

TRANSIT EQUITY and ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES 1-21-16

Committee members in attendance

Andre Baugh
T. Allen Bethel (Board liaison)
Heidi Guenin
Roberta Hunte (Co-chair)
Hannah Kelley
Dylan Kenney
Anneliese Koehler
Judi Martin (Co-chair)
Julia Metz
Nicole Phillips
Rebecca Stavenjord
Holly Sullins

Staff in attendance

John Gardner, Diversity & Transit Equity
Doug Kelsey, Chief Operating Officer
Ryan McBee, Diversity & Transit Equity
Jake Warr, Diversity & Transit Equity

Guests in attendance

Tiffany Thompson

Fare Enforcement

(See PowerPoint for framework of conversation)

Committee discussion:

- Fare enforcement causes a plug in the court system, which is costly. Can costs be re-distributed?
- Multnomah County Safety & Justice Challenge: How do we reduce reliance on jail system?
 - o Abbey Stamp and Local Public Safety Coordinating Council. Rebecca will put in touch with Jake
- If goal is less fare evasion, how do we effectively accomplish this? Are there other options?
- Fare inspectors basically don't have other options than citations
- Are there #'s for bus operators (i.e. is there disparity in driver behavior?)
- "For me it's a relief that I don't experience on the bus what I experience on the MAX."
- "Operators and fare inspectors are the face of TriMet."
- Geographic differences?
 - o Jake will look into available data to examine this.
- It's unclear to many riders that IPT is possible. It is much too harsh a penalty given the crime.

- What is TriMet's overall goal for fare enforcement?
 - o Doug Kelsey: consistency and fairness. In Vancouver, jail is never an outcome of fare evasion.

Individual member final thoughts:

Roberta: Misdemeanor is too harsh a penalty.

Julia: Geographic data should be used to inform the process.

Nicole: Wants everything to be fair. System is stacked against you (profiling, courts). Clear, explainable understanding of why TriMet does fare enforcement is crucial. Transparency. Zero-tolerance is harsh – are there alternatives to help people pay fares?

Heidi: Flexibility is good, but how do we protect that from implicit bias? Training, etc?

Proportionality is off currently. There needs to be space for human interactions.

Rebecca: Has a lot of questions. Interested in further data. More conversation on how riders' perspectives can be heard. What can we do to help?

Hannah: Wants to know SES of who is being stopped (both ticketed and let go). Transparency.

Dylan: 1. Evasion surveys – would like to see age added. 2. Implicit bias training.

Judi: Curious about confusion people feel. We want people (including youth) to ride TriMet.

Work group should address police vs. inspectors – need more clarity for riders.

Andre: Need more data. Is it a level playing field for the whole system? Cost-shifting: what are the costs on the system from ticket to incarceration? TriMet values: does the penalty fit the crime? Is TriMet living up to its values in this way?

Holly: IPT is an issue. Would like to see more data re: exclusions. This can set up people for failure. Need more clarity on application and to be given out more rarely.

Scotty: Implicit bias training Metro is undertaking could serve as a model. Extent of enforcement and long term costs on people. Need more transparency.

Anneliese: \$175 is a lot. Need enough to deter but that's a big burden. Long-run consequences if can't pay

eFare recap

Committee member thoughts:

- Didn't hear about CBO contracts and no RFT
- Last minute community engagement results in talking to the same people
- Would be good to see TEAC recommendations and TriMet response on one doc, and create timeline to revisit
 - o Jake will compile and bring to next meeting
- Jake/John will bring eFare outreach plan to TEAC
- Hope to see earlier outreach prior to decisions being made