

Metro Riders' Advisory Council
January 9, 2013

Ms. Silva called the January 2013 meeting of the Metro Riders' Advisory Council to order at 6:38 p.m. She noted that in the absence of the chair, whose term on the Council had expired, she would be leading the evening's meeting, and that elections for new Council officers would be held later in the meeting.

The following members were present:

Carl Seip, District of Columbia Vice Chair
Lorraine Silva, Virginia Vice Chair, Arlington County
James Wright, Maryland Vice Chair, Prince George's County
Ben Ball, District of Columbia
Italo Cruz, District of Columbia
Frank DeBernardo, Prince George's County
Barbara Hermanson, City of Alexandria
Pat Jackson, Fairfax County
Patricia King-Adams, District of Columbia
Karen Lynch, Prince George's County
Kara Merrigan, Arlington County
Alexander Parcan, Montgomery County
Carol Carter Walker, At-Large
Frederick Walker, Fairfax County
Etta Cheri Washington, District of Columbia
Mary Ann Zimmerman, Montgomery County

Other individuals present:

John Pasek, Council staff coordinator, Metro
Loyda Sequeira-Castillo, Board Secretary, Metro
Alison Simon, Office of Customer Research, Metro

Chris Barnes, member of the public
Drew Hunter, member of the public
Graham Jenkins, member of the public
Kathi Spray, member of the public

II. Public Comment Period:

Chris Barnes introduced himself to the new Council members and said that he was hopeful that the Council will make strides this year and would be happy to help with that in any way possible. He noted that he had previously told the Council about the Metro-related conversations taking place on Twitter and had urged members to participate. He noted that out of the Council's 21 members, he was only able to identify four people on Twitter and that only one person, Carl Seip, participated at all in conversations about Metro. He said that he hoped that this participation would increase in the coming year and offered any assistance members need to do so.

Mr. Barnes also told members that he had offered space on his website for Council members to submit short introductions and biographies to help riders get to know them, but that no members of the Council had taken him up on his offer. He said that he hoped that members would reconsider this offer this year. Mr. Barnes said that he was looking forward to working with the Council in addressing the challenges and frustrations that Metro riders face every day.

Kurt Raschke noted that the London Underground was celebrating its 150th anniversary and shared some of its performance metrics, comparing those with Metro's. He said that the London Underground achieved much higher performance targets than Metro, which is only 36 years old. He asked riders to think about why Metro cannot even meet its own performance goals, let alone the goals of a system that is significantly older.

Drew Hunter asked the Council to make looking into how the Metro Transit Police Department operates in terms of policing rail stations a priority for its work in 2013. He said that he often sees police at the Gallery Place station near the Verizon Center, but not at L'Enfant Plaza or other stations. He said that Metro is not responding to increases in robberies, stabbings and suicides and that Metro Transit Police need to change their operating procedures to address these issues. He told the Council that the Metro was becoming more dangerous from a crime perspective and said that the Council needs to put pressure on the police chief to fix this issue.

Kathi Spray introduced herself as an advocate for transit riders and for the disability community and told members of the Council that, like Mr. Barnes, she wanted to offer the website she runs, dcparratransit.info, as a resource for the Council to do outreach and provide information. She noted that while many issues related to accessibility are often the province of Metro's Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC), there is a need for the RAC to be involved because both individuals with disabilities and able-bodied individuals use the Metro fixed-route system and share the same concerns. She said that she hoped that the RAC and AAC would work more closely together in 2013 on issues of mutual concern.

Graham Jenkins compared his experience riding the subway in New York versus riding the Metro as it relates to headways. He noted from recent experience that riders in New York were incredibly frustrated by a twelve-minute headway, while weekend headways on the Metro can range from 12-20 minutes and increase substantially when there is trackwork. He told the Council that there have been studies that have shown that people are willing to wait up to ten minutes for trains without a schedule, but with its longer headways, Metro might as well just provide a schedule and consider itself commuter rail. He said that Metro needs to provide a way to get around that is fast, frequent and safe; running trains more frequently would solve many problems that Metro faces, such as crowding.

III. Approval of Agenda:

Mr. Seip moved approval of the agenda as presented. This motion was seconded by Ms. King-Adams. Without objection, the agenda was approved as presented.

IV. Approval of Past Meeting Minutes:

Ms. Walker moved the approval of the March 2012, September 2012, October 2012, November 2012 and December 2012 minutes *en bloc* as presented. This motion was seconded by Mr. Ball. Without objection, the meeting minutes were approved as presented.

V. Member Introductions:

Ms. Silva asked members to briefly introduce themselves. Members provided information about which communities they represented, why they wanted to serve on the Council and how they use Metro and other transit in the region.

VI. Customer Satisfaction Survey Results:

Alison Simon, Director of Metro's Office of Customer Research, presented the results of Metro's "Voice of the Customer" survey for the third quarter of 2012 (July – September).

Dr. Simon noted that she came to Metro about a year and a half ago and was asked to start a customer research department at Metro to incorporate customer ideas and opinions into Metro programs on a larger scale. She told the Council that she has conducted about 20-25 surveys during her time at Metro and that the most successful survey she conducted was one in conjunction with Fairfax County regarding the names for the new Silver Line stations. She said that about 16,000 people participated in that survey and that it resulted in new names for some of the stations on this line.

Dr. Simon explained that when she arrived at Metro, one of the first things that she did was to shut down the customer satisfaction survey as it existed, because it asked very general questions that weren't as informative as questions that drilled down to focus on specific issues occurring in the present. She noted that she spent a year conducting focus groups with bus and rail customers

to put together a whole new customer research program, and would be presenting the first quarter's worth of results from that program.

Dr. Simon noted that, at the end of her presentation, she would also be presenting results of the customer satisfaction of MetroAccess customers, which is conducted by interviewing MetroAccess customers.

Dr. Simon explained that Metro randomly called approximately 400 bus and 400 rail customers and asked them about their opinions on a randomly-selected trip from among their last several bus or rail trips. She noted that there is a random selection process to choose participants and also to randomly choose the trip that will be discussed.

Dr. Simon then presented the key findings from the first quarter of FY2013 (July – September).

She explained that Metro had a high “likelihood to recommend” for both bus and rail service, which is used in the industry as a measure of customer loyalty, and then provided more specific measurements for each service, Metrobus and Metrorail.

With regard to Metrobus, Dr. Simon told members that there were some demographic differences in the results that she wanted to point out:

- Riders under 35 years old report significantly lower reliability with the bus system than those over 35;
- Regular commuters are more likely to recommend Metrobus than non-commuters;
- Hispanic customers are more likely to recommend Metrobus than non-Hispanic customers.

Dr. Simon noted that Metrobus scores for cleanliness – both for buses and bus stops, were among the higher scores in the transit industry compared to other large transit systems. She also explained that the survey rated customers' interaction with bus operators, and told Council members that customers didn't expect significant interactions with their bus operators, but that they did expect a greeting or acknowledgment from the operator when boarding the bus.

She said that the numbers for Metrobus were on par with other large transit agencies for bus, and that since this is the first set of results for this survey, Metro will use it as a baseline against which it can measure the results from subsequent customer surveys.

Dr. Simon then reviewed the findings for Metrorail. She noted that rail service is more complex than bus service, but that Metro would expect to see numbers similar to peer agencies. She noted that while Metrorail scored high with regards to satisfaction (80%) and “likelihood to

recommend” (79%), the reliability score, at 69%, was closer to the average among rail transit agencies.

Dr. Simon noted some demographic differences with regard to the Metrorail results:

- Hispanic riders rated Metrorail reliability significantly lower than non-Hispanic riders;
- Commuters are significantly less likely to recommend the rail system than non-commuters.

She also noted some geographic differences among the results:

- Red and Orange line riders were significantly more likely to rate reliability lower than Green, Yellow and Blue riders;
- The reliability score is significantly lower (at 65%) than the reliability score for the other large transit agency that asked about reliability as part of its survey. The New York MTA had a reliability score of 84%.

Dr. Simon then provided information about expected vs. actual trip length, which measures perceptions of reliability. She noted that the average and actual trip lengths varied by three minutes, but that in 80% of the cases, they were the same. She said that reliability perceptions are influenced not only by on-time performance, but also by security on the rail system and the smoothness of the ride.

Dr. Simon noted that the results for cleanliness and climate control in rail stations were rated among the highest in the industry, but that the cleanliness and climate control on the train wasn't rated as high, possibly due to the age of some of the cars in the Metrorail fleet. With regard to announcements, only 44% of riders heard and understood announcements in railcars, while 33% of riders in railcars heard the announcements but didn't understand them, and 27% of riders on station platforms heard the announcements but didn't understand them. Dr. Simon said that the clarity of the announcements is a driver of reliability findings.

With regard to customer interactions with rail station managers, Dr. Simon said that customers didn't expect to be greeted or acknowledged by station managers, but Metro wants to make sure that its station managers are “approachable.” She noted that only 69% of station managers were rated as approachable, which was a disappointing result and is one of the lowest numbers among peer agencies.

Dr. Simon then provided results on safety and security on the fixed-route system. She noted that these results were among the highest, if not the highest, in the transit industry. She said that parking lot security was rated lower than the other security figures, but that she was unable to find results from a comparable agency with which to compare those figures.

Dr. Simon then reviewed the findings for MetroAccess paratransit service and explained how Metro selects survey participants to ensure that they have used the system recently.

With regard to the survey results for MetroAccess, Dr. Simon noted that it received very high results for safety and driver courtesy and helpfulness. She also told Council members that MetroAccess rated very highly (91%) for trying its best to help riders when a problem occurs.

Dr. Simon then reviewed the results to questions on customer satisfaction, which was rated at 62%, and went over the various reasons why customers reported that they were dissatisfied with MetroAccess service.

She explained that Metro is developing Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that measure customer satisfaction to add to its *Vital Signs* report, the various departments are developing action plans to address items from the survey and will be adding a customer component to the new MetroAccess paratransit contract. She told the Council that she will come back to the Board later in 2013 to report on Metro's progress.

Ms. Silva then opened the floor to comments by members of the public.

Public Comments

Mr. Barnes noted that if 85% of the bus fareboxes are working, then 15% aren't working, which is a big problem for a system that is trying to make every dollar count. He also noted that if one in six people think that the service is unreliable, which, out of a six-car train is 210 riders that think the service is unreliable. Mr. Barnes suggested that the best way to improve the reliability of the Passenger Information Display Signs (PIDS) would be to turn them off on the weekends when Metro is doing trackwork. He added that the expected length of riders' trips may be high because riders are conditioned to expect their trips to take forever.

In regard to the numbers showing customers' ability to hear/understand announcements, Mr. Barnes said that he thought that Metro was supposed to have more professional voices to make in-station announcements, though he hasn't noticed this happening yet. He added that, regarding parking lot safety, a large number of the comments he has seen on Twitter with regard to this subject focus on lighting in the parking lots and if Metro would improve lighting, this could help. He suggested comparing this number to malls or other large parking lots around the area.

Mr. Jenkins said that he had a couple of concerns about the survey's methodology. He said that the measurement of "likelihood to recommend" doesn't seem like much of an indicator because so many of Metro's customers have no other options. He added that he thought that the sample size of 800 individuals was small for a system of Metro's size and asked whether it included cell

phone-only customers or intermodal commuters. Mr. Jenkins said that the fact that Metro riders have “worst rides” that they want to share with survey takes is an indicator of significant problems. He added that comparing Metro to other transit systems takes focus away from trying to reach 100% satisfaction. He said that this report shows Metro’s shortcomings.

Mr. Hunter said that he wanted to know if there is a program to retrain station managers who have received customer complaints. He suggested that having station managers interact more with customers would show improvements and said that there needed to be punishments for rude station managers, since they are Metrorail’s frontline employees. He said that he would like to hear what Metro is doing to improve these employees’ performance.

RAC Comments:

Mr. Seip said that he thought that the survey was helpful in identifying areas where Metro could improve. He noted the slide that showed specific areas where customers were dissatisfied with MetroAccess service, but didn’t see similar information for rail or bus, and asked whether this information could be provided. He said that such information could help the RAC identify areas it should work on. Dr. Simon said that she could add this to the survey, though she noted that it would add time to an already long survey.

In response to a question from Mr. Seip, Dr. Simon said that some of the questions from the survey are standard within the transit industry, while other questions focus on the same topics but are worded differently to more accurately reflect Metro.

Mr. Wright said that he found the information interesting and that he was surprised by the high number for “bus driver approachability,” given the number of rude bus drivers that he has encountered.

Ms. King-Adams thanked Dr. Simon for bringing her experience to Metro and said that she was very happy with the MetroAccess survey in that it gave a better picture of what customers were feeling, as opposed to the results from the bus and rail surveys. She asked whether it would be possible to get information from customers about what they think needs to be done to improve Metro. Dr. Simon said that it would be possible to gather such information by conducting a panel survey, but that she didn’t like that method for this type of survey because one ends up talking to the same people over and over again, and she would rather have a random sample of respondents.

Mr. DeBernardo asked whether there is a way to conduct a survey of individuals who have left the Metro system on why they no longer ride. Dr. Simon said that this would be possible, but it would be expensive to search out individuals who are former Metro riders. She added that she had talked with some of these individuals as part of the focus groups that she had run and that

they had left Metro because the service no longer worked for them because they had moved or changed jobs, because of insufficient headways or because it's cheaper to drive. She said that she would have to do a whole separate survey to find out that information, but that she thought it was an interesting idea and thanked Mr. DeBernardo for his suggestion.

Ms. Jackson asked Dr. Simon who Metro shared the survey results with and what their reaction was. She said that some of the numbers should make people outraged, especially for items that are wholly within Metro's control, as bus operator greetings and system reliability. Dr. Simon explained that both Metrobus and Metrorail have customer service training programs underway. She said that the Metrobus operator program began in November 2012 and customer service training will also be incorporated into the new operator training program. For rail station managers, Dr. Simon said that Metrorail began its program in September 2012 and it will continue through end of 2013.

Mr. Parcan said that the survey's conclusions seem wildly out of step with regular riders' experience and that this may be because Metro isn't measuring rider dissatisfaction. He asked whether Dr. Simon had reviewed previous Metro customer satisfaction data, noting that it wasn't identical to the current survey. He said that Metro's customer satisfaction numbers are low, maybe not compared to other transit agencies in the U.S., but compared agencies like the London Underground, which has a 98.6% satisfaction rating.

Ms. Simon noted, in response to Ms. Jackson's earlier question, that she shared her findings with Metro's Executive Leadership Team, Metro's Board of Directors and shared the MetroAccess information with the Accessibility Advisory Committee. She said that she didn't think that the AAC was alarmed at the findings and noted that because it's the first survey, it is a baseline information about Metro and can only be compared against other transit properties' results.

Ms. Merrigan noted that everyone wants to see higher survey results and asked whether there were any expectations prior to the survey. Dr. Simon said that since the survey was brand new, there weren't any expectations regarding results. In response to additional questions from Ms. Merrigan, Dr. Simon said that it takes 17 minutes for a respondent to complete a Metrobus or Metrorail phone survey and 10 minutes to complete a MetroAccess phone survey. She said the survey will be repeated quarterly (twice/year for MetroAccess) and that there is an additional survey regarding customer knowledge of MetroAccess that is conducted quarterly. Dr. Simon also noted that she is pushing for customer satisfaction survey results to be a part of the new MetroAccess paratransit contract to hold the vendor accountable for achieving a certain level of customer service.

Ms. Hermanson said that the Council needs this kind of information to understand customers' concerns and asked about how Metro asked about reliability. Dr. Simon read the question from

the survey regarding reliability. In response to Ms. Hermanson's question about which days Metro asked about when querying riders about their trips, Dr. Simon said that her staff separated trips into weekday, Saturday and Sunday and randomly chose trips based on the number of riders for each of those time periods. She also explained that the time shown as "average trip time" was a mix of weekday, Saturday and Sunday trips encompassed the time from when a rider entered a rail station to when he or she exited the rail station at their destination.

In response to an additional question from Ms. Hermanson, Dr. Simon said that the survey did not include any questions on whether station managers were visible to customers, but that she did include that question on a different survey she conducted.

Ms. Zimmerman asked if Dr. Simon's survey was related to the paper survey that was given to riders that asked about their trip. Dr. Simon responded that the two surveys are not related – the paper survey is used to collect origin/destination and jurisdiction of residence information for funding purposes. In response to a question from Ms. Zimmerman about why Metro didn't ask about escalator or elevator availability, Dr. Simon said that she didn't include questions about elevators and escalators in her survey because Metro already has the numbers on escalator and elevator availability internally. She said that she has the option to add in questions in subsequent iterations of the survey.

Dr. Simon noted, in response to a comment from Ms. Zimmerman, that she has separate scorecards for each department that provides details on the results for that department.

Mr. Ball thanked Dr. Simon for her presentation and urged her to take advantage of the Council as a way to get feedback. He noted that there weren't any questions in the trip planning portion of the survey about smartphone apps or other technological features such as its interactive voice response phone system or text message bus arrival service. He said that it's difficult for anyone to provide an overall measure of his or her satisfaction with Metro because of the significant variability in the quality of trips, which wasn't really covered in the survey. He said that Metro should be asking whether buses and trains come often enough, whether they go where riders need them to and whether the service is sufficient enough for riders to live car free.

Ms. Walker said that she was concerned that questions on elevators and escalators weren't included in the survey. She also noted that many riders don't have a choice on whether or not to use Metro, so that would skew the "likely to recommend" results. In response to a question from Ms. Walker as to whether the results of the survey would be shared with the public, Dr. Simon noted that the survey results would be posted on the Metro website as part of the *Vital Signs* report.

Ms. Washington discussed her experience with Metrobus and Metrorail surveys and suggested that Metro send out staff to administer the Metrobus surveys to improve its response rate. She also raised concerns about the distribution of Metrorail customer surveys in stations, specifically regarding the staff who distributed the surveys.

Ms. King-Adams moved to table items VII (Council Meeting Structure) through X (RAC and AAC reports) and proceed to the Council elections (Item XI). Mr. Ball seconded this motion.

In response to a question from Mr. Seip, Ms. King-Adams said that she is proposing deferring the remainder of the agenda aside from the elections and open mic period to the next meeting because of time constraints. Mr. Seip said that he was concerned that if the Council didn't establish subcommittees at this meeting, those committees would be unable to begin meeting in February. He said that he would prefer to continue with the agenda as presented and only table items once it reaches 8:30 p.m.

Ms. Silva called for a vote on this motion:

In favor: Mr. Ball, Ms. Jackson, Ms. King-Adams, Ms. Lynch, Ms. Washington, Mr. Wright, Ms. Zimmerman

Opposed: Mr. Cruz, Mr. DeBernardo, Ms. Hermanson, Ms. Merrigan, Mr. Parcan, Mr. Seip, Ms. Silva, Ms. Walker, Mr. Walker

This motion failed (7-9-0)

Mr. DeBernardo then moved to move item XI (2013 Council Elections) to the next item and continue with the remainder of the agenda as time permits. This motion was seconded by Ms. King-Adams. Without objection, this motion was approved.

Ms. Silva said that if any members had additional questions regarding the customer satisfaction survey to send those to Mr. Pasek.

VII. 2013 Council Elections:

Chair:

Ms. Silva opened the floor for nominations for the office of Chair.

Mr. Seip moved to nominate Mr. Ball for the position of Chair. This motion was seconded by Ms. King-Adams.

Mr. Ball noted that he had not planned to run for chair but that when it was determined that Mr. Seip couldn't run, he considered running instead. He said that Metro faces challenges such as declining ridership and the impression that Metro is "broken," but also opportunities, like the

Silver Line coming at the end of the year. He said that there is an impression that Metro is isolated from its riders, so the RAC has a full agenda ahead of it.

He said that he thinks the RAC needs to be smart activists – data-driven, results-oriented and smart about how it conducts its business and talks with Metro. He added that the RAC has been responsive to what Metro asks of it, but has not asked for much from Metro, and so the Council needs to balance its agenda better between items brought by Metro and those initiated by the Council. Mr. Ball noted that the previous chair did an excellent job in terms of building relationships within Metro and that the Council should nurture those relationships within the coming year but that the Council needs to ask for more from Metro and have more two-way conversations between it and Metro.

Mr. Ball also said that the Council needs to be more active in the media and to use its bully pulpit more. He added that it needs to have more discipline regarding the structure of its meetings. He noted that he has served one year on the Council and will defer to longer-serving members on some issues. Mr. Ball told Council members that he is a bureaucrat, so he has an understanding of how a bureaucracy like Metro works. He said that he views the Council members as public servants and hopes that other members do, too.

There were no further nominations for the position of Chair, so Ms. Silva closed the floor for nominations. Mr. Ball was elected Council Chair by acclamation.

District of Columbia Vice Chair:

Ms. Silva opened the floor for nominations for the office of District of Columbia Vice Chair.

Mr. DeBernardo nominated Ms. Walker for the position of District of Columbia Vice Chair. This motion was seconded by Ms. King-Adams.

Ms. Walker told Council members that she has been involved in the Council's review and revision of its bylaws, as well as its work on reviewing Metro's governance structure along with being an active member of the Council's budget and service adjustment working groups. Ms. Walker said that if she were elected, she wanted the Council to have more follow-through with members of the public who address its meetings and make the Council more accessible to the public by taking its meetings out into the community. She said she is also interested in representing the demographic of "active seniors" such as herself that needs Metro to maintain her quality of life.

There were no further nominations for the position of District of Columbia Vice Chair, so Ms. Silva closed the floor for nominations. Ms. Walker was elected District of Columbia Vice Chair by acclamation.

Maryland Vice Chair:

Ms. Silva opened the floor for nominations for the office of Maryland Vice Chair.

Ms. King-Adams nominated Mr. Wright for the position of Maryland Vice Chair. This motion was seconded by Ms. Merrigan.

Mr. Wright said that he wanted to work with the Council's Maryland members if elected Vice Chair, and said that he liked what Mr. Ball said about the Council being more activist, and encouraged everyone to be more proactive in terms of engaging Metro and the general public. He noted that Marylanders put a lot of money into Metro and they need to be heard. Mr. Wright said that, if elected, he will work to make that so.

There were no further nominations for the position of Maryland Vice Chair, so Ms. Silva closed the floor for nominations. Mr. Wright was elected Maryland Vice Chair by acclamation.

Virginia Vice Chair:

Ms. Silva opened the floor for nominations for the office of Virginia Vice Chair.

Mr. Ball nominated Ms. Hermanson for the position of Virginia Vice Chair. This motion was seconded by Mr. Seip.

Ms. Hermanson said that she wants the Council to be an indispensable partner to the Board. She said that she wants the Board to count on the Council's feedback and for the Council to be more relevant and active and that she is willing to put in the time and energies to make that happen.

There were no further nominations for the position of Virginia Vice Chair, so Ms. Silva closed the floor for nominations. Mr. Wright was elected Virginia Vice Chair by acclamation.

VIII. Council Meeting Structure:

Ms. Silva turned the floor over to Mr. Seip to discuss the Council's proposed meeting structure.

He referred members to a proposal contained in their meeting packets and noted that, in December, the Council voted to approve adding two new subcommittee meeting dates each month for a total of three, with members attending two of those meetings. He explained that the proposal outlined specific actions that he would walk the Council through at this meeting.

Mr. Pasek suggested that these issues may best be addressed by the Council's new leadership team.

Mr. Ball moved that between now and the next Council meeting, members send him potential subcommittee meeting topics that they can then present to the Council at the next meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Seip.

Mr. DeBernardo said that he felt that it would be better to have the discussion of what the committees will cover take place after the Council decides on what items it wants in its workplan for the coming year.

Mr. Ball said that he thought the issue could go either way and that the workplan might drive the committee structure or the committee structure might drive the workplan.

Ms. Zimmerman noted that the next meeting isn't for another month, and said that if there were a way to have a discussion on this topic between now and the next meeting, it would allow the Council to make a decision in February. Ms. Silva noted that was something the Council did regularly.

Mr. Ball restated his motion. Mr. Seip suggested that the Council aim for subcommittee meetings to begin in February, which Mr. Ball agreed with.

In favor: Mr. Ball, Mr. Cruz, Ms. Hermanson, Ms. Jackson, Ms. King-Adams, Ms. Lynch, Ms. Merrigan, Mr. Parcan, Mr. Seip, Ms. Silva Ms. Walker, Mr. Walker, Ms. Washington, Mr. Wright, Ms. Zimmerman

Opposed: Mr. DeBernardo

This motion was approved (15-1-0)

IX. Workplan Development:

Mr. Pasek noted that this item was put on the agenda to allow for members of the public to provide input into the Council's workplan. He said that that if the Council was going to discuss this item offline, he would suggest giving members of the public the opportunity to give their input now.

Ms. Silva asked for comments from members of the public.

Public Comments:

Mr. Raschke noted that much of the Council's business takes place electronically between meetings and suggested that if there were a way, using the internet, for members of the Council and members of the public to communicate with each other, that would help advance the discussion between meetings. Mr. Pasek suggested that individuals could send comments to the Council's email address.

Mr. Jenkins said that he appreciated the new Council and said that he hoped that the Council would have a more adversarial relationship with Metro, since representing riders requires demanding things on their behalf. He said that he liked the potential workplan items, including off-peak frequencies, and also suggested the Council discuss funding streams for long-term capital investment and how to advocate and lobby for increased resources for those investments.

RAC Comments:

Mr. Ball suggested that the Council find one topic to discuss at its next meeting and suggested that it should be trackwork – specifically when it will be completed, the status of projects and how Metro can better inform riders about trackwork.

Mr. Ball moved that this be the topic for the February Council meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Parcan.

In favor: Mr. Ball, Ms. Hermanson, Ms. Jackson, Ms. Lynch,
Mr. Parcan, Mr. Seip, Ms. Silva, Ms. Washington, Mr. Wright, Ms.
Zimmerman

Opposed: Ms. Merrigan, Ms. Walker, Mr. Walker

Abstaining: Mr. DeBernardo, Mr. Cruz

This motion was approved (10-3-2)

X. Open Mic:

Ms. Silva asked if members had any comments for the “Open Mic” period.

Mr. Seip said that he appreciated everyone’s support over the past year and looked forward to the coming year. Mr. DeBernardo led the Council in a round of applause for the outgoing leadership.

XI. Adjournment:

Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:44 p.m.