

Public Safety Advisory Committee

Prepared by the PSAC Facilitator Team

MEMO

Date: April 7th, 2022

To: Metro Office of the Chief Executive Officer

From: Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC)

Re: Outcomes from the April 6th, 2022 PSAC Meeting - Guidance on Metro's FY23 Public Safety Budget

During the April 6th, 2021 Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) meeting, the advisory body held a vote to approve the following:

- A proposal to approve the recommendations for Guidance on Metro's FY23 Public Safety Budget (Link: [draft Guidance on Metro's FY23 Public Safety Budget here](#))

Below is a summary of the committee action:

- PSAC voted to approve a modified version of the Guidance on Metro's FY23 Public Safety Budget. Those modifications are detailed below. The vote was 9 "yes," 1 "no," 1 "abstain," and 4 members "absent." (Link: [Approved Guidance on Metro's FY23 Public Safety Budget](#))

Proposal to approve the recommendations of the recommendations on Guidance for Metro's FY23 Public Safety Budget

Members requested three modifications to the draft recommendations. The following modifications are as follows and are indicated by a green highlight in the approved document.

- Understanding that this document focuses on the coming year's Public Safety Budget, the committee asked to explicitly mention that its long-term vision is for Metro to transition away from the policing contracts and move to being served by non-contracted law enforcement. This directive was [previously approved by the committee in this document](#).
- The committee requested additional detail be added to the takeaway regarding "Recategorization and Increased Transparency When Naming Budget Items."
- The committee requested the creation of a line item in future Public Safety Budgets that would fund coordination between the Office of Race and Equity and System Safety & Law Enforcement on public safety program development and implementation.

With these modifications, the recommendations were approved by a simple majority vote.

APPROVED: Public Safety Advisory Committee LA Metro FY23 Budget Guidance

About these recommendations

To assist in Metro's Fiscal Year 2023 Budget process, facilitators polled members of the Public Safety Advisory Committee on their preferences regarding funding allocations in the Public Safety budget. Members were provided with funding categories and budget line items from Metro's FY22 budget. Committee members could respond that more funding, about the same funding, or less funding should be committed to the budget line items identified by Metro staff. Members could also respond "I'm not sure" and provide questions and context that would aid them in making a decision.

The funding categories, budget line items, and percentages from Metro's FY22 budget are detailed below:

<i>Funding Category/Line Item</i>	<i>Amount (Percentage)</i>
Creating a Safe Environment (\$18.8M or 5.8% of total Public Safety budget)	
Call Point Security Program	\$5M (1.55%)
Flexible Dispatch Pilot	\$1M (0.31%)
Pilot Safety Strategies for bus stop lighting	\$1.5M (0.47%)
Pilot Safety Strategies aboard buses	\$1.5M (0.47%)
Elevator Attendants	\$1M (0.31%)
Replacement of Non-Revenue Vehicles	\$800K (0.25%)
Track and Tunnel Intrusion Systems	\$8M (2.49%)
Emergency Response (\$46M or 14.3% of total Public Safety budget)	
Emergency Security Operations	\$46M (14.3%)
Homeless Outreach (\$11.85M or 3.68% of total Public Safety Budget)	
Homeless Counts	\$250K (.08%)
Outreach Teams	\$5M (1.55%)
Shelter Services	\$3.6M (1.12%)

<i>Funding Category/Line Item</i>	<i>Amount (Percentage)</i>
Pilot Homeless Strategies	\$3M (.93%)
Investments in Technology (\$7.43M or 2.31% of total Public Safety budget)	
Digital Rider Alert System	\$500K (0.16%)
Rescue Rider Pilot	\$400K (0.12%)
Transit Watch Marketing	\$150K (0.05%)
Additional cameras, fencing and security kiosks at key locations	\$250K (.08%)
Purchase, install and replace new CCTV cameras and DVRs at Rail Stations and bus lines	\$3M (.93%)
SSLE delivery of telecommunication devices	\$285K (.09%)
Subscription to a Workflow Management Software Application for personnel complaints and use-of-force investigations	\$1M (.31%)
Cyber Security and Architecture Assessment	\$1.7M (.53%)
Procure services for badge readers at substations, fencing at Union Station, and promoting safety and security throughout Metro	\$150K (.05%)
Law Enforcement (\$162M or 50.36% of total Public Safety budget)	
Los Angeles Police Department	\$88M (27.35%)
Los Angeles Sheriff's Department	\$66M (20.52%)
Long Beach Police Department	\$8M (2.49%)
SSLE Staffing Resources and Training (\$4.6M or 1.43% of total Public Safety budget)	
Temporary staff allocations to support SSLE's key initiatives	\$600K (0.19%)
Global Security Exchange Annual Conference and other trainings for non-contract staff	\$12,500 (0.004%)
Labor and fringe costs	\$4M (1.24%)
Security Presence (\$51M or 15.85% of total Public Safety budget)	

<i>Funding Category/Line Item</i>	<i>Amount (Percentage)</i>
Private Security with RMI	\$24M (7.46%)
Metro Transit Security	\$27M (8.39%)
Transit Ambassador Program (\$20M or 6.22% of total Public Safety budget)	
Transit Ambassador Pilot Program	\$20M (6.22%)

Budget Guidance

Using the respondent data from the survey administered in advance of the 03/02/22 General Committee meeting, the facilitation team has drafted the following guidance. The “Key Takeaways” section summarizes high-level recommendations and areas of clear alignment among committee members. The “Detailed Feedback” section provides more in-depth polling results and discusses additional information needs for PSAC members to provide further feedback.

Polling results can be found in summary [here](#) and as individual responses [here](#).

Key Takeaways

- 1) **Less Funding for Private Security:** Roughly 86% of committee members would like to see less funding allocated to private security personnel on Metro.
- 2) **More Funding for Homeless Services:** For almost all strategies under Homeless Outreach Services, committee members would like to see funding increase.
- 3) **No Increase for Law Enforcement Contracts:** For the Law Enforcement Contracts, members would not like to see funding increase. Instead, they opt for a decrease in funding or recommend that funding remain the same.
- 4) **More Funding for Transit Ambassadors:** Members would like to see funding increase for the Transit Ambassador pilot program.
- 5) **Continue Investing in “Creating a Safe Environment”:** Members would like to see the funding increase or remain the same for the Creating a Safe Environment strategies.
- 6) **Mixed Feedback re: Technology:** Funding for Investments in Technology see mixed preferences based on the individual strategies. However, for all strategies in this category, members seek to increase or maintain funding levels.
- 7) **No Consensus Around Emergency Response and Safety & Security:** There is no clear consensus around the funding for Emergency Response or Safety & Security Initiatives Support.

- 8) **Need for Revised Categorization and Increased Transparency When Naming Budget Items:** Members requested that a number of budget line items be recategorized or renamed in the preceding table. The reorganization should strive to increase public understanding of how monies will be used and better reflect the end recipient of Public Safety Budget funds. Members felt that certain terminology or vague titling (such as “Emergency Response” being used for the design and construction of a physical building) obfuscated the funding’s purpose. Additionally, this request attempts to correctly categorize when funds are going to law enforcement or agencies or internal System Safety initiatives.
- 9) **Request for Public Safety Budget to Include Funding for Metro’s Office of Equity and Race (OER):** Citing information from a presentation on the forthcoming Place-Based Implementation Strategy, members requested that forthcoming Public Safety Budgets include a line-item set-aside for the SSLE department to coordinate with OER on new and ongoing public safety program development and implementation.

Detailed Feedback

Creating a Safe Environment

Members call for funding to increase or be maintained for most strategies in this category. Increases in funding are preferred for Flexible Dispatch and Elevator Attendants. However, members have expressed concern about law enforcement’s involvement in the Flexible Dispatch system, indicating it would further embed law enforcement in a program intended to increase the use of alternative first responders to police. See [draft recommendations from the Non-Law Enforcement Alternatives ad hoc committee](#) for further context.. Bus Stop Lighting, the Call Point Initiative, and Onboard Bus Pilot Safety Strategies are split between members desiring an increase to funding or a continuation of the same level of funds. Replacement of Non-Revenue Vehicles is largely preferred to remain the same, but it should be noted that several members are unclear about the function of this item. Finally, members are split on how funding should be allocated for Track and Tunnel Intrusion Systems.

Additional information requests for this category include:

- Further detail on non-revenue vehicles and track/tunnel intrusion systems;
- Providing a summary of the quantitative safety benefits of lighting;
- Information on how track/tunnel intrusion systems may affect people living with disabilities;
- And exploring the possibility of including and increasing budgets for cleaning, custodians, and operators under this category.

Emergency Response

The committee is split on the allocation of funding to the Emergency Security Operations budget item. Polling results show roughly 43% preferring funding remain the same, 29% preferring an increase in funding, 21% preferring less funding, and 7% unsure. The item is described in the survey as an initiative to “...support delivery of the Emergency Security Operations Center (ESOC) building design. It is a key part of Metro’s overall strategy of enhancing its system

security program, interoperable communications infrastructure, transit incident monitoring, security technology operational monitoring, and emergency management systems.”

Additional information requests for this category include:

- Sharing outcomes and Key Performance Indicators for the Emergency Response initiatives

Homeless Outreach

The committee recommends allocating more funding to Outreach Teams, Shelter Services, and Pilot Homelessness Strategies. Each of these items has over 70% of members indicating that there should be more funding dedicated to these initiatives. However, the committee is split on the funding for Homeless Counts, with results showing roughly 36% preferring more funding, 29% preferring the same level of funding, 29% opting for a reduction in funding, and 7% being unsure.

Investments in Technology

This category sees the most divisive results amongst the committee. Digital Rider Alerts, the Rescue Rider Pilot, and More Tech Resources at Key Metro Locations all have a majority of respondents who prefer an increase in funding, with a lesser but still sizable contingent who prefer to sustain the current level of funding. However, More Tech Resources also has a notable contingent of members (~21%) that prefer a decrease in funding.

Conversely, respondents prefer sustaining current funding levels for Transit Watch Marketing and the Cyber Security Assessment; there is a smaller group who prefer to increase funding. Notably, the Cyber Security Assessment has 21% of respondents asking for more information on this item; respondents indicate a lack of specificity for this initiative.

Other items – Funding of CCTV Cameras, Provision of Telecommunications Devices, Badge Readers et al., and Workflow Management Software – offer no clear consensus. Funding for CCTV Cameras see members voting 43% to have funding stay the same, 36% to increase, and 21% to decrease. The Provision of Telecommunications Devices see the following results: roughly 43% prefer the same level of funding, 29% want an increase, and 21% want a decrease in funding. For Badge Readers et al., the results are: roughly 43% for increased funding, 36% for the same level of funding, and 21% of members needing more information. The Workflow Management Software item is equally split, with results of 36% for more funding, 36% for the same level of funding, 14% for less funding, and 14% requesting more information.

Additional information requests include:

- The incidence rates of missed trips to inform the effectiveness of the Rescue Rider Pilot;
- Key Performance Indicators for Transit Watch application;
- Evidence of Metro employee support for various initiatives receiving funding;
- Additional information on the Cyber Security and Architecture Assessment;
- More detail related to the function of badge readers and the utility of fencing at Union Station.

Law enforcement

The committee is largely split on the funding for Law Enforcement Contracts. For the LAPD contract, 50% of respondents say funding should remain the same, whereas 43% say funding should decrease. For the LBPd contract, 57% say funding should stay the same, whereas 43% say funding should decrease. Notably, results for the LASD contract differ, with 64% calling for a decrease in funding for the Sheriffs and 29% saying funding should remain consistent.

While the committee understood that these recommendations operate within the realities of the coming year, they called upon Metro to adhere to the committee's long-term vision for transitioning away from the Multi-Agency Policing Contracts. They called for these funds, which take up more than half the budget, to be redistributed to community-identified alternatives for public safety such as the Transit Ambassador program. For additional context on this vision, see [previous PSAC recommendations that call for the ceasing of Metro's contracted law enforcement services](#).

SSLE Staffing Resources and Training

The committee is divided on this item, with this section having the highest percentage of requests for more information. For Temporary Staff Allocation, 36% of members call for more funding, 36% prefer the same level of funding, 14% recommend less funding, and 14% require more information. For Non-Contract Staff Training, the majority of members (57%) suggest the same level of funding, 14% request more funding, 14% prefer less funding, and 14% require more information. For Labor and Fringe Costs, members indicate the following preferences: roughly 36% for the same level of funding, 29% for more funding, 29% requiring more information, and 7% for less funding. Metro should provide further explanation for all items in this category if the agency seeks a conclusive poll.

Security Presence

The committee has differing opinions on the two items in this category. They categorically call for less funding to Private Security with RMI, with 86% of respondents indicating a preference for less funding. This preference tracks with previous recommendations from the committee; [members recommended that contracted security is phased out and reimaged as in-house Metro positions](#). Members are split as to how to fund Metro Transit Security, with 43% calling for increased funding, 29% calling for the same level of funding, and 29% calling for a reduction in funding.

Transit Ambassador Pilot Program

Note: voting on this item occurred during the 3/16 General Committee meeting and results can be found in the video [here](#).

Members were in support of increasing or maintaining funding for the forthcoming Transit Ambassador pilot program. This item sees members voting 70% to increase funding, 24% to maintain funding levels, and 6% to decrease funding. Members have previously called for a shift of funds from contract security and contracted law enforcement to support the Transit Ambassador program, along with other unarmed public safety alternatives.

Additional Considerations

In keeping with PSAC's continued calls for change, committee members expressed that the forthcoming budget does not propose enough of a shift from the existing Metro public safety paradigm. Rather than continuing to increase funding to law enforcement services that have not demonstrated an empirical value for their contracts, the committee recommends that Metro prioritizes mental health services, [homeless outreach and shelter services](#), [transit ambassadors](#), and funding safety initiatives outlined in Metro's [Customer Experience plan](#). Additionally, the committee recommends for Metro to practice innovative leadership and trial pilot programs that are consistent with the Metro Board-approved [mission and values statements for public safety](#).