Contents

1 Executive Summary
2 <mark>*To be added in future drafts after the work group reviews/revises this content*</mark>

3 Part 1: Work Group Overview

4

5 Work Group Background and Charge
6 On August 11, 2021, the Metropolitan Council formed the Metro Transit Police Work Group. The
7 business item stated that the purpose of forming this Work Group is to facilitate the police review.

8 In June 2020, Chair Zelle announced that the Metropolitan Council "in fulfilling our oversight role will be
9 conducting a comprehensive review of the Metro Transit department's policing policies, practices, and
10 relationships," and that this review would "inform our ongoing efforts to improve transit security and
11 customer experiences on our region's transit system."

12 In July 2020, the Metropolitan Council began working with the Citizens League to develop and
13 implement a robust community engagement strategy to guide this work. The Police Work Group is
14 charged with developing recommendations based on the Citizens League work and other information
15 and feedback received by the work group. The business item included two duties of the Police Work
16 Group:

17 **1. Design a series of Committee of the Whole discussions**

18 The Work Group will design a series of Committee of the Whole discussions that will occur at an
19 approximately monthly basis from August 2021 through February 2022. The Committee of the Whole
20 meetings should provide opportunities for the Council Members to receive information from the MTPD,
21 the results of the Citizens League review and other public input and from other sources, ask questions,
22 articulate priorities, and provide feedback as the work group develops recommendations

23 **2. Develop recommendations for consideration by the full Council**

24 By February 28, 2022, the Metro Transit Police Review Work Group will report back to the full
25 Metropolitan Council with recommended transit safety and security outcomes and strategies to achieve
26 the outcomes. The recommendations must also identify data and other information that Metro Transit
27 will provide the Metropolitan Council as part of regular Metro Transit Police Department (MTPD)
28 updates that will begin in Q1 2022. Once the Metropolitan Council accepts the recommendations, the
29 adopted outcomes and strategies will serve as Metropolitan Council policy guidance for the Metro
30 Transit Police Department.

31 Please see Appendix 1 for more information on the Police Work Group's membership, process, and work
32 plan.

33

34 Building on the Citizens League Safety Review
35 Citizens League Review Background
36 When calling for the police review in June 2020, Chair Zelle committed to begin this process with deep,
37 authentic community engagement. The Metropolitan Council partnered with the Citizens League to

1   conduct this community engagement. The Police Work Group is charged with taking in and building
2   from the feedback received through the Citizens League process to develop recommendations.

3   The Citizens League, along the Twin Cities Innovation Alliance, prioritized community voices in creating
4   the engagement process and in facilitating conversations and surveys. From September 2020 to August
5   2021, more than 1,000 people participated in various aspects of the process, which included planning
6   discussions, stakeholder interviews, virtual public meetings, outreach at busy transit centers, and an
7   online survey. And this engagement work was only the beginning.

8   In September the Citizens League and Twin Cities Innovation Alliance presented to the Police Work
9   Group. Additionally, the Citizens League interim report was presented to the Committee of the Whole in
10 August 2021, and the final report was discussed at the September Committee of the Whole meeting.

11 Citizens League Review Summary

12 *Key themes from participants*

13 The following themes arose from the Transit Safety Conversations. It is important to note that during
14 this process it became clear that community members and stakeholders do not distinguish Metro
15 Transit Police from other police departments. Therefore, the results should be looked at through an
16 overall lens of public safety/transit safety in Minnesota.

17 **Perception vs. reality of safety.** In all the community engagement efforts the perception vs. reality of
18 safety was discussed.

19 **Passenger behavior impacts safety**. Respondents talked a great deal about other passenger's behaviors
20 and the impact this had on their perceptions and realities of safety.

21 **More riders lead to a feeling of safety**/ Due to the COVID19 pandemic, many riders talked about the
22 decrease in ridership and how having less people using trains and buses makes them feel unsafe. It is
23 important to note that overcrowded buses and trains do not lead to a feeling of safety and as some
24 participants noted actually lead to unsafe situations.

25 **Safety is more than enforcement**. Respondents mentioned that safety isn't just about fare
26 enforcement. Safety is being able to ride on transit without worry of physical and/or emotional harm,
27 without risk of violence or theft of personal property, without having to witness violence, with comfort,
28 and to arrive on time to one's destination without being harassed. Safety is found in clean facilities and
29 equipment. Safety includes being free from racial profiling and/or gender-based harassment. Safety
30 relates to frequency and timeliness of buses and trains.

31 **The presence of an authority figure leads to a greater sense of safety**. While there was a mix of
32 opinions shared about how safety is perceived with the presence of Metro Transit police, there was a
33 desire to see the Metro Transit police interact more with riders to build stronger community
34 relationships. A major theme that arose here was that people feel safer when there is some type of
35 authority figure present on platforms, buses, and trains.

36

37 *Key themes from stakeholders*

38 **Perception vs. Reality**. Every conversation included a discussion of how to separate people's
39 perceptions of safety from the actual on-the-ground reality of safety. Most expressed in some way that

1 for their largely white, affluent bases made up of people who do not need to take transit, perception is
2 more important.

3 **Bias and Discrimination, Centered on Race**. Whether coded or explicit, most conversations involved
4 some kind of reference to how race plays into perceptions of safety

5 **People**. The number one thing interviewees talked about when discussing their ideal vision for a public
6 transit system was people. People make up a transit system, and a system without people riding is not
7 doing its job. A well-populated system contributes to more feelings of safety.

8 **What is MTPD doing well?** Groups generally approved of the work the MTPD is doing, but most
9 mentioned that the use of uniformed police officers for low-level issues is an inefficient use of
10 resources.

11 **What could MTPD be doing better?** All groups indicated that they would like to see some kind of official
12 presence on the buses, trains, and platforms. Most agreed either that sworn police officers themselves
13 were not needed on a regular basis, or police presence should not be creating a climate of intimidation.
14 Most indicated support for some kind of ambassador program with folks who are identifiable, but not
15 armed or in a police uniform, who can be a friendly and helpful presence in the system.

16 **In your wildest dreams, what does a safe public transit system look like?** Respondents mentioned that
17 a safe public transit system would be one that is filled with people from all kinds of neighborhoods, and
18 of all different socio-economic backgrounds. That a safe public transit system is one that is clean, well-
19 maintained, reliable, and well-funded. Lastly, a safe public transit system is one that is an economic
20 driver that plays a key role in connecting people to jobs.

21 *Citizens League findings and recommendations*
22 • **Review other transit systems.** Conduct review of other cities transit systems to understand their
23   best practices, how they're addressing perceptions of safety vs realities of safety, and to learn
24   from jurisdictions that have robust transit systems in place.
25
26 • **Continue community engagement efforts**. The Transit Safety Conversation project should be
27   viewed as a snapshot in time. This project took place during an exceptional time in our
28   environment and state with the murder of George Floyd leading to civil unrest, the trial of Derek
29   Chauvin which impacted people's willingness and ability to participate in another public safety-
30   related project, and the COVID- 19 pandemic that changed ridership trends due to the public
31   health risks and fears.
32
33 • **Safety is more than enforcement**. As a forum participant put it, "A safe public transit system is a
34   well- funded public transit system." There are many strategies Metro Transit could invest in and
35   implement that would lead to an increased sense of safety among the ridership. A safer, cleaner
36   transit system would result in increased choice riders and increased fare revenue.
37
38 • **The behavior of other riders has a huge impact on perceptions of safety**. To some degree much
39   of this is outside the direct scope of Metro Transit's ability to impact: homelessness, agism,
40   sexism, poverty, chemical abuse. Many of the behaviors that riders complained about are
41   behaviors that are perceived as problematic in all public spaces, and Metropolitan Council

1 should be collaborating with other jurisdictions within the state, counties, and cities to solve
2 some of these social issues that impact safety. Advocating at the state and federal levels for
3 increased resources and capacities may also work to address the need.

4 Please see Appendix 2 for a longer summary of the Citizens League review. The full Citizens League
5 report is available *here.*

Metro Transit Employee Feedback Summary

6

7 The Police Work Group sought more information about the experiences and ideas of Metro Transit
8 employees. The work group received employee perspectives by reviewing results of frontline employees
9 who participated in the Citizens League process, results of an MTPD employee survey, and through
10 opportunities for employees to speak at the work group's public meetings.

Frontline Employee Engagement

11

12 During the Citizens League process, Council staff conducted on-site, in-person engagement with
13 operators and other frontline staff, such as maintenance, cleaners, and mechanics. This effort did not
14 specifically target MTPD employees, though MTPD employees had access to the employee survey open
15 during this time. Approximately 100 employees showed up to engagement events and filled out
16 surveys.

17 Themes from this engagement included:

18 • More prominent "security" presence on vehicles and general availability
19
20 • Demonstrable consequences for behaviors on the system
21
22 • Cameras, barriers, other safety features help
23
24 • Concern about creating an unwelcome environment for passengers
25
26 • Employees generally feel unsafe and anxious about safety on transit

MTPD Employee Survey

27

28 The work group directed staff to survey MTPD employees. The survey was conducted in mid-October
29 2021. In total, 118 MTPD employees (63%) responded. In the survey, eleven questions were repeated
30 from a January 2020 survey to compare responses between 2020 to 2021. Additionally, new 2021-only
31 questions were added to the survey at the request of the Police Work Group.

32 Overall results show a decrease in job satisfaction, increased concern there are not enough MTPD staff,
33 disagreement that referrals and enforcement actions are adequately resolved by other entities, and a
34 perceived lack of support from leadership and community.

November 5 Employee Panel

35

36 Eight Metro Transit employees were selected by the following groups to participate in the employee
37 panel:

38 • Transit Safety & Security Committee
39

1 • Metro Transit Equity & Inclusion Team

2

3 • ATU

4

5 • TMSA

6

7 • LELS – Full Time Officers

8

9 • LELS-Supervisors

10 Panel and Work Group Member comments included (not exhaustive list):

11 • **Safety concerns.** Frontline employees shared their experiences and expressed significant
12 concerns about their safety and security.

13

14 • **Response time.** Employees who require police assistance feel response time is slow, and there is
15 too little presence on the system to effectively support them.

16

17 • **Officer retention.** MTPD officers are leaving for other departments, but most are staying within
18 law enforcement.

19

20 • **Systemic issues.** Current situation is not unique or isolated to Metro Transit; broader systemic
21 issues are operating, and some are further compounded by the pandemic.

22

23 • **Leveraging partnerships.** Structures for accountability and leveraging partnerships to address
24 systemic issues are important.

25

26 • **Ideas.** Employees on the panel offered several ideas for improvements.

27 ## December 17 Public Comment Opportunity
28 Four MTPD officers participated in the public comment opportunity. They shared their perspectives on
29 officer recruitment and retention challenges and training as well as shared examples from their
30 experience as MTPD officers.

31 ## Public Feedback Summary

32 ## December 17 Public Comment Opportunity
33 The work group dedicated the December 17, 2021 meeting to public comment. This opportunity was
34 promoted through Council channels, including Council Member newsletters and social media.

35 Ten people provided comments during the December 17 meeting, including people speaking as
36 individuals and people representing organizations. Additionally, three comments were submitted in
37 writing prior to the meeting.

38 Themes from the comments included:

39 • **Justice.** Transit policing is an environmental justice and a racial justice issue.

1 · **Practices of other agencies.** Systems across the country are grappling with similar issues, and
2 Metro Transit should draw on practices from other transit agencies.
3

4 · **Transit service.** Route reliability and frequency is key to safety, and Metro Transit has needed to
5 reduce service due to operator shortage.
6

7 · **Conditions and behavior.** Experiences with poor behavior and conditions on vehicles and
8 platforms; too few officers visibly present. Consider other conditions when improving safety,
9 including equitably distributed clean, heated, well-lit shelters and reducing transit fares.
10

11 · **Office training.** Concerns about officer training (e.g., fewer in-person trainings due to COVID.)
12

13 · **Officer staffing levels.** Concerns about officer retention and why officers are leaving for other
14 departments
15

16 · **Working conditions.** Concerns about working conditions for operators, police officers, and
17 CSOs, including communication between operators and police
18

19 · **Police treatment of riders.** Concerns about police officer treatment of riders
20

21 · **Budget and resource allocation.** Concerns about resource allocation, including the growth of
22 MTPD budget, where officers are deployed, etc.
23

24 · **Public involvement.** Effective and frequent public engagement and communication are
25 important; need to bring community-lived experience into policy.
26

27 · **Administrative citations.** Support for administrative citations for fare non-compliance.
28

29 · **Expanded CSO programs.** Several comments about the expanded CSO program and need for
30 ambassadors, including:
31 o Some voiced support for the general direction of unarmed personnel who focus on
32 customer service, connecting people to services, and deescalating situations.
33 o CSO expansion might be a step in the right direction but only available to people on a
34 law enforcement career track.
35 o Concerns about CSOs carrying weapons (also concerns with MTPD officers being armed)
36 o Metro Transit needs to provide more information on CSO program goals and
37 performance.

38 Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee Comments
39 *November 3, 2021 TAAC Meeting*
40 Staff provided a brief Police Work Group overview to the Council's Transportation Accessibility Advisory
41 Committee (TAAC) during their November meeting, and TAAC members shared their feedback.

42 Comments included:

1   • **TAAC involvement.** TAAC members felt TAAC should have been more involved in the Police
2   Work Group from the start.
3

4   • **Members' experiences.** Several TAAC members shared their personal experiences riding Metro
5   Transit, including times when they've felt unsafe or uncomfortable riding or waiting for transit.
6

7   • **Questions about current practice.** TAAC members raised issues and posed questions, including:
8   ○ How are employees trained to work with people living with different types of disabilities
9   and multiple disabilities? (police officers, CSOs, and bus operators)
10   ○ Conditions of facilities – importance of good lighting, questions about when facilities are
11   open or locked

12 *February 2, 2022 TAAC Meeting*
13 Work Group Chair Chamblis presented a Police Work Group update to TAAC at their February 2022
14 meeting. TAAC members asked questions and provided feedback, including:

15   • **Coordinating with social and community service partners.** TAAC members posed questions
16   about how the Council coordinates with counties, social services, and community service
17   providers, including the nature of the collaboration and whether the Council receives data or
18   reports on high-demand ("hot spot") areas and needs from partners that can be used to guide
19   the Council's work.
20

21   • **Raising awareness about expectations.** Encouraged the work group to add "education" to their
22   recommendations – public transit is a collective experience, and some riders treat it as an
23   individual experience. Metro Transit can do more to raise awareness of expectations.
24

25   • **Disability justice**. TAAC Chair shared resources about the disability justice movement that
26   pertains to this work.
27

28   • **Unsheltered homelessness.** Concerns about people using bus stops as shelters and how that
29   will be addressed.
30

31   • **Officer staffing levels.** Officer recruitment/retention is an issue region wide and how is the
32   Council making sure MTPD is competitive with other law enforcement agencies.
33

1 Part 2: Work Group's Recommended Approach

2

3 *Considerations as you review and discuss Part 2:*

4 • ***Work group priorities*** *– placeholder for 2/11 discussion*
5 • ***Format for recommendations.*** *Work group may want to discuss the format of for*
6 *recommendations.*
7 • ***Draft goals.*** *The goals as currently drafted may not meet the SMART goal standard. The work*
8 *group can direct that Metro Transit/MTPD develop SMART goals as part of the action plan phase*
9 *that will follow the recommendations.*
10 • ***Deadline for Metro Transit/MTPD action plan.*** *The work group has not decided when Metro*
11 *Transit and MTPD should report back with the action plan they will develop based on these*
12 *recommendations.*

13

14 Values Guiding the Work Group's Recommendation

15 The work group identified several values and principles to guide their work.

16 **Key words**: dignity, fairness, just, anti-racist, quality, efficiency, positive impact, systems level approach,
17 stakeholders, community of accountability, safety/security

18 L**ist** of values (not in any order):

19 • Value **safety and security** on transit

20 • **Dignity, fairness**, and **just for all**

21 • **Rebuild confidence** in the **quality of transit for all**

22 • Value the broad **diversity** of the community we serve, including ability, race, ethnicity, gender,
23 and age

24 • Apply **anti-racist lens** and practice to this work. *1/14 and 1/28 meetings included discussions*
25 *about the need to define or clarify anti-racist lens/ant-racism for the purpose of the work group's*
26 *work and solutions*

27 • **Accountability and decision making** – requires mutual accountability or community of
28 accountability. Recognize the roles of Council Members, Metro Transit, MTPD leadership, and
29 external partners. Includes ensuring open, meaningful dialogue between Chief and Council.

30 • **Stakeholders** are key to success and to building strong recommendations – both internal and
31 external

32 • **Responsive to feedback** – not enough to accept feedback, need to follow **best public**
33 **participation practices** and follow up with people to let them know what was done with their
34 feedback and the actions that will be taken as a result

35 • **Systems-level approach**, not band-aids

- Assess recommendations to **ensure positive impact**/aim to **reduce negative impacts** on key communities

- Consider **efficient use of resources**

- Recommendations should be **realistic** and **doable**

Recommendation: Metro Transit and MTPD should develop a unified action plan to implement the recommended vision and goals by [date.]

The work group's vision identifies three areas of work:

1. Provide a quality transit experience for all through an anti-racist, equitable, and inclusive approach to transit safety, security, and policing

2. Address systemic issues by fostering community relationships and partnerships

    Demonstrate responsive leadership and accountability for results

Vision 1: Provide a quality transit experience for all through an anti-racist, equitable, and inclusive approach to transit safety, security, and policing

Issues

1. **Problematic conditions on transit vehicles and at facilities.** Problematic conditions and behavior that violates laws or Code of Conduct at facilities and on transit vehicles lead riders and employees to feel unsafe – important to provide quality experience for all.

2. **Low ridership.** Ridership is down significantly during the pandemic which contributes to riders feeling less safe; building ridership may lead to an increased feeling of safety.

3. **Service unreliability.** Unreliable or infrequent transit service contributes to riders feeling less safe.

4. **Insufficient youth engagement.** Metro Transit does not currently have a formal, comprehensive plan to engage with youth that includes collecting, maintaining, reviewing, and acting on data about interactions with youth.

5. **Insufficient official presence.** Perception that there is a lack of sufficient official presence with authority and skill on the system.

Goal 1.1: Provide a safe, consistent, quality experience for all on buses, trains, and facilities

This goal includes:

a) **Ensure quality conditions.** Provide transit stops and facilities that are brightly lit and clean.

b) **Prevent and address violations.** Ensure that violations of the Code of Conduct and laws are addressed. Take steps to educate and raise awareness about expectation to reduce incidents.

c) **Increase official presence with authority and skill.** Build a well-coordinated team of police, non-sworn personnel, and maintenance employees working together to improve customer experience.

d) **Improve transit service.** Continue efforts to improve the frequency and reliability of transit.

Progress on this goal may be measured by customer satisfaction, number of customer and employee complaints (e.g., complaints of feeling insecure, experiencing discrimination), and number of incidents.

The work group recognizes the correlation between increasing ridership and providing a safe, consistent, quality experience for all. Achieving a safe, consistent, and quality experience is important to rebuilding ridership, which in turn, may also improve a sense of safety.

Work Group Priorities
For discussion on February 11

Vision 2: Address systemic issues by fostering community relationships and partnerships

Issues
1. **Large jurisdiction stretches resources, requires partnerships.** Metro Transit Police Department is responsible for a large system that crosses many boundaries and jurisdictions. There is a need for strong relationships with local governments, city/county attorneys, and other stakeholders to improve conditions on transit and around transit facilities that are beyond Metro Transit's control.

2. **Systemic problems affect transit.** Systemic problems in the region's communities contribute to issues observed on transit. This can include crime, untreated severe mental illness, chemical addiction, homelessness, problems stemming from the pandemic, etc. *Potential follow-up discussion: are there also internal systemic issues that should be named?*

3. **Current law requires use of police officers to issue fare non-compliance citations.** The Minnesota State Legislature has not passed administrative citations policy, which would allow non-sworn personnel to inspect fares and issue citations for fare non-compliance, MTPD to redeploy officers to focus on public safety needs, and Metropolitan Council to reduce the penalty for fare non-compliance.

Goal 2.1: Communicate and engage with other jurisdictions, including law enforcement agencies, to work together towards solutions with immediacy and regularity

Potential follow-up discussion: Does the work group want to include language in Goal 2.1 to specifically address the Metropolitan Council's (and Council Members') roles and influence in solving systemic issues in the region that affect transit?

The work group recognizes the need mutual accountability or for creating a community of accountability around achieving transit safety.

1 Progress on this goal may be measured by tracking meetings and other communications with other
2 jurisdictions.

3 *Goal 2.2: Pass administrative citations legislation*

4

5 This goal includes:

6   a) **Advocate for law change.** Continue to advocate for administrative citations authority at the
7   legislature.

8

9   b) **Continue expanding non-sworn presence.** Continue Metro Transit efforts to increase official,
10   non-sworn presence on the transit system.

11 The work group recognizes that passing administrative citations legislation is not in the Metropolitan
12 Council's control. Administrative citations legislation would allow Metro Transit to issue an
13 administrative citation for fare non-compliance instead of the current criminal citation that can only be
14 issued by police officers. This change would allow employees who are not sworn police officers to
15 address fare compliance and would allow MTPD officers to focus their time on public safety issues.
16 Additionally, administrative citations authority would mean that people are not issued criminal citations
17 for fare non-compliance. The Council would handle administrative citations in-house (instead of sending
18 to the judicial system) and could lower the fine, which is currently set at approximately $180.

19 Progress on this goal may be measured by whether the legislature passes and the Governor signs
20 administrative citations legislation. If passed, additional measures could be established to track progress
21 on implementation and the outcomes of moving from criminal citations to administrative citations.

22 *Work Group Priorities*
23 *For discussion on February 11*

24

25 Vision 3: Demonstrate responsive leadership and accountability for results
26 *Note/Disclaimer – The Vision 3 section especially needs review and further work group discussion. The*
27 *draft content here is a staff attempt to combine some of the issues/gaps because police work group*
28 *members stated they felt there was duplication and a mix of problems and strategies in the previously*
29 *discussed list.*

30 *Issues*
31   1. **Council Member-MTPD communications.** Insufficient opportunity for Council Members to
32   regularly converse with Chief and GM regarding transit safety/security in addition to receiving
33   structured presentations.

34

35   2. **Lack of regular reports.** Lack of regular (routine) evaluation, data, and reporting on positive and
36   negative outcomes and regarding resource allocation.

37

38   3. **Unclear roles.** Distinctions among roles and responsibilities (e.g., Metro Transit and MTPD, RA,
39   Council Members) relating to transit policing and safety can be unclear.

1 4. **Employee concerns.** Employees expressed concerns about their sense of safety at work.
2

3 5. **Officer staffing levels.** Officer attrition increased in 2021; issues relating to officer recruitment
4   and retention need to be addressed.
5

6 6. **Timely response to feedback.** Need timely response to constituent feedback regarding safety on
7   transit.
8

9 *Goal 3.1: Develop effective communication structure between MTPD and Council so Council Members are*
10 *aware of and can act on issues affecting transit security and policing in a timely manner*
11

12 This goal includes:

13 a) **Increase depth and frequency of conversations.** Provide more opportunities for less-structured
14   conversations between Council Members and MTPD. Move beyond only providing PowerPoint
15   presentations in Council meetings.
16

17 b) **Communicate about challenges.** Police should provide Council Members with information
18   about the issues and challenges facing MTPD. With more regular information, Council Members
19   can act before conditions are dire.
20

21 c) **Report data and information to regularly.** Provide reports to the Metropolitan Council and
22   public on a regular basis that include qualitative data, quantitative data, and other information
23   to assess performance and outcomes. This work includes creating standards for collecting data,
24   analyzing data, setting targets and desired performance outcomes, and reporting data.
25

26 The work group recognizes that the business item forming the Police Work Group presumes there will
27 be quarterly MTPD updates to the Metropolitan Council. Goal 3.1 elaborates on what the work group
28 recommends in terms of Council-MTPD communications.
29

30 *Goal 3.2: Define positive and negative outcomes and evaluate policies, practices, and procedures to ensure*
31 *positive outcomes and reduce negative impacts on communities.*
32

33 This goal includes:

34 a) **Define positive outcomes and assess performance.** This includes understanding progress
35   towards the value of making sure all are treated with dignity, fairness, and in a just manner**.**
36   *(This may relate to 3.1.c. on lines 24-27.)*

37 *Goal 3.3: Seek out and address employee transit safety security needs and concerns in a meaningful and*
38 *timely manner*
39

1   This goal includes:

2   a) **Collect employee feedback.** Continue the use of employee surveys, committees/employee
3   groups, and other channels to receive direct employee feedback.
4
5   b) **Take action and follow up with employees.** Ensure consistent communications and follow up
6   with employees, so employees know what actions are taken based on feedback and why.

7

8   *Goal 3.4: Seek out and address public feedback on transit safety and security in a meaningful and timely*
9   *manner*
10

11 This goal includes:

12 a) **Respond quickly to concerns.** Set standards for responding to constituent concerns and
13   complaints and assessing current staff capacity to meet those standards. This also includes
14   following public engagement best practices and following up with people who provide feedback,
15   so they know what happened with the input they provided.
16
17 b) **Follow public engagement best practices[1].** Use public engagement best practices that recognize
18   and value the broad diversity of the communities we serve (gender, race, ethnicity, people living
19   with disabilities, age). This includes specifically supporting and engaging youth in our
20   communities.
21

22 *Work Group Priorities*
23 *For discussion on February 11*

24

25 Ideas for Data and Information
26 The business item forming the Police Work Group states that the work group's recommendations *must*
27 *also identify data and other information that Metro Transit will provide the Metropolitan Council as part*
28 *of regular Metro Transit Police Department (MTPD) updates that will begin in Q1 2022.*

29 Work group members discussed the importance of establishing standards for collecting, analyzing, and
30 reporting information This includes using both quantitative data and qualitative data. Data should be
31 disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age... *are there other categories that should be named for data*
32 *disaggregation? See also Goal 3.1 above.*

---

[1] The Metropolitan Council's Public Engagement Plan contains guidance about preferred practices related to
engagement. Staff will be recommending updates to the plan as a result of the Citizens League work and feedback
from employees and community members as part of this process. In addition, a full update of the Public
Engagement Plan will occur in conjunction with the 2050 regional planning process, which will involve additional
public engagement

1　The work group recommends regular reports include:

2　*Work group members suggested the following items at the 1/28/22 meeting*

3　• MTPD staffing levels

4　• Employee satisfaction level

5　• What's the "solve" rate for MTPD cases/actions and what happens afterwards? Do we get an

6　appropriate outcome?

7　• Information on issues at our facilities and on vehicles

8　• Management of resources

9

10　*For reference – the following list of outcomes, inputs, outputs, and disparities/equity is drawn from*

11　*staffs' presentation at the 12/3/21 work group meeting. It's copied here as an example to help feed work*

12　*group discussion but may not represent the interests of work group members and needs further*

13　*discussion. When Metro Transit/MTPD develop the action plan based on the recommendations, staff will*

14　*need to identify what "good" performance means (reducing, improving, etc.), the degree of control or*

15　*influence the Met Council has over the measure (especially for "outcome" measures), assess data*

16　*quality/availability, etc.*

17　*Outcomes*

18　• *Number and severity of crimes that occur*

19　• *Customer and employee sense of safety*

20　*Inputs*

21　• *Resources for patrols, engagement, inspections, investigations, etc.*

22　• *Number of officers, CSOs, etc.*

23　• *Allocation of resources that contribute to public safety, including staff time and by location*

24　*Outputs*

25　• *Coverage of the system, operator check-ins, on-boards*

26　• *Calls for service, response time to calls*

27　• *Fare inspections, warnings, citations, arrests*

28　*Address disparities and equity*

29　• *Identifying potential disparate outcomes in policing*

30　• *Understanding mechanisms of disparities*

31　　o *Bias and systemic racism*

32　• *Addressing disparities*

33　　o *Hiring*

34　　o *Training*

35　　o *Policy*

1   Appendices

2

3   1 - Work Group Process

4

5   Members

6 The business item establishing the work group named Council Member Chamblis to chair the work
7 group and appointed seven additional Council Members to serve on the work group: Atlas-Ingebretson,
8 Fredson, Lilligren, Muse, Sterner, Vento, and Wulff.

9 When Ms. Atlas-Ingebretson resigned from the Council in October 2021, she remained on the work
10 group as a community member. Council Member Muse resigned from the work group in November
11 2021.

12 In addition to the members appointed to the work group, the Equity Advisory Committee (EAC) named
13 member Anita Urvina Davis to serve as the EAC liaison to the work group.

14 The membership of the work group comprises quorums of the Council's Community Development
15 Committee and Environment Committee.

16   Meetings

17 The work group met approximately every two weeks from August 27, 2021 through February 25, 2022
18 for a total of <mark>14 meetings.</mark>

19 Meetings were scheduled for 90 minutes each and were publicly noticed three business days in advance
20 per Open Meeting Law.

21 Meeting agenda and materials are kept on the Metropolitan Council's website:
22 https://metrocouncil.org/Council-Meetings/Committees/Community-Development-Committee/Metro-
23 Transit-Police-Work-Group.aspx. Video of meetings is available upon request.

24 Meetings were structured based on the work group's work plan developed in September, summarized in
25 Table 1.

26

Police Work Group Report | First Draft for 2/11/22 Discussion

1 *Table 1: Work Plan Summary*

2

Phase 1 Focus: Work Group kick-off/initial issue identification	
August 27	**Kick-off** • Work group introductions • Discussion of priorities, desired outcomes • MTPD Department Overview Presentation Review • Review August 11 business item (work group charge)
September 10	**Citizens League Engagement Report** • Receive and discuss final Citizens League engagement report
Phase 2 Focus: Review existing policies, practices, and procedures and identify potential recommendations	
September 23	**Develop work plan/schedule** **Overview of 21st Century Policing at MTPD** - Chief Frizell **Initial overview of other transit agencies' approaches -** overview of past research; discuss what additional information is desired
October 8	**Shared values and principles on safety** • Council Member discussion to identify values and principles that will guide this work
October 15	**Conditions on the system** • Review existing Code of Conduct content and enforcement, including how this relates to customer perceptions of safety • Homeless Action Team Update • Partnerships with community groups, including presenters from A Mother's Love
November 5	**Frontline employee perspectives** • Frontline workers perspectives – hear directly from frontline employees • Results of MTPD employee survey
November 19	**Youth, including minors** • Policies/procedures that govern interaction with youth, including minors • Officer training for interacting with youth • MTPD programs focused on youth • Metro Transit Student Pass programs, including MTPD interactions with youth who use the bus to go to/from school
December 3	**Data, governance, and accountability structures** • Overview of existing data and reporting • Data the Council wants to receive on a regular basis
December 17	**Open forum/public comment opportunity** • Opportunity for individuals or organizations to speak directly to the work group
Phase 3 Focus: Develop recommendations	
January 4	**Discuss framework for developing recommendations** • Values discussion
January 14	**Identify issues and gaps**
January 28	**Identify goals**
February 11	***Discuss first, incomplete draft of recommendations, make decisions, provide direction to staff to refine report draft***
February 25	***Wrap up work group*** • *Provide final directions to staff to finish recommendations document that will be sent to the Council by February 28, 2022, per the August 2021 business item*
February 28	*Recommendations transmitted to full Council per business item deadline*

1 The work group satisfied the business item requirement of providing monthly updates to the
2 Metropolitan Council Committee of the Whole:

3 • [September 15, 2021](#)
4 • [October 20, 2021](#)
5 • [November 17, 2021](#)
6 • [December 15, 2021](#)
7 • [January 19, 2022](#)
8 • **February 16, 2022** (link will be added after the meeting)

9 ## 2- Citizens League Review Summary
10

11 The following summary is drawn from the summary sent to all Council Members in September 2021, and
12 some of this content is included in Part 1 of this report

13 The page references tie to the Citizens League report**:** [https://citizensleague.org/wp-](https://citizensleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Citizens-League_Transit-Safety-Project_-Final-Report.pdf)
14 [content/uploads/2021/09/Citizens-League_Transit-Safety-Project_-Final-Report.pdf](https://citizensleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Citizens-League_Transit-Safety-Project_-Final-Report.pdf)

15

16 *Key themes from participants*
17 *Pages 6-7*

18 The following themes arose from the Transit Safety Conversations. It is important to note that during
19 this process it became clear that community members and stakeholders do not distinguish Metro
20 Transit Police from other police departments. Therefore, the results should be looked at through an
21 overall lens of public safety/transit safety in Minnesota.

22 **Perception vs. reality of safety** – In all of the community engagement efforts the perception vs. reality
23 of safety was discussed.

24 **Passenger behavior impacts safety** – Respondents talked a great deal about other passenger's
25 behaviors and the impact this had on their perceptions and realities of safety.

26 **More riders lead to a feeling of safety** – Due to the COVID19 pandemic, many riders talked about the
27 decrease in ridership and how having less people using trains and buses makes them feel unsafe. It is
28 important to note that overcrowded buses and trains do not lead to a feeling of safety and as some
29 participants noted actually lead to unsafe situations.

30 **Safety is more than enforcement** – Respondents mentioned that safety isn't just about fare
31 enforcement. Safety is being able to ride on transit without worry of physical and/or emotional harm,
32 without risk of violence or theft of personal property, without having to witness violence, with comfort,
33 and to arrive on time to one's destination without being harassed. Safety is found in clean facilities and
34 equipment. Safety includes being free from racial profiling and/or gender-based harassment. Safety
35 relates to frequency and timeliness of buses and trains.

36 **The presence of an authority figure leads to a greater sense of safety** – While there was a mix of
37 opinions shared about how safety is perceived with the presence of Metro Transit police, there was a
38 desire to see the Metro Transit police interact more with riders to build stronger community

1 relationships. A major theme that arose here was that people feel safer when there is some type of
2 authority figure present on platforms, buses, and trains.

3

4 *Key themes from stakeholders*
5 *Pages 11-14*

6 **Perception vs. Reality** – Every conversation included a discussion of how to separate people's
7 perceptions of safety from the actual on-the-ground reality of safety. Most expressed in some way that
8 for their largely white, affluent bases, made up of people who do not need to take transit, perception is
9 more important.

10 **Bias and Discrimination, Centered on Race** – whether coded or explicit, most conversations involved
11 some kind of reference to how race plays into perceptions of safety

12 **People** – the number one thing interviewees talked about when discussing their ideal vision for a public
13 transit system was people. People make up a transit system, and a system without people riding is not
14 doing its job. A well-populated system contributes to more feelings of safety.

15 **What is MTPD doing well?** Groups generally approved of the work the MTPD is doing, but most
16 mentioned that the use of uniformed police officers for low-level issues is an inefficient use of
17 resources.

18 **What could MTPD be doing better?** All groups indicated that they would like to see some kind of official
19 presence on the buses, trains, and platforms. Most agreed either that sworn police officers themselves
20 were not needed on a regular basis, or police presence should not be creating a climate of intimidation.
21 Most indicated support for some kind of ambassador program with folks who are identifiable, but not
22 armed or in a police uniform, who can be a friendly and helpful presence in the system.

23 **In your wildest dreams, what does a safe public transit system look like?** Respondents mentioned that
24 a safe public transit system would be one that is filled with people from all kinds of neighborhoods, and
25 of all different socio-economic backgrounds. That a safe public transit system is one that is clean, well-
26 maintained, reliable, and well-funded. Lastly, a safe public transit system is one that is an economic
27 driver that plays a key role in connecting people to jobs.

28

29 *Findings & Recommendations*
30 *Pages 7, 17-18*

31 - best practices, how they're addressing perceptions of safety vs realities of safety, and to learn
32   from jurisdictions that have robust transit systems in place.

33

34 - **Continue community engagement efforts**. The Transit Safety Conversation project should be
35   viewed as a snapshot in time. This project took place during an exceptional time in our
36   environment and state with the murder of George Floyd leading to civil unrest, the trial of Derek
37   Chauvin; impacting people's willingness and ability to participate in another public safety related
38   project, and the COVID- 19 pandemic that changed ridership trends due to the public health
39   risks and fears.

- **Safety is more than enforcement**. As a forum participant put it, "A safe public transit system is a well- funded public transit system." There are many strategies Metro Transit could invest in and implement that would lead to an increased sense of safety among the ridership. A safer, cleaner transit system would result in increased choice riders, and increased fare revenue.

- **The behavior of other riders has a huge impact on perceptions of safety**. To some degree much of this is outside the direct scope of Metro Transit's ability to impact: homelessness, agism, sexism, poverty, chemical abuse. Many of the behaviors that riders complained about are behaviors that are perceived as problematic in all public spaces, and Metropolitan Council should be collaborating with other jurisdictions: state, county, and cities to solve some of these social issues that impact safety and advocating at the state and federal levels for increased resources and capacities to address the need.

Some of the strategies named by the collective rider community include:

1. Clean, well-lit, and well-maintained stops, platforms, and vehicles. Daily garbage removal and timely replacement of broken facilities. This includes timely and thorough snow removal. Riders will rise to the environment they are given. Create an 'Adopt a platform' model based on the 'adopt a highway' Program or create jobs and hire enough people to do this right.

2. Address pedestrian crossing safety; install flashing lights at pedestrian crossings not at intersections, especially along the Green Line.

3. Address the reliability of existing routes and times. Improve the mobile apps that track times and vehicle movements. Add service so wait times are reduced.

4. Either eliminate fares, provide reduced fares to people experiencing economic hardship, and/or enclose train platforms so that only ticketed riders can enter.

5. Provide customer service, anti-racism, and de-escalation training to drivers and conductors. The driver's behavior has a significant impact on perceptions of safety among riders.

6. Add conductors to check fares if needed. Employ a community safety approach and hire unarmed ambassadors/helpers/security to de-escalate conflicts, address negative behavior, and connect those needing services to the appropriate resources.

7. Increase capacity for bicyclists to access transit by adding more bike racks and bike racks that will accommodate fat tire cycles for winter commuters.

8. Create a more effective and responsive emergency text, button or call system.

9. Consult people with disabilities before installing safety features and/or accommodations.

10. Provide drivers with a translation app so that people with limited English proficiency can feel safe.

11. Sponsor Public Service Announcements and visual campaigns on the transit vehicles can help create cultural norms that prevent some of the gender based and disability-based harassment. Perhaps a "safety matters to me" campaign.

12. Train Transit police, drivers and/or ambassador type staff how to appropriately respond to and handle sexual harassment and sexual violence incidents so that victims are not retraumatized. This is significant problem to be addressed.

13. Continue to convene and engage the ridership community by utilizing the Community Planning Committee long term. This community engagement process needs to continue. Because of the context marginalized communities were not reached, more time is needed. And it needs to be ongoing to ensure the rider voice is driving the design of a safe for all transit system.

Question for work group members: are there other items that should be appended to the report?