

Riders' Advisory Council

December 6, 2006

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Jaffe called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and took roll. The following RAC members were present:

Members Present:

Dennis Jaffe (Chair)  
Mary Blyther  
Denise Brown  
Steve Cerny  
Katy Chang  
Dr. Sharon Conn  
Pat Daniels  
Rodney Elin  
Pedro Erviti  
Susan Holland  
Nancy Iacomini  
Charles Metcalf  
Kevin Moore  
Michael Snyder

Members Not Present:

Justin Chittams  
Don Padou  
Patrick Sheehan  
Lillian White

**II. Public Comment Period**

Sanford Holmes, who described himself as an infrequent Metrorail and bus rider expressed his concern about the closure of the west entrance of the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro station and the late notice given to riders about the closure. The west side of the entrance would be closed "temporarily." Mr. Jaffe noted that he had also received a complaint about the entrance closure and noted that this would be closed for two years; he has asked staff for more details and is awaiting a response. Mr. Moore clarified that the entrance closed was on the southbound side of Georgia Avenue. Mr. Holmes responded that the bus bays on this side of the station have been redistributed to other locations nearby. Mr. Moore then asked whether the new development being built at this location was the cause for the entrance closure. In

response, Mr. Holmes stated that the development is the cause for the closure, but other similar developments at other locations, such as at Columbia Heights, have not required such long-term entrance closures. Mr. Jaffe noted that his communication to staff he suggested that Metro engage in more interactive dialogue with the community before undertaking these kind of actions.

Mr. Elin asked whether or not the elevator will also be out of commission for two years; Mr. Holmes replied that he was unsure whether or not the elevator would also be closed for a similar duration. Mr. Elin stated that it would be “unacceptable” for the elevator to be closed for two years. In response to Mr. Moore’s question, Mr. Holmes responded that the entrance would reopen after two years – it would not be closed permanently.

Dr. Conn asked for clarification as to when Mr. Holmes first saw notice of the entrance closure. He responded that notice was put up within the past week, approximately two weeks before the entrance closure. Mr. Jaffe thanked him for coming to make his comments to the RAC.

Mr. Jaffe then asked again if any members of the public wished to make comments.

John Pincus, from Adams-Morgan has noted that he has stopped riding Metrobus’ 16<sup>th</sup> Street line (S2/S4) because buses are unreliable and come in “convoys.” This is due to the fact that buses are also forced to contend with automobile traffic. Mr. Pincus had questions as to why more “stretch” buses aren’t used on the 16<sup>th</sup> Street line – he has heard that these buses don’t fit in the 14<sup>th</sup> Street bus garage. He noted that there have been improvements in the late evenings (around 10 p.m.) to deal with crowding.

Mr. Jaffe asked for Mr. Pincus’ suggestions for improvements to make the line function better – he suggested turning buses around that are heading northbound closer in to the city center – further south of Colorado Avenue. He also suggested that more buses be assigned south of Columbia Road to ensure that riders are not passed by because buses are overcrowded.

Dr. Conn asked a question of clarification as to whether or not this was the S2/S4 route with buses operating to Silver Spring. In response, Mr. Pincus stated that some buses either begin or end at 16<sup>th</sup> St. and Colorado Avenue.

Mr. Pincus also noted that small buses (such as those that run on the 98 line) have some kind of leak and the interior of the buses have an unpleasant odor.

Mr. Snyder noted that a similar bus service complaint about the Z-line buses was lodged at yesterday’s Town Hall Meeting – that buses were full before reaching the end of their route and had to pass up riders. He suggested “short turn” buses that would have space for riders closer to the end of the routes.

### **III. Review of November 1, 2006 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Elin moved approval of the minutes, seconded by Dr. Conn.

Members then made corrections and clarifications to the November 1, 2006 minutes.

After corrections and clarifications to the minutes were made, Mr. Jaffe took a vote on the minutes, as amended.

The following members voted to approve the minutes as amended (12-0-2):

Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Blyther, Ms. Brown, Mr. Cerny, Ms. Chang, Dr. Conn , Ms. Daniels, Mr. Elin, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Mr. Moore, Mr. Snyder;

Mr. Iacomini and Mr. Metcalf abstained from voting.

Mr. Jaffe noted that the current RAC membership numbers 19, so for motions to pass, they would need a majority of RAC members, or 10 votes in the affirmative.

### **IV. Bus Service Change Brochures**

Murray Bond, from Metro's Office of Marketing, noted that Metro would be making some service changes this winter. Mr. Bond noted that Metro makes periodic changes to its bus service and when Metro makes these changes, it puts out information on the changes to ensure that the public is aware of adjustments in their bus routes. Mr. Bond introduced Carmen Mack, who describe some of the changes made to the brochures in response to feedback received from the RAC's Bus Subcommittee earlier in the year.

In response to a question from Ms. Holland, Mr. Bond responded that Metro staff were the only people who have seen this brochure so far. Ms. Holland then raised a concern as to whether this would go out in all formats to ensure that it was accessible to individuals with disabilities. Mr. Bond responded that the printed brochure meets all Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Ms. Mack added that this information was also made available on buses. There was discussion among members of the RAC, including Mr. Jaffe and Ms. Iacomini, as to how riders with visual impairments would be made aware of the notices and know that schedules would be changed.

Ms. Mack also stated that bus drivers often announce route changes to their customers though she could not ensure that this was something all operators do. She said that she would make Metro's Bus Services Division aware of the concerns Ms. Holland had raised.

Dr. Conn asked whether or not there was some kind of email list that individuals with disabilities could subscribe to in order to get information on service changes sent to them. Mr. Bond responded that, yes, there was an email service that individuals could sign up for, but this information may not be in the correct formats for accessibility.

Dr. Conn also noted her concern that these changes will be implemented December 31<sup>st</sup>; when many of the regular drivers will be on vacation, and unable to give this information to riders. She noted that, if there were some kind of email list or website these riders could go to, that would be helpful.

Mr. Jaffe asked when these brochures would be available on buses – Mr. Bond responded next Friday, December 15<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Mack then went over the listing of routes being changed that would appear on the first page of the brochure, per the RAC's earlier suggestion. She then moved on to the second page and explained the differences between the two versions provided to riders. Version 1 organized service changes by jurisdiction, while Version 2 organized service changes by type of service change.

Mr. Jaffe asked for riders' preferences. Before taking a vote, members asked for additional information.

Mr. Moore asked whether the information presented on the first page would be the same for both brochures. Ms. Mack responded that yes, the first page provided would be the same on both brochures.

Mr. Elin stated that he thought that it was great that staff was able to incorporate the changes suggested by the RAC. He stated that he thought that the jurisdictional listing would make more sense to riders. He also noted that he subscribes to Metro's E-Alerts which sends out press releases; he wanted to make sure that these service changes were included in Metro's E-Alerts. Ms. Mack responded that these changes are announced in a press release and so should be part of the E-Alerts system, but that she would bring this issue to staff's attention.

Mr. Metcalf noted that he had concerns for Mr. Bond on the timing of the announcement – specifically that brochures would go to the printer immediately following the RAC meeting and then be distributed on or around December 15<sup>th</sup>. He stated that giving the public two weeks' notice is "unacceptable." Mr. Jaffe then asked for other questions or comments from members of the RAC.

Ms. Brown had a question about the listing of the changes for the R12 – the information provided is not very specific. Ms. Mack responded that because the changes were minor, around 3 minutes or so, and the changes would affect many trips, it would be hard to incorporate that information into the brochure – instead, the public is asked to pick up a new timetable. In response to Ms. Brown's question, Ms.

Mack said that new timetables are generally made available at the same time as the service change brochures are distributed. Mr. Bond also noted that Metro is currently testing the NextBus system, which would allow riders to get real-time information on their buses and not need to rely on a printed timetable.

Ms. Brown also raised a question about why certain changes were made to the Z13 line. In response, Ms. Mack noted that she only puts the information out to the public and does not participate in developing the new schedules. She also noted that, in past experience, if that information is put out prior to 10-15 days before the actual service changes, riders forget that changes are coming. Ms. Mack also noted that Metro puts out schedule change information in bus “Take One” racks in both English and Spanish and through the local media outlets.

Mr. Jaffe asked for a show of hands from RAC members as to whether or not members feel that two weeks is sufficient notice to give riders of service changes – the RAC was divided on this issue.

Ms. Brown noted that, while she would normally think that two weeks is necessary, greater advance notice would be necessary due to the holidays.

Mr. Jaffe then asked for a sense of the RAC as to whether members preferred service changes displayed geographically (Version 1) or by type of service change (Version 2). RAC members largely supported displaying changes geographically (Version 1).

Mr. Moore noted that he is an everyday bus rider and native Washingtonian and has never had experience with bus drivers noting that service will be changing. Ms. Mack asked whether or not he had seen brochures such as the one provided in “Take One” racks on the buses or signs alerting riders to service changes. Mr. Moore responded that he had seen these on buses. He wanted to know whether or not the new timetables would be made available at the same time; Ms. Mack responded that yes, timetables would be made available, and around the same time that service change brochures would be distributed. Mr. Jaffe stated that, if RAC members find that these timetables are not available aboard buses, to make that known as well. Mr. Moore also asked whether timetables at bus stops would be changed as well. Ms. Mack stated that these schedules at bus stops are supposed to be changed concurrent with the schedule changes.

Dr. Conn noted that it would be helpful to suggest to riders to pick up a new timetable or use Metro’s “Trip Planner” in instances such as the R12 which do not provide specific trip change information. Ms. Mack said that she would add that information to the brochure. Ms. Brown asked that this be done also for the listing of the U8 changes. Ms. Chang added that a similar change needs to be noted on the 66 and 68 lines.

Ms. Holland had concerns about reliance on email communications; not everyone has access to email. She also noted concerns that individuals with disabilities may not

know to take brochures. Ms. Holland suggested coordinating with the “Metro is Accessible” committee and other agencies working to help individuals with developmental disabilities to ride fixed-route transit to get this information out to those individuals. Ms. Mack stated that the information was made available on throughout the bus and rail system. Ms. Holland asked again that this information be sent to the Metro is Accessible Committee; Ms. Mack responded that she would forward this to the Committee staff contact.

Ms. Iacomini also noted that there will be two changes made to the 24T route, and suggested listing both of these changes at the same place in the brochure so readers don’t look for only one change and thereby miss the second change listed. Ms. Mack said that she could add a note in each listing that there are additional changes and that readers should refer to another location in the brochure.

Ms. Blyther wanted to know whether or not automated announcements on buses could be made around the same time the service changes take effect. Ms. Mack said that she would look into this. There was also discussion between Ms. Blyther, Dr. Conn, Mr. Erviti and Ms. Mack about the S91 “Springfield Circulator” route and whether it is a Metro-operated service. Ms. Mack stated that this was, in fact, a Metrobus route.

Mr. Moore suggested that there be regular contact between the Marketing Department and the “Metro is Accessible” as part of the Marketing Department’s outreach for service and schedule changes. Ms. Mack stated that this is something that she can do.

Dr. Conn had questions as to whether or not information concerning service changes could be added to the automated announcements provided on buses. Mr. Bond replied that because the announcements on buses are required under the ADA, this limits the changes that can be made to these announcements. He noted that he has looked into this issue in the past but would follow-up to see what kind if limitations are placed on these announcements. Mr. Bond added that it may be helpful for the RAC to weigh-in on this issue.

Mr. Jaffe thanked Mr. Bond and Ms. Mack for coming to the RAC and asked that they continue to work with the RAC in communications. He also asked that they continue to work with the RAC and its Bus Subcommittee in the future. He also noted his concerns about the amount of text in the document and suggested eliminating duplicate words or phrases and arranging information in charts and asked that this be explored with future service changes.

Mr. Metcalf noted that he had concerns with the timing of the service changes – they will occur on December 31<sup>st</sup>, when people are not paying attention and will not get this information. He asked that the RAC go on record as recommending a different time for the service changes, such as after the holidays. Mr. Moore stated that Metro conducts service changes regularly and on a routine basis and that it is very likely that

Metro has enacted service changes around the holidays in years past. He said that he doesn't feel that the timing of this round of service changes presents a problem.

Dr. Conn noted that since Metro's changes occur fairly frequently, Metro should consider enacting its service changes at regularly scheduled intervals.

Mr. Jaffe asked if any members of the RAC would be willing to put forward a motion to this effect.

Mr. Moore stated that there may be situations such as the construction at the Georgia Avenue – Petworth station which require changes to be made at specific times that may not coincide with these preplanned schedule change dates.

Mr. Jaffe asked again whether any members of the RAC wanted to make a motion concerning the timing of the service changes. No RAC members made a motion to do so.

Mr. Cerny suggested that Metro work to get information out onto buses prior to December 15<sup>th</sup>, but other RAC members stated that they didn't think that, given the requirements for printing and distribution, Metro could distribute these brochures any sooner than currently planned.

## **V. Rail Subcommittee Items**

Mr. Cerny noted that a presentation was given to the Rail Subcommittee at its November meeting on the "Metro Performs" program. He noted that some changes have been made to the program since it was presented to the full RAC earlier in the year. Mr. Cerny then asked John Pasek, the RAC Staff Coordinator, whether this program has been by the Board of Directors. In response, Mr. Pasek and Mr. Jaffe stated that this was supposed to be discussed at the December 7<sup>th</sup> Operations Committee meeting, but that this was delayed to allow Board Members to attend the funeral of the Metro worker who recently lost his life while on duty.

Mr. Cerny then noted some changes to the program since it was previously presented to the RAC:

- Musicians/performers will not be required to pay a fee to participate in the program;
- Performers will not be allowed to solicit donations during their performances;

Mr. Cerny noted the Post's article on the "Metro Performs" program that appeared recently. He stated that performers will only be at specific, high-volume stations and only during midday and evening periods.

Mr. Cerny noted that the RAC Rail Subcommittee, at its last meeting, recommended that the RAC endorse the "Metro Performs" program, as modified.

Mr. Cerny then moved that the RAC support Board approval of the Metro Performs program and was seconded by Mr. Erviti.

Mr. Moore raised a question about whether or not there would be “stepped-up” enforcement of non-sanctioned entertainers as part of the revised “Metro Performs” program. In response, Mr. Snyder, stated that there would need to be outreach to let these performers know about the requirements to take part the “Metro Performs” program.

Dr. Conn asked whether or not performers would be required to belong to a musicians’ union. In response, Ms. Brown stated that she was not aware of any union requirement, but that musicians would have to be certified by jurisdictional arts councils. There was further discussion among RAC members about requirements for union membership; Ms. Iacomini then read from a recent Washington Post article concerning the Metro Performs program and noted that union membership for musicians was not mentioned in the article.

Mr. Jaffe then asked whether or not any members have questions or wanted to make changes or additions to the motion on the floor.

Mr. Cerny asked to restate his motion to include that the Metro Board consider allowing performers during the morning rush period as well. Mr. Elin seconded the new motion as made by Mr. Cerny.

Mr. Erviti and Ms. Chang noted their support for the amendment to allow performances during the morning rush hour. Ms. Chang also noted that she had concerns about station access as part of the “Metro Performs” program.

Ms. Holland stated that she wanted to ensure that musicians would not impede station access for individuals with disabilities, especially visual impairments. She also asked that law enforcement officers be made aware of the program.

Ms. Holland then moved, in collaboration with Mr. Jaffe, to amend the motion to include that performers do not impede station access for individuals with disabilities. Ms. Conn noted difficulties in controlling crowds to ensure that access would not be impeded – if a sufficiently large crowd gathered to watch a performer, it would be very difficult to ensure that access is not, in some way, impeded.

Mr. Jaffe took a vote on Ms. Holland’s amendment concerning station access. All RAC members present voted in the affirmative, with the exception of Dr. Conn, who voted against the amendment. This motion passed (13-1-0).

Mr. Snyder asked that the motion be amended to ensure that Metro establish clear policy for outreach to existing performers around Metro stations to let them know about the “Metro Performs” program. The motion was seconded.

The RAC then voted to approve Mr. Snyder's amendment on outreach to performers, with 13 in favor, and Dr. Conn abstaining. (13-0-1).

The RAC then took a vote on the motion, as amended. The motion passed, with all RAC members present voting in the affirmative, with the exception of Dr. Conn, who voted against the motion (13-1-0).

## **V. Resolution on Metro Policies and Practices**

Mr. Jaffe noted that he had distributed possible motions on several topics to RAC members. He asked that members review these motions and, should they wish, consider putting forward motions for the RAC to endorse or revise any or all of the listed positions, put forth alternatives, or take no action.

Mr. Elin then moved Recommendation 4, concerning the painting of the International Symbol for Accessibility at bus stops. The recommendation was as follows:

"The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that to make bus riders who use wheelchairs more visible to bus drivers:

- a) Metro expeditiously and deliberatively examine the idea by painting a three foot square International Symbol for Access approximately 20" from the curb at all bus stops where feasible;
- b) Metro seek feedback to this idea by disability advocates and bus riders who use wheelchairs;
- c) Metro present to the Riders' Advisory Council the results of the agency's consideration of this idea;
- d) If evaluation of this idea is feasible, Metro begin implementing the idea at bus stations located at Metrorail stations, followed by implementation at bus shelter owned by Metro where feasible and seeking cooperation of WMATA jurisdictional partners to implement this idea.

This motion was seconded by Dr. Conn.

Ms. Holland raised a question as to what, specifically, this resolution would mean. She also suggested incorporating this suggestion in with any changes being made as part of coordination with the ongoing regional bus stop survey.

Ms. Iacomini left the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

In response to a question from Ms. Blyther, Ms. Holland gave details on the Bus Stop Study and its work identifying the accessibility of and amenities at public transit stops throughout the Washington area.

Dr. Conn noted that she would prefer that the boarding area identified by the ISA be used by all riders with disabilities, not just those in wheelchairs. She asked that the

initial sentence of the motion be modified to reflect that change. She noted that this would help bus drivers to know that they need to pull their bus fully to the curb to assist elderly or disabled passengers in boarding. She also expressed concern about tying the implementation of painting the ISA at bus stops to any kind of survey or study that might cause delay.

Mr. Metcalf left the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

Mr. Jaffe then offered suggested language for the two amendments. The RAC first voted to amend the initial sentence to read: “The Riders’ Advisory Council recommends that to make all bus riders with disabilities more visible to bus drivers.”

The remaining RAC members in attendance (Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Blyther, Ms. Brown, Mr. Cerny, Ms. Chang, Dr. Conn, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Elin, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland and Mr. Snyder) voted in favor of this amendment, with Mr. Moore abstaining (11-0-1).

Mr. Jaffe then suggested language for the amendment put forward by Ms. Holland, which would be added on to the end of Item a) of the motion, reading, “in addition, coordinate this effort with the bus stop survey.” The remaining RAC members in attendance (Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Blyther, Ms. Brown, Mr. Cerny, Ms. Chang, Dr. Conn, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Elin, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland and Mr. Snyder) voted in favor of this amendment, with Mr. Moore abstaining (11-0-1).

Following the vote, Mr. Jaffe asked if there was additional discussion on the main motion.

Mr. Moore noted that he had concerns as to whether or not painting the ISA at bus stops would be helpful; he stated that he had concerns about the placement of this symbol where riders with disabilities would be visible to bus drivers, he also noted his concerns as to creating separate waiting queues for individuals with disabilities and with the disabilities. He also stated his concern with visibility of riders with disabilities waiting at this location, especially if this location was located on the opposite side of a bus shelter from the approaching bus. Mr. Moore also noted that there may be other effective ways to alert drivers to the presence of individuals with disabilities at bus stops, such as a passenger activated flashing light or flag that would get drivers’ attention. Dr. Conn noted that individuals with wheelchairs would need to be in a location where the wheelchair ramp would deploy. Mr. Moore said that he wondered if there were another way to achieve visibility that doesn’t require riders to be in a specific spot that may not be a convenient place for them to wait – as an example, if the location of the painted ISA is outside of a bus shelter, passengers with disabilities waiting there would be exposed to inclement weather.

Ms. Daniels noted that there should be some way for individuals with disabilities to get on the bus first in order to get priority seating.

Mr. Moore noted that he agreed with Ms. Daniels' concerns, and that his concern was with making drivers aware of waiting riders with disabilities. In discussion with Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Moore moved to amend the Item a) to read: "Metro expeditiously and deliberatively examine the *ideas to achieve this, such as* by either painting a three foot square International Symbol for Access approximately 20" from the curb at all bus stops, where feasible *and/or some other kind of device which that visually alerts the driver to the presence of bus riders with disabilities.*" This motion was seconded by Ms. Daniels.

Ms. Daniels noted her experience with bus drivers not stopping exactly at the bus stop, which presents difficulties for riders, especially those with disabilities.

Mr. Jaffe then clarified the language on this amendment and called for a vote.

All remaining RAC members voted in favor of this amendment (Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Blyther, Ms. Brown, Mr. Cerny, Ms. Chang, Dr. Conn, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Elin, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Mr. Moore and Mr. Snyder). (12-0-0)

Mr. Snyder then asked for clarification as to whether or not there were additional items to vote on, specifically calling for bus drivers to be required to stop their buses at this designated location and to ensure that the ISA was not painted on the street. There was discussion from RAC members concerning the ability of bus drivers to stop at designated places every time – Mr. Moore noted that sometimes they are prevented from doing this due to parked cars or other obstructions. Mr. Jaffe asked to separate the two issues and have the RAC first address the issue of where the ISA should be painted.

Mr. Jaffe then took a vote to amend the motion to change the language of Item a) in the motion to read, "approximately 20" from the curb, *away from the street*, at all bus stops, where feasible."

Mr. Cerny asked whether or not this has been done elsewhere. Mr. Elin replied that he had seen this in place in San Diego this summer. Mr. Cerny then asked why it was necessary to have such an extensive feedback process if this has been successfully employed at another agency. Mr. Jaffe stated that there have been some concerns raised during the RAC's discussion that need to be looked at. He also stated that one of the concerns the RAC has raised with Metro is in its implementation of certain ideas without sufficient testing and feedback, and that this would also provide guidelines for Metro to get feedback and to look for possible improvements.

There was further discussion by RAC members of the wording of the amendment.

The wording of the full motion is as follows:

"The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that to make bus riders with disabilities more visible to bus drivers:

- a) Metro expeditiously and deliberatively examine the idea of painting a three foot square International Symbol for Access approximately 20" from the curb, away from the street at all bus stops and/or providing some other kind of device that visually alerts the driver to the presence of bus riders with disabilities, where feasible and in coordination with the regional bus stop survey;
- b) Metro seek feedback to this idea by disability advocates and bus riders who use wheelchairs;
- c) Metro present to the Riders' Advisory Council the results of the agency's consideration of this idea;
- d) If evaluation of this idea is feasible, Metro begin implementing the idea at bus stations located at Metrorail stations, followed by implementation at bus shelter owned by Metro where feasible and seeking cooperation of WMATA jurisdictional partners to implement this idea.

The RAC then voted on this motion, as amended. All RAC members remaining at the meeting (Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Blyther, Ms. Brown, Mr. Cerny, Ms. Chang, Dr. Conn, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Elin, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Mr. Moore and Mr. Snyder) voted in favor of the amendment (12-0-0).

Mr. Snyder then moved Items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 as put forward on the handout provided by Mr. Jaffe. The text of the items is as follows:

1. The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that Metro consciously institutionalize seeking and seriously considering input by the RAC, the Elderly and Disabled Committee and other rider advocates and riders as changes are considered in operational, policy and budget issues.
2. The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that Metro provide options for members of the public to sign up for electronic notification of Metro meetings and events of special interest to them.
5. The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that Metro initiate the widely-adopted practice of following up with customers to ask them how satisfied they were with the staff reply to complaints they submitted to the agency and with the subsequent results.
6. The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that Metro proceed with adding the "bumpy domes" to platforms at all train stations at which they are not in place.
7. The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that Metro aggressively seek evaluation by the riding public of the audibility of train operators.
8. The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that the Metro Board of Directors make it a priority to recruit and appoint an independent Inspector General to increase

accountability at the agency.

This motion was seconded by Dr. Conn.

In reference to Item 7, Mr. Cerny noted that Metro is implementing several audibility improvements and the RAC should give Metro some time to implement these changes. In response to a question from Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Cerny stated that there are some technological issues that Metro is currently working on to improve audibility of announcements. Mr. Jaffe responded that this motion, as proposed, focuses on the diction of those making the announcements.

In reference to Item 8, Dr. Conn raised question about who recruits the Inspector General (IG) and to whom the IG would report. Mr. Jaffe responded that the IG would report to the Metro Board. There was discussion among RAC members, including Dr. Conn, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Moore and Mr. Snyder, as to whom the Inspector General would report. It was agreed that the Metro IG position would report to whichever authority is outlined in the federal legislation concerning dedicated funding for Metro.

Mr. Moore stated that he would like to see the amendment be made stronger; working with Mr. Jaffe, the following language was put forward: “RAC recommends that the Metro Board of Directors recruit and appoint an independent IG to increase accountability at the agency within the current fiscal year.”

Ms. Holland seconded the amended motion as read.

Ms. Chang left the meeting at 8:36pm.

All RAC members present (Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Blyther, Ms. Brown, Mr. Cerny, Dr. Conn, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Elin, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Mr. Moore and Mr. Snyder) voted in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Elin then moved to change the terminology in Item 6, referring to tactile platform edge material from “bumpy domes” to “truncated domes,” as this is the terminology employed by Metro. Mr. Moore added that he felt that this language should also be made stronger, in terms of requiring Metro to take action by a specified date. He stated that he was unaware that all Metro stations do not currently have truncated domes on their platforms. Mr. Elin responded that he believed that the lack of truncated domes at rail stations was a budget issue more than anything else. Mr. Moore replied that Metro should then make this a priority in terms of their upcoming budget.

Ms. Holland then asked that language be added to reflect that the Elderly and Disabled (E&D) Committee has also been working on this issue. Mr. Jaffe noted his reluctance to add any language that would imply that the RAC was speaking for the E&D Committee in this instance. Mr. Jaffe suggested the following language: “The

RAC recommends that Metro proceed, in concurrence with the Elderly and Disabled Committee..."

Mr. Moore then asked for language which would reflect some kind of timetable for Metro to take action on this issue, with Mr. Jaffe suggesting adding the word "expeditiously" to the motion. Mr. Elin responded that the Metro Board has made a policy decision on this already and the hold-up in not completing truncated dome installation is a budgetary one.

Mr. Moore stated that he feels that the RAC needs to express to Metro that completing installation of truncated domes be made a priority by the agency. Mr. Moore noted that he recently read of the increase in administrative positions at Metro and that those should be cut rather than Metro not moving forward with installing truncated domes.

Mr. Moore then suggested adding the language "within the fiscal year" to the motion on truncated domes. With further discussion, this was amended to read, "...no later than June 30, 2008." Mr. Snyder accepted this as a friendly amendment to the motion he put forward.

All remaining RAC members voted in favor of the motion (Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Blyther, Ms. Brown, Mr. Cerny, Dr. Conn, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Elin, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Mr. Moore and Mr. Snyder). (11-0-0)

Mr. Jaffe then gave some background on Item 3 – specifically that Metro offered parking validation to attendees at the recent Regional Bus Conference and did not offer similar reimbursements to those using transit. There was discussion as to why Metro, as a transit agency, undertook an action that did not encourage transit usage.

Dr. Conn then moved Item 3:

3. The Riders' Advisory Council recommends that Metro's policy concerning Metro-sponsored events reflect its mission of providing safe, reliable, cost-effective and responsive transit services by siting events at Metro-accessible locations and by ensuring that any travel reimbursements provided to attendees are balanced and equitable.

She was seconded my Mr. Moore.

Ms. Brown noted that she had concerns regarding this amendment as it refers to a one-time incident and does not have larger relevance to recurring events. Mr. Jaffe submitted that this is an issue of Metro's "culture" as an agency. Mr. Snyder suggested getting more information on Metro's policies for such situations before making any recommendations.

Mr. Elin then moved to table this item, and was seconded by Mr. Erviti. All members present (Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Blyther, Ms. Brown, Mr. Cerny, Dr. Conn, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Elin, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Mr. Moore and Mr. Snyder) voted in favor of tabling this motion.

**XI. New Business:**

Ms. Holland noted that she received correspondence from Anne Arundel County as to why RAC and other committees do not have members from such non-compact jurisdictions.

Mr. Moore raised the issue of the availability of RAC meeting materials (handouts, presentations, etc.) to the public and to RAC members prior to RAC meetings. He stated that this is done for Metro's Board of Directors meetings and should be implemented in a similar way, for RAC meetings.

Mr. Jaffe noted that RAC elections would be coming up in January and suggested conducting elections by secret ballot.

**XII. Adjournment:**

Ms. Holland made a motion to adjourn, the motion was seconded. All members present voted to adjourn and the meeting was adjourned at 8:51 p.m.