



Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC)
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 1:00 PM

**TO JOIN THE VIRTUAL MEETING, LOG ON TO
THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS THROUGH YOUR
PREFERRED BROWSER:**

<https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1608154748>

FOR TELEPHONE ACCESS DIAL
(669) 900 9128

When prompted enter Meeting ID:
160 815 4748

CAPTIONS ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH ZOOM LIVE
CAPTIONING

**TO ACCESS REAL TIME LIVE CAPTIONS PLEASE LOG ON
TO:**

https://www.streamtext.net/player?event=Metro_AAC

AGENDA

Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC)

1	Member and Staff Introductions Housekeeping Items	1:00 – 1:10 pm Kathleen Barajas, Chair
2	ACTION: Approval of May 14, 2026 Minutes	1:10 – 1:20 pm Kathleen Barajas, Chair
3	INFORMATION: Review Text of Advisory Body Code of Conduct	1:20 – 2:00 pm Armando Roman, Metro
4	COMMITTEE UPDATES	2:00 – 2:30 pm
5	PUBLIC COMMENT	2:30 – 2:45 pm Kathleen Barajas, Chair (2 minutes per speaker)
6	ADJOURNMENT	2:45 - 3:00 pm Kathleen Barajas, Chair



**TO REQUEST ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE AGENDAS IN ALTERNATIVE
FORMATS, PLEASE CALL 213.922.4067. LIVE
CAPTION IS PROVIDED AT EVERY COMMITTEE
MEETING**

Meeting Minutes for May 14, 2026

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Accessibility Advisory Committee

Members in Attendance:

Kathleen Barajas (Chair)
Cynde Soto (First Vice-Chair)
Jared Rimer (Executive Member)
Ellen Blackman
Deaka McClain
Greg Kuhl
Raul Tafoya
Blanca Angulo
Fran Sereseres
Daniel Garcia
Fernando Roldan
Max Romero
Arlene Descargar
Olga Parra

Excused:

Karen Esquivel-Mayes



Metro
Antonio Mendez



Absent:

Kevin Dixon

Mark Panitz

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kathleen Barajas called the meeting to order following opening remarks and housekeeping items from Metro staff. Staff welcomed participants attending in person and virtually, reminded attendees that the Committee's purpose is to advance accessibility and ensure that people with disabilities have a meaningful voice in Metro's work, and asked everyone to engage with kindness and respect toward Committee members, presenters, staff, and members of the public.

Roll call was conducted. Staff confirmed that fourteen members were present and that a quorum had been established, allowing the Committee to proceed with voting items and the remainder of the agenda.

2. ACTION: Approval of March 12, 2026 meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the March 12, 2026 meeting minutes. Fernando Roldan moved to approve the minutes, and Deaka McClain seconded the motion. During discussion, Jared Rimer noted a possible duplicate listing of Max Romero in one version of the



Metro



materials. Staff reviewed the document and indicated that Max Romero appeared once in the version being used for the meeting, while also acknowledging the comment and thanking members for carefully reviewing the materials.

A roll call vote was conducted. Members present voted to approve the March 12, 2026 minutes, with Arlene Descargar abstaining. The motion carried, and the March 12, 2026 meeting minutes were approved.

3. INFORMATION: Code of Conduct for Advisory Bodies

Julie Nguyen from Metro's Ethics Department presented information regarding the newly adopted Code of Conduct for Metro advisory bodies. She explained that Metro advisory bodies provide important input to the Board and that the new Code of Conduct is intended to establish consistent expectations for professional conduct across advisory committees. She noted that Metro already has formal conduct rules for contractors, lobbyists, employees, and the Board, but that advisory bodies did not previously have one unified, agencywide code. The new code was described as a baseline document intended to protect the quality of advisory work, support a safe and productive meeting environment, avoid the appearance of impropriety, affirm a nondiscriminatory environment, address abusive or derogatory conduct, clarify rules regarding confidential



Metro

information and Metro resources, and provide a process for suspension or removal of members who violate its terms.

Members asked how the new Code of Conduct relates to the Committee's bylaws and the AAC's existing code of conduct. Julie explained that the Board of Directors had already approved the advisory body Code of Conduct and that no vote by the AAC was required. She further clarified that the code applies across Metro advisory committees, while the Metro Board has its own separate code. Staff and members discussed that the AAC had previously developed its own code of conduct in 2019 and that the bylaws subcommittee may compare that existing AAC document with Metro's new advisory body Code of Conduct to determine whether any AAC-specific provisions should be retained through the bylaws or another committee document.

Members also asked whether additional training would be required. Julie stated that the presentation was intended to serve as training on the Code of Conduct and that she would provide the written text of the code, the presentation, and the transcript. She also indicated that she could provide a refresher if members reviewed the materials and determined that additional guidance would be helpful. Staff suggested placing the Code of Conduct on a future agenda so the Committee can review the written text together and invite Ethics staff back if members have





Metro
questions.



4. INFORMATION: Fiscal Year 2027 Budget

Tina Panek, Jenny Wang, and Meybel Monge presented Metro's proposed Fiscal Year 2027 budget. The presentation provided a high-level overview of the balanced budget, including revenues by funding source and expenditures by program area. Staff explained that a major share of Metro's revenues comes from county sales taxes and state sales and diesel fuel taxes, with additional resources from capital and bond funding, operating revenue, and other sources. Expenditures were organized across major program areas, including operations and maintenance, capital improvements, transit infrastructure development, pass-through programs, regional rail, highway and multimodal development, general planning, congestion management, debt service, and oversight and administration.

The operations and maintenance portion of the budget was presented as approximately \$2.99 billion, including funding for bus, rail, and the Metro Micro pilot program. Staff described planned investments in station experience, cleaning, public safety, revenue service hours, and service plan implementation. Station experience improvements discussed during the presentation included safe, clean, ADA-accessible restrooms, taller fare gates at selected stations, elevator and escalator modernization and



Metro



replacement, elevator open-door programming for cleanliness, lighting improvements, and other efforts intended to improve safety, cleanliness, reliability, and customer experience. Staff also described public safety investments including community intervention specialists, crisis response, homeless outreach, Transit Ambassadors, Metro Transit Security Officers, private security, and the continuing shift toward an in-house Department of Public Safety. Cleaning investments included daily cleaning at key bus terminals, rail cleaning across all lines, end-of-line cleaning, midline train cleaning, and custodial staffing at hotspot stations.

Staff summarized the capital improvement program, transit infrastructure development program, pass-through funding, regional allocations, and other program areas. The capital improvement program was described as supporting bus, rail, and other asset improvements, including zero-emission bus procurement and charging infrastructure, rail vehicle purchases and refurbishments, customer experience enhancements, and Olympics-related improvements. The Measure R and Measure M transit infrastructure development program was described as supporting planning, environmental clearance, and construction work for major projects, including Sepulveda, E Line and K Line extensions, D Line sections, East San Fernando Valley light rail, and the Southeast Gateway Line. Pass-through programs included local agency programs, regional transit funds, Access Services,



Metro



federal grants, active transportation, and the LIFE program. Staff also described outreach efforts, including the My Metro Budget activity, youth-focused outreach, stakeholder meetings, notices in print publications, community-based organization outreach, and public comment opportunities through the budget portal, email, mail, and the May 21 public hearing. Committee members raised several comments and questions regarding the budget. Max Romero asked about highway multimodal development and capacity improvements, including whether the level of investment in highway projects was appropriate when Metro also has significant transit needs. He also raised concerns about Metro's transition to electric buses, citing operational issues, charging infrastructure concerns, air conditioning problems, and the need to avoid overreliance on electric buses until the fleet and infrastructure can reliably support regular service. Max also asked about timelines for elevator and escalator replacement and emphasized that older stations, particularly in the Pasadena area, need sustained infrastructure reinvestment, including elevators, benches, garages, and other aging station assets. Staff indicated that operations would have more detailed information regarding elevator and escalator schedules and that the comments would be taken back.

Daniel Garcia asked where accessibility investments appear in the budget and raised interest in additional accessibility features, including systems or staffing to guide people who are blind or have low vision. Staff



Metro



referenced Access Services funding within regional transit allocations and noted that accessibility-related work also includes Waymap and other guidance tools. Daniel clarified that he was interested in a more human-centered guidance model similar to approaches he had observed in Europe. Staff agreed that more information would be needed regarding whether there are budget resources for accessibility-related pilots or similar efforts.

Fernando Roldan and Fran Sereseres raised concerns regarding transportation connections between the Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita, Los Angeles, Union Station, and Metrolink service. Fernando asked whether budget resources could support improved service connections and whether Metrolink, Santa Clarita Transit, and Antelope Valley agencies could develop a disability advisory committee or similar forum. Fran described the time-consuming Access transfer process from Lancaster to Sylmar and then to Los Angeles, the impact of mid-day Metrolink service gaps or station closures, the importance of clear notices at stations, and the need for shelter and accessible waiting areas at the Lancaster station. Staff stated that feedback would be taken back to the appropriate teams and confirmed that the July Metrolink Board meeting is open to the public.

Deaka McClain asked about funding for the Access for All program and Butterfly transportation, including



Metro



whether additional funding could support expanded hours and payment options. Kathleen Barajas asked whether additional wheelchair-accessible vehicles could be added to the Metro Micro fleet or similar low-cost accessible services, particularly for areas not currently covered. Staff explained that Access Services funding is increasing but that specific questions regarding Access for All, Butterfly, and Metro Micro accessible vehicle expansion would need to be directed to the appropriate operations staff. Max also asked whether regional rail funding could help Metrolink address vehicle issues affecting service, and staff responded that the Metrolink budget was still being developed for consideration by its Board.

5. INFORMATION: AD HOC BOARD COMPOSITION COMMITTEE

Lillian De Loza-Gutierrez from Metro Community Relations presented on Metro's Ad Hoc Board Composition Committee and facilitated a listening session regarding Metro Board governance. She explained that Metro is unique among transportation agencies because it serves as operator, builder, funder, and transportation planner for Los Angeles County, a region with more than 10 million people and 88 cities. She reviewed Metro's formation in 1993 through the merger of RTD and the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission and explained that the current Board structure was established by state law. She noted that changes to the Metro Board



Metro



do not occur automatically and would require state legislative action.

Lillian explained that the discussion is connected to Measure G, which voters approved in 2024. Measure G changes Los Angeles County governance by creating an elected County Executive beginning in 2028 and expanding the County Board of Supervisors from five to nine members by 2032. She emphasized that those county governance changes do not automatically change the Metro Board. In response, Metro's Board Chair established an ad hoc committee to review governance issues and gather community input before any future decisions are made. The committee includes representatives from the Metro Board, business community, labor, councils of governments, the County governance reform task force, and transit riders, and is expected to make recommendations to the Metro Board by the end of June.

The presentation reviewed the current 13-member Metro Board structure, including all five County Supervisors, the Los Angeles Mayor and three mayoral appointees, representatives selected by city sectors, and a non-voting member appointed by the Governor. Staff also reviewed the responsibilities of the Board, including setting policy, approving major projects and transportation funding, overseeing the Chief Executive Officer, and making decisions that affect transportation across the county. Staff shared demographic context for Los Angeles County and noted that the City of Los Angeles currently remains



Metro



above the statutory population threshold related to its representation on the Board. Staff also compared Metro's Board structure with peer transit agencies and noted that appointment structures vary, that major changes generally require legislative action, and that Metro is unusual because all County Supervisors serve on its Board.

Rosalba, from Metro Community Relations, led members through a live polling activity through Slido. Participants were asked introductory questions, provided zip codes, indicated whether they use Metro, described their familiarity with the Board structure, rated how well the current Board reflects community needs, and identified factors that should be prioritized in any future board composition. In the poll, transit riders and people with firsthand experience using transit and mobility challenges emerged as a top priority, along with diversity, historically underserved communities, and community representation. Staff stated that the feedback would be shared with the Ad Hoc Board Composition Committee and invited additional feedback through surveys, email at governance@metro.net, voicemail, and upcoming outreach at the Lancaster Metrolink station.

Members emphasized that future Board members should have firsthand experience using the transit system and should understand the conditions faced by customers. Max Romero stated that people making decisions about transit should ride the system or otherwise experience the services they oversee. Cynde Soto noted that Metro's Service Councils grew



Metro



out of concerns that decision-makers did not ride the bus, and she reinforced the importance of having Board members who use the system. Daniel Garcia asked about Metro's authority over Metrolink. Staff explained that Metro funds the portion of Metrolink service that operates within Los Angeles County and that Los Angeles County has representation on the Metrolink Board. Fran Sereseres asked whether she could receive materials from the Lancaster outreach event because she could not attend, and staff indicated that information could be provided.

6. NEW BUSINESS

Under new business, staff reminded members about an upcoming emergency evacuation exercise scheduled for Saturday at 5:00 a.m. at Hawthorne/Lennox Station. Staff noted that information had been circulated and that members interested in attending could coordinate with staff. Deaka McClain confirmed her attendance and asked for logistical guidance. Staff explained that the exercises occur early because they must take place before revenue service or without disrupting regular service, and that the exercises may involve full-scale emergency response scenarios with law enforcement and other public safety partners. Staff stated that a summary package with photos, videos, and reports from the exercises would be prepared for a future meeting.

Fernando Roldan reported that the City of Burbank



Metro



would hold a special meeting on May 20 at 3:00 p.m. regarding Metro bus project updates and strongly encouraged AAC members to participate. Staff agreed to circulate the information to the Committee. Members then discussed elevator reliability and accessibility concerns across the Metro system. Jared Rimer raised an unconfirmed concern that an elevator at Vermont/Santa Monica had reportedly been down for several months and that additional observation may be needed by a sighted person. Max Romero reiterated concerns about ongoing elevator issues at stations in the San Fernando Valley and Pasadena area, including elevators that repeatedly fail, doors that do not fully close, visible gaps while elevators are moving, and a lack of clear replacement timelines. Greg Kuhl stated that elevator reliability creates significant access and liability concerns for Metro and emphasized that riders who cannot use stairs must have reliable elevator access at all times. He also stated that stations should have at least two elevators whenever possible so that an outage does not make a station inaccessible.

Deaka McClain suggested that the Committee consider preparing a letter regarding elevator reliability and timely repairs, including a request that Metro and the Board address elevator access as a necessity for people with disabilities. Staff stated that a letter could be brought back to the Committee for consideration and that the item could be placed on a future agenda. Daniel Garcia asked whether a report regarding elevator issues could be prepared, and staff



Metro



agreed to look into developing a report. Fernando Roldan encouraged members to raise these concerns with candidates and elected officials during the election year. A public participant also commented that Metro should consider engaging disability organizations and Paralympic athletes in emergency preparedness work and raised concern that the newly opened Wilshire/Fairfax Station was already listed as having unavailable elevator access. Staff stated that the Wilshire/Fairfax elevator issue had reportedly resulted from a construction-related damage to elevator power equipment shortly before opening and that repairs were being addressed.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

During public comment, a caller stated that the online Eventbrite posting for the AAC meeting appeared to link to an agenda from December 2025 rather than the current meeting agenda. The caller thanked Jared Rimer for posting the current agenda on his website and emphasized that meetings open to the public should have accurate and accessible information regarding how to attend and how to review the agenda.

Staff agreed that the outdated agenda link was unacceptable and stated that the agenda had been sent to the appropriate posting staff in advance of the meeting. Staff committed to following up with the IT or posting staff responsible for Eventbrite and to



Metro

elevating the issue so that it does not happen again.



8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kathleen Barajas adjourned the meeting at 3:30
PM