

TRANSIT EQUITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES 9-15-16

Committee members in attendance

Andre Baugh
Scotty Ellis
Roberta Hunte
Anneliese Koehler
Judi Martin
Julia Metz
Nicole Phillips
Rebecca Stavenjord

Staff in attendance

John Gardner, Diversity & Transit Equity
Jake Warr, Diversity & Transit Equity

Fare Enforcement

- Multiple teams are working on different components of FE. Some members voiced concern that TEAC won't be informing recommendations, just responding to them.
- Various areas of focus: Legal, Data analysis, Safety/security, Practices & Procedures
- Outcomes: How do you know that you've made a change? We're asking now, "How do you view fare enforcement?" should come back in a year to see if change is noticeable.
- Why are we talking about this as TEAC? What is our goal in doing this? What does success look like?
- Why is fare evasion criminalized? How do we de-criminalize it?
- Potential measurable outcome: decrease in African American population being cited.
- Question: will data analysis address locationality? Issues of hot spots and disproportionality.
- Issue of costs: for individual, TriMet, court system. How do we reduce for all three?
- How can we think in terms of shifting priorities?
- Mitigation and diversion programs?
- Fare enforcement uniforms communicate authority/criminality.
- Theme of listening sessions: be nice, be respectful.

- Consequences on the back end impact interaction w/ public (i.e. misdemeanor). Power differential high between inspectors and riders.
- Culture: hear safety a lot, but part of culture is that people who don't pay fare are bad people. Observation: drivers appear to be more circumspect about checking fares since arrest filmed and posted on FB. Some drivers have taken it upon themselves to enforce fares. Ex: speaking to a child in an inappropriate way.
- It's about consistency of message/communication. Different from one bus to another.
- Potential for implicit bias w/ flexibility. Can policies address that on a training/professional development end?
- Approach seems to be distrusting first.
- Customer service vs. enforcers.
- More enforcement is not better enforcement.
- Issue of clarity from public perspective of who is doing what. Need to define and communicate roles between fare inspection and police.
- Participants at listening sessions asked for both consistency and flexibility.
- How to incorporate above considerations/recommendations into process:
 - Key concepts/themes/issues of focus
 - Lens through which to look at recommendations
- How do we measure as a group whether this is being met? Quantitative and qualitative pieces?
- The sooner we get this to working group the better. Would like to get this into format before next TEAC meeting.
- Aim to put product together by next FE group meeting (Friday 9/23).
- Statement from TEAC w/ bulleted list of key areas/issues/etc and offer saying we're willing to help expand upon list and come up w/ specifics.
- Beyond financial costs – health, emotional. Can that be captured?

Low-income Fare

- Update from John on process – Four Nines still working on cost modeling.

- In addition to elected official etc. task force, community task force.
- Meeting September 27th
- Could bring attention/leverage to the conversation by getting federal legislator staff involved. Have something about this at housing summit?

TriMet Equity Team

- D & TE too small of a unit to take on full agency's needs in terms of equity. Want to get buy-in from other staff in agency.
- Minneapolis model. TEAC will be updated, consulted?
- Need buy-in of senior management.
- Metro undergoing similar process of getting staff to contribute on top of normal workload. Following Mult Co model.