MTA Board:

- a. Disorderly behavior toward the Board or any member of the staff thereof, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- b. A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- c. Disobedience of any lawful order of the Chair, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the Board; and
- d. Any other unlawful interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting.

INFORMATION RELATING TO AGENDAS AND ACTIONS OF THE BOARD

Agendas for the Regular MTA Board meetings are prepared by the Board Secretary and are available prior to the meeting in the MTA Records Management Department and on the Internet. Every meeting of the MTA Board of Directors is recorded on CD's and as MP3's and can be made available for a nominal charge.

DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The State Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 84308) requires that a party to a proceeding before an agency involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, including all contracts (other than competitively bid, labor, or personal employment contracts), shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions in an amount of more than \$250 made within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to any officer of the agency, additionally PUC Code Sec. 130051.20 requires that no member accept a contribution of over ten dollars (\$10) in value or amount from a construction company, engineering firm, consultant, legal firm, or any company, vendor, or business entity that has contracted with the authority in the preceding four years. Persons required to make this disclosure shall do so by filling out a "Disclosure of Contribution" form which is available at the LACMTA Board and Committee Meetings. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the assessment of civil or criminal penalties.

ADA REQUIREMENTS

Upon request, sign language interpretation, materials in alternative formats and other accommodations are available to the public for MTA-sponsored meetings and events. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made at least three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please telephone (213) 922-4600 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Our TDD line is (800) 252-9040.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

A Spanish language interpreter is available at all Board Meetings. Interpreters for Committee meetings and all other languages must be requested 72 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (213) 922-4600 or (323) 466-3876.

HELPFUL PHONE NUMBERS

Copies of Agendas/Record of Board Action/Recordings of Meetings - (213) 922-4880 (Records Management Department)
General Information/Rules of the Board - (213) 922-4600
Internet Access to Agendas - www.metro.net
TDD line (800) 252-9040

NOTE: ACTION MAY BE TAKEN ON ANY ITEM IDENTIFIED ON THE AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

61. [2015-0750](#)

CONSIDER:

- A. receiving and filing **response to Motion by Director James Butts**; and
- B. directing the CEO to pursue in the 2016 State Legislative Session legislation that would clarify the status of Transit Security Officers and their authority.

Attachments: [Attachment A - A Motion by Director James Butts](#)
[Attachment B - Report on the Review of Metro Law Enforcement and Security C](#)
[Attachment C - Correspondence from Teamsters](#)
[Attachment D - Correspondence from LASD](#)
[Attachment E - Correspondence AFSCME Letter](#)

62. AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 12 to Contract No. PS2610LASD with the **County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) to provide law enforcement services** for up to twelve (12) months for the period covering July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 in the amount of \$102,851,600, thereby increasing the total contract value from \$466,719,113 to \$569,570,713. [2015-0701](#)

Attachments: [AttachA PROCUREMENT SUMMARY](#)
[AttachB ContractModificationLog](#)
[AttachC MTA Additions FY 2015-16 20150520 \(3\)](#)
[AttachD Service Units by Position](#)
[Attachment E TPD Highlights and Accomplishments - May 27 2015 \(3\)](#)

63. **RECEIVE AND FILE report on monthly update on transit policing performance.** **2015-0681**

Attachments: Attachment A - TRANSIT POLICING DIVISION REPORT - APR 2015
Attachment B - Matrix of Bus Operator Assault Suspects

Consideration of items not on the posted agenda, including: items to be presented and (if requested) referred to staff; items to be placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Committee or Board; and/or items requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Committee subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

Adjournment



Board Report

File #:2015-0750, **File Type:**Informational Report

Agenda Number:61.

2nd REVISED
AD HOC TRANSIT POLICING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
JUNE 18, 2015

SUBJECT: METRO TRANSIT POLICING AND SECURITY WORKLOAD/STAFFING ANALYSIS

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE AND APPROVE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO METRO'S STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

- A. receiving and filing **response to Motion by Director James Butts**; and
- B. directing the CEO to pursue in the 2016 State Legislative Session legislation that would clarify the status of Transit Security Officers and their authority.

ISSUE

At the April 30, 2015 Board Meeting, Director James Butts approved a motion (Attachment A) to have staff return to the Ad-Hoc Transit Policing Oversight Committee in June regarding:

- A. An update of the Transit Security Officers Equipment issues;
- B. The progress of the discussions with the Sheriff as they pertain to an MOU under PC 830.7 (e); and
- C. The procurement of an outside consultant for the implementation of the next steps recommended in the I.G.'s report.

DISCUSSION

At the April 30, 2015 Board Meeting, the Metro Board directed the Inspector General to move forward and implement the next steps as described in the April 2015 report (Attachment B) and initiate the procurement of a qualified outside consultant to assist Metro staff in the creation of a Metro Transit Policing and Security Workload Model. Additionally, the motion requested status updates on the Transit Security Equipment issues and the progress of the discussions with the Sheriff as they pertain to an MOU under PC 830.7(e). Below are the status updates:

- A. An update of the Transit Security Officers Equipment issues and PC 830.7 (e):

- Discussions have been held with LASD management, Teamsters and AFSCME representatives on the path forward. LASD concerns remain regarding the issues associated with an MOU pursuant to PC 830.7 (e). However, all parties desire clarity on the “status while on duty” for the Transit Security Officers. This will address the powers of arrest and protective equipment issue. As a result, all parties have expressed an interest in Metro pursuing legislation to clarify these issues. Attachments C, ~~D~~, D, and E reflects correspondence from the Teamsters ~~and LASD~~, LASD, and AFSCME concurring with this approach.

B. The procurement of an outside consultant for the implementation of the next steps recommended in the I.G.’s report.

- The Inspector General’s Office prepared a Statement of Work (SOW) to hire a consultant. Staff anticipates release of the RFP by ~~July~~ June 15, 2015.

NEXT STEPS

Office of the Inspector General will hire a consultant for the implementation of the next steps as recommended in the I.G.s report (Attachment B). Staff will also return to the Board with status updates on the Transit Security Officer Equipment issues as well as the discussions with the Sheriff regarding the MOU under PC 830.7 (e).

The preliminary development of the membership of the working group and their tasks has commenced pending the hiring of the consultant and the new Executive Officer, who is anticipated to be hired by July 30th.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - A Motion by Director James Butts

Attachment B - Report on the Review of Metro Law Enforcement and Security Option

Attachment C - Correspondence from Teamsters

Attachment D - Correspondence from LASD


Attachment E - Correspondence from AFSCME

Prepared by: Duane Martin, DEO, Project Management, (213) 922-7460

Karen Gorman, Inspector General, (213) 922-2975

Michael Turner, DEO, Government Relations, (213) 922-2122

Reviewed by: Stephanie Wiggins, Interim Deputy Chief Executive Officer,
(213) 922-1023



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

A Motion by Director James Butts

In the latest Board Box reports to the Board from the Interim Deputy CEO, it appears that progress is being made in regards to the issues of the Transit Security Officers Security Equipment and the discussions of an MOU with the Sherriff relating to Penal Code Section 830.7(e).

As it pertains to the Office of the Inspector General's report on the review of Law Enforcement and Security Options, I believe it would be timely for this Board to take the next steps regarding the recommendations contained in the report.

In order to adequately assess an efficient deployment and work force strategy a qualified consultant team should be brought in. This team must have the necessary Community Transit policing experience, both Bus and Rail to conduct this assessment.

This consultant should be required to assemble a working group of current security service providers, a representative of the incoming CEO and a member of the Ad Hoc Transit Policing Oversight Committee to provide input on the organizational enforcement philosophy and priorities.

This study should make recommendations after reviewing crime statistics, ridership, fare evasion, graffiti, and vandalism. It should then recommend a deployment concept of operations using a mix of fare inspectors and law enforcement.

I, THEREFORE, MOVE that this Board instruct the Inspector General to move forward and implement the recommended Next Steps as described in the report and initiate the procurement of a qualified outside consultant.

I further Move that the Metro staff and Sheriff report back to the Ad Hoc Transit Policing Oversight Committee in June on these issues; specifically in regards to:

- A** An update of the Transit Security Officers Equipment issues;
- B** The progress of the discussions with the Sherriff as they pertain to an MOU under PC 830.7(e); and
- C** The procurement of an outside consultant for the implementation of the next steps recommended in the I.G.'s report.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Office of the Inspector General
818 West 7th Street, Suite 500
Los Angeles, CA 90017

213.244.7300
213.244.7343

28

REVISED
AD HOC TRANSIT POLICING OVERSIGHT
April 16, 2015

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF METRO LAW ENFORCEMENT AND SECURITY OPTIONS

ISSUE

In January, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) was asked by the Board Chair's Office to obtain a consultant to analyze various options presented to the Ad Hoc Transit Policing Oversight Committee and for providing law enforcement and security services for the Metro transit system.

DISCUSSION

The review analyzed four law enforcement and security options. The review found that the three options (1, 2, and 3 discussed below) presented by Metro staff are less desirable given proposed mix of law enforcement to Metro transit security and the size of the Metro transit system, both in ridership and geographical areas covered. The review found that the fourth option identified by Board staff is the most desirable from a security standpoint. This option would maintain the current model of a single law enforcement agency being supplemented by Metro transit security officers. In this regard, Metro management needs to ensure that appropriate deployment, community policing, and operational strategies for buses and rail are in place, and that management has input into the deployment strategy of law enforcement agency personnel. This input, combined with continual oversight and effective management, and coordination are crucial to the success of the next contract.

1. Scope of the Review

The OIG prepared a scope of work for the Request for Proposal to obtain an expert consultant to perform this review. Bazilio Cobb Associates (BCA), the consulting firm that conducted the prior review of the contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) was hired to perform the review. The review team was augmented by two transit policing experts – Robert Wasserman, lead consultant for the former Bratton Group, and Paul MacMillan former Chief of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. The scope of this review focused on three options presented on the proposed structure for the future law enforcement contract and a fourth option identified by the Board staff.

- Option 1. Use a single law enforcement agency to provide police officers; reduce the number of sworn officers from current levels; and direct Metro employed Transit Security Officers (TSOs) to conduct fare checks and increase safety presence.
- Option 2. Use multiple law enforcement agencies to provide police officers; reduce the number of sworn officers from current levels; and direct Metro employed TSOs to conduct fare checks and increase safety presence.
- Option 3. Use only Metro police and TSOs; security staff will be allocated by Metro.
- Option 4. Maintain the same level of sworn officers, but deploy them differently to enhance security, and increase the number of Metro TSOs. (This option was not presented by Metro staff, but was developed through Board staff discussion.)

Other options may be adopted after a deployment analysis is conducted.

2. Background

The current contract with LASD includes personnel at a total annual cost of \$88.7 million. Current sworn staffing is budgeted at 468 positions, with 425 actual filled sworn positions. Civilian or professional staffing is currently budgeted at 176 (includes security assistants), with 138 actual filled staff. Metro also directly employs transit security officers to provide security over Metro facilities. Metro is in the process of developing and issuing a Request for Proposals to select and award a contract for law enforcement and security services.

3. Results of the Review

The consultant completed the review and issued a report on the law enforcement and security options (Attachment A).

a. Analysis of Security Service Options

The options were presented with preliminary cost estimates made by Metro staff that allowed some comparison based on the financial implications of the various options. However, those cost estimates need to be more fully vetted to ensure they contain accurate cost information including ancillary or hidden costs that may accrue over the length of the contract. In addition, the analysis was based on the average in-service staffing by LASD rather than the total number of LASD staff actually assigned to the Metro contract so an appropriate cost comparison was problematic. Cost should always be a consideration when deciding the ultimate security and policing strategy; however, it should not be the deciding factor. The Consultant's conclusions and perspectives on the four options presented to and discussed by Board staff are summarized below:

- **Option 1** proposes using a single law enforcement agency to police the system, reducing the number of sworn officers and deploying additional Metro security to provide a visible presence on the system. The consultant does not recommend significant reductions in sworn officer staffing levels prior to conducting an in-depth deployment analysis based on the needs to provide law enforcement coverage and response. The assignment of Metro TSOs could provide a visible presence that would allow for the perception of enhanced security.
- **Option 2** proposes using multiple law enforcements agencies to police the Metro system, with the sworn officer staffing below sworn staffing currently provided. The management and oversight of this option would be difficult to maintain, and would divide the entire system in a number of contracts that must be managed separately. This might not be practicable because of factors such as the increased contract oversight nor would it provide a consistent level of security throughout the system. That being said, the contracting out of some of the service areas should not be totally discounted.
- **Option 3** proposes the creation of a distinct police force dedicated to Metro. This option would require large startup costs over an extended period of time. It would also limit the involvement of specialized ~~assets~~ assets and training that a large law enforcement agency has to offer. Ongoing recruitment, training, and equipment costs make this option less desirable. This option was originally used to police the Metro system and was discontinued. Metro should also maximize the use of basic services that should be provided at no cost by local law enforcement agencies.
- **Option 4** intends to maintain the current sworn officer staffing levels and augment them with Metro security. In order to implement a full community and operational policing strategy for the Metro system, the current level of sworn officers could be revised based on risk, staffing, and deployment analysis. Further research and data analysis would be necessary to determine the optimum number and mix of personnel. This option is the most desirable from a system safety perspective of the four options, but it does not provide for any cost savings.

b. Considerations Moving Forward

The review identified key issues that should be considered, discussed, and resolved to the extent possible to most effectively move forward.

Current Staffing and Deployment of services provided by LASD have evolved over time and are not based on an in-depth analysis of workload (crime, calls for service, coverage, etc.) or the risk and mitigation strategies needed to address those risks. Moving forward, an in-depth analysis of workload, a risk assessment, identifying risk

mitigation strategies, and identifying staffing and deployment needs and approach to implement these strategies should be conducted to provide a foundation for evaluating future options and to arrive at the optimum number and mix of law enforcement and security personnel.

The Role of Security Officers needs to be made clear to provide a visible deterrence as well as to observe and report any unlawful activity to law enforcement personnel. Metro security officers are not sworn or certified law enforcement officers and do not have authority to detain or arrest. They cannot be made responsible for responding to law enforcement incidents. While Metro security officers may play an effective role in expanded fare enforcement efforts, replacing large numbers of sworn law enforcement personnel would likely result in a significant reduction in the level of public safety and security within the system and slower response times to incidents throughout the system.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies have a responsibility to provide basic services to Metro buses and trains within their jurisdictions consistent with the service provided to all others within their jurisdiction. Metro should not have to contract with these agencies for these basic services, but may choose to contract for dedicated or supplemental resources from local agencies. It is important that Metro and local jurisdictions understand that the current staffing provided by LASD cannot provide complete police coverage of the entire transit system spread over many square miles, particularly with regard to buses. Local law enforcement should respond unless a Metro contracted law enforcement unit is nearby.

Management and Oversight of law enforcement services are keys to the safety and security of the Metro system regardless of the structure. Establishing short and long-term priorities for law enforcement services is a critical role for Metro management. The current law enforcement contract provides opportunities for Metro to accomplish this, including development of bus and rail policing strategies which should provide specific guidance on how the contracted law enforcement agency will use its resources to impact priority problems on the transit system. Directing actual law enforcement personnel and resources will not be effective until priorities are clearly identified and communicated.

4. Recommended Next Steps

- Conduct an in-depth deployment analysis of workload, a risk assessment, risk mitigation strategies, and staffing and deployment needs and approach to implement these strategies to provide a foundation for evaluating future options, and to arrive at the optimum number and mix of law enforcement and security personnel.
- Work with local law enforcement agencies to identify the level of basic services these agencies can provide to Metro buses and trains within their jurisdictions consistent with the service provided to all others within their jurisdictions.


Develop agreements with these agencies to both improve service to Metro and reduce the need for contracted law enforcement services.

- Regarding the timing for selecting future law enforcement contract services, either:
 - Extend the current law enforcement services contract until such time as the in-depth deployment analysis of workload risk assessment, risk mitigation strategies, and staffing and deployment needs and approach to implement these strategies is completed, or
 - Issue the Request for Proposals for law enforcement services assuming continuation for the current service levels, with the caveat that the level of services would be adjusted upon completion of the risk assessment and staffing and deployment analysis.
 - If budget constraints dictate that the budget for law enforcement services be reduced, request the LASD to provide options and the impact for varying levels of budget reductions.
 - Clearly define the appropriate role for Metro security personnel based on their level of authority, and ensure training, weaponry, and equipment is consistent with that role.
 - Establish short and long-term priorities for law enforcement services and develop effective means for providing oversight to ensure contract services are provided consistent with priorities.
 - Continue to move forward on implementation of the recommendations made in the LASD Contract Audit and APTA Peer Review report issued in 2014.
5. The consultant discussed the draft report with Metro management and considered their input in finalizing the report. Management is in agreement with the content and recommended next steps contained in the report.

ATTACHMENT

Report on Review of Metro Law Enforcement and Security Options

Prepared by Jack Shigetomi, Deputy Inspector General - Audits
(213) 244-7305



Karen Gorman
Inspector General



Metro Office of the Inspector General

**Review of Metro Law Enforcement
and Security Options**

April 2015

Submitted by

BCA Watson Rice LLP
in association with
Strategic Policy Partnership, LLC
and
Chief Paul MacMillan (Retired)
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority

April 3, 2015

Karen Gorman, Inspector General
Office of the Inspector General
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-4-5
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: REVIEW OF METRO LAW ENFORCEMENT AND SECURITY OPTIONS


Dear Ms. Gorman,

BCA Watson Rice LLP is pleased to submit this report on our review of Metro Law Enforcement and Security Options. This report was prepared with assistance from Robert Wasserman and Paul MacMillan. Robert Wasserman is the Chairman of Strategic Policy Partnership, LLC, and was the lead consultant for The Bratton Group during our recent audit of Metro's contract with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. Paul MacMillan was the Chief of Police of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Police Department until November 2014.

Our report provides analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of each of the four law enforcement and security options. Our report also provides considerations for review, discussion and resolution moving forward.

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance we received from Metro management and the management of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. We reviewed and discussed the draft report with Metro staff and made changes based on their input and suggestions. They are in agreement with the content and recommendations contained in this report.

Respectfully,



Michael J. de Castro
Managing Partner

Robert Wasserman

Robert Wasserman, Chairman
Strategic Policy Partnership, LLC



Paul MacMillan, Chief of Police (Retired)
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	1
2. Background	5
3. Objectives, Scope and Methodology	7
4. Analysis of Law Enforcement and Security Service Options.....	8
Option 1: Single Law Enforcement Agency at Reduced Staffing Level, Supplemented by Metro Security Officers	8
Option 2: Multiple Law Enforcement Agencies at Reduced Staffing Level, Supplemented by Metro Security Officers	11
Option 3: Establish Metro Police Supplemented by Metro Security Officers	14
Option 4: Maintain Current Law Enforcement Staffing Deployed Differently, Increase Number of Metro Security Officers.....	17
5. Considerations Moving Forward – Next Steps	19
Staffing and Deployment Based on Risks and Risk Mitigation Strategies	19
Role of Metro Security.....	19
Role of Local Law Enforcement Agencies	20
Management and Oversight of Law Enforcement Services	21
Appendix: Review Team Members’ Background Information	A-1



1. Executive Summary

Background

Metro's current contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) includes personnel at a total annual cost of \$88.7 million. Current sworn staffing is budgeted at 468 positions, with 425 actual filled sworn positions. Civilian or professional staffing is currently budgeted at 176, with 138 actual filled staff positions. (The civilian positions include 106 budgeted security assistant (fare enforcement) positions, with 89 actual filled security assistant positions.)

Metro also directly employs transit security officers to provide security over Metro facilities. Metro is in the process of developing and issuing a request for proposals (RFP), selecting and awarding a contract for the law enforcement and security services currently provided by the LASD. In January 2015, Metro staff presented information on three potential options on the structure for the future law enforcement and security services during a briefing of the Board staff. During this meeting the Board staff identified a fourth potential option.

Objective and Scope

The objective and scope of work for this project was to examine four options for providing law enforcement and security services to the Metro system. Three of the options were presented to the Board staff and the Ad Hoc Transit Policing Committee in January 2015, and Board staff added the fourth option.

As Metro continues to expand its services and the perception of safety and good order continue to be a concern to the Board, the customers and the employees, important decisions need to be made relative to the best way to provide for law enforcement and security.

Analysis of Security Service Options

The options were presented with preliminary cost estimates made by Metro staff that allowed some comparison based on the financial implications of the various options. However, those cost estimates need to be more fully vetted to ensure they contain accurate cost information including ancillary or hidden costs that may accrue over the length of the contract. In addition, the analysis was based on the average in-service staffing by LASD rather than the total number of LASD staff so an appropriate cost comparison was problematic. Cost should always be a consideration when deciding the ultimate security and policing strategy, however, it should not be the deciding factor.

Transit agencies throughout the country use various policing strategies to provide for the safety and security of their employees and customers. Some have their own dedicated police forces and others use their city police department to police the system when no jurisdictional issues are of concern. Others use a hybrid system of local police and security officers while some contract out the entire security policing function to private security officers. There is no one model that can be used as a comparison for the LA Metro system. Each system has developed their policing strategy over time based on historical precedence and the political environment at any given time.



Regardless, most, if not all, rely on cooperation of local law enforcement agencies to respond to incidents that require immediate police action.

The discussions that follow are based on the consultants' collective experience and understanding of current LASD staffing levels. Based on industry best practices the reduction in law enforcement staffing levels in the three options presented by Metro staff would not be appropriate given the size of the Metro transit system, both in ridership and geographical area covered.

The following summarizes our perspectives of the four options presented to and discussed by Board staff.

- **Option 1** proposes using a single law enforcement agency to police the system, reducing the number of sworn officers and deploying additional LA Metro security to provide a visible presence on the system. While we do not recommend reductions in sworn officer staffing levels based on the need to provide law enforcement coverage and response, the assignment of security officers that fall under the direction of Metro staff could provide a visible presence that would allow for the perception of enhanced security.
- **Option 2** proposes using multiple law enforcement agencies to police the system, with sworn staffing below what is currently provided. The management and oversight of this option would be difficult to maintain. It would divide the entire system in a number of contracts that must be managed separately. This would not be practicable nor would it provide a consistent level of security throughout the system. That being said, the contracting out of some of the service areas (e.g., Los Angeles, Long Beach, Pasadena) should not be totally discounted. Metro should also maximize the use of basic services that should be provided at no cost by local law enforcement agencies.
- **Option 3** proposes the creation of a distinct police force dedicated to Metro. This option would require large startup costs over an extended period of time. It would also limit the involvement of the specialized assets and training that a larger law enforcement agency has to offer. Ongoing recruitment, training and equipment costs make this option impractical. It should be pointed out that this option was originally used to police the Metro system and was abandoned several years ago.
- **Option 4** maintains current sworn officer staffing levels and augments them with Metro security. In order to implement a full community and operational policing strategy for the Metro system, the current level of sworn officers could be revised based on risk, staffing, and deployment analysis. Further research and data analysis would be necessary to determine the optimum number and mix of personnel. This option is the most reasonable from a system safety perspective of the four options.

With an appropriate deployment and community policing strategy and operational strategies for buses and rail in place, the current model of a single law enforcement agency being supplemented by Metro security staff seems to be the most viable option



to provide security for LA Metro. Financial considerations notwithstanding, it would appear to be the most effective strategy as the system continues to expand.

Metro staff needs to ensure that they have input into the deployment strategy of LASD personnel and deployment of Metro security personnel. This input, combined with continual oversight and effective management and coordination are crucial to the success of the next contract.

Considerations Moving Forward

The following are key realities and issues that should be considered, discussed, and resolved to the extent possible to most effectively move forward.

- **Current Staffing and Deployment** of services provided by LASD have evolved over time and are not based on an in-depth analysis of workload (crime, calls for service, coverage, etc.) or the risks and risk mitigation strategies needed to address those risks. Moving forward, conducting an in-depth analysis of workload, a risk assessment, identifying risk mitigation strategies, and identifying the staffing and deployment needs and approach to implement these strategies should be accomplished to provide a foundation for evaluating future options, and to arrive at the optimum number and mix of law enforcement and security personnel.
- **The Role of Security Officers** is to provide a visible deterrence, as well as to observe and report any unlawful activity to law enforcement. Metro security officers are not sworn or certified law-enforcement officers and do not have authority to detain or arrest. They cannot be responsible for responding to law enforcement incidents. While Metro security officers may play an effective role in expanded fare enforcement efforts, replacing large numbers of sworn law enforcement personnel with security personnel would likely result in a severe reduction in the level of public safety and security within the system and slower response times to incidents throughout the system.
- **Local Law Enforcement Agencies** have a responsibility to provide basic services to Metro buses and trains within their jurisdictions consistent with the service provided to all others within their jurisdictions. Metro should not have to contract with these agencies for these basic services, but may choose to contract for dedicated or supplemental resources from local agencies. It is important that Metro and local jurisdictions understand that the current staffing provided by LASD can in no way provide complete police coverage of the transit system spread over many square miles, particularly with regard to buses. Local law enforcement should provide first response unless a Metro contracted law enforcement unit is nearby.
- **Management and Oversight** of law enforcement services is key to the safety and security of the Metro system regardless of the structure. Establishing short and long-term priorities for law enforcement services is a critical role for Metro management. The current contract provides opportunities for Metro to accomplish this, including development of the bus and rail policing strategies with



the contracted law enforcement agency, which should provide specific guidance on how the contracted law enforcement agency will use its resources to impact priority problems on the transit system. Directing actual law enforcement personnel and resources will not be effective until priorities are clearly identified and communicated.

Recommended Next Steps

The following are the next steps we recommend be taken by Metro management to most effectively move forward:

- Conduct an in-depth analysis of workload, a risk assessment, risk mitigation strategies, and the staffing and deployment needs and approach to implement these strategies to provide a foundation for evaluating future options, and to arrive at the optimum number and mix of law enforcement and security personnel.
- Work with local law enforcement agencies to identify the level of basic services these agencies can provide to Metro buses and trains within their jurisdictions consistent with the service provided to all others within their jurisdictions. Develop agreements with these agencies to both improve service to Metro and reduce the need for contracted law enforcement services.
- Regarding the timing for selecting future law enforcement contract services, either:
 - Extend the current law enforcement services contract until such time as the in-depth analysis of workload, risk assessment, risk mitigation strategies, and the staffing and deployment needs and approach to implement these strategies is completed, or
 - Issue the Request for Proposals (RFP) for law enforcement services assuming continuation of the current service levels, with the caveat that the level of services would be adjusted upon completion of the risk assessment and staffing and deployment analysis.
- Clearly define the appropriate role for Metro security personnel based on their level of authority, and ensure training, weaponry, and equipment is consistent with that role.
- Establish short and long-term priorities for law enforcement services and develop an effective means of providing oversight to ensure contract services are provided consistent with these priorities.
- If budget constraints dictate that the budget for law enforcement services be reduced, request the LASD to provide options and impact for varying levels (10%, 20% 30%) of budget reductions.
- Continue to move forward on implementation of the recommendations made in the LASD Contract Audit and the APTA Peer Review issued in 2014.



2. Background

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) contracted with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) to provide Metro with transit law enforcement services on July 1, 2009. The initial contract was for 3 years, and provided for a renewal for two additional years. The contract has been extended to cover the current fiscal year, at a total annual cost of \$88.7 million. Under this extension, current sworn staffing is budgeted at 468 positions, with 425 actual filled sworn positions. Civilian or professional staffing is currently budgeted at 176, with 138 actual filled staff positions. (The civilian positions include 106 budgeted security assistant (fare enforcement) positions, with 89 actual filled security assistant positions.)¹

Metro also directly employs transit security officers. Metro Security's primary role is to provide security for Metro facilities. This includes the Gateway Building, parking lots, bus division facilities, and similar operations. It also includes providing security over Metro revenue collection and cash counting operations. In these roles, Metro Security has the role of providing a visible deterrence, as well as to observe and report any unlawful activity to law enforcement.

Metro is in the process of developing and issuing a request for proposals (RFP), selecting and awarding a contract for the law enforcement services currently provided by the LASD. In January 2015, Metro staff presented the Board staff with information on three potential options on the structure for the future law enforcement contract. During this meeting the Board staff identified a fourth potential option. These options are:

- Option 1. Use a single law enforcement agency to allocate police officers/deputies as guided and defined by Metro. Reduce the number of sworn officers, and direct deployment of Metro employed Transit Security Officers (TSOs) to conduct fare checks and increase safety presence.
- Option 2. Use multiple law enforcement agencies as guided and defined by Metro. Reduce the number of sworn officers, and direct deployment of Metro employed TSOs to conduct fare checks and increase safety presence.

¹ LASD Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staffing and Minutes of Service Provided - The contracting and billing approach used by the LASD is based on providing and billing for line level units of service. Examples include a 40-hour one-deputy unit, a 56-hour two-deputy unit. The amount of line level service units contracted for is developed into a staffing plan, which includes the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) LASD personnel needed to both provide the line level units, and to provide the management, supervision, and support for these units. The FTE staffing in the current LASD contract extension includes a total of 468 budgeted FTE sworn positions, and a total of 176 budgeted professional or civilian FTE positions. The contract requires the LASD to provide the contracted service units (tracked and billed in minutes) rather than the FTE employees. In this way, the service is intended to be consistent, regardless of vacancies within the FTE staffing due to turnover, extended sick time, or workers compensation absences. It is also important to note that law enforcement services are provided 24 hours each day, 7 days a week, and 365 days each year. As a result, the actual number of sworn staff on duty at any given time will range from about 140 to 180 sworn personnel.



- Option 3. Use only Metro police and TSOs. Allocation of security staff established by Metro.
- Option 4. Maintain the same level of sworn officers, but deploy them differently to enhance security; and increase the number of Metro TSOs. (Note: this option was not presented by Metro staff, but was developed through Board staff discussion.)



3. Objectives, Scope and Methodology

The objective of this review was to evaluate the four options discussed during the January 2015 Board staff briefing regarding the Metro Law Enforcement Services Contract as outlined in the Statement of Work provided by Metro Office of the Inspector General. The Statement of Work for this review specifically required the following tasks be completed:

- A. Review relevant portions concerning deployment and staffing only of:
 1. Audit report on the LASD contract
 2. Transit Community Policing Plan prepared by LASD
 3. APTA peer review report on transit security
 4. Power point on Metro Security Contract
- B. Interview (via telephone/webcam):
 1. LASD management, and
 2. Metro management and other appropriate staff, and
 3. Other persons who might have information or input helpful to the analysis.
- C. Analyze the four options concerning deployment and staffing discussed above and as set forth in Metro Staff's presentation, and any other options that the consultant might recommend for the future Metro Security Contract considering the following:
 - Consistent with industry and/or APTA best practices,
 - Consultant's experience and expertise with transit community policing,
 - Maximizing security and safety while achieving efficiency and cost effectiveness,
 - Providing effective and efficient bus security and safety, and
 - Recommendations and findings made in the audit report on the LASD contract and the APTA peer review report.
- D. Provide a written analysis of the pros and cons of each security contract Option analyzed in terms of deployment, staffing (i.e., ratio of law enforcement to Metro transit security), and use of one or multiple law enforcement entities, and recommend which option would provide the best path forward considering the areas described in Section C above.



4. Analysis of Law Enforcement and Security Service Options

Below we provide our analysis of the four options presented and discussed at the January Board staff meeting. This discussion includes an overview of each, as well as analysis of each using the following five criteria:

- Law Enforcement Response and Service Effectiveness
- Control and Oversight over Service Delivery
- Fare Enforcement Effectiveness
- Legal Liability Potential

Option 1: Single Law Enforcement Agency at Reduced Staffing Level, Supplemented by Metro Security Officers

This option increased the level of non-law enforcement security coverage, especially to the bus system. This was accomplished by reducing the number of sworn personnel currently being provided by the LASD. Metro Security staffing would be increased. These Metro Security personnel would be deployed throughout the bus and rail system in teams with supervision by Transit Security Sergeants.

Exhibit 1		
Option 1: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
Law Enforcement Response and Service Effectiveness	Deployment of sworn personnel by Division could improve system coverage.	Reduction in the level of law enforcement personnel staffing and deployment would have a substantial negative impact on the ability to respond to and address incidents or crimes throughout the system. It is unlikely the contract law enforcement agency would accept responsibility for providing the current level of law enforcement services to the Metro system with the reduced staffing levels.
Control and Oversight over Service Delivery	Metro would exercise increased control and oversight over the fare enforcement efforts and outcomes through direct authority over added Metro Security personnel.	The security and law enforcement personnel deployed throughout the system would be divided or split between two organizations, each with their own independent organization structure and chain of command.



Exhibit 1		
Option 1: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
		Command, control, and coordination of personnel in the field would be more complicated and difficult.
Fare Enforcement Service Effectiveness	The role of the Metro Security Officers would be limited to providing a sense of security within the system through their presence, observing and reporting to law enforcement any incidents or issues requiring law enforcement, and performing fare enforcement activities. Given this, the level of fare enforcement and effectiveness would likely be substantially increased.	To be effective, Security Officers would need to be empowered with some sort of fare enforcement authority, which will require some type of lengthy administrative action to occur (e.g. legislation, board approval, union negotiations, etc.). These actions will be time consuming and may have political implications. Security personnel would not be permitted to issue penal code based citations to minors unless the law is changed, resulting in fewer citations for minors. Currently only law enforcement personnel can issue penal code based citations to minors.
Legal Liability Potential	None	Metro Security Officers might appear to the public to be able to respond to crimes in progress and other law enforcement incidents, without having the authority to provide that response. Metro Security Officers, to be helpful, could potentially respond to such incidents, resulting in liability exposure for themselves and Metro.

Option 1, as presented, is not recommended. While there is potential to deploy law enforcement personnel differently and more efficiently, reduction in sworn-personnel provided by the LASD is not realistic without a severe reduction in the level of safety and security within the system. In addition, response times to incidents throughout the



system that require a law enforcement action would likely prove to be unacceptable to the Metro Board and management.

While there may be some advantages to Metro using its own security force to handle fare enforcement and other minor infractions, (e.g. homeless, loitering, smoking, etc.); they need legal authority to conduct these types of interactions. There would also be related training and other ancillary costs that may be difficult to accurately capture for the basis of this report. Despite these costs under this option, it does allow for the deployment of Metro employees at Metro's discretion and under their direct control. More importantly, it provides additional security throughout the system.

Law enforcement personnel duties concerning fare enforcement responsibility could become secondary as a guiding metric. Fare enforcement by the law enforcement agency would then be used more as crime prevention and management strategy, rather than a revenue generating strategy.



Option 2: Multiple Law Enforcement Agencies at Reduced Staffing Level, Supplemented by Metro Security Officers

This option splits the law enforcement contract among multiple agencies, and increases the level of non-law enforcement security coverage, especially to the bus system. This was accomplished by reducing the number of personnel currently provided by the LASD, adding other law enforcement agency personnel, and additional transit security personnel.

Exhibit 2		
Option 2: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
Law Enforcement Response and Service Effectiveness	For those locations where local law enforcement agencies would be providing service, response times might be improved due to a concentration of law enforcement personnel dedicated to Metro in those areas.	<p>Reduction in the level of law enforcement personnel staffing and deployment would have a substantial negative impact on the ability to respond to and address incidents or crimes throughout the system in those areas where no local law enforcement agency is under contract to Metro because contract law enforcement personnel would be spread too thinly over a large geographic area.</p> <p>Law enforcement would play a limited role in the overall effectiveness of a community policing strategy.</p> <p>Coordination among multiple organizations and clarity over responsibility for response to individual incidents could potentially negatively impact response and service.</p> <p>It is unlikely the contract law enforcement agencies would accept responsibility for providing dedicated law enforcement services to the Metro system with the staffing levels outlined.</p>



Exhibit 2		
Option 2: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
Control and Oversight over Service Delivery	Metro would exercise increased control and oversight over the fare enforcement efforts and outcomes through direct authority over added Metro Security personnel.	The security and law enforcement personnel deployed throughout the system would be divided or split among multiple organizations depending on the number of local law enforcement agencies contracted with, each with their independent organization structure and chain of command. Command, control and coordination of personnel in the field would be much more complicated and difficult.
Fare Enforcement Service Effectiveness	The role of the Metro Security Officers would be limited to providing a sense of security within the system through their presence, observing and reporting to law enforcement any incidents or issues requiring law enforcement, and performing fare enforcement activities. Given this, the level of fare enforcement and effectiveness would likely be substantially increased.	To be effective, Security Officers would need to be empowered with some sort of fare enforcement authority, which will require some type of lengthy administrative action to occur (e.g. legislation, board approval, union negotiations, etc.). These actions will be time consuming and may have political implications. Security personnel would not be permitted to issue penal code based citations to minors unless the law is changed, resulting in fewer citations for minors. Currently only law enforcement personnel can issue penal code based citations to minors.
Legal Liability Potential	None	Placing Security Officers in a position where they appear to the public to be able to provide the appropriate response to crimes in progress and other incidents, without them having the authority to provide that



Exhibit 2		
Option 2: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
		response, puts them in a very difficult position. Metro Security would potentially respond in a manner outside their authority resulting in substantial liability exposure for themselves and Metro.

Option 2, as presented, is not recommended. There is potential to deploy law enforcement personnel differently and more efficiently. There is also potential to supplement the current contract law enforcement services with local police. However, the proposed reduction in the law enforcement services currently provided by the LASD is not realistic without a severe reduction in the level of safety within the system and unacceptable response times to incidents throughout the system.

Under this option, each law enforcement agency would be responsible for coverage in their jurisdiction and the command and control by Metro would be extremely difficult to maintain. The oversight of each individual contract will ultimately prove problematic and unmanageable. Splitting the contract between law enforcement agencies creates an environment where no one has complete ownership of the overall policing strategy. Security effectiveness becomes disjointed and accountability is difficult to maintain.

If the Metro Security force is expanded and law enforcement personnel are reduced the contract law enforcement agency could only react to some of the calls for service. It would be much more limited in undertaking proactive, problem-solving operational services and establishing a strong community policing presence. This is contrary to the current best practice in policing strategies that advocate for a more visible presence and interaction with the community.



Option 3: Establish Metro Police Supplemented by Metro Security Officers

Under this option the Metro Police agency would be reconstituted at reduced sworn staffing levels. Law enforcement personnel would be hired as direct employees of Metro. Metro Police would be supplemented by an increase in the number of Metro Security personnel.

Exhibit 3		
Option 3: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
Law Enforcement Response and Service Effectiveness	None	<p>Significant reduction in the level of law enforcement personnel staffing and deployment would have a substantial negative impact on the ability to respond to and address incidents or crimes throughout the system.</p> <p>Direct access to specialized units such as tactical teams, explosive detection assets, etc. would be reduced if not eliminated.</p>
Control and Oversight over Service Delivery	<p>Metro would exercise increased control and oversight over the fare enforcement efforts and outcomes through direct authority over added Metro Security personnel.</p> <p>The security and law enforcement personnel deployed throughout the system would be combined into one organization. Command and control and coordination of personnel in the field would potentially be more direct.</p>	<p>Metro would lose the ability it currently has to remove law enforcement personnel at will by directing the contract law enforcement agency to reassign individuals. Disciplining and discharging Metro Police personnel could potentially be difficult.</p>
Fare Enforcement Service Effectiveness	<p>The role of the Metro Security Officers would be limited to providing a sense of security within the system through their presence, observing and reporting to law enforcement any</p>	<p>To be effective, Security Officers would need to be empowered with some sort of fare enforcement authority, which will require some type of lengthy administrative action to occur</p>



Exhibit 3		
Option 3: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
	incidents or issues requiring law enforcement, and performing fare enforcement activities. Given this, the level of fare enforcement and effectiveness would likely be substantially increased.	(e.g. legislation, board approval, union negotiations, etc.). These actions will be time consuming and may have political implications. Security personnel would not be permitted to issue penal code based citations to minors unless the law is changed, resulting in fewer citations for minors. Currently only law enforcement personnel can issue penal code based citations to minors.
Legal Liability Potential	None	Metro Police under this option would have the authority to address law enforcement issues. However, this option relies heavily on the presence of Metro security officers. Placing security officers in a position where they appear to the public to be able to provide the appropriate response to crimes in progress and other incidents, without them having the authority to provide that response, puts them in a very difficult position. Metro Security would potentially respond in a manner outside their authority resulting in substantial liability exposure for themselves and Metro.

Option 3, as presented, is not recommended. The level of Metro Police staffing presented would be lower than the level currently provided by LASD under contract. This reduction in law enforcement services provided is not realistic without a severe reduction in the level of safety and security within the system and unacceptable response times to incidents throughout the system. In addition, the total number of officers is not conducive to a viable community policing strategy for a transit system that continues to expand.



Rebuilding the Metro Police would be a major and lengthy undertaking. There would be a significant transition period while this option is implemented. The costs of this transition have not been factored into this option by Metro staff.

While a Metro Police force would allow for continuous command and oversight, the long-term disadvantages such as personnel issues, liability, union and supervisory concerns would create an increased burden on Metro.



Option 4: Maintain Current Law Enforcement Staffing Deployed Differently, Increase Number of Metro Security Officers

Option 4 was not presented to the Board staff. The Board Staff identified this option through discussion and it was presented to the Ad Hoc Transit Policing Committee. This option maintains the current level of law enforcement services, and increases the level of non-law enforcement security coverage system-wide.

The LASD currently conducts fare enforcement using security assistants. These personnel and costs could potentially be eliminated or reduced given the fare enforcement efforts of the increased Metro Security personnel.

Exhibit 4		
Option 4: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
Law Enforcement Response and Service Effectiveness	Service could be enhanced by more effectively deploying LASD personnel as a part of an operational transit policing strategy, as well as specific bus and rail policing plans.	None
Control and Oversight over Service Delivery	Metro would exercise increased control and oversight over the fare enforcement efforts and outcomes through direct authority over added Metro Security personnel.	The dedicated law enforcement agency or agencies may discount Metro input relative to deployment citing the ability of Metro to assign security to affected areas
Fare Enforcement Service Effectiveness	The role of the Metro Security Officers would be limited to providing a sense of security within the system through their presence, observing and reporting to law enforcement any incidents or issues requiring law enforcement, and performing fare enforcement activities. Given this, the level of fare enforcement and effectiveness would likely be substantially increased.	The dedicated law enforcement agency or agencies may limit responsibility for fare enforcement due to Metro security involvement.
Legal Liability Potential	None	Placing Security Officers in a position where they appear to the public to be able to provide



Exhibit 4		
Option 4: Advantages and Disadvantages		
Criteria	Advantages	Disadvantages
		the appropriate response to crimes in progress and other incidents, without them having the authority to provide that response, puts them in a very difficult position. Metro Security would potentially respond in a manner outside their authority resulting in substantial liability exposure for themselves and Metro.

This option allows for current staffing levels to be maintained and allows for better control and deployment of Metro Security personnel. Once a deployment and staffing analysis is performed, it may allow for reduction in certain staffing levels within the contract law enforcement agency or agencies when Metro security officers are empowered to perform fare enforcement. Determining an appropriate mix of sworn and non-sworn personnel to police the system should be performed. Creative ways to improve safety and fare compliance at minimum increased cost is a reasonable objective as the Metro system expands. Option 4 could provide a step toward that objective.



5. Considerations Moving Forward – Next Steps

Option 4, maintaining the current law enforcement resources deployed differently, is the most viable option of the four options presented and/or discussed. Determining how these resources should be deployed differently is key to moving forward with providing law enforcement and security services for the Metro System. The following are key issues that should be considered, discussed, resolved and clarified to the extent possible in order to most effectively move forward.

Staffing and Deployment Based on Risks and Risk Mitigation Strategies

Ideally, the current staffing and deployment of LASD law enforcement services should be based on a detailed analysis of the safety and security needs of the Metro system. This would include clear identification of the various risks that face the Metro system followed by a discussion and identification of a set of strategies for mitigating these risks, and clear staffing and deployment needs to implement these risk mitigation strategies.

The current staffing and deployment of the law enforcement services provided by LASD to the Metro System have evolved over time, and does not appear to be fully articulated based on risk and risk mitigation strategies. While deployments in an overarching community policing strategy can be based solely on risk, there are times that other considerations for deployment should be employed. This is especially true in the mass transit environment where high visibility patrols are an effective use of personnel to provide reassurance to the riding public in a reserved fashion, and where civilian personnel can perform the more close-up fare inspection work. Consideration should be given to total ridership by line or by station, crime within a certain distance outside of the station, the location of the station itself (e.g. near a tourist attraction, a hospital, large business, historical landmark, etc.) and political or customer input.

Some of this could have been accomplished through the development of an overall Transit Policing Plan, a Bus Operations Policing Plan, and a Rail Operations Policing Plan. The requirements for these plans in the current law enforcement contract provided the opportunity for Metro to clearly articulate its safety and security priorities and for the LASD to clearly outline strategies to meet these priorities.

Moving forward, conducting a risk assessment, identifying risk mitigation strategies, and then identifying the staffing and deployment needs and approach to implement these strategies should be accomplished to provide a foundation for evaluating future options.

Role of Metro Security

Each of the three options presented to the Board staff included substantial expansion of the use of Metro Security personnel to provide safety and security throughout the system. These three options also included reductions in sworn law enforcement staffing, whether provided by LASD, local law enforcement agencies, or a newly reconstituted Metro Police agency.



Metro Security has the role of providing a visible deterrence, as well as to observe and report an unlawful activity to law enforcement. Metro Security officers are not sworn or certified law-enforcement officers and do not have authority to detain or arrest. They therefore cannot be made responsible for responding to law enforcement incidents.

Metro Security Officers need to be provided training that clearly indicates the limits of their authority to avoid liability concerns. This will allow them to take positive actions when they confront problematic situations. Their role is not minimal; they provide an important adjunct to the law enforcement roles performed by a contracted law enforcement agency as well as local police in meeting Metro's security needs. It is important, however, that they not be expected to take actions that would place them in danger or face liability challenges.

While Metro Security may play an effective role in expanded fare enforcement efforts, security personnel cannot replace law enforcement in areas that require the authority to detain and arrest. A reduction in the level of sworn personnel may reduce safety and security within the system and result in slower response times to incidents throughout the system.

Role of Local Law Enforcement Agencies

The contract with LASD required development of a Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with police agencies throughout the Metro service area. The intent of the MOU's was to ensure that these agencies would be used to augment or supplement the law enforcement services provided under contract.

Local law enforcement agencies have a responsibility to provide basic services to Metro buses and trains within their jurisdictions consistent with the service provided to all others within their jurisdictions. Particularly with buses, which travel completely above ground and are a part of the urban neighborhood, local law enforcement can best be a first responder to incidents on those buses, just as they are to other situations in the neighborhood. Sharing responsibility with these local law enforcement agencies for responding to some types of incidents on buses and trains is appropriate.

The LASD has been developing MOU's with local police agencies. However, the primary purpose of the MOU's developed appears to be clarifying that the Metro buses and trains are the jurisdiction of the LASD rather than attempting to leverage these local resources to augment and improve law enforcement response to incidents on buses and trains.

It is important that Metro and local jurisdictions understand that the current staffing provided to LASD can in no way provide complete police coverage of the transit system spread over many square miles, particularly with regard to buses. Local law enforcement must provide first response unless an LASD unit is nearby. In those situations, the LASD Transit Services follow-up on the incident will help understand whether it is a part of a pattern requiring strategic responses to prevent future occurrences.



Metro is funding transit policing services so that coverage is provided beyond that which local law enforcement can provide. This is particularly true with regard to rail, which is often very separate from the neighborhood through which it runs. But local law enforcement has a core responsibility to respond to many incidents involving transit in their neighborhoods. This immediate and sometimes dual response should be articulated in any MOU's that are implemented with local law enforcement.

Management and Oversight of Law Enforcement Services

The presentation to the Board staff and Ad Hoc Transit Policing Committee stated that under the current model "LASD establishes priorities for resource allocation and deployment of personnel throughout the system." This expresses a need for increased control over law enforcement resources and services by Metro management. Efforts have been occurring to improve the coordination between LASD and Metro management in the past six months, moving toward a more collaborative approach.

In some areas Metro can exercise more control over contracted law enforcement services than if it directly employed law enforcement resources. For example, under the contract Metro can request specific LASD personnel be removed from the Transit Services Division and reassigned immediately. This can be requested without cause or discussion. Metro would have much more difficulty removing directly employed law enforcement personnel.

It may be helpful to distinguish between the functions and roles of establishing priorities, and directing law enforcement resources. Establishing short and long-term priorities for law enforcement services is a critical role for Metro management. The current contract provides opportunities for Metro to accomplish this, including development of the bus and rail policing strategies with the Metro law enforcement provider and expectations on specific performance indicators. These strategies should clearly outline the priorities for law enforcement services. They are far different from the Community Policing Strategy that has been developed, as they provide specific guidance on how the LASD will use its resources to impact priority problems on the transit system. At a minimum, any new contract should provide these requirements and enforcement of the terms should be a priority.

Directing actual law enforcement resources is, and should be, a role reserved to the command structure of the Metro contracted law enforcement agency, consistent with the priorities established by Metro management. In cities, it is the role of the Mayor or City Manager to establish priorities and provide direction regarding what they need. It is the role of the police chief to decide how to deploy law enforcement resources to accomplish those priorities. The Metro Board and management should be able to exercise the same control over priorities and direction.



Appendix:
Review Team Members' Background Information

Robert Wasserman (Strategic Policy Partnership, LLC), served as the Lead Consultant for The Bratton Group's role in the Metro LASD Contract Audit completed for the Metro Office of the Inspector General in 2014. Mr. Wasserman has been intimately involved in transit policing activities for some years, with work including the assessment and design of the transit policing strategy for Transport for London (UK), has served as Interim Director of Transport Policing and Enforcement for Transport for London, developed the performance management (CompStat) initiatives for that agency, and developed the strategic policing plan for the Transit Police in Boston, among many other engagements over the years. He recently served as the lead consultant to the Department of Homeland Security on Suspicious Activity Reporting on rail systems throughout the United States. He is presently serving as a senior advisor to Commissioner William Bratton of the New York Police Department.

Paul MacMillan, Chief of Police (Retired), Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, joined the MBTA Transit Police Department in November 1983. He worked in various positions within the department including Patrol, Investigative Services, Accreditation, and Field Training. He was promoted through the ranks and on November 6, 2008, the MBTA Board of Directors appointed then Deputy Chief MacMillan as the Chief of the Department. Chief MacMillan was the first MBTA Transit Police Officer to rise through the ranks to become Chief in the history of the agency. He received a B.S. in Criminal Justice from Northeastern University, a Graduate Certificate in Dispute Resolution from the University of Massachusetts, Boston and a M.A. Degree in Criminal Justice from Western New England College. He is also a graduate of the FBI National Academy and the Senior Management Institute for Police. He was Chair of the Transit Police and Security Peer Advisory Group and Chair of the Committee for Public Safety for the American Public Transportation Association and has participated in numerous peer reviews of transit police and security departments. In addition, he was an assessor and Team leader for the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA).

Scott Bryant, BCA Watson Rice Management Consulting Partner, served as the project manager for the Metro LASD Contract Audit completed for the Metro Office of the Inspector General in 2014. He has worked extensively with law enforcement and public safety organizations and agencies. Scott recently led a review of the staffing and services of the Port Police for the Port of Los Angeles. He also conducted a review of staffing of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department for the County Auditor/Controller. Scott served as Special Assistant to the Chief of Police in Oakland California. For the Orange County Sheriff, Scott was responsible for developing a strategic management approach including a focus on specific outcome oriented goals and developing specific outcome indicators to monitor progress toward these goals. In Long Beach, Scott was responsible for evaluating a proposal by the Los Angeles County Sheriff to provide police services citywide. He also evaluated contracted law enforcement services for the cities of Compton and Elk Grove.



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

Raymond B. Whitmer
Secretary-Treasurer

June 5, 2015

Phillip A. Washington, CEO
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Washington:

Teamsters Local 911 would like to extend a very warm welcome to you in your new role heading the Los Angeles County MTA. Teamster is aware that you bring to this very important office a wealth of knowledge, experience, and dedication. We are committed to working with you and your team in the delivery of the best public services to the residents of Los Angeles County.

As you may be aware, Teamsters have been supportive of seeking legislation that will grant limited status while on duty under the California Penal Code to the personnel of the Department of Security and Law Enforcement of the Metro Transit Authority.

Thank you in advance for your support and I look forward to hearing back from you. Should you have any questions, I can be contacted at (213) 926-6305.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Judith Bustamante".

Judith Bustamante
Business Representative



County of Los Angeles
Sheriff's Department Headquarters
4700 Ramona Boulevard
Monterey Park, California 91754-2169



JIM McDONNELL, SHERIFF

June 9, 2015

Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Washington:

With a transportation system that moves approximately 1.5 million persons a day, the need for a properly equipped policing and security force is paramount to system security and the public's perception of safety. Authority, in conjunction with the scope of work personnel perform, is a cornerstone in any force's effectiveness. I would like to express my support of Metro management and Teamsters Local 911's joint interest in pursuing legislation aimed at enhancing Metro Security authority. Such codified authority would ensure personnel have the requisite tools to perform tasks associated within their scope of work in maintaining the safety and security within the Metro system.

Legislation aimed at this tenet holds value and is a course of action I support Metro in pursuing.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Chief Ronene Anda, Transit Policing Division, at (213) 922-5219.

Sincerely,

JIM McDONNELL
SHERIFF

A Tradition of Service



American Federation of STATE, COUNTY and MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO

Headquarters: 514 SHATTO PLACE, 2RD FLOOR, SUITE 215 • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90020

PHONE: (213) 487-9887

Ext. 395

FAX: (213) 263-9884

AFSCME Local 3634
MTA Supervisors

June 11, 2015

To: Mr. Phillip A. Washington
CEO Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA)
1 Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012

Dear Mr. Washington,

The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Union, Local 3634 (AFSCME Local 3634) would like to take this opportunity to welcome you and your family to the LACMTA family. We are excited to have someone with your expertise and understanding of a complex transit agency leading us to the next level in our pursuit of excellence. We pledge our commitment to work with you in this endeavor.

I have been informed that you have been briefed on a problem that exist within our Transit Security regarding the lack of authority by security personnel to perform the task of providing public and worker safety on a daily basis. AFSCME 3634 has been working with LACMTA in exploring solutions to this issue. In so doing, and by this correspondence, AFSCME Local 3634 would like you to know that we support efforts by the Agency to seek legislation that will grant limited status to our security personnel while on duty.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Ernest Waters'.

Ernest Waters, President
AFSCME Local 3634
LACMTA Supervisors

**Board Report**

File #:2015-0701, **File Type:**Contract

Agenda Number:62.

**AD HOC TRANSIT POLICING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
JUNE 18, 2015****SUBJECT: LOS ANGELES METRO PROTECTIVE SERVICES****ACTION: APPROVE UP TO TWELVE (12) MONTHS CONTRACT TIME EXTENSION
WITH COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT****RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to execute Modification No. 12 to Contract No. PS2610LASD with the **County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) to provide law enforcement services** for up to twelve (12) months for the period covering July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 in the amount of \$102,851,600, thereby increasing the total contract value from \$466,719,113 to \$569,570,713.

ISSUE

The current Memorandum of Understanding with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) was approved by the Board for the period covering July 2009 through June 30, 2014, including two one-year options.

DISCUSSION

In May 2013, staff initiated the development of a preliminary Scope of Work for the new Transit Policing contract in anticipation of expiration of the current contract on June 30, 2014. On June 2013, the Board directed staff to conduct an audit on the current LASD contract and incorporate the recommendation(s) from this audit into the new transit policing scope of work. As a result, the procurement for a new transit policing contract was postponed until staff received the scheduled audit report in January 2014.

In March 2014, staff issued a "Request for Interest" to determine the number of interested parties for the new transit policing contract. The Request for Interest is used by staff in assessing the new policing scope and procurement schedule. As of March 31, 2014, Metro received four responses to the "Request for Interest".

On April 24, 2014, the Board authorized a six (6) month extension for the period covering July 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014 to allow staff to review and discuss the findings, and recommendations from the "Los Angeles Sheriff's Department Contract Audit" with the Board. The pertinent

recommendations were incorporated into the new draft Transit Policing Statement of Work. On November 6, 2014, the Board authorized an additional six (6) months contract extension for the period covering January 1, 2015 to June 30, 2015 for the following reasons:

1. Review draft Transit Policing Statement of Work with the Ad Hoc Transit Policing Oversight Committee of Board members (Per Motion By: Mayor Garcetti, Supervisor Molina, Supervisor Antonovich, and Director Fasana, Item A)
2. Release the Request For Proposal for Transit Policing Contract;
3. Proposals Review;
4. Board authorization to award the new Transit Policing Contract

During the last 12 months, LASD has performed a number of specialty services as outlined in Attachment E. Staff is returning to the Board to request up to twelve (12) months contract extension in order to complete the following items:

1. Review draft Transit Policing Statement of Work with the Ad Hoc Transit Policing Oversight Committee of Board members (Per Motion By: Mayor Garcetti, Supervisor Molina, Supervisor Antonovich, and Director Fasana, Item A); and
2. Release the Request For Proposal for Transit Policing Contract.
3. Provide Law Enforcement Services to Foothill and Expo Extensions and add additional administrative staff and Deputies to support the new Transit Policing Division and current rail lines.

In May 2013, staff initiated the development of a preliminary Scope of Work for the new Transit Policing contract. In June 2013, the Board directed staff to conduct an audit on the current LASD contract (audit performed by Bazilio Cobb Associates) and have staff incorporate the recommendation(s) from this audit into the new draft transit policing scope of work. On February 10, 2015, Bazilio Cobb Associates was retained by Metro to evaluate the proposed transit community policing models and provide Metro with recommendations to return to the Board for further discussion leading into the new Transit Community Policing contract. Staff would like to consider the recommendation(s) for inclusion in the current draft scope of work.

Staff is currently in the recruitment process for the Board authorized Executive Officer, System Security & Law Enforcement. Staff would like to provide the new Executive Officer an opportunity to review the current draft scope of work prior to submitting to the Ad Hoc Transit Policing Oversight Committee for review.

The implementation of Item #2, Release the Request For Proposal for Transit Policing Contract, will be contingent upon the final review of the Transit Policing Statement of Work. Staff has included a detailed procurement schedule for the new Transit Policing procurement identifying critical milestones pertinent to this time extension:

The implementation of Item #3, Provide Law Enforcement Services to Foothill and Expo Extensions and add additional administrative staff and Deputies to support the new Transit Policing Division and current rail lines, is outlined in this report. The contract costs for FY16 are based on a phased approach to reflect revenue operations for Foothill and Expo Extensions.

IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD FOR THE POSITIONS (PURPOSE / JUSTIFICATION)

Expansion: October 1, 2015

Total Expansion Cost: **\$1,756,458**

(1) Lieutenant - (Area) (Gold Line)

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$143,316 x 1 = \$143,316 (Nine month's cost: \$107,487)

Provides management and supervision of all LASD personnel assigned to provide contracted law enforcement services for the expansion of Metro's Gold Line. The area lieutenant is the main point of contact and acts as liaison between Metro employees and Transit Policing Division (TPD) in addressing community policing service issues and providing solutions, while ensuring the quality of services provided to Metro customers and employees.

(1) Lieutenant - (Area) (Green Line)

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$143,316 x 1 = \$143,316 (Nine month's cost: \$107,487)

Provides management and supervision of LASD personnel; sergeants, deputies, and security assistants assigned to provide contracted law enforcement services for Metro's Green Line. Develop and implement fare enforcement and quality-of-life operations in order to increase fare and reduce crime and Metro violations. The area lieutenant acts as liaison between other police agencies, Metro customers, and employees in addressing community policing service issues and providing solutions, while ensuring the quality of services provided to Metro customers and employees.

(2) Sergeants - (Field) (Gold and Expo Lines)

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$119,496 x 2 = \$238,992 (Nine month's cost: \$179,244)

Provides direct supervision to LASD line personnel assigned to the expansion of the Gold and Expo Lines. The field sergeants are required to provide direct supervision to line deputies at a ratio of seven deputies to one sergeant (7:1), thereby ensuring effective supervision in the field.

(20) Sheriff's Deputy - (Generalist) (Gold and Expo Lines)

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$90,816 x 20 = \$1,816,320 (Nine month's cost: \$1,362,240)

Provides law enforcement services and are the frontline personnel that have direct contact and interaction with Metro's customers and employees in providing a safe environment on or near the Gold and Expo Lines transit system.

Expansion: January 1, 2016

Total Expansion Cost: **\$2,699,567**

(1) Captain (Central Operations Bureau (COB))

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$183,652 (Six month's cost: \$91,826)

Provides overall management and supervision for the newly created Central Operations Bureau

(COB) as the unit commander. COB provides critical consolidated support resources that include the Threat Interdiction Unit, Explosive Detection Canine Team, Crime Impact Teams, Crisis Response Unit (Mental Health), Detective (investigations), Training and Scheduling, Special Projects, and Logistics. This position will coincide with the anticipated expansion of Metro and the corresponding need for police services in the mass-transit environment.

(2) Lieutenants - (Operations and Detective)

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$143,316 x 2 = \$236,632 (Six month's cost: \$143,316)

One lieutenant will be the operations lieutenant for COB that will provide administrative and field operational support to the unit commander. This position will ensure timely processing of all policing-related reports including, but not limited to; dissemination of safety-related alerts or notifications and policies and procedures to line personnel. The second lieutenant will be assigned to the Detective Unit for investigations. With the expansion of Metro comes the anticipated increase of conducting timely investigations of cases in order to ensure efficient resolution of cases.

(2) Sergeants - (Operations and Traffic)

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$119,496 x 2 = \$238,992 (Six month's cost: \$119,496)

One sergeant will be the operations sergeant for COB that will assist the unit commander and lieutenant in the day-to-day administrative and field operational management of the unit. This position will ensure timely monitoring and processing of all policing and administrative-related reports, thereby ensuring the flow of information to TPD personnel and Metro employees on as-needed basis. The second sergeant will be the supervisor for the traffic unit. This position will provide immediate response to traffic collisions involving Metro buses and expedite the investigation process in order to minimize delays in Metro's mass-transit system.

(6) Sergeants - (Field)

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$119,496 x 6 = \$716,976 (Six month's cost: \$358,488)

The field sergeants will provide direct line supervision to LASD line personnel assigned in the expansion of the Metro rail line. The field sergeants are required to provide direct supervision to line deputies at a ratio of seven deputies to one sergeant (7:1), thereby ensuring effective supervision in the field.

(42) Sheriff's Deputies - (Generalist)

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$90,816 x 42 = \$3,814,272 (Six month's cost: \$1,907,136)

Provides law enforcement services as required in the Metro contract, ensuring the safety of Metro customers and employees for the expansion of the Metro rail system. These deputies are the frontline personnel that have direct contact and interaction with Metro customers and employees.

(1) Secretary V

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$55,319 (Six month's cost: \$27,660)

The Secretary V will provide personal secretarial assistance to the unit commander of COB. This position will be responsible, and not limited to; screening in-person inquiries and telephone calls,

providing requested information and personally taking care of inquiries and calls, which do not require the attention of the unit commander. Thereby, ensuring the time of the unit commander is utilized effectively in more important and mission critical tasks at hand.

(1) Operations Assistant I

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$50,371 (Six month's cost: \$25,186)

This position will assist the operations staff at COB by providing routine administrative staff support functions, such as; assisting in budget monitoring, procurement request, supplies inventory, preparing inter-office and departmental correspondence, memoranda, reports, unit procedural manuals, and other documents utilizing specialized office software applications, including those specifically for LASD's use only. This position will work closely with the operations sergeant to ensure that all required reports and documents are completed in a timely manner by the units under COB.

(1) Law Enforcement Technician

Adjusted Annual Salary @ \$52,918 (Six month's cost: \$26,459)

This position assists sworn personnel by independently performing technical law enforcement-related service and support functions in LASD. Law enforcement service and support functions encompass duties supporting the maintenance and operation of a division or unit, which include, but are not limited to; unit vehicle maintenance and service, unit supplies maintenance, transport, load, and unload large, bulky, and/or heavy personal or evidentiary property to a warehouse or other location as directed.

TOTAL POSITIONS EXPANSION COST: \$4,456,025

**METRO PROTECTIVE SERVICES
TENTATIVE ACQUISITION SCHEDULE
AWARD WITH DISCUSSIONS
TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE, LOWEST PRICE METHODOLOGY**

Milestone	Completion Date
Receive concurrence from Ad Hoc Committee and Metro Safety & Security Executive Officer	January 28, 2016
Transmittal of SOW, Evaluation Criteria, Submittal Requirements, Estimate, Goal Evaluation, Requisition ____ [fill-in] ____	February 11, 2016
Individual Acquisition Plan and Source Selection Plan Approved	February 18, 2016
Advertisement and Solicitation Issued	February 26, 2016
Proposals Received	March 28, 2016
Proposal Evaluation (DEOD, Pre-Qualification, Pre-Award Audit, etc.)	April 18, 2016
Recommendation for Award	May 26, 2016

Board Approval	June 23, 2016
Contract Start Date	July 1, 2016

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

The authorization of FY16 contract extension will provide positive impact on safety for our employees and patrons by mitigating potential terrorist incidents and deterring crimes on our transit system.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The contract proposal for FY16 is \$102,851,600, which is 15%, or \$13,964,624 more than the \$88,886,976 contract value authorization in FY15.

A portion of the funding of the \$102,851,600 for exercising Modification No. 12 is currently included in the FY16 Proposed Budget. It will be the responsibility of the Project Manager to amend the budget upon approval of this contract authorization in Cost Center 2610, System Security and Law Enforcement under multiple bus and rail projects in Account 50320-Contract Services, as well as Foothill/Expo 2 Extensions under project 860200 and 860301 respectively:

LASD Transit Community Policing Contract

Multiple Bus and Rail Projects:	\$94,509,337.49
Project: 860200 (Foothill): 30 Deputies/Command Staff	\$3,602,340.63
Project: 860301 (Expo): 42 Deputies/Command Staff	\$4,739,921.88
Total:	\$ 102,851,600

Impact on Bus and Rail Operating and Capital Budget

The FY16 funding for contract Transit Policing Services will come from Enterprise Fund revenues (fares, sales tax revenues, and TDA4). No other sources of funds were considered for these expenses because this is the appropriate fund source for activities that benefit bus and rail operations.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

An option considered would be to provide transit policing services through an alternative means to the LASD contract. This alternative is not recommended because this is a critical security program and we do not currently have in place alternative policy or strategy, nor do we have in place the security assets, to provide the current level of protection for our customers and employees if the Contract Modification 12 is not approved.

NEXT STEPS

Metro staff will begin the Request for Proposal (RFP) process for a new transit policing contract. Staff will seek Board staff assistance throughout this RFP process. Staff will report back to the Board


on a monthly basis with the status of the procurement processes. We anticipate to complete the hiring of the new Executive Officer by July 30, 2015.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A - Procurement Summary
- Attachment B - Contract Modification/Change Log
- Attachment C - Breakdown of LASD Personnel
- Attachment D - Service Units by Position and Other Costs
- Attachment E - Highlights and Accomplishments

Prepared by: Duane Martin, DEO Project Management (213) 922-7460

Reviewed by: Ivan Page, Interim Executive Director, Vendor/Contract Management
(213) 922-6383
Stephanie Wiggins, Interim Deputy Chief Executive Officer
(213) 922-1023



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

TRANSIT COMMUNITY POLICING SERVICES/PS2610LASD

1.	Contract Number: PS2610LASD		
2.	Contractor: County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department		
3.	Mod. Work Description: Continuation of Transit Law Enforcement Services		
4.	Contract Work Description: Metro System-Wide Law Enforcement Services		
5.	The following data is current as of: 5/22/15		
6.	Contract Completion Status		Financial Status
	Contract Awarded:	07/01/09	Contract Award Amount: \$65,921,937
	Notice to Proceed (NTP):	n/a	Total of Modifications Approved: \$400,797,176
	Original Complete Date:	06/30/12	Pending Modifications (including this action): \$102,851,600
	Current Est. Complete Date:	06/30/15	Current Contract Value (with this action): \$569,570,713
7.	Contract Administrator: James Nolan		Telephone Number: (213) 922-7312
8.	Project Manager: Duane Martin		Telephone Number: (213) 922-7460

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve modification no. 12 issued in support of continued Metro system-wide law enforcement services, as set forth in Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) PS2610LASD currently in effect between Metro and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

This Modification will be processed in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type is fixed unit rate.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) is for a five year term covering the period between July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2014 (inclusive of two one-year options). This MOU was approved by the Board of Directors in May of 2009 in the amount of \$65,921,937. Several contract actions/modifications have been executed and approved by the Board over the life of the MOU.

(Refer to Attachment B – Contract Modification Log)

B. Cost/Price Analysis

The recommended price has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon LASD's proposed rates established on an annual basis by the County of Los Angeles Auditor-Controller as required by Government Code Section 53069.8(b). The proposed rates were reviewed and found to be consistent with the pricing established by the Auditor-Controller.

CONTRACT MODIFICATION/CHANGE LOG

TRANSIT COMMUNITY POLICING SERVICES/PS2610LASD

MOU no.	Original Memorandum of Understanding	Date	Amount
PS2610LASD	Transit Policing/Law Enforcement Services	July 1, 2009	\$65,921,937
Mod. no.	Description	Date	Amount
1	In December of 2009, the Metro Board approved Modification #1 to add \$2,895,460 to the MOU for additional law enforcement personnel on the Metro Gold Line Eastside extension.	12/10/09	\$2,895,460
1A	Threat Interdiction Unit (TIU) is grant funded and was approved by Board.		\$943,216
2	In July of 2010, the Board approved Modification #2 for second year funding in the amount of \$62,937,004, which was a 9.2% reduction over the previous year.	7/22/10	\$62,937,004
3	Modification #3 was executed under CEO authority covering a one-month extension for the period between July 1, 2011 and July 31, 2011 in the amount of \$5,470,211.	6/22/11	\$5,470,211
4	Modification #4 was executed by Board approval covering a two-month extension for the period between August 1, 2011 and September 30, 2011 in the amount of \$11,167,883.	8/4/11	\$11,167,883
5	Modification #5 was executed by Board approval covering a one-month extension for the period between October 1, 2011 and October 31, 2011 in the amount of \$5,470,211.	9/22/11	\$5,470,211
6	Modification #6 was executed by Board approval covering November 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012 in the amount not-to-exceed \$58,844,951, the third year of the MOU.	11/1/11	\$58,844,951
7	Modification #7 was executed between LASD and Metro's Deputy Chief Executive Officer to amend Section D. Training. This modification will allow LASD to complete their officers' training at Metro.	8/1/12	\$0.00
8	Modification #8 was executed by Board approval covering July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 in the amount not-to-exceed \$80,622,638, the fourth year of the MOU.	1/23/13	\$80,622,796
8A	MOU Mod 8 was \$297,170 below Board approved amount of \$80,622,796		-\$297,170
9	Modification #9 was to exercise Option 2 to MOU PS2610LASD with the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) to	9/1/13	\$83,855,638

	provide law enforcement services for the period covering July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 in the amount not-to-exceed \$83,855,638, an increase of \$3,225,217 over the current fiscal year.		
10	Modification #10 was to exercise up to six (6) months contract time extension with the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) to provide law enforcement services for the period covering July 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014 in the amount not-to-exceed \$44,443,488.	6/5/14	\$44,443,488
11	Modification #11 was to exercise up to six (6) months contract time extension with the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) to provide law enforcement services for the period covering January 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015 in the amount not-to-exceed \$44,443,488.	1/1/15	\$44,443,488
12	Pending Board Approval Modification #12, the subject of this Board action, is to exercise up to twelve (12) months contract time extension with the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) to provide law enforcement services for the period covering July 1, 2015 through June 6, 2016 in the amount of \$102,851,600.	7/1/15	\$102,851,600
	Modification 1 thru 12 Total:		\$503,648,776
	New MOU Total Value		\$569,570,713

Position	FY 2014-15	Additions 07-01-15	Additions 10-01-15	Additions 01-01-16	FY 2015-16
Chief	1				1
Commander	2				2
Captain	2			1	3
Lieutenant- Operations Lieutenant	3			1	4
Lieutenant- Detectives	0			1	1
Lieutenant- Watch Commander	5				5
Lieutenant- MTA Security Liaison	0				0
Lieutenant- Service Area Commander	6		2		8
Sergeant- Operations	3			2	5
Sergeant- Scheduling	1				1
Sergeant- Detectives	2				2
Sergeant- Watch Sergeant	10				10
Sergeant- Field Sergeant	43		2	6	51
Sergeant- Canine Sergeant	1				1
Sergeant- Motor Sergeant	3				3
Sergeant- Threat Intradiction Unit	2	1			3
Bonus I- Watch Deputy	5				5
Bonus I- Detective	13				13
Bonus I- Court Deputy	3				3
Bonus I- Team Leaders	13				13
Bonus I- Canine	11				11
Bonus I- Mental Evaluation Team	4				4
Bonus I- Master FTO	1				1
Bonus I- Field Training Officer	20				20
Bonus I- Motor Team Leader	1				1
Bonus I- Access Service Investigator	2				2
Deputy- Motor	24				24
Deputy- Scheduling	3				3
Deputy- Special Projects	2				2
Deputy- TIU	27	3			30
Deputy- Training	2				2
Deputy- Field	256		20	42	318
Total Sworn	471	4	24	53	552
Deputies to Supervisors	Field Deputies +FTO			Field Sergeants	Ratio
Field Personnel	338			51	6 5/8

SERVICE UNITS BY POSITION AND OTHER COSTS

Service Units	Number	Unit Cost	Annual Cost
40 Hour One Deputy Units	8	\$ 270,852.68	\$ 2,166,821.43
56 Hour Two Deputy Units	61	\$ 758,387.50	\$ 46,261,637.58
56 Hour One Deputy Units	77.5	\$ 379,193.75	\$ 29,387,515.68
Non-Relieved Deputy Units	7	\$ 246,229.71	\$ 1,723,607.96
MET Deputy	4	\$ 260,311.18	\$ 1,041,244.71
Team Leaders	13	\$ 260,311.18	\$ 3,384,045.31
Team Leader - Motor Officer	1	\$ 270,275.34	\$ 270,275.34
Non-Relieved Sergeant Units	3	\$ 298,778.89	\$ 896,336.67
Canine Deputy	11	\$ 260,311.18	\$ 2,863,422.95
Motor Units	24	\$ 255,419.39	\$ 6,130,065.31
Access Services Investigator	2	\$ 166,253.60	\$ 332,507.20
Security Assistant	106	\$ 59,651.46	\$ 6,323,054.39
Subtotal			\$ 100,780,534.53
Special Overtime Fund			\$ 1,800,000.00
WC/UI	6.21%		\$ 98,544.20
Metro Liason (120 Day Contract)			\$ 51,000.00
Canine Support			\$ 71,522.00
Subtotal			\$ 2,021,066.20
Liability Insurance	0.00%		\$ -
Training Fund			\$ 50,000.00
Total Supplemental Cost			\$ 2,071,066.20
Total Contract Cost			\$ 102,851,600.72



Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Transit Policing Division

Highlights and Accomplishments

Overview

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) is the largest Sheriff's Department in the United States and employs over 18,000 sworn and professional staff. The Department's countywide resources are vast and include, to name a few, the following: Major Crimes Bureau, Emergency Operations, Headquarters Detectives, Scientific Services, Patrol Divisions, Transportation, Courts and Custody Facilities, Community Oriented Policing Bureau, Aero Bureau (the Department's airborne fleet), Homicide Bureau, Fraud and Cyber Crimes, Arson/Explosives, Special Victims Bureau, Special Enforcement Bureau (SWAT Teams), Operations Safe Streets, and the Gang Enforcement Team. While Transit Policing Division (TPD) provides Countywide services and resides under the Sheriff's Department's larger umbrella, its nearly 650 sworn and professional staff serve as a dedicated resource and policing force for Metro.

Transit Policing Division Services and Support

Routine patrol and fixed-post assignment of deputies and security assistants stand at the core of TPD's daily deployment and span the commands of Transit Bureau North, Transit Bureau South, Central Operations, and Metrolink. Field personnel are supported through a diverse network of ancillary services, specific to Metro's needs and a Transit policing environment. Specialty services include the following:

- Threat Interdiction Unit - a premier and nationally recognized counterterrorism unit
- Detective Bureau - investigates and assists in the prosecution of transit specific crimes, as well as "photo enforcement" management
- Crime Impact Teams – address crime trends, quality-of-life issues, series offenders, surveillance, search warrant service, graffiti abatement, prosecution of prolific taggers and the like.
- Bus Riding Team - an innovative and newly created team that promotes law enforcement visibility, conducts plain clothes operations, and addresses crime trends specific to bus lines
- Canine Teams – system-wide explosives scent detection
- Crisis Response Unit – comprises teams of Mental Evaluation Deputies and Department of Mental Health Clinicians
- Field Training Program – established in 2012, this programs comprises 20 training officers who specialize in transit specific tactics, communication, and problem solving
- Sheriff's Reserve and Volunteer Program – 17 reserve deputies and 30 active volunteers
- Service Area Lieutenants, Team Leaders, and Professional Staff who support the Division's operation within each unit. In addition, LASD oversees the day-to-day management of Metro Security and Contract Security services, which total in the hundreds of personnel

Transit Policing Division Snap-Shots and Statistics

Citations and Arrests (2012-2015)

- Citations Issued 374,798
- Arrests made 32,357

Bus Riding Team Boarding, Ride and Fare Check Data (September 2014 to Current)

- Bus Boardings 11,081
- Bus Rides 5,406
- Fare Checks 476,010

Crime Impact Team Statistics (August 31, 2014 to Current)

- Citations 964
- Arrests 1,023
- Rides and Boardings 200
- Plain Clothes Ops., Reports, Parole/Probation Searches and Search Warrants 533

Crisis Response Unit - Contacts, Transports, 5150 WIC, Cites, Trespass and Location Checks (2014 Totals)

- Total Contacts 3,384
- Transports to Services 324
- 5150 (Person Determined Mentally III) 348
- Citations Issued 65
- Trespassing 550
- Location Checks 4,404

Detective Bureau-Crime Statistics and Like Jurisdiction Comparisons (May 2014/May 2015)

- TPD Cases Cleared By Arrest 81% Other Jurisdiction Comparison* 53%
- TPD Solve Rate (All Crimes) 88.9% Other Jurisdiction Composite 78.7-86.2%
- Felony Complaints Filed (D.A.) 31.3% Other Jurisdiction Composite 18-25.3%
- Cases Rejected (City Atty./D.A.) 16.6% Other Jurisdiction Composite 22.2-25.2%

TSOI "Bus Policing Pilot" - Boarding and Fixed-Post Locations (January 9, 2015 to Current)

- Total Number of TSO Bus Boardings 7,843
- Total Number of TAPS (Fares Checked) 91,118
- High-Boarding Locations: Include El Monte Station, Union Station adjacent stops, Wilshire Boulevard at Western and Vermont, Universal City/Studio City Red Line Station Bus Terminal, North Hollywood Orange Line Bus Terminal, and Hollywood Boulevard at Highland.
- Fare Box data revealed TSO visibility and checks improved fare collection efforts on the lines where they were deployed (consistently)
 - o Examples: Fare Collection was up 8.2% at Chavez/Vignes, 10.5% at 7th Street, and 6.5% Universal City Station

*Other jurisdictions surveyed, 53% was the highest comparative in the "cleared by arrest" category.

Community Oriented Transit Policing

Transit Policing Division embraced recent audit findings concerning Transit Policing services for Metro. It has implemented many of the Audit's recommendations and has self-initiated other efforts aimed at achieving the goals and objectives contained in the comprehensive transit community policing plan.

- TPD now provides monthly crime reports to the Metro Board in an effort to ensure transparency, foster accountability, and information share.
- TPD's Strategic Plan and Community Policing plans have been realized, with Metro due to receive the latest installment of the annual Community Policing Plan in July 2015.
- Relationships have been fostered with partner agencies and community stakeholders who Metro and LASD serve. TPD personnel regularly meets with local agencies such as Long Beach, Santa Monica, and the Los Angeles Police Department, as well as attend agency briefings and stakeholder community meetings.
- TPD personnel orchestrated the creation of a Transit Policing "Division," in order to best meet Metro's diverse needs. Personnel, budget, and other aspects of Division autonomy will favorably and increasingly influence how TPD performs its work for Metro.
- TPD has worked collaboratively with Metro in providing Public Service Announcements aimed at enhancing the public's perception of a safe transit system, curbing Operator assaults, reporting suspected child exploitation or inappropriate and/or unlawful sexual advances on the system.

Creativity, Innovation, and Partnership Projects with Metro

- In collaboration with Metro (and the "day-to-day management of Metro Security"), TPD embarked upon multiple 'never before' pilots, each of which have yielded favorable results. One such pilot was a Fare Enforcement and MPV Pilot initiated with TSOI's. Despite obstacles along the way, today, Metro Security personnel regularly perform fare inspections, MPV checks, and issue citations within the Metro system. A separate/second Bus Boarding Pilot was recently initiated (using formerly non-existent, unarmed, Metro Security personnel and unfilled FTE's). The Bus Boarding pilot has proved highly successful and yields consistent favorable results on fare box revenue, wherever the TSOI's are deployed. Because of this success, TPD (via the Director of Security), replicated the program and now there are two teams completing this task.
- LASD has recently sent Metro Security to a number of POST-certified training courses, critical to their craft and Metro's Mission. These include Active-Shooter Training, Mental Health Training, and a POST-approved Cultural Diversity course provided through the Museum of Tolerance.
- TPD has worked collaboratively with Metro in offsetting instances of operator assaults (whether via bus boardings, rides, plain clothes and/or uniformed operations, public service announcements or crime prevention through environmental design efforts. Recommendations acted on by Metro concerning Operator Partitions, CCTV or Operator Training (in defusing interactions) appear to be having favorable results and among this, operator feedback on partitions has proved largely favorable; and their effect, seemingly positive thus far.
- TPD has created a recurrent publication (and well over a year's worth of bi-monthly educational "pushes") entitled, "Did You Know?" These educational and/or officer safety related briefings are driven via email and reach all TPD personnel. Bite-sized training pieces are distributed on the 15th and 30th of each month and train personnel in important safety information, such as bus shut offs, the 3rd rail, the Transit Watch App or other important safety/system information.



Board Report

File #:2015-0681, File Type:Informational Report

Agenda Number:63.

AD-HOC TRANSIT POLICING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE JUNE 18, 2015

SUBJECT: MONTHLY UPDATE ON TRANSIT POLICING PERFORMANCE

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE report on monthly update on transit policing performance.

ISSUE

On September 4, 2014, the board requested that staff provide a monthly update on transit policing performance to Systems Safety and Operations Committee. Specifically, the board requested monthly updates on criminal activity, fare enforcement, response time, deployment and perception of safety.

DISCUSSION

In June 2015, staff continues to be proactive in working with Operations and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department in addressing perception of safety, criminal activity, fare enforcement, response time, and deployment. Below are key highlights:

Perception of Safety:

- The ridership survey was developed to allow staff and law enforcement to receive feedback from the public to their perceptions of safety. The feedback from the public will help staff in deployment of resources to appropriate areas and enhancing customer interface, such as increase presence in areas identified to be of concern by the public. The new survey for rail only was completed in May 2015, and the survey on bus will be completed by the end of June 2015.

Bus Operator Assaults:

- In California, an assault crime takes place when there is an act of force upon another person. "Aggravated Assault" is a commonly used term for the crime of "Assault with a Deadly Weapon" (ADW). The California Penal Code 245 defines this crime as one that is committed with any type of deadly weapon or by means of force that is *likely to cause* great bodily injury

to another. As such, a non-aggravated would be an assault which would not cause GBI (great bodily injury).

- Comparing January-April 2014 to January-April 2015, there has been an increase of 25 assaults, from 35 total assaults in January-April 2014 and 60 total assaults in January-April 2015. Of the 60 total assaults, 85.7% of the Aggravated Assaults, and 28.6% of the Non-Aggravated Assaults have had a suspect taken into custody. The majority of bus operator assaults are fare related followed by requesting a stop.
- Attachment B contains the matrix for the Bus Operator assault suspects LASD has been tracking.
- Of the 60 total operator assaults from January-April 2015, there were 49 Non-Aggravated Assaults, 7 Aggravated Assaults, 3 Robberies, and 1 Sex Crime. Of the 60 assaults, 22 suspects used their hands/feet for the method of assault, followed by 18 suspects spitting, 8 throwing food or liquid, 8 using a weapon, 3 throwing other objects, and 1 sexual harassment.
- From January-April 2015, there have been 113,514,294 bus boardings and 60 total operator assaults, equating to 1 bus operator assault per 1,891,904 boardings.

Operator Safety:

- Los Angeles Metro Protective Services (LAMPS) is working with Metro Information and Technology Services Department to develop a proof-of-concept for live on-bus video streaming. The live on-bus video capabilities will allow security and law enforcement the ability to gain situational awareness and deploy accordingly to the incident as reported by our operators. This exploratory approach will continue for the next four to five months
- The pilot program for Operator barriers and live on-board video display monitors began in March 2015. As of May 18, 2015, Metro has taken delivery of 239 New Flyer buses equipped with live on-board video display monitors and currently has 206 buses in service. As of June 4, 2015 Metro staff anticipates to receive 268 buses equipped with this system no later than mid-June 2015. Of the 239 New Flyer buses, 94 are equipped with Operator barriers and 61 buses with barriers are currently in service.
- Every bus that has an Operator barrier (94 buses) also has a live on-board video display monitor.
- Surveys and communication pieces are being sent to bus operators and divisions in regards to the pilot program for the operator barriers and the live on-board video display monitors. There have been 69 total surveys received from Divisions 1,2,7,9, and 15. The feedback being received is positive.
 - 69% of respondents state the feel safe-somewhat safe operating a bus with an Operator Barrier.

- 70% of respondents state the feel safe-somewhat safe operating a bus equipped with live on-board video display monitor.
- Currently there has been one Bus Operator non-aggravated assault (threw liquid) since the implementation of the live on-board video display monitors. There have been no reported Operator assaults since the implementation of the Operator barriers.

Transit Security Officer (TSO) Bus Boarding Activity:

- Transit Security Officers (TSO's) have been deployed since January 9, 2015 at high boarding locations on the Metro bus system to perform fare checks. Locations to-date include: El Monte station, Downtown L.A., Wilshire Blvd at Western and also Vermont, Universal City/Studio City Red Line Station Bus Terminal, North Hollywood Orange Line Bus Terminal, and Hollywood Blvd. at Highland (in front of Red Line station).
 - Analyses of farebox data indicate that TSO fare checks are improving fare collection on the lines where they are working high boarding stops. Three different one-week comparison showed cash fare collections up by 8.2% (Chavez/Vignes), 10.5% (7th Street), and 6.5% (Universal City Station).
 - The total number of TSO Bus Boardings as of May 8, 2015 is 7,393. The total number of fare checks is 77,858.

Criminal Activity:

ILP (Intelligence Led Policing) Top 3 Priorities 4/02/2015-4/15/2015

1. South Bus

- Trending: South bus has experienced an increase in crimes over the last year. Since January 2015, there have been 62 crimes requiring ILP strategies in which 54 of those were crimes against persons.
- Targeted Deployment: Based on the data for South Bus, the best time for any special operations would be between 10:00am-6:00pm.
- Action Taken: The daily in-service was updated for each shift, to highlight the areas in need of: extra patrols, bus rides, and boardings per ILP.

2. Red Line: Civic Center- Wilshire/Western

- Trending: The Red Line has had an increase of crimes requiring ILP strategies of 36% since 2014. The area of concentration has had 20 crimes since January 2015. Pershing Square and Westlake/MacArthur Park have had the most with 6 crimes requiring ILP strategies.

- Targeted Deployment: Based on the data for the Red Line, the best time for operations are between 6:00am-11:00am, fare enforcement and volunteers should be focusing their efforts during this peak time.
- Action Taken: LASD special teams have continued with multiple fare enforcement operations at Pershing Square Station and McArthur Park Station.

3. North Bus: Central

- Trending: Since January 2015, there have been 103 crimes requiring ILP strategies in which 88 of those were crimes against persons on North Bus Central, with the highest amount of crimes occurring on the Vermont, Western, and Crenshaw lines.
- Targeted Deployment: Based on the data for North Bus, the best time for operations would be 2:00pm-8:00pm on Vermont, Western, and Crenshaw.
- Action Taken: Between April and May, LASD special teams have conducted both uniform and plain-clothes operations which include high visibility boardings, bus rides, and fare checks. On a daily basis, deputies conducting bus boardings and fare checks on the Vermont and Wilshire bus lines. Deputies have also received positive feedback from operators and patrons regarding the higher visibility.

ILP (Intelligence Led Policing) Top 3 Priorities 4/16/2015-4/29/2015

1. South Bus

- Trending: South bus has experienced an increase in crimes over the last year. Since January 2015, there have been 66 crimes requiring ILP strategies in which 57 of those were crimes against persons.
- Targeted Deployment: Based on the data for South Bus, the best time for any special operations would be between 10:00am-6:00pm.
- Action Taken: The daily in-service was updated for each shift, to highlight the areas in need of: extra patrols, bus rides, and boardings per ILP. South bus conducted a plain clothes operation that led to 50 patrons being cited for various quality of life crimes and 2 patrons arrested.

2. Red Line: Civic Center-Wilshire/Vermont

- Trending: The Red Line has had an increase of crimes requiring ILP strategies of 36% since 2014. The area of concentration has had 25 crimes since January 2015 in which 24 of those were crimes against persons. Wilshire/Vermont has

had the most with 9 crimes requiring ILP strategies.

- Targeted Deployment: Based on the data for the Red Line, there the best times for operations are between 6:00am-12:00pm in which extra patrols, fare enforcement, and volunteers should be focusing their efforts during those times
- Action Taken: Between April and May, LASD personnel have conducted four operations based on the ILP data. The focus of these operations was high visibility, fare enforcement, to ride Red Line trains, and check platforms as well as the street level for quality of life/criminal activity.

3. North Bus: Central

- Trending: Since January 2015, there have been 116 crimes requiring ILP strategies in which 99 of those were crimes against persons on North Bus Central, with the highest amount of crimes occurring on the Vermont, Western, and Crenshaw lines.
- Targeted Deployment: Based on the data for North Bus Central, the best time for operations would be 2:00pm-8:00pm on Vermont, Western, and Crenshaw lines.
- Action Taken: Between April and May, LASD special teams have conducted both uniform and plain-clothes operations which include high visibility boardings, bus rides, and fare checks. Deputies have received positive feedback from operators and patrons regarding the higher visibility.

LASD Success Stories

- **4/16/2015:** LASD Transit Policing Division Chief Ronene Anda joined Mr. Washington, several other Metro Board Members, and the Executive Director of the organization "Peace Over Violence", at a media event highlighting Sexual Assault Awareness Month. Chief Anda commented on the disparity of persons who, through a Metro customer survey, did not report instances where they felt as if they were harassed on the Metro system. Chief Anda encouraged Metro patrons to report all instances in which they are made to feel uncomfortable or harassed.
- **4/25/2015:** A male Blue Line patron was assaulted at the San Pedro Station. He was pushed onto the tracks where he received serious injuries including a broken femur, requiring surgery. Patrol arrested the suspect blocks away and Detectives were able to obtain a confession. The suspect pled to 245(a)(1)PC Assault with a Deadly Weapon and 243(d) PC, Great Bodily Injury. As a result of the plea, the suspect will serve 5 years in State Prison and receive a strike.
- **4/29/2015:** LASD Transit Policing Division deputies responded to a call of a bus operator being assaulted at 3rd St. and Fairfax Ave. in Los Angeles. The male suspect had feigned as if he was going to spit on the Female Bus Operator, and then struck her in face several times.

The deputies were able to find the suspect and he was positively identified by several witnesses. The suspect was arrested on scene for felony assault on the bus operator, and misdemeanor assault on another patron. Several Metro Board Members took note of the incident via board alert and applauded LASD for their quick and efficient work

Fare Enforcement:

- In April 2015, law enforcement performed 845,429 fare checks on the rails and Orange Line. In comparison, law enforcement performed 553,786 fare checks on the rails and Orange line in March 2015, resulting in an increase of 291,643 fare checks from March 2015 to April 2015.

	FARES MONTHLY					FARES MONTHLY			
MAR	CHECKED	TARGET	TARGET	RIDERSHIP	APR	CHECKED	TARGET	TARGET	RIDERSHIP
Red/Purple	170,576	220,000	78%	4,009,324	Red/Purple	234,212	220,000	106%	3,800,539
Blue	77,008	212,000	36%	2,093,530	Blue	153,319	212,000	72%	2,093,530
Green	107,297	136,000	79%	992,213	Green	163,179	136,000	120%	992,213
Gold	74,349	116,000	64%	1,132,481	Gold	121,319	116,000	105%	1,132,481
Expo	39,033	90,000	43%	805,534	Expo	63,548	90,000	71%	805,534
Orange	74,941	92,000	81%	731,114	Orange	98,047	92,000	107%	731,114
Bus	10,582	-			Bus	11,805	-		
Total	553,786				Total	845,429			

Response Time:

- In April 2015, the average response time for “Calls for Service” (Emergency, Priority and Routine) for all rail lines and buses was 17.3 minutes. LASD currently complies with Metro’s Performance Metrics requirement of average of 30 minutes for calls for service. Specifically, the response time for emergent calls was 6.8 minutes.

Deployment:

- Transit Policing Division deploys sworn and professional staff in geographical regions throughout the Metro transit system to suppress crime and disorder on all modes of Metro transportation in the region. Region sizes are determined based on crime and disorder trends, as well as deployment strategies. A service area lieutenant is accountable for suppressing crime and disorder issues in their respective region using the principals of Community Policing. Supplemental Crime Impact Teams, Bus Riding Teams, and the Threat Interdiction Unit are system wide law enforcement assets deployed to suppress crime hotspots and emerging crime trends. The Intelligence-Led Policing Process is used as the primary tool in determining deployment of law enforcement services.


ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - MTA Monthly Report

Attachment B - Matrix of Bus Operator Assault Suspects

Prepared by: Duane Martin, DEO Project Management, (213) 922-7460

Reviewed By: Duane Martin, DEO Project Management, (213) 922-7460
Stephanie Wiggins, Interim Deputy Chief Executive Officer,
(213) 922-1023



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

*LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
TRANSIT POLICING DIVISION
RONENE M. ANDA, CHIEF*



**MTA
MONTHLY REPORT
April 2015**

Prepared by the Crime Analysis Unit



*LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
TRANSIT POLICING DIVISION
RONENE M. ANDA, CHIEF*


TABLE OF CONTENTS

Monthly Statistics


Summary	3
Part 1 Crimes by Month - Rail.....	4
Part 1 Crimes by Month - Bus.....	5
Blue Line	6
Green Line	7
Expo Line	8
Red Line	9
Gold Line	10
Orange Line	11
Silver Line	12
South Bus.....	13
North Bus	14
Union Station.....	15
Reserve Company Services.....	16

TRANSIT POLICING DIVISION - April 2015

Apr Crimes - 352



YTD Crimes - 1326




Part 1 Crimes per 1,000,000 Riders


	2015 Jan -Apr	2014 Jan -Apr	2013 Jan - Apr	2012 Jan - Apr
Blue	13.3 ↑	13.0	14.5	10.7
Green	18.8 ↓	20.7	21.7	17.9
Expo	14.9 ↑	12.0	13.5	N/A
Red	5.0 ↑	4.3	4.6	2.9
Gold	10.6 ↑	4.9	6.2	3.5
Orange	8.6 ↑	6.7	4.6	3.8
Silver	1.4 ↓	2.1	1.6	1.9
Bus	1.6 ↑	1.0	1.0	0.7

Arrow indicates an increase or decrease from last year.


Apr Arrests - 696




YTD Arrests - 2519




Apr Citations - 5922




YTD Citations - 24510



Apr Calls For Service - 2431



YTD Calls For Service - 9531



SATURATION RATE

April	BLUE	GREEN	EXPO	RED	GOLD	ORG	TOTAL
Ridership	2,093,530	992,213	805,691	3,800,539	1,132,481	731,114	9,555,568
Contacts	153,319	163,179	63,548	234,212	121,319	98,047	833,624
%Passengers Inspected	7.32%	16.45%	7.89%	6.16%	10.71%	13.41%	8.72%
Boardings	0	0	0	2,285	909	651	3,845
Rides	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Fare Warnings	0	0	0	0	250	66	316

YTD	BLUE	GREEN	EXPO	RED	GOLD	ORG	TOTAL
YTD Ridership	8,516,418	3,989,900	3,216,263	15,509,227	4,623,487	2,911,752	38,767,047
YTD Contacts*	388,900	455,736	197,469	796,534	381,559	279,140	2,499,338
%Passengers Inspected	4.57%	11.42%	6.14%	5.14%	8.25%	9.59%	6.45%
Boardings	3,130	3,256	1,899	8,999	5,140	5,622	28,046
Rides	0	0	0	0	0	45	45
Fare Warnings	2,022	998	1,590	3,950	2,442	276	11,278

* Contacts are calculated by adding MPV checks, triple/doubles and citations.

System-Wide Highlights

Part 1 Crimes have increased by 11% from Jan - Apr 2015 compared to Jan - Apr 2014.

The Green Line had a decrease in part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders, while the other rail lines had an increase.

Overall, buses had an increase in part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders from the same period last year.

*Part 1 Crimes by Month - Rail

Blue Line	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	10	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Agg Assault	12	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Theft	10	8	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Petty Theft	3	4	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
GTA	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
BTFV	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Arson	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	41	26	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

Green Line	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	6	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Agg Assault	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Theft	8	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Petty Theft	2	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
GTA	5	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
BTFV	3	1	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	27	10	24	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

Expo Line	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Agg Assault	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Theft	3	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Petty Theft	4	4	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
GTA	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
BTFV	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12	14	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

Red Line	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	4	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Agg Assault	3	2	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Theft	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Petty Theft	5	10	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
GTA	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
BTFV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	17	17	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

Gold Line	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Agg Assault	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Theft	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Petty Theft	2	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
GTA	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
BTFV	7	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	19	11	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

* Part 1 Crimes are calculated in accordance with the FBI Uniform Crime Report standards.
 Homicides, Rapes, and Aggravated Assaults are counted by the number of victims.

Part 1 Crimes by Month - Bus

Orange Line	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Agg Assault	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Theft	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Petty Theft	2	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
GTA	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
BTFV	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	1	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

Silver Line	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agg Assault	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Theft	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Petty Theft	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
GTA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BTFV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

South Bus	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	8	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Agg Assault	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Agg Assault on Op	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Burglary	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Theft	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Petty Theft	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
GTA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
BTFV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20	13	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48



North Bus	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	6	9	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Agg Assault	9	12	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Burglary	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Theft	4	8	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Petty Theft	5	8	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
GTA	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
BTFV	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	26	38	31	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

Union Station	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agg Assault	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Agg Assault on Op	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Theft	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Petty Theft	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
GTA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
BTFV	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	3	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Homicide	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	38	23	27	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Agg Assault	38	26	25	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Agg Assault on Op	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Burglary	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Grand Theft	34	30	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
Petty Theft	27	41	37	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
GTA	17	3	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
BTFV	16	7	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Arson	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	174	133	146	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593

BLUE LINE

REPORTED CRIME		
PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	1
Rape	0	0
Robbery	2	22
Agg Assault	5	27
Agg Assault on Op	0	0
Burglary	0	0
Grand Theft	6	31
Petty Theft	2	14
Motor Vehicle Theft	1	8
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	2	8
Arson	1	2
SUB-TOTAL	19	113
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	6	24
Battery Rail Operator	0	0
Sex Offenses	2	7
Weapons	4	12
Narcotics	5	36
Trespassing	8	31
Vandalism	3	18
SUB-TOTAL	28	128
TOTAL	47	241




Part 1 Crimes per Station		
Station	Apr	YTD
7th/Metro	0	4
Pico	0	2
Grand	0	3
San Pedro	2	3
Washington	0	1
Vernon	0	1
Slauson	0	6
Florence	3	11
Firestone	1	6
103rd St	1	5
Willowbrook	2	17
Compton	1	8
Artesia	1	11
Del Amo	3	11
Wardlow	1	3
Willow	4	14
PCH	0	0
Anaheim	0	2
5th St	0	2
1st St	0	0
Transit Mall	0	2
Pacific	0	1
Total	19	113

ARRESTS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	33	116
Misdemeanor	113	487
TOTAL	146	603

CITATIONS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	853	3,886
Other Citations	174	441
Vehicle Code Citations	254	1,008
TOTAL	1,281	5,335

CALLS FOR SERVICE				
TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	32	4.5	105	4.8
Priority	155	11.5	717	13.6
Routine	192	23.2	813	20.8
Total	379	16.8	1635	16.6

FARE ENFORCEMENT		
	Apr	YTD
Ridership	2,093,530	8,516,418
Contacts	153,319	388,900
% of Patrons Inspected	7.32	4.57
Boardings	0	3,130
Ride	0	0
Fare Warning	0	2,022



Blue Line Highlights



The Blue Line had 2 less part 1 crimes, which is a 2% decrease from the same period last year.

Part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders were up from the same period last year.

*5 yr average is based on the average of part 1 crimes from 2010 - 2014.

GREEN LINE

REPORTED CRIME		
PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	2	12
Agg Assault	1	6
Agg Assault on Op	0	0
Burglary	0	0
Grand Theft	3	15
Petty Theft	4	13
Motor Vehicle Theft	2	15
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	2	14
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	14	75
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	5	19
Battery Rail Operator	0	0
Sex Offenses	0	2
Weapons	2	4
Narcotics	0	19
Trespassing	1	6
Vandalism	5	12
SUB-TOTAL	13	62
TOTAL	27	137




Part 1 Crimes per Station		
Station	Apr	YTD
Redondo Beach	0	1
Douglas	1	1
El Segundo	0	1
Mariposa	0	1
Aviation	2	9
Hawthorne	0	6
Crenshaw	0	5
Vermont	2	4
Harbor	2	11
Avalon	3	6
Willowbrook	1	10
Long Beach	0	10
Lakewood	2	4
Norwalk	1	6
Total	14	75

ARRESTS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	9	41
Misdemeanor	15	136
TOTAL	24	177

CITATIONS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	410	2,305
Other Citations	57	272
Vehicle Code Citations	32	230
TOTAL	499	2,807

CALLS FOR SERVICE				
TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	14	6.6	37	6.3
Priority	80	28.2	294	15.6
Routine	111	17.5	453	20.7
Total	205	20.9	784	18.1

FARE ENFORCEMENT		
	Apr	YTD
Ridership	992,213	3,989,900
Contacts	163,179	455,736
% of Patrons Inspected	16.45	11.42
Boardings	0	3,256
Ride	0	0
Fare Warning	0	998





*5 yr average is based on the average of part 1 crimes from 2010 - 2014.

Green Line Highlights
The Green Line had 17 less part 1 crimes, which is a 19% decrease from the same period last year.
Part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders were down from the same period last year.

EXPO LINE

REPORTED CRIME

PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	2	8
Agg Assault	0	1
Agg Assault on Op	0	0
Burglary	0	0
Grand Theft	2	13
Petty Theft	7	21
Motor Vehicle Theft	0	2
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	0	3
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	11	48
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	2	4
Battery Rail Operator	0	0
Sex Offenses	0	0
Weapons	0	1
Narcotics	0	2
Trespassing	1	3
Vandalism	7	13
SUB-TOTAL	10	23
TOTAL	21	71



Part 1 Crimes per Station

Station	Apr	YTD
7th/Metro	0	0
Pico	0	0
23rd St	0	2
Jefferson/USC	0	2
Expo/USC	0	2
Expo/Vermont	0	0
Expo/Western	1	5
Expo/Crenshaw	1	4
Farmdale	0	1
La Brea	0	3
La Cienega	6	11
Culver City	3	18
Total	11	48

ARRESTS

Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	8	12
Misdemeanor	26	64
TOTAL	34	76

CITATIONS

Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	139	1,052
Other Citations	21	81
Vehicle Code Citations	294	843
TOTAL	454	1,976

CALLS FOR SERVICE

TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	5	7.0	18	5.9
Priority	41	17.2	147	13.0
Routine	66	22.7	251	23.7
Total	112	20.0	416	19.2

FARE ENFORCEMENT


	Apr	YTD
Ridership	805,691	3,216,263
Contacts	63,548	197,469
% of Patrons Inspected	7.89	6.14
Boardings	0	1,899
Ride	0	0
Fare Warning	0	1,590

Expo Line Highlights

The Expo Line had 10 more part 1 crime, which is a 26% increase from the same period last year.

Part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders were up from the same period last year.



Part 1 Crimes - YTD



*Expo line opened in April 2012, so a 2 yr average from 2013 - 2014 is calculated.

RED LINE

REPORTED CRIME		
PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	2	12
Agg Assault	10	21
Agg Assault on Op	0	0
Burglary	0	0
Grand Theft	0	5
Petty Theft	13	37
Motor Vehicle Theft	0	3
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	0	0
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	25	78
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	13	39
Battery Rail Operator	0	0
Sex Offenses	5	13
Weapons	2	7
Narcotics	13	37
Trespassing	3	14
Vandalism	3	15
SUB-TOTAL	39	125
TOTAL	64	203




Part 1 Crimes per Station		
Station	Apr	YTD
Union Station	3	8
Civic Center	0	1
Pershing Square	3	6
7th/Metro	1	2
Westlake	3	10
Wilshire/Vermont	7	11
Wilshire/Normandie	0	2
Vermont/Beverly	0	0
Wilshire/Western	0	2
Vermont/Santa Monica	1	3
Vermont/Sunset	0	1
Hollywood/Western	0	3
Hollywood/Vine	1	3
Hollywood/Highland	0	4
Universal	0	5
North Hollywood	6	17
Total	25	78

ARRESTS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	21	92
Misdemeanor	73	376
TOTAL	94	468

CITATIONS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	1,142	4,491
Other Citations	169	521
Vehicle Code Citations	310	863
TOTAL	1,621	5,875

CALLS FOR SERVICE				
TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	21	5.7	70	5.3
Priority	193	13.0	741	13.2
Routine	201	21.6	883	23.4
Total	415	16.8	1694	18.2

FARE ENFORCEMENT		
	Apr	YTD
Ridership	3,800,539	15,509,227
Contacts	234,212	796,534
% of Patrons Inspected	6.16	5.14
Boardings	2,285	8,999
Ride	0	0
Fare Warning	0	3,950



RED Line Highlights



The Red Line had 9 more part 1 crimes which is a 13% increase from the same period last year.

Part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders were up from the same period last year.

*5 yr average is based on the average of part 1 crimes from 2010 - 2014.

GOLD LINE

REPORTED CRIME		
PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	2	7
Agg Assault	1	8
Agg Assault on Op	0	0
Burglary	0	1
Grand Theft	2	6
Petty Theft	4	12
Motor Vehicle Theft	0	3
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	1	12
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	10	49
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	2	10
Battery Rail Operator	0	0
Sex Offenses	0	1
Weapons	1	3
Narcotics	3	13
Trespassing	0	2
Vandalism	2	20
SUB-TOTAL	8	49
TOTAL	18	98




Part 1 Crimes per Station		
Station	Apr	YTD
Sierra Madre	4	10
Allen	1	2
Lake	0	0
Memorial Park	0	1
Del Mar	1	3
Fillmore	0	0
South Pasadena	0	0
Highland Park	1	6
SW Museum	0	0
Heritage Square	0	3
Lincoln Heights	0	3
Chinatown	0	0
Union Station	0	6
Little Tokyo	1	2
Pico	0	0
Mariachi	0	0
Soto	1	4
Indiana	1	8
Maravilla	0	0
East La	0	0
Atlantic	0	1
Total	10	49

ARRESTS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	10	19
Misdemeanor	28	120
TOTAL	38	139

CITATIONS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	453	1,791
Other Citations	53	216
Vehicle Code Citations	65	334
TOTAL	571	2,341

CALLS FOR SERVICE				
TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	7	9.7	26	8.0
Priority	78	14.6	293	15.8
Routine	92	25.3	325	26.1
Total	177	20.0	644	20.7

FARE ENFORCEMENT		
	Apr	YTD
Ridership	1,132,481	4,623,487
Contacts	121,319	381,559
% of Patrons Inspected	10.71	8.25
Boardings	909	5,140
Ride	0	0
Fare Warning	250	2,442



Gold Line Highlights

The Gold Line had 27 more part 1 crimes, which is an 123% increase of from the same period last year.



Part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders were up from the same period last year.

*5 yr average is based on the average of part 1 crimes from 2010 - 2014.

ORANGE LINE

REPORTED CRIME

PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	0	2
Agg Assault	0	4
Agg Assault on Op	0	0
Burglary	0	0
Grand Theft	3	4
Petty Theft	7	11
Motor Vehicle Theft	0	3
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	0	1
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	10	25
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	1	6
Battery Bus Operator	0	0
Sex Offenses	0	0
Weapons	1	3
Narcotics	0	5
Trespassing	0	1
Vandalism	6	11
SUB-TOTAL	8	26
TOTAL	18	51



Part 1 Crimes per Station

Station	Apr	YTD
North Hollywood	1	3
Laurel Canyon	1	1
Valley College	0	0
Woodman	0	1
Van Nuys	3	3
Sepulveda	1	2
Woodley	0	1
Balboa	1	2
Reseda	1	4
Tampa	0	1
Pierce College	0	2
De Soto	0	0
Canoga	0	1
Warner Center	0	0
Sherman Way	1	1
Roscoe	1	1
Nordhoff	0	0
Chatsworth	0	2
Total	10	25

ARRESTS

Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	1	17
Misdemeanor	18	94
TOTAL	19	111

CITATIONS

Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	125	1,040
Other Citations	6	25
Vehicle Code Citations	76	346
TOTAL	207	1,411

CALLS FOR SERVICE

TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	2	3.0	12	5.8
Priority	47	13.1	140	16.9
Routine	38	23.1	127	26.1
Total	87	17.3	279	20.6

FARE ENFORCEMENT


	Apr	YTD
Ridership	731,114	2,911,752
Contacts	98,047	279,140
% of Patrons Inspected	13.41	9.59
Boardings	651	5,622
Ride	11	45
Fare Warning	66	276

Orange Line Highlights

The Orange Line had 4 more part 1 crimes, which is a 20% increase from the same period last year.


Part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders were up from the same period last year.

Part 1 Crimes - YTD




SILVER LINE

REPORTED CRIME		
PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	0	0
Agg Assault	0	0
Agg Assault on Op	0	0
Burglary	0	1
Grand Theft	0	0
Petty Theft	0	1
Motor Vehicle Theft	0	0
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	0	0
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	0	2
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	1	2
Battery Bus Operator	0	0
Sex Offenses	0	0
Weapons	0	0
Narcotics	1	1
Trespassing	0	0
Vandalism	1	5
SUB-TOTAL	3	8
TOTAL	3	10



Part 1 Crimes per Station		
Station	Apr	YTD
El Monte	0	1
Cal State LA	0	0
LAC/USC	0	0
Alameda	0	0
Downtown	0	0
37th St/USC	0	0
Slauson	0	0
Manchester	0	0
Harbor Fwy	0	0
Rosecrans	0	0
Harbor/Gateway	0	1
Total	0	2




ARRESTS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	0	2
Misdemeanor	2	4
TOTAL	2	6

CITATIONS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	1	2
Other Citations	4	7
Vehicle Code Citations	8	42
TOTAL	13	51

CALLS FOR SERVICE				
TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	3	7.0	4	6.3
Priority	7	16.6	39	12.1
Routine	6	14.8	22	15.4
Total	16	14.1	65	12.9

FARE ENFORCEMENT		
	Apr	YTD
Ridership	380,534	1,451,963
Contacts	135	1,122
% of Patrons Inspected	0.04	0.08
Boardings	62	326
Ride	0	9
Fare Warning	0	5



Silver Line Highlights

The Silver Line had 1 less part 1 crime, which is a 33% decrease from the same period last year.

Part 1 crimes per 1,000,000 riders were down from the same period last year.

*4 yr average is based on the average of part 1 crimes from 2011 - 2014.




South Bus Patrol

REPORTED CRIME

PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	1	14
Agg Assault	3	10
Agg Assault on Op	0	4
Burglary	0	1
Grand Theft	1	10
Petty Theft	2	8
Motor Vehicle Theft	0	1
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	0	0
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	7	48
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	3	18
Battery Bus Operator	3	15
Sex Offenses	2	5
Weapons	1	5
Narcotics	7	21
Trespassing	0	2
Vandalism	2	6
SUB-TOTAL	18	72
TOTAL	25	120

Part 1 Crimes per Sector

Sector	Apr	YTD
Gateway Cities	2	10
South Bay	5	38
Total	7	48



ARRESTS

Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	15	58
Misdemeanor	69	284
TOTAL	84	342

CITATIONS

Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	25	56
Other Citations	6	8
Vehicle Code Citations	137	562
TOTAL	168	626

CALLS FOR SERVICE


TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	9	10.2	28	9.6
Priority	92	15.0	381	15.0
Routine	97	25.4	371	26.8
Total	198	19.9	780	20.5

FARE ENFORCEMENT*

*South Bus Fare Enforcement data is combined with North Bus.

South Bus Highlights



The South bus Lines had 12 more part 1 crimes, which is a 33% increase from the same period last year.




*5 yr average is based on the average of part 1 crimes from 2010 - 2014.

North Bus Patrol

REPORTED CRIME		
PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	6	28
Agg Assault	8	35
Agg Assault on Op	2	3
Burglary	1	1
Grand Theft	7	30
Petty Theft	7	26
Motor Vehicle Theft	2	4
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	0	1
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	33	128
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	22	68
Battery Bus Operator	13	32
Sex Offenses	3	12
Weapons	1	4
Narcotics	8	26
Trespassing	0	1
Vandalism	26	53
SUB-TOTAL	73	196
TOTAL	106	324



Part 1 Crimes per Sector		
Sector	Apr	YTD
San Gabriel	2	11
Westside	3	15
San Fernando	0	5
Central	28	97
Total	33	128




ARRESTS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	43	116
Misdemeanor	119	379
TOTAL	162	495

CITATIONS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	53	126
Other Citations	45	106
Vehicle Code Citations	961	3,647
TOTAL	1,059	3,879

CALLS FOR SERVICE				
TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	23	7.6	89	8.4
Priority	392	15.5	1,483	16.5
Routine	331	26.7	1,333	27.1
Total	746	20.2	2,905	21.1

FARE ENFORCEMENT		
	Apr	YTD
Ridership*	27,665,846	109,150,579
Contacts	11,805	30,392
% of Patrons Inspected	0.04	0.03
Boardings	4,942	21,449
Rides	1,113	4,420
Fare Warning	381	1,741





North Bus Highlights
The North Bus Lines had 16 more part 1 crimes, which is a 14% increase from the same period last year.

*5 yr average is based on the average of part 1 crimes from 2010 - 2014.

Union Station

REPORTED CRIME		
PART 1 CRIMES	Apr	YTD
Homicide	0	0
Rape	0	0
Robbery	0	0
Agg Assault	4	9
Agg Assault on Op	0	0
Burglary	1	1
Grand Theft	1	3
Petty Theft	3	11
Motor Vehicle Theft	1	1
Burg/Theft From Vehicle	1	2
Arson	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	11	27
Selected Part 2 Crimes		
Battery	8	18
Battery Bus Operator	0	0
Sex Offenses	1	1
Weapons	0	4
Narcotics	1	15
Trespassing	2	6
Vandalism	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	12	44
TOTAL	23	71




Part 1 Crimes at Union Station		
Westside	5	15
Eastside	6	12
Total	11	27



ARRESTS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Felony	7	36
Misdemeanor	22	66
TOTAL	29	102

CITATIONS		
Type	Apr	YTD
Fare Evasion Citations	14	60
Other Citations	28	62
Vehicle Code Citations	7	87
TOTAL	49	209

CALLS FOR SERVICE				
TYPE	Apr		YTD	
	Total	Avg	Total	Avg
Emergency	2	N/A	6	3.3
Priority	47	6.4	145	6.7
Routine	47	18.4	178	14.3
Total	96	12.3	329	10.7



Union Station Highlights

Union Station had 14 more part 1 crimes, which is a 108% increase from the same period last year.

*3 yr average is based on the average of part 1 crimes from 2012 - 2014.



LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
 TRANSIT POLICING DIVISION
 RONENE M. ANDA, CHIEF

**ALLOCATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES
 RESERVE COMPANY SERVICES
 March 2015**

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	YTD
TSB San Fernando Valley	121	82	149	114									466
Westside/Central Motors	156	193	362	318									1029
SGV Volunteer Company	437	385	397	286									1505
Blue/Green Line Sector	32	22	22	93									169
TOTAL	746	682	930	811	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3169

*Each month, Reserve totals will display totals from the previous month because totals are not submitted until the end of each month.

The LASD reserve units are attached to regular LASD units of assignments. The reserves are there to perform the same function as any deputy. In that way, the reserves augment the force at no increase in cost. Contract agencies benefit significantly by the presence of reserves since they are directly paying for the LASD contract and do not have to pay for the additional reserve force.

www.lasdreserve.org

ATTACHMENT B

Matrix Bus Operator Assault Suspects										
Reason	Line	Type	Date	Day	Time	Narrative	Arrest Made	Charges Requested	Charges Filed	Sentence (Probation/Time/Jail or Prison)
Fare	L704	Non-Aggravated Assault	1/5/2015	Mon	8:00	Sus MH/40-50/508/175 spit on bus op over fare				
Previous Problems	L71	Non-Aggravated Assault	1/7/2015	Wed	13:50	Sus FB/40/507/130/Blk/Bro threw water on bus op for previous problems				
Policy/Smoking	L710	Non-Aggravated Assault	1/7/2015	Wed	19:55	Sus MB/25-35/506/140 spit on bus op over smoking policy				
Fare	L240	Non-Aggravated Assault	1/10/2015	Sat	1:30	Sus MH/25-35/509/190/Blk/Brn spit on bus op over fare				
Fare	L117	Aggravated Assault	1/11/2015	Sun	12:20	Assault suspects arrested for punching bus op over fare	Yes	243.3PC	243.3PC	Referred to C.A. for misdemeanor
Fare	L770	Non-Aggravated Assault	1/12/2015	Mon	16:45	Sus Castillo, Christopher punched vic in chest over bus fare	Yes	647(F)PC; 853.7PC		
Cut suspect off	L108	Aggravated Assault	1/14/2015	Wed	11:30	Assault suspect arrested for stabbing bus op w/ screwdriver for cutting him off	Yes	422(A)PC & 14601.1(A)PC		
Demand stop	L780	Non-Aggravated Assault	1/15/2015	Thu	19:20	Sus MB/20s/601/150/red punched bus op in face over demanding to stop				
Disorderly	L18	Non-Aggravated Assault	1/20/2015	Tue	14:30	Sus MB/509/200/30s punched bus op in face on bus				
Fare	L780	Non-Aggravated Assault	1/23/2015	Fri	15:45	Battery suspect arrested for hitting bus op over fare	Yes	243.3PC		
Verbal Altercation	L48	Aggravated Assault	2/2/2015	Mon	10:32	Battery sus arrested for hitting bus op with cane	Yes	243.3PC		
Fare	L117	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/2/2015	Mon	17:57	Sus MB/16/507-508/170-180 threw ice cubes at bus op over fare				
No Reason	L60	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/4/2015		11:04	Battery sus arrested for rubbing bus op leg	Yes	243.3PC		Case Rejected by the DA - Insufficient Evidence
Fare	L53	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/7/2015	Sat	14:15	Sus MH/18-25/506/150 spit on bus op for quoting fare				
Policy/seating	L754	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/7/2015	Sat	17:45	Sus FB/49-50/507/160/Bln/Bro punched and kicked the bus op regarding policy				
Fare	L754	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/7/2015	Sat	17:21	quoted fare				
Domestic	L757	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/10/2015	Tue	20:47	Sus bf Taylor, Donta punched bus op in face three times over domestic argument				
No Reason	L611	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/12/2015	Thu	14:15	Sus FB/40s/Blk/Bro threw hot soup at the bus op				
Verbal Altercation	L760	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/13/2015	Fri	10:52	Mutual combat of bus op/passenger				
No Reason	L204	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/13/2015	Fri	0:42	Attempt Carjacking Sus arrested	Yes	10851(a)CVC & 243.3PC	10851(a)CVC & 243.3PC	30 Days Jail & 1 year Summary Probation
Tap Card	L460	Aggravated Assault	2/25/2015	Wed	10:15	Assault sus arrested for assaulting bus op	Yes	245(A)(1)PC; 211PC		
Policy/sitting	L33	Non-Aggravated Assault	2/27/2015	Fri	3:30	Assault sus arrested for hitting bus op	Yes	242PC		
Bus Line Info	L83	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/1/2015	Sun	17:45	Sus MB/34-36/507-509/160-180 punched bus op in face over wanting a different bus line information	No			Suspect deceased
Fare	L2	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/4/2015	Wed	16:10	punched a bus patron				
Tap Card	L45	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/10/2015	Tue	16:45	Sus MB/18/511/150 spit on bus op when he asked to see Tap Card	Yes			
Demand Stop	L910	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/14/2015	Sat	13:45	Sus FB/30-35*507-508/150-160/Blk/Bro w/ Tiger paw tattoos on thighs spit on bus op				
Route	L4	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/16/2015	Mon	21:54	Battery sus arrested for spitting on bus op	Yes	242/243.3PC; 640(D)(1)PC	242/243.3PC; 640(D)(1)PC	Convicted - 1 year Summary Probation & 8 days jail
No Reason	L761	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/17/2015	Tue	8:30	Sus MW/50-55/508/160 spit on bus op				
Route	L2	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/18/2015	Wed	9:30	Sus FW/25/Bro/Grn threw cold coffee at bus op over bus detour				
Demand Stop	L-Silver	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/19/2015	Thu	21:05	Sus MW/600/180 threw food at bus op for missing stop				
Fare	L150	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/20/2015	Sat	17:30	Sus MW/600/200/Bln/Brn punched bus op in face over fare				
Wanted Entry	L210	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/21/2015	Sat	20:05	Battery sus arrested for throwing cold liquid at bus op	Yes	243.3PC		
Demand Stop	L18	Aggravated Assault	3/23/2015	Mon	17:45	Sus MH/600/200 threatened bus op with knife demanded stop				
Policy/Disabled Companion	L260	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/25/2015	Wed	13:15	Battery sus arrested for shoving bus op	Yes	242/243.3PC		
Policy/end of line	L20	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/27/2015	Fri	7:00	Sus MB/509/160/30yrs punched bus op after he woke him up				
Money	L204	Robbery	3/27/2015	Fri	12:00	when she tried to stop him and exited bus				
Fare	L720	Non-Aggravated Assault	3/31/2015	Tue	15:20	Sus MB/28-35/509/190 threw cold liquid at bus op when asked about fare				
Fare	L70	Aggravated Assault	4/1/2015	Wed	23:33	Sus MH/18 hit bus op in face for quoting fare	Yes	245(A)(1)PC		
Route	L757	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/1/2015	Wed	14:50	Sus FA/50-60/500-502/100-120/Bro/Bro hit bus op on forearm with palm over bus route				
Demand Stop	L120	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/3/2015	Fri	13:15	Sus FB/20/507/125/Blk/Blk threw cold liquid on bus op after he demanded stop				
Other	L603	Aggravated Assault	4/5/2015	Sun	14:46	Assault suspect arrested for shooting at a bus, bus op hit with glass	Yes	246.3PC	246.3PC	
Other	L207	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/5/2015	Sun	19:25	Sus MB/511/200/50-55yrs spat on bus op b/c air conditioner was on				
Attempt-Jewelry	L108	Robbery	4/8/2015	Wed	14:45	Attempt Robbery sus arrested	Yes	211PC		
Other-Cigarettes	L720	Robbery	4/9/2015	Thu	16:50	Robbery sus arrested	Yes	211PC		
Other/Walked in front of bus	L10	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/12/2015	Sun	11:50	walking in front of bus				
Route	L206	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/15/2015	Wed	17:55	Vic (bus op) non-desirous of prosecution	No			Victim non-desirous
Fare	L233	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/16/2015	Thu	12:46	Battery sus arrested for spitting on bus op	Yes	415.3PC & 243.3PC	415.3PC & 243.3PC	
Fare	L704	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/17/2015	Fri	7:00	Sus MH/45/507/170 spit on the bus op for quoting fare after TAP cards had no funds				
Other/Cut Suspect off	L233	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/17/2015	Fri	8:00	Sus FB/40-41/509/110/Blk/Brn threw food at bus op for almost hitting her				
No Reason	L207	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/18/2015	Sat	14:30	Sus FB/25-30/507/medium/Blk/Blk threw liquid and liquor bottle at bus op for unknown reason				
Fare	L33	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/22/2015	Wed	14:15	MW/507-509/130/30-40hrs spat on bus op over fare				
Fare	L754	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/23/2015	Thu	12:52	Sus MH spat on bus op over fare				
Other	L233	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/24/2015	Fri	21:05	Sus MH/508/170/30 threw dirt on bus op for calling depts on him				
Fare	L152	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/26/2015	Sun	11:42	Sus MH/30-35/508/150/Blk/Bro spit in bus op face over fare				
No Reason	L788	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/27/2015	Mon	9:13	Battery sus arrested for hitting bus op in head for no reason				
Fare	L150	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/28/2015	Tues	14:50	Sus MH/18-21/506/170 spit on bus op for quoting fare				
Bus op closed door on sus	L16	Non-Aggravated Assault	4/29/2015	Wed	18:33	Assault sus arrested for hitting bus op when bus op closed doors on him				

*Highlighted in yellow: have court dates pending or have been referred to the LA City Attorney's Office with no disposition yet.