

MINUTES  
MEETING OF THE SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM  
PUBLIC SECURITY COMMITTEE (PSC)

October 9, 2025

[Clerk's note: Except where noted, public, staff and Committee Member comments are paraphrased. The full comment can be heard by reviewing the recording at the [MTS website](#).]

**1. Roll Call**

Chair Montgomery Steppe called the Public Security Committee meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. A roll call sheet listing Public Security Committee Member attendance is attached as Attachment A.

**2. Public Comments**

There were no Public Comments.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

Committee Member Goble moved to approve the minutes of the May 30, 2025, MTS Public Security Committee meeting. Committee Member Dillard seconded the motion, and the vote was 5 to 0 in favor, with Committee Members Hall and Fernandez absent.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**4. Administrative Penalty Program Under Public Utilities Code Section 99580 (Section 99580) (Karen Landers)**

Karen Landers, MTS General Counsel, presented on the Administrative Penalty Program Under Public Utilities Code Section 99580. She presented on: the PSC Direction to Staff provided on May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025, Transition Plan Elements, Establishing the scope of the program, Penalty Amounts, Eligible Violations, Disqualifying Factors, Consequences for Unresolved or Multiple Violations, Draft Ordinances and Other Policy Changes, Contracts Needed to Implement Transition & Program, Additional Transition Activities and the Estimated Costs to Change to Administrative Model, and Staff Recommendations.

**Public Comment**

There were no Public Comments.

**Committee Comment**

Chair Montgomery Steppe thanked MTS Staff for the information, noting that the topic has been under discussion for several years. She shared that she had ideas regarding the staff's recommendation, emphasizing the importance of considering the agency's current limitations, violations, and costs. Chair Montgomery Steppe expressed her preference for the proposed penalty scale under the potential new program: a \$75 fine for the first offense, a reduced amount of \$55 for minors, the continuation of three hours of community service, a \$100 penalty for missing the deadline, and \$125 for missing the

second deadline. She suggested that this approach could serve as a hybrid version between the existing program and the new administrative penalty model.

Chair Montgomery Steppe also provided input on the types of violations to be included in the program, stating that the “Expectorating (Spitting)” violation should specify spitting on a person. Ms. Landers clarified that the existing statute defines the violation as occurring “in a facility or on a vehicle,” and that the agency could potentially expand the definition to include spitting on a person. Ms. Cooney added that, in her experience, the ordinance was only applied in situations where Code Compliance Inspectors were detaining a patron for another matter and the individual spat toward passengers. Chair Montgomery Steppe agreed that this violation should remain outside the scope of the Administrative Program parameters.

Ms. Landers asked whether Chair Montgomery Steppe would prefer to include the full statute description under the violation given its vague context or remove it entirely. Chair Montgomery Steppe stated that she would like it to reflect similar conditions to those of an assault case. She requested additional feedback once the ordinance language is developed and emphasized that the intent behind the violation should be carefully considered. Chair Montgomery Steppe expressed her personal view that spitting is offensive and unsanitary, noting that spitting on the ground or in a transit station is very different from spitting at or on another person. Ms. Landers agreed and responded that she could prepare language to clearly distinguish between those scenarios. Chair Montgomery Steppe then asked about the collection process, specifically regarding the potential use of the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) for debt recovery. She inquired about the possible financial impact and the level of infrastructure the agency would need to provide. Ms. Landers explained that the impact remains uncertain. She shared that, based on her research, other agencies such as SF Muni and BART have referred cases to the FTB. However, in order to do so, an agency must provide the patron’s Social Security Number (SSN) information. MTS does not currently collect that information for fare violations and would prefer not to begin collecting it. Chair Montgomery Steppe agreed with this position.

Ms. Landers noted that additional research is needed and that she may not have completed the findings by the December PSC meeting, but potentially by the March meeting. She added that it is unclear whether the FTB requirement for SSNs serves as a deterrent or is directly tied to the collection process. Ms. Landers further reported that, based on discussions with LA Metro and other agencies, obtaining accurate patron information is challenging. She mentioned that collection vendors typically ask for a minimum threshold for debt recovery and verification of data to ensure compliance with collection laws. Ms. Landers mentioned that this underscores the importance of SSN linkage to avoid pursuing incorrect individuals. Ms. Landers also mentioned uncertainty regarding how other agencies and courts manage their collection processes. She explained that the FTB’s minimum qualifying debt is \$10, but submission requires an SSN and compliance with various prioritization criteria. Chair Montgomery Steppe asked whether MTS currently has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or referral agreement with the courts. Ms. Landers clarified that once citations are submitted to court, MTS receives limited follow-up, typically monthly or quarterly summaries that are not itemized. She added that the agency occasionally receives restitution for vandalism cases but otherwise lacks detailed visibility into payment outcomes. Ms. Landers

emphasized that the goal of the program is not revenue generation but rather to establish a structured system that encourages compliance and responsible fare payment. The objective is to deter fare evasion by creating accountability, not profiting from penalties.

Ms. Cooney stated that the agency's primary objective is to promote fare compliance, which is the foundation of the proposed program. Chair Montgomery Steppe noted that another consequence of implementing the program could involve exclusionary processes and orders, which can be challenging to manage. Ms. Landers explained that agencies are permitted to issue exclusion orders as part of their enforcement tools, allowing them to state, "If you do this, we have the right to exclude you." She mentioned that determining the total number of exclusion orders issued across agencies would require additional research and could be labor intensive. Ms. Landers further shared that MTS prepares exclusion orders but only issues them in connection with public safety concerns. Approximately ten have been issued to date, primarily involving individuals who pose ongoing threats to employees, operators, or public safety, or who interfere with safe operations. She added that while many individuals commit fare violations, she could not envision the agency managing over one hundred active exclusion orders at once.

Chair Montgomery Steppe commented that while many individuals violate the fare policy, not all citations are paid. She observed that there are distinctions among those who pay, those who do not, and those who repeatedly violate without payment. Ms. Cooney added that although exclusionary measures have not traditionally been a common industry practice, other agencies are increasingly adopting them as a more effective approach to address repeat offenders and harassment related behaviors. Ms. Landers concluded by noting that exclusion orders are applied with discretion and are not used for minors. The orders are primarily intended to remove individuals from transit vehicles or property when necessary. She emphasized that fare enforcement is not meant to strand passengers but to encourage compliance, for example, requiring a rider without a fare to disembark and purchase one. In the case of minors, the focus is educational, reminding them to utilize available tools such as the Youth Opportunity Pass, which is consistent with practices at other agencies. Ms. Landers provided an example, explaining that patrons who rely on public transit for work would go through the same enforcement process, and if found without proof of fare, would need to wait for the next trolley or bus to continue their trip.

Chair Montgomery Steppe stated that she believed her recommendations on at least two of the discussed items were clear and expressed interest in hearing feedback from the Committee Members. She also noted that the topic of exclusionary measures had been discussed in prior meetings and requested that the concept of exclusionary orders be further developed and presented to the Board of Directors for consideration. Vice Chair Dillard suggested that, for frequent offenders, if the Administrative Program moves forward, the agency could require the purchase of a monthly pass to continue using the transit system. Ms. Landers responded that the concept could be explored further, though specific language has not yet been developed. Vice Chair Dillard added the possibility of incorporating a "Traffic School" component into the program. Ms. Landers shared that LA Metro allows individuals cited for a first offense to purchase a monthly pass in lieu of paying a fine.

Vice Chair Dillard expressed interest in exploring that option and inquired whether the Traffic School concept would be managed by MTS or structured similarly to the DMV's Traffic School process. Ms. Landers stated that it is unclear whether LA Metro manages the program internally, through a vendor, or via an online platform. She noted that the cost of an online course would likely be minimal, and that the agency could potentially receive a notice of course completion as part of the compliance process. Vice Chair Dillard suggested that requiring the purchase of a monthly pass could serve as an appropriate alternative to completing Traffic School or community service hours. Chair Montgomery Steppe agreed, noting that the idea seemed fair and could be noted for further discussion to encourage broader participation in the program. Ms. Landers added that these options could be incorporated under community service as flexible alternatives and could be presented for consideration at future meetings. She also clarified that including such options would not interfere with her ongoing research on the Administrative Program. Chair Montgomery Steppe expressed support for including this alternative. Vice Chair Dillard clarified that her proposal would not apply to minors.

Committee Member Goble thanked MTS staff for bringing forward this complex topic for discussion. He noted that transitioning from a criminal enforcement model to an administrative model represents a significant and costly shift and emphasized the importance of considering the broader impacts of such a change. Committee Member Goble explained that under the criminal model, the intent is to prevent individuals from being labeled as criminals for receiving a transit citation that could result in misdemeanor charges and in contrast, the administrative model shifts the issue toward collections, which may introduce different consequences. Committee Member Goble asked whether there is a monetary threshold below in which a collections agency would decline to pursue a debt, and whether unpaid citations could be reported to credit bureaus. He cautioned that credit reporting could have a lasting negative effect, potentially more severe than a criminal citation by impacting an individual's ability to obtain credit or secure a car loan needed for work travel. Committee Member Goble encouraged the committee to fully evaluate these potential unintended consequences and to seek clarity on how credit bureau reporting may apply. Committee Member Goble stated that if unpaid citations are not reported to a credit bureau or pursued by a collection agency, there would effectively be no penalty for nonpayment. He cautioned that this could create a *de facto* honor system in which fare evasion goes unaddressed, emphasizing the importance of evaluating the program from that perspective to ensure accountability.

He also highlighted the importance of maintaining the morale of the Code Compliance Inspectors and ensuring they understand the value and impact of their work. Committee Member Goble noted that, according to information that will be presented in the next agenda item, there has been a significant increase in enforcement and compliance presence across the system since February 2025. He added that despite approximately 5,200 citations being eligible for diversion during the first three months of implementation, no individuals have opted to complete community service, though he supported continuing to offer it as an available option. Committee Member Goble noted that only 2-4% of eligible diversion citations have been resolved through payment of the \$25 fine. He stated that MTS currently has one of the most lenient fee structures among agencies, as the statutory fine is \$75 but MTS charges only \$25. Despite the lower amount, payment compliance remains minimal, and after 120 days, unpaid citations are referred to the court for processing.

He added that under an administrative model, it would not be practical to set a collection amount higher than \$25, since most individuals would likely prefer to pay the lower fine. Committee Member Goble emphasized that collection agencies would not profit from pursuing a \$25 debt, and even if the fees were increased to \$100 to account for administrative costs, it would still be less efficient than the current process. He expressed that the broader discussion of criminal versus administrative enforcement remains complex and stressed the importance of ensuring community awareness and creating meaningful deterrents for repeat violators. Committee Member Goble added that MTS should leverage available technology to identify repeat offenders rather than relying solely on fare verification, noting that at present, the agency has no way to distinguish between first-time and repeat violations. He concluded that, in many cases, the most effective immediate response may simply be to instruct nonpaying riders to exit the vehicle, thereby creating a natural consequence for fare evasion. Committee Member Goble stated that fines and community service requirements have not produced meaningful compliance and emphasized that the larger issue is determining the appropriate enforcement response for those who fail to pay fares. Committee Member Goble compared fare violations to parking or other low-level infractions, stating that fare enforcement should be treated with similar consistency and recommended that individuals unable to afford a fare could seek assistance through county support programs. However, he reiterated his concern regarding the potential unintended consequences of involving credit bureaus in the collection process and requested additional information on that matter.

Committee Member Foster stated that, after listening to the discussion, he acknowledged that he may not be fully familiar with all aspects of the topic but expressed curiosity about how outreach efforts are conducted to inform the public about available options under the program. He noted that, to date, he personally was not aware of what options exist and emphasized the importance of ensuring riders are well informed as the program is implemented and evaluated. Committee Member Foster added that it is also important to understand the composition of MTS's ridership, which has been discussed and analyzed extensively, when considering the shift from a criminal to an administrative model. He emphasized that this distinction is central to the discussion and reiterated his support for pursuing an administrative process in line with the Committee's objectives. Council Member Foster also provided feedback on the proposed penalty structure, stating that the suggested amounts \$75 or a lower rate for students, and \$125 for the second deadline are reasonable and consistent amounts with the agency's understanding of its ridership and desired outcomes.

Committee Member Goble referred to the list of thirteen PUC 99580 violations proposed for inclusion in the administrative model and sought clarification on whether the agency has discretion to determine which violations would be a part of the administrative process. He referenced the violations highlighted in red on the presentation slide and specifically asked, if "Carrying Explosive or Acid, Flammable Liquid, or Toxic or Hazardous Material" were excluded from the administrative process, what the corresponding criminal charge would be for such an offense. Ms. Landers stated that she had not yet researched the specific penalties for each violation but believed that most are classified as infractions rather than misdemeanors. She added that fare evasion, for example, is an infraction unless an individual commits three or more violations, at which point it may be treated as a misdemeanor. She offered to review and

confirm the classifications. Committee Member Goble thanked her and said he would appreciate that information, additionally he stated, from a practical standpoint, that while spitting on a person could constitute assault, spitting on a facility or vehicle raises other operational concerns. He asked who was responsible for addressing such incidents.

Ms. Cooney responded that janitorial staff are responsible for cleaning transit vehicles. Committee Member Foster then asked what occurred if a rider urinated or defecated on a vehicle while it is in service. Ms. Cooney explained that in such cases, the operator would stop the vehicle and disembark passengers. Ms. Landers added that the vehicle would then be taken out of service at the next stop, depending on the severity of the situation. Committee Member Foster observed that this would result in service disruption while waiting for a replacement vehicle. Ms. Cooney agreed and noted that, depending on the circumstances, Hazardous Materials (HAZMAT) personnel may also be required. Ms. Landers acknowledged that this type of violation should have been emphasized more strongly, given its potential operational impact. Committee Member Foster concluded that violations such as spitting, particularly given public health concerns related to COVID-19, as well as carrying explosives or hazardous materials, urinating, or defecating, all present significant public safety and operational challenges. He stated that these should be carefully considered when determining which violations are eligible for inclusion in the administrative model and recommended continued review of these factors before final decisions are made.

Committee Member Foster stated that the discussion regarding potential credit reporting is important and should continue. He noted that while he may not agree that a criminal citation has less long-term impact than credit reporting, he believes both can be detrimental and create different types of obstacles for individuals. For that reason, he emphasized the need for further discussion on the issue and suggested that public input should also be considered to support a more comprehensive conversation. Committee Member Foster, regarding repeat violations, shared a phrase often used by his father: "A hard head makes us soft", emphasizing that accountability must exist and that at some point a clear line must be drawn. He noted that while fare evasion may be an isolated violation in some cases, certain offenses listed for a discussion may involve additional factors that warrant further consideration. Committee Member Foster added that these issues also relate to how the transit system interacts with communities of concern, including access to resources, services, and support that individuals may need. He acknowledged that the matter is complex but offered these comments as his feedback. He concluded by reiterating that while the administrative model allows the agency to work with riders to resolve violations, there should ultimately be a point at which repeated violators are addressed. Committee Member Foster also requested a follow up on the proposal to offer a monthly pass option in connection with fare evasion cases.

Chair Montgomery Steppe stated that she had a few additional comments, she agreed that there should be continued discussion regarding credit reporting implications, noting that her main concern lies between two approaches either not collecting payment at all or referring unpaid citations to the FTB. Chair Montgomery Steppe explained that, in her view, exclusionary orders help maintain accountability and ensure that the consequence matches the violation. Once enforcement extends beyond the transit system, such as through FTB collections, it begins to impact individuals in other areas of life. She believes that exclusionary measures within the system can provide an appropriate

balance of accountability without long-term financial consequences. Chair Montgomery Steppe emphasized that until federal funding allows for free service, riders are required to pay a fare. From her perspective, fare enforcement should affect an individual's ability to ride, not their long-term financial standing. She reiterated that accountability should remain within the transit environment and suggested exploring equipment or systems that could support a stronger exclusionary process. She referenced the work of the Transit Transformation Task Force, which is evaluating similar policies statewide and identifying technology capable of tracking repeat violations to strengthen exclusionary procedures. She expressed that, as with any criminal accountability, there should be a record of repeated offenses, and those unwilling to comply may ultimately forfeit access to transit services.

Chair Montgomery Steppe concluded by stating that further discussion will be needed to refine the agency's approach and acknowledged the Public Security committee for their ongoing efforts and the many ideas already implemented, expressing appreciation for the continued collaboration and thoughtful dialogue on the topic. Ms. Landers asked Chair Montgomery Steppe for clarification regarding next steps on the topic of collections. She inquired about the Chair's preferred areas of study and the Committee's direction to the Board regarding the fine structure. Ms. Landers suggested that staff could issue a Request for Information (RFI) to potential collection vendors to determine whether they would be willing to contract with MTS, the associated costs, and whether credit bureaus would be involved in the process. She added that the inquiry could also identify what specific information vendors would require to collect unpaid fines and what data could be shared with MTS. She noted that obtaining these details would help shape the administrative model the Committee envisions and allow staff to better define what consequences could be implemented, including whether unpaid citations would be pursued without credit bureau reporting. Ms. Landers proposed returning to the PSC in March 2026 with the findings and data collected to support a follow-up discussion and potential recommendations.

Chair Montgomery Steppe responded that, procedurally, the topic could potentially be revisited during the Committee's final scheduled meeting in December to determine how the ordinance should address credit reporting versus criminal records. Ms. Cooney noted that there may not be sufficient time to complete the necessary research before that meeting. Ms. Landers agreed, explaining that obtaining responses from credit bureaus and other relevant parties would likely take additional time. She indicated that staff would need to develop appropriate questions, distribute inquiries, and gather responses, and that the upcoming holiday period could further limit the timeline. Chair Montgomery Steppe stated that, if that were the case, it might not be necessary to hold a December meeting on the topic. Vice Chair Dillard asked Ms. Landers whether fines referring to collections such as \$25 or \$75 citations are automatically reported to credit bureaus once the collection process begins, or if there are limitations or conditions that determine when or whether reporting occurs. Ms. Landers responded that there are established rules governing credit reporting but noted that she did not have detailed knowledge of those requirements at the time. She stated that understanding those rules would be an important component of evaluating the program and determining whether such fines would ultimately be collectible.

Ms. Landers explained that staff would need to explore several related questions, including whether fines could be set below certain thresholds, whether collection agencies are required to report debts to credit bureaus, and whether the agency could instruct vendors not to report those debts. She noted that staff would likely compile a list of questions and distribute them to industry partners and potential vendors to gather information and insights. She added that staff could also examine how other jurisdictions handle similar processes, such as parking citations. Ms. Landers explained that parking violations are typically easier to enforce because they are tied directly to a vehicle. If a parking citation remains unpaid, the jurisdiction may place a hold on the vehicles' registration through the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), making it easier to connect the violation to the party responsible. Unlike parking violations, transit violations are not tied to a vehicle's registration, which creates fewer enforcement mechanisms when a citation remains unpaid. She noted that with parking citations, unresolved fines eventually affect a vehicle's registration, making it difficult to ignore the issue. In contrast, transit violations do not have a similar connection, which presents challenges in determining how to address nonpayment. Vice Chair Dillard asked whether violators would receive notice that an unpaid citation could be reported to credit bureaus.

Ms. Landers responded that under the current program no such notice is provided, as citations are referred directly to the court system. She noted that if an administrative program with collections were implemented, the agency could include notifications warning violators that failure to pay may result in the debt being referred to collections, encouraging payment before additional actions occur. Vice Chair Dillard stated that she would support including clear communication with violators, so they have an opportunity to resolve the issue before it progresses to collections. She also suggested that providing alternative options such as allowing individuals to purchase a monthly pass could offer another way for violators to resolve the citation and avoid further administrative or credit related consequences. Vice Chair Dillard emphasized that offering such options could allow individuals to address the violation and conclude the process without additional complications. Committee Member Rodriguez thanked staff for preparing the presentation and expressed appreciation for the information provided. He stated that, from an ideological perspective, all committee members share the goal of ensuring that MTS is successful and that the system remains safe. However, he emphasized that stricter penalties should not be implemented in a way that disproportionately impacts certain communities. He noted the importance of equity, particularly for communities in the South Bay, including National City, where many residents rely heavily on public transit. Committee Member Rodriguez asked how many citations are issued annually. Ms. Landers responded that the data has changed since February and will be presented in the next agenda item, noting that the current approximate volume is slightly over 2,000 citations per month.

Committee Member Rodriguez then asked whether staff had data showing where citations are issued throughout the system. Ms. Landers stated that staff did not have that information available. Committee Member Rodriguez commented that this data would be helpful in evaluating enforcement practices and ensuring that certain areas or groups are not disproportionately targeted. He also asked whether citations are issued in multiple languages, including Spanish. Ms. Landers stated that she believes the citations are currently issued only in English. Committee Member Rodriguez suggested that Spanish language citations should be considered, noting that a significant number of

riders travel from Tijuana and may primarily speak Spanish. Committee Member Rodriguez further asked about the number of officers assigned throughout the trolley system and whether they are distributed evenly across the network. Ms. Landers responded that this information would be addressed in the next presentation and that she was not the appropriate staff Member to provide those details.

Committee Member Rodriguez explained that his questions were intended to ensure that enforcement practices remain equitable. He reiterated his interest in understanding how officers are deployed throughout the system and emphasized that he would not support enforcement approaches that result in over-policing certain areas and asked whether personnel issuing citations spoke Spanish, noting that many riders are monolingual Spanish speakers. Committee Member Rodriguez suggested that the agency could consider providing stipends or incentives for employees who speak additional languages, as is done in some municipalities, in recognition of the region's linguistic diversity. Committee Member Rodriguez asked whether officers engage in a conversation with individuals when issuing a citation. Ms. Landers confirmed that they did. Committee Member Rodriguez asked whether Code Compliance Inspectors (CCIs) offer riders the option to purchase a ticket or monthly pass at the time a citation is issued. Ms. Landers responded that this is not part of the current program. She explained that the Board approved a change effective February 1, 2025, eliminating the option to purchase fares at the time of the citation, however, when a citation was issued, individuals are informed about the Diversion Program and provided with information about how to participate. Committee Member Rodriguez stated that he would be interested in revisiting the possibility of allowing riders to purchase a fare or monthly pass at the time of the citation in the future. He expressed agreement with Vice Chair Dillard's suggestion that providing an option such as purchasing a monthly pass on the spot could be beneficial. Committee Member Rodriguez also reiterated his support for the administrative citation process, while acknowledging that financial penalties can have lasting impacts on individuals, he noted that records and financial penalties could have lasting impacts on individuals as well. Committee Member Rodriguez noted that records and financial consequences can follow individuals in areas such as employment and other opportunities, and he emphasized the importance of being mindful of those impacts. He concluded by stating that he looks forward to reviewing additional data at the next meeting.

Committee Member Goble thanked the Chair and stated that he had several follow-up questions. He expressed agreement that issuing a request for information to collection agencies would be important in understanding the requirements for collections and noted that it would be necessary to determine whether information such as a Social Security number or California identification number would be required and what would occur if such information were not available, as this could affect the feasibility of pursuing collections. Committee Member Goble also stated that it would be helpful to understand the process used by the FTB and the potential impacts of referring to debts through that system. In addition, he requested information regarding the potential cost of investing in equipment that could identify individuals with prior violations. Committee Member Goble asked how the current court process functions once a citation is referred to court, including whether there are mechanisms for individuals to resolve or clear citations after the fact, specifically he asked whether citations could be dismissed or expunged once payment is made, and whether the total amount owed would include

both the citation and court costs. Ms. Landers responded that MTS has a positive working relationship with the Homeless Court program. She explained that even individuals who are not part of the homeless community may be referred to available services. Additionally, Ms. Landers described that Homeless Court holds outreach events where individuals with existing court violations or cases sent to collections may have those matters reviewed and potentially dismissed or resolved. Ms. Landers stated that, although such situations are relatively rare, MTS has occasionally worked with the Homeless Court team to assist individuals seeking to resolve past violations. She explained that the San Diego Superior Court, along with the local prosecutor's office and public defender's office, already have infrastructure in place to support this process, and MTS has been able to participate when appropriate.

Committee Member Goble noted that the process sounded somewhat complex but suggested that there may be an opportunity to explore a similar concept for transit-related violations. He mentioned the possibility of creating a "Transit Court" model, similar to how Homeless Court events are held in community settings, where individuals could address multiple violations in a more accessible manner. Committee Member Goble suggested that the agency could consider offering similar assistance at a transit station or other accessible location, where patrons could be invited to resolve outstanding violations, potentially resulting in a dismissal through the court system. Ms. Landers responded that participation in such events could be possible. She noted that MTS currently does not send its own representatives to staff to set informational tables at those events but stated that staff could explore that option. Committee Member Goble asked whether riders are aware of these opportunities, noting that the program is primarily branded as Homeless Court, and may limit awareness among riders who might benefit from the program. Ms. Landers clarified that if patrons contact MTS in advance, staff can assist them with resolving citations. She added that if a citation has already been processed through the court system, additional resources are available on the MTS website to help individuals address those cases. Committee Member Goble acknowledged that the discussion may be moving slightly ahead of the current agenda item and referenced Slide 20, which displayed an informational postcard about the Diversion Program, asking whether that material is currently provided to patrons. Samantha Leslie, MTS Deputy General Counsel, responded that the flyer referenced would be discussed in greater detail during the next agenda item and explained that the flyer was created as a pilot resource for the Office of Homeless Solutions to distribute through hygiene kits provided to individuals experiencing homelessness. Ms. Leslie stated that MTS staff planned to include the flyer in these kits along with other resource information in order to evaluate whether this approach helps increase awareness of the Diversion Program. She noted that the initiative is intended to test new methods of providing information beyond the agency's standard outreach channels. Committee Member Goble thanked Ms. Leslie for the information.

### **Action Taken**

Informational item only. No action taken.

**5. Transit Security and Passenger Safety Department Report Fiscal Year 24-25 (Dan Brislin)**

Dan Brislin, MTS Deputy Director of Transit Security and Passenger Safety and Samantha Leslie, MTS Deputy General Counsel, presented on Transit Security and Passenger Safety Department Report Fiscal Year 24-25. He presented on: Transit Security & Passenger Safety staff, New Training Efforts, Homeless Outreach Team (H.O.T), Naloxone (NARCAN), Encampment Details, Bus Enforcement Support Team (B.E.S.T), K-9 Program (Regional Asset), Data Driven Crime Reduction Efforts, Law Enforcement Collaboration, Communication Center, Fare Inspections & Citations, Special Enforcement Detail, the current Fare Enforcement Diversion Program, Diversion Participation, Partner Outreach and Fare Revenue, Crime and Incident Data (CY 2024-2025), Assaults, Assaults on Code Compliance Inspectors and Transit Security Officers, Non-Compliant Arrests, Group A Crimes: Trolley, Group A Crimes: Bus, Overall Crime Reduction, TSA Gold Standard Award and department representation.

[Clerk's note: During the meeting, staff reported the following 2024 Homeless Outreach stats: 16,708 homeless outreach contacts, 209 accepted shelter placements, 15 individuals successfully placed into permanent housing, 5,083 resources accepted, and 429 outreach events were conducted by MTS. Following the meeting, staff conducted a review and provided the following updated stats 12,612 homeless outreach contacts, 177 accepted shelter placements, 15 individuals successfully placed into permanent housing, 1,933 resources accepted, and 282 events were conducted by MTS during 2024.]

**Public Comment**

There were no Public Comments.

**Committee Comment**

Committee Member Goble thanked staff for the presentation and asked how the department determines where to deploy resources when addressing crime reduction, referencing statistics presented on incidents such as arson, vandalism, assault, and robbery. Mr. Brislin responded that the department's Crime Analyst, Josh Ortiz's, current role is to track crime trends across the system on a daily basis. He noted that the analysis includes reviewing crime reports and reports prepared by staff, verifying incidents through Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) footage when necessary, and aggregating the information to identify recurring issues and based on this data driven approach, resources are deployed to address specific criminal activity trends, such as increases in drug activity, lewd conduct, or vandalism in a particular area. Mr. Brislin explained that the information used is actionable and not subjective, allowing the department to deploy the Passenger Safety team to focus attention on areas where issues are occurring in order to reduce incidents. Mr. Brislin followed up on whether incidents are geotagged to identify specific buses, trolleys, or locations between stops

and stated that the department is continuing to develop those capabilities in collaboration with law enforcement agencies and through tools such as Power BI to better understand where incidents occur within the system. He offered to have the department's crime analyst to provide additional details. Committee Member Goble thanked Mr. Brislin for the information and declined the additional presentation due to the limited time remaining.

Committee Member Goble referenced slide 13 and noted the yellow transit Security Dispatch sign displayed on trolleys and at stations that provide contact information for reporting issues. Drawing from his experience in marketing, he stated that black lettering on a yellow background is one of the most visible color combinations and suggested that the visibility of the signage may contribute to the high number of calls for service reported, which totaled 46,633. Committee Member Goble asked whether additional Dispatch operators were needed to accommodate the increase in calls. Mr. Brislin responded that the department is currently developing and expanding its Dispatch staffing. He stated that additional permanent staff are being added and that supervisors are becoming more specialized in their roles. He noted that supervisors have been sent through the POST Dispatch Academy to further professionalize the program and that staff regularly coordinate with fire agencies to ensure more seamless responses to medical aid calls. Mr. Brislin stated that the Dispatch staff have done an outstanding job supporting the program. Committee Member Goble asked whether staff could provide the location of the 17 special enforcement details referenced in the presentation. Mr. Brislin responded that staff could provide that information. Committee Member Goble further commented on outreach efforts related to fare enforcement and the Diversion Program. He noted that while some programs focus on individuals experiencing homelessness, there are also fare evaders who are not part of that population. He suggested that efforts should ensure those individuals are also aware of opportunities to resolve citations and clear violations. Committee Member Goble referenced the concept of a "transit court" or similar program that could allow individuals to resolve violations more quickly than through traditional processes, noting the potential value of such opportunities.

Committee Member Goble commented on the reported increase in fare revenue, noting that the annualized increase of \$2.8 million contributes to a total increase of approximately \$6.8 million. He observed that the additional CCI's cost approximately \$4 million and stated that the program has effectively paid for itself while providing additional value to the system. He added that the presence of CCI's is likely to contribute to avoided costs related to vandalism, arson, and other crimes, noting that robbery incidents were reported to be down 24 percent. Committee Member Goble concluded by stating that the CCI program has exceeded expectations and commended staff for their work. Committee Member Rodriguez thanked staff for the presentation and expressed appreciation for the work of the department. He agreed with Committee Member Goble that increased staff presence can help encourage compliance, as

individuals become more aware that fare inspections may occur and are therefore more likely to purchase a ticket. Committee Member Rodriguez then referenced the “broken windows theory” and asked Mr. Brislin to briefly summarize it for the committee. Mr. Brislin explained that the theory suggests that when smaller issues are not addressed, they can escalate into larger problems. Committee Member Rodriguez clarified that if a broken window in a building is left unrepaired, it may signal that no one is maintaining the property, which can lead to additional damage or disorder.

He noted that the concept is relevant when considering the transit system holistically, emphasizing the importance of maintaining a visible presence to ensure that patrons feel safe using the trolley system. Committee Member Rodriguez added that in areas with higher ridership, issues such as graffiti and cleanliness should be addressed promptly and requested staff to consider providing a report on response times and how quickly such incidents are addressed.

Vice Chair Dillard thanked staff for the presentation and acknowledged the work of the Transit Security and Passenger Safety team. She also referenced previous discussions regarding implicit bias and anti-discrimination training and expressed appreciation that the department incorporated those considerations. Vice Chair Dillard noted that the presentation demonstrated progress in several areas and commended staff for their work, describing the report as excellent.

Chair Montgomery Steppe also congratulated the department on receiving the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Gold Standard Award, noting that it was a significant accomplishment. She highlighted the reported 58 percent decrease in vandalism and recognized the role of CCIs in increasing presence throughout the system. She further noted that the reduction in vandalism helps avoid additional costs associated with cleanup and repairs and contributes to the overall reduction in crime across the transit system. Chair Montgomery Steppe mentioned that ongoing efforts, including improvements to lighting, murals, and other initiatives, reflect a holistic approach to enhancing the transit environment and concluded by thanking staff.

#### **Action Taken**

Informational item only. No action taken.

#### OTHER ITEMS

##### **6. Committee Member Communications**

There was no Committee Member Communications and Other Business discussion.

##### **7. Next Meeting Date**

The next Public Security Committee meeting is scheduled for December 5, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

##### **8. Adjournment**

Chair Montgomery Steppe adjourned the meeting at 11:02 a.m.

/S/ Monica Montgomery Steppe  
Chairperson  
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

/S/ Jasiel Estolano  
Committee Clerk  
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Attachment: A. Roll Call Sheet

SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM  
PUBLIC SECURITY COMMITTEE MEETING

ROLL CALL

MEETING OF (DATE): October 9, 2025 CALL TO ORDER (TIME): 9:04 am

ADJOURN: 11:02 am

REPRESENTING	BOARD MEMBER	ALTERNATE	PRESENT (time arrived)	ABSENT (time left)
Chair	Montgomery Steppe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	no alternate	9:04 am	11:02 am
Vice Chair	Dillard <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	no alternate	9:04 am	11:02 am
Committee Representative	Fernandez <input type="checkbox"/>	no alternate	ABSENT	ABSENT
Committee Representative	Foster <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	no alternate	9:04 am	11:02 am
Committee Representative	Goble <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	no alternate	9:04 am	11:02 am
Committee Representative	Hall <input type="checkbox"/>	no alternate	ABSENT	ABSENT
Committee Representative	Rodriguez <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	no alternate	9:04 am	11:02 am

COMMITTEE CLERK: /S/ Jasiel Estolano