I. Roll Call

Mr. Jaffe called the meeting of the Riders’ Advisory Council to order at 7:08 p.m.

He then recognized the following members of Metro’s Board of Directors who were in attendance at the meeting: Charles Deegan representing Maryland, Catherine Hudgins, representing Fairfax County, and Gladys Mack, representing the District of Columbia and Chair of Metro’s Board of Directors. Mr. Jaffe also noted that Ann Chisholm, manager of Metro’s Public Participation Branch, Jack Requa, Acting General Manager, and John Catoe, Incoming General Manager.

Mr. Jaffe then invited Mrs. Mack and Mr. Catoe to speak.

Mrs. Mack said that she was pleased to be in attendance this evening and noted that it has only been a year since she was at the RAC’s “kick-off” session. She then offered her congratulations to RAC members for their work over the past year and said that it has been a great distinction for Board members to know that RAC members are “looking over their shoulders” to ensure that they are giving proper attention and recognition to Metro’s riders.

Mrs. Mack said that she wanted to give particular thanks to Mr. Jaffe for his work as RAC chair. She stated that the RAC was fortunate to have him as a chair. She noted that Mr. Jaffe is a tenacious individual and that she and he had been engaged in several discussions and negotiations throughout the past year. Mrs. Mack added that they always came to consensus on the matters that they discussed because they both care about the riders’ and their welfare. She noted that the RAC helps Board members see issues from a different perspective.

Mrs. Mack then noted that the RAC worked with Metro when issues arose with MetroAccess. Mrs. Mack noted that if Dennis and the RAC had not been in existence, MetroAccess changes would not have been implemented in the same way. She noted that recommendations from the MetroAccess workshops, such as door-to-door service, were recently approved by the Board of Directors. She again offered her congratulations and welcomed the new members of the RAC to the Council.

Mr. Jaffe responded noted that he and Mrs. Mack had “active” conversations during his tenure as chair and said that she was one of the most gracious he had known. He also thanked Mrs. Mack for allowing him rapport with and access to her throughout the year.
Mr. Jaffe then asked Mr. Catoe to address the RAC. Mr. Catoe thanked Mr. Jaffe and the RAC for allowing him to address the group. He noted his previous experience with advisory groups, and stated that working with these groups such as the RAC has been critical when making changes to service. He said that it is critical that managers of an organization have an understanding of issues from a riders’ perspective and committed to seeking riders’ input. He also agreed to “match rides” with the RAC, as he will be riding system every day. Mr. Catoe added that he will match information with the RAC to improve the system for all of Metro’s customers. Mr. Catoe thanked the Board of Directors for giving him the opportunity to serve as General Manager and added that he looks forward, with a great deal of excitement, to working with the Board. He noted that he does not begin at Metro until January 25th and looks forward to talking with the RAC once he is on-board with Metro.

Mrs. Hudgins offered congratulations to RAC members on their participation. She noted that she represents from Fairfax County and rides all the way in from outer Fairfax. She said that she wanted to emphasize that Metro has a “regional focus” to provide the best transportation system possible. Mrs. Hudgins also noted that Fairfax County has over one hundred advisory committees which help the County develop a foundation on what its policies should be. She again offered her appreciation for the RAC members’ service and wished members a happy new year.

Mr. Deegan noted that he represented Prince George’s County and the State of Maryland on Metro’s Board of Directors. He thanked RAC members for serving and pledged that he wanted to hear input from the RAC. He added that he is excited about Mr. Catoe coming in as new general manager and noted that both he and Mr. Catoe are native Washingtonians. Mr. Deegan also echoed Mrs. Hudgins’ comments about Metro being a regional system. He said that RAC members are always welcome to contact him and gave out his contact information.

Mr. Jaffe thanked Mr. Deegan for his remarks and noted that the RAC will be discussing public input on the budget and wanted to know how long members of the Board of Directors will be in attendance this evening. Mr. Jaffe then asked to take advantage of their presence to discuss aspects of the budget.

Mr. Jaffe said that members of the RAC have noted that, institutionally, WMATA has moved forward in listening to riders and the RAC during the last year. He added that many members of the RAC still feel that the process of listening to riders or the RAC is not “institutionalized” within the agency. Mr. Jaffe stated that WMATA needs to improve its marketing materials on subjects such as SmarTrip. Mr. Jaffe also noted his concern with Metro’s data on Day Pass usage and the effect of any proposed fare increase on other Metro passes. He said that he is hearing “a lot of anger” about what would happen to buses and bus fares as part of new budget. Mr. Jaffe added that the Metro’s customer service center is “largely ineffectual” and that a survey should go out to all those who contact
customer service to give them feedback. Before moving to public comment, Mr. Jaffe asked if any RAC members wished to add their comments. No RAC members took the opportunity to add their comments. Mr. Jaffe thanked the members of the Board of Directors and Metro staff for their attendance.

II. Public Comment Period

Mr. Jaffe asked if there were any members of the public who wish to make comments. There were no comments from the public.

III. Introduction of new members

Mr. Jaffe then asked returning RAC members to introduce themselves and tell which jurisdiction they represent, which transit mode (bus or rail) that they use and any particular subjects they are interested in.

Justin Chittams – represents the District of Columbia, rides Metrorail and is interested in safety and security;
Katy Chang – represents the District of Columbia, and noted that she is mostly interested in Metrobus service;
Pat Daniels – represents the District of Columbia and said that she is interested in senior and disabled policies;
Sharon Conn – represents Prince George’s County and noted that she is the Metrobus subcommittee chair;
Denise Brown – represents Prince George’s County and said that she is interested mainly in Metrorail, but also bus stops and shelters.
Michael Snyder – represents Montgomery County and is noted that he is interested in customer service and safety/security and primarily rides Metrorail.
Pedro Erviti – represents Fairfax County most interested in increasing bus services outside of rush hour to western Fairfax County.
Lillian White – represents the City of Alexandria and said that she is mostly interested in Metrorail service.
Steve Cerny – represents Fairfax County and said that he is interested equally in bus and rail and is currently the chair of the Metrorail subcommittee.
Nancy Iacomini – represents Arlington County and stated that she is primarily interested in Metrorail.
Kevin Moore – an At-Large representative on the RAC, though noted that he lives in the District of Columbia and said that he is equally interested in rail and bus.
Pat Sheehan – said that he lives in Montgomery County, but as the Chair of the Metro’s Elderly and Disabled (E&D) Subcommittee, he brings viewpoint of E&D to the RAC and added that he thinks that the RAC was very successful on MetroAccess issues over the past year.
Mr. Jaffe asked new members to introduce themselves and give a brief overview of their interests and why they wanted to join the RAC. He also noted that the RAC has several opportunities for members to serve on subcommittees.

Kaiya Sandler – said that she represents Montgomery County and while she mostly rides rail, but interested in both bus and rail.

Aline Stone – said that lives in Fairfax and while she rides both Metrobus and Metrorail, she is mostly interested in improvements to Metrobus service.

Cesar Maxit – said that he works in Tysons Corner and lives in Adams Morgan and is interested in both Metrobus and Metrorail.

Nardra Johnson – said that she is interested in both Metrobus and Metrorail and added that she has concerns about customer service, security and safety, and communications. She said that she wants to see Metro broadcast good info to customers.

Armando Cortinez – said that he is originally from Texas and noted that he is public transit dependent; he lives in Washington and works in Maryland;

Kelsi Bracmort – noted that she works in the city and is interested in improving Metrobus service for customers and increasing ridership, noting that there are security and safety improvements that she sees during her commute on Metrobus that can be improved.

IV. Review of December 6, 2006 Minutes

Mr. Jaffe then moved on to the approval of minutes from the December RAC meeting and then went over how the RAC uses Robert’s Rules of Order in approving minutes.

Dr. Conn moved approval of the December 6, 2006 minutes which was seconded by Mr. Erviti. Mr. Jaffe took the opportunity to clarify Mr. Moore’s comments which appeared on page 14 of the minutes, noting that they relate to materials handed out at RAC meetings. The motion was then voted on, with 10 members voting in favor (Chang, Daniels, Conn, Brown, White, Iacomini, Snyder, Erviti, Cerny, Moore), none opposed and nine abstaining (White, Chittams, Sheehan, Sandler, Stone, Maxit, Johnson, Cortinez, Bracmort). (10-0-9).

Mr. Jaffe then recognized and thanked Rodney Elin, who was in attendance, for his service to the RAC during 2006. He also introduced John Pasek, RAC Staff Coordinator, to the new RAC members.

V. Bylaws, Standards of Conduct and Policies:

Mr. Jaffe then asked if new members had questions on bylaws or standards of conduct. He then asked whether any returning members had questions. Dr. Conn asked about the process to make changes to the RAC’s bylaws, since these were approved by the Board of Directors. Mr. Jaffe responded that changes would need to be approved by the Board of Directors and said that any changes should go
through the RAC’s Rules and Administrative Subcommittee. Mr. Jaffe also noted that all members of RAC have opportunity to contact Metro staff and members of the Board of Directors. He said that a subject to focus on during the coming year would be for RAC members to determine which kind of questions to ask whom, members of the Board of Directors, Staff Coordinator, or Metro staff. Mr. Jaffe continued that he thinks that it’s helpful for RAC members to contact staff members directly to get information.

Ms. White stated that the RAC is a public forum, and that there are considerations that need to be made concerning communications such as emails. In response to Ms. White’s comment, Mr. Jaffe noted that, when RAC members communicate with staff, their comments need to be made such in such a way that it can be reasonably determined that members are not speaking for the entire RAC. Mr. Jaffe noted that the RAC votes on issues and that when it takes positions on issues, it does so after a vote is taken. He elaborated that only in rare situations, such as when he needed to provide comments to the Board of Directors on the budget within a short timeframe, does he offer the RAC’s position on an issue without a vote having been taken. Ms. White noted that she had raised this issue because Metro’s General Counsel came in last year to go through the bylaws line-by-line for new members. Mr. Jaffe asked that the new chair, in concert with Mr. Pasek, communicate with new members to ensure that they understand the bylaws, standards of conduct and other issues.

Mr. Jaffe then moved on to election procedures. After ensuring that information outlining election procedures had been provided to RAC members, he then explained that the RAC has three officers, and elections will be held at this meeting to elect new officers. He noted that the bylaws prescribe that the chair position rotate jurisdictions, so that the chair elected cannot be from the District of Columbia, since he (the previous chair) represents the District. He also noted that the election procedures are similar to the ones used last year, with the addition of a suggestion for voting by secret ballot.

Mr. Jaffe also noted the bylaws include discussion on “termination of membership.” He stated that the council can choose to terminate membership of someone who misses three meetings in a row. Mr. Jaffe said that the RAC was lenient with this rule during 2006, but that there may need to be tightening of this rule for 2007. Mr. Jaffe also noted that the bylaws allow termination of membership due to a “consistent pattern of derogatory behavior” and asked for decorum in communication between RAC members and staff, etc.

Mr. Jaffe then asked RAC members to read the Standards of Conduct. He noted that it mostly concerned financial interests within the household that relate to transportation. He further stated that the Standards of Conduct also called for RAC members to act with “high ethical standards” at all times. Mr. Jaffe asked for additional questions from members and suggested that if members have questions, they should ask questions of other RAC members, especially the new
chair, or staff. He also noted that Katy Chang had served the RAC as parliamentarian during the past year.

VI. **Metrorail Platform Tile Replacement**

Mr. Jaffe introduced Joe Triolo and Hitendra Patel from Metro’s Office of Infrastructure Renewal, along with Ed Riley, Metro’s architect, to deliver a presentation on platform tile replacement and to answer questions from RAC members.

Messrs. Triolo and Patel then went through a presentation concerning platform tile replacement at the Minnesota Avenue and Deanwood Metrorail stations.

During the presentation, Mr. Cerny and Ms. Iacomini clarified that the RAC didn’t reach consensus on the square-vs.-hexagonal tile issue. She said that while there was discussion at the RAC’s Rail Subcommittee meeting, a decision was not made.

Mr. Maxit asked how staff determined that the structural integrity of the concrete has been compromised. Mr. Patel responded that a structural analysis had been done and also that a measurement of the salinity of the concrete determined that its strength had been weakened. Mr. Maxit also asked whether demolition work would be required. Mr. Patel responded that, yes, demolition of existing platform segments would need to be performed prior to installing new segments.

Dr. Conn asked how this work would be done during the weekends. Mr. Patel and Mr. Triolo explained that the platform would be removed in segments over several weekends. Dr. Conn expressed her concerns about having passengers at the station when work was occurring. Mr. Patel responded that the segment of the platform being replaced would be blocked off and trains would be single-tracked on the opposite side of the platform.

Mr. Sheehan asked whether these stations have truncated domes on the platform currently and whether they would be installed as part of the platform replacement. Mr. Patel responded that there are not currently truncated domes at these stations but that they would be installed as part of the work performed.

Ms. White noted her concerns about the outdoor stations, particularly the slip-resistance of the new tile versus the old tile. She asked what kind of slip-resistance the new tile had and whether the new tile would be an improvement. Mr. Triolo said that the porcelain tile has better slip-resistance than the quarry tiles which are currently used. Mr. Patel said that the tiles have been through a testing process. Mr. Riley noted that this tile has a lot better coefficient of friction than the current tile, meaning that it is more slip-resistant. He also noted that this tile has been used and tested by the Metropolitan Transit Authority in New York—
Metro has been in contact with the MTA to learn about the performance of this tile. Mr. Riley said that the industry standard is to test tiles only on dry surfaces, so Metro has used field research from New York to get additional information.

Mr. Triolo then continued with the presentation.

Dr. Conn asked about the advantages and disadvantages of the various tile types. Mr. Triolo explained that, compared with the existing tiles 12” square is more economical and there would be less joints for water to seep through. Dr. Conn then asked what the difference in cost would be between the till types. Mr. Patel responded that the tile cost would be approximately 40% more for 10” hex and 50% more for 8” hex. He said that this means the replacement would cost anywhere from $50-60,000 more vs. $100-120,000 more.

Ms. Iacomini further clarified the cost differential between the various types of tiles. Mr. Patel explained, in response to additional questions from Dr. Conn, that Metro did not have total cost estimates for the work, but rather percentage estimates for cost comparisons. He said that more information is needed to develop an exact price for the work, rather than just a comparison.

Ms. Johnson suggested that members go and look at the tile displays. RAC members then proceeded downstairs to look at tile samples.

RAC members returned to the meeting room after evaluating the tiles and Mr. Jaffe asked members if they had additional questions or comments.

Mr. Maxit asked that since the tile issues were caused by water damage, would it be better to look at larger tiles, which would mean fewer joints. Mr. Triolo responded that Metro was looking at larger, square tiles for just this reason.

Dr. Conn stated that she preferred the old tile compared with the new tile, that it better color, slip-resistance, etc. She asked about the necessity for making a change. Mr. Triolo responded that the porcelain tiles would offer better maintainability and would not need to be replaced as frequently due to cracks or other damage. Mr. Patel added that states that water seepage would be reduced by using the porcelain tiles, which would in turn limit damage to platform substructures.

Mr. Chittams suggested that he could communicate to the Ward 7/8 listserv, because those people actually use the Minnesota Avenue and Deanwood Stations. Mr. Jaffe asked about the timetable for the decision-making process. Mr. Patel responded that this information will be provided to the Board of Directors at its February meeting. Mr. Jaffe then said that he thinks it would be possible for the RAC to vote on this at its February monthly meeting, which would allow for additional outreach.
Ms. Iacomini said that, while additional outreach to specific communities around Deanwood and Minnesota Avenue, she said that these tiles will become the “new standard” for replacements and new construction. She asked Mr. Riley where these new tiles would be used. He replied that the underground stations would remain largely unchanged, except for “safety areas” such as at the bottom of escalators. Ms. Iacomini said that this means that the questions before the RAC are: 1) porcelain or quarry tile; 2) this would largely be used for outdoor stations, both new and existing (replacements).

Dr. Conn asked if there were other options besides those presented. Mr. Riley answered that there was one other porcelain tile option from another manufacturer. He said that Metro has relied largely on New York City MTA’s experience, which has had this tile in its system for approximately 4-5 years.

Mr. Jaffe asked Ms. Iacomini and and Mr. Cerny for input on what direction the RAC should take. Ms. Iacomini suggested taking vote on porcelain-vs.-quarry tile. She said that staff and other groups would frame additional discussions such as tile shape, locations for replacement and other issues.

Dr. Conn asked for a listing of stations where porcelain tile had been installed.

Mr. Cerny suggested having an advisory vote to get a sense of the RAC on this issue.

Ms. Chang left the meeting at 8:39 p.m.

Mr. Cerny moved that the RAC advise Metro staff to use porcelain tile for replacement at outdoor stations; this was seconded by Nancy Iacomini. Mr. Maxit asked to clarify that the recommendation was made to staff, rather than the Board of Directors. Mr. Cerny and Mr. Jaffe responded that yes, this was just a recommendation to staff, as the RAC is not ready to make an endorsement to the Board of Directors.

Mr. Cerny then restated his motion, but changed “outdoor stations” to “Minnesota Avenue and Deanwood Stations.” Mr. Jaffe then asked for consistency in language between the two motions. Ms. Iacomini said that it would be more appropriate for the RAC to vote on tile replacement at Minnesota Avenue and Deanwood, rather than system-wide, as Metro staff will be using these locations as a test, and this would allow staff to make changes in the future after getting results from these two locations. Mr. Patel said that the presentation to the Board of Directors put forward using porcelain tile as the new standard. Ms. Iacomini said that she believes that Mr. Cerny wanted to allow Metro to conduct a test and get results, rather than putting forward a suggestion for a whole new standard.
Mr. Cerny restated the motion, moving that Metro use porcelain tile to rehabilitate the platforms at Minnesota Avenue and Deanwood Stations. Ms. Iacomini seconded the motion.

Mr. Moore then amended the motion to add “in the most economical configuration.” Mr. Erviti seconded this motion. Mr. Jaffe said that this mixed two different issues, shape cost being two different things. Mr. Moore replied that it was his understanding that shape was related to cost. He then said that, this would likely mean square tile, and restated the motion, changing it to “using 12-inch square tiles.” Ms. Iacomini said that she could support the initial wording of the motion (“most economical configuration”), but not the change to square tiles, as square tiles may not necessarily be the most economical. Mr. Moore then changed his motion back to “in the most economical configuration.”

The RAC voted 13-3-1 to approve the motion, with Dr. Conn, Ms. Johnson, and Ms. White voting against the motion and Ms. Brown abstaining.

Mr. Jaffe thanked staff for their presentation and said that there should be continued discussion, as appropriate, on this issue, with the Rail Subcommittee and other channels. Ms. Iacomini stated that she thought it would be interesting to see how the installation of the new tiles goes, whether it disrupts ridership, and the quality of the finished product once installation is completed.

VII. FY2008 Budget

Mr. Jaffe said that he wanted to give a quick outline of issues related to Metro’s FY2008 Budget and would allow the new chair to possibly create a committee which would channel RAC and public input on the budget. He said that the budget begins July 1, 2007. Mr. Jaffe said that he believes that the goal is to have a thoughtful and meaningful process that will have influence on the adoption of the budget, making it more rider-friendly than it is at present. Mr. Jaffe suggested holding workshops similar to the 7000-series railcar workshops in which RAC members participated. Mr. Jaffe said that he wanted to avoid a “rant session,” but rather to focus on constructive dialogue which would result in positive recommendations that are friendlier to riders.

Mr. Jaffe added that, historically, the public has had extremely limited input on the budget and noted that determinative decisions on the budget often take place at committee meetings, where public comments are not permitted. Mr. Jaffe noted that a public forum was held last July on the budget and that Board of Directors has indicated informally that it is open to having more open, interactive sessions on the FY2008 budget which would allow additional input. Mr. Jaffe also noted that Board Members have reacted very negatively to increases in fares and decreases in service in the budget as proposed. Mr. Jaffe suggested that the goal of the committee would be to develop forums to allow for public input and to include staff in these budget sessions. He again stated that his suggestion is for
the new chair to create an “ad hoc” committee to create sessions that would allow for constructive public input.

Dr. Conn noted that she is bothered by the discussions of fare increases, and wanted to know if this had been discussed in meetings last year. Mr. Jaffe responded that Dan Tangherlini had mentioned in approximately April 2006 that a fare increase would need to be seriously considered by the agency as part of the FY08 budget. Mr. Jaffe added that Mr. Tangherlini also mentioned possible changes to Metro’s fare policy with respect to discounts for either off-peak or reverse-commuter riders. Mr. Jaffe noted that this was not mentioned by any Metro Board members at Town Hall meetings held in late 2006.

VIII. Comments from Chair

Mr. Jaffe then moved on to provide brief comments for his last meeting as chair and said he would then move on to the nomination and election process for the new chair. He said that there have been improvements to MetroAccess by Metro but that there’s a long way to go. Mr. Jaffe said that he wanted to emphasize that major improvements were made to MetroAccess, because the RAC channeled the energy of the stories in the Washington Post into positive action. He said that this increased pressure on the Board of Directors. Mr. Jaffe added that the RAC also had success in preventing bus routes from being eliminated, and has had some success opening up budget process to the public. Mr. Jaffe also stated that members of the RAC were appointed to a task force on joint development. He added that Metro co-hosted Town Hall Meetings with the RAC during 2006 as well.

Mr. Jaffe said that while these are “steps forward,” WMATA is not moving forward far enough in meaningful ways. He stated that there are too many times where the RAC isn’t being listened to. Mr. Jaffe suggested that RAC members should focus next year on how to better navigate the agency to get information and develop issues. He said that RAC members should be aware of the “natural tension” of the RAC, in that members are appointed by the agency that they are charged with holding accountable. Mr. Jaffe said that there is an opportunity for the RAC to increase its visibility in the coming year and also apologized to members for not providing them with documents in a timely fashion over the last year.

Mr. Jaffe then offered suggestions on issues which the RAC may want to focus on over the next year:

- Improving the audibility of train operators;
- Advocating for electronic sign-up for meeting notices, etc.;
- Improving pedestrian access to transit;
- Improving the quality of marketing materials put out by Metro;
- announcement of bus stops by bus drivers;
• Providing more neighborhood maps, bus system maps and bus schedules on Metrobuses and in Metrorail stations;
• Increasing advertisement within the system, which Mr. Jaffe noted may be best developed as RAC members discuss the FY2008 budget in light of the budget issues.

Mr. Jaffe thanked the Council for the privilege of serving as chair.

IX. Election of 2007 RAC Officers.

Mr. Jaffe opened the floor for nominations for RAC chair for 2007. Mr. Cerny nominated Michael Snyder, and was seconded by Mr. Moore. Mr. Snyder accepted Mr. Cerny’s nomination. No other members were nominated for the position.

Mr. Snyder then gave a brief statement which outlined his goals for the coming year: to try to find a way to prevent Metro from having a fare increase – he said that he thinks that there are other, more creative ways to come up with ways to cover budget shortfall; to avoid cuts in service; to make safety and security a priority at Metro and noted the recent fatalities at Metro. Mr. Snyder also stated that he wants the RAC to be recognized and respected by Metro as representative of riders. He said that he wants everyone at Metro when planning a project or initiative to ask “what would customers on RAC think of this idea?”

Mr. Jaffe then said that it may be possible to entertain a motion for secret ballot for the election of the 1st Vice Chair position, but since there is only one candidate for Chair, it’s not necessary to vote by secret ballot. Mr. Jaffe then called for a vote.

All members present voted in the affirmative to appoint Mr. Snyder chair, with the exception of Mr. Snyder, who abstained. (18-0-1)

Mr. Snyder then chaired the meeting from this point forward.

Mr. Snyder opened nominations for 1st Vice Chair and noted that, because he is from the State of Maryland, neither the 1st or 2nd Vice Chair can be from Maryland.

Dr. Conn nominated Mr. Jaffe for the position of 1st Vice Chair and was seconded by Ms. Daniels. Mr. Jaffe declined the nomination.

Mr. Chittams then nominated Mr. Maxit for the position of 1st Vice Chair and was seconded by Mr. Erviti. Mr. Maxit accepted the nomination. Dr. Conn nominated Mr. Erviti. Mr. Erviti declined the nomination because he said he would not be
able to complete the one-year term. Dr. Conn then nominated Mr. Cerny for the position of 1st Vice Chair and was seconded by Mr. Erviti. Mr. Cerny accepted the nomination.

Mr. Snyder called for both candidates for the 1st Vice Chair give brief remarks.

Mr. Maxit said that he felt that it was an exciting time to be on the RAC and that he saw a great deal of energy from RAC members. He also mentioned that he had experience serving on a neighborhood council in Dallas and has training in conflict resolution. Mr. Maxit also pointed out he felt that Mr. Cerny would also make an excellent candidate. Mr. Cerny then gave brief remarks, and noted his experience serving on citizens advisory committees in Reston and in Fairfax County and with the regional Transportation Planning Board. He said that he agreed with Mr. Snyder’s platform and that his biggest issue would be to get respect from the Metro Board to have it take the RAC’s recommendations seriously.

Mr. Jaffe moved to conduct the election via secret ballot and was seconded by Ms. Stone.

Ms. Iacomini then suggested that, since Mr. Cerny is from Virginia and Mr. Maxit is from the District of Columbia, that the top vote-getter become 1st Vice Chair and the other individual be 2nd Vice Chair. Dr. Conn said that she was opposed to this proposal.

The RAC then voted, by a margin of 9-7-2, with two abstentions, to conduct the election by secret ballot.

While votes were being collected, Mr. Snyder noted that Subcommittees will begin meeting next Wednesday and that all are invited to participate in meetings, though only those appointed to the Committees could vote. He asked Dr. Conn to stay on as chair of the Metrobus Subcommittee and Mr. Cerny to continue to chair the Metrorail Subcommittee. He also asked Ms. Iacomini to chair the Rules and Administrative Subcommittee, which she declined to do. Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Moore to continue to chair the Budget Committee, which he agreed to do. He said that he had begun working on workshops on Metro’s upcoming budget and asked for Mr. Moore’s help in setting these up.

Mr. Pasek tallied the votes and said that Mr. Cerny had won the position as 1st Vice Chair.

Mr. Moore left the meeting at 9:16pm

Mr. Snyder then opened the floor for nominations for 2nd Vice Chair. Mr. Erviti nominated Mr. Maxit and was seconded by Mr. Cerny. Mr. Maxit accepted the nomination. Mr. Snyder clarified that anyone nominated for this post must be
from the District of Columbia. Dr. Conn nominated Ms. Chang, who was not present at the meeting.

Mr. Jaffe stated that when he talked with Ms. Chang about this issue earlier she said that she wasn’t interested in any chair positions on the RAC. Mr. Snyder then asked for the RAC’s concurrence to postpone the election of 2nd Vice Chair until the February meeting. Dr. Conn then proposed to withdraw her nomination, and Mr. Jaffe said that it may be helpful to discuss the matter with Ms. Chang personally.

Dr. Conn moved postponement of the election of the 2nd Vice Chair and was seconded by Mr. Chittams.

All members present voted in favor of postponing the election, with Mr. Jaffe voting in the opposition and Mr. Maxit abstaining. (13-1-1)

Ms. Bracmort left the meeting at 9:18 p.m.

Mr. Pasek said that he had sheets for RAC members to fill out to get their contractor ID cards and that he would provide them additional information soon.

Mr. Jaffe moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Mr. Snyder. All RAC members voted in favor of adjournment and the meeting was adjourned by Mr. Snyder at 9:19 p.m.