

**Riders' Advisory Council**  
**May 2, 2007**

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. Snyder called the May meeting of the Riders' Advisory Council to order at 6:31 p.m.

The following members of the RAC were present:

Mary Blyther (Arlington County)  
Steve Cerny (Fairfax County)  
Sharon Conn (Prince George's County)  
Patricia Daniels (District of Columbia)  
Pedro Erviti (Fairfax County)  
Susan Holland (Prince George's County), arrived 6:36 p.m.  
Dennis Jaffe (District of Columbia), arrived 6:34 p.m.  
Nardra Johnson (Montgomery County)  
Cesar Maxit (District of Columbia), arrived 6:34 p.m.  
Kevin Moore (At-Large)  
Kaiya Sandler (Montgomery County)  
Pat Sheehan (Elderly and Disabled Committee)  
Michael Snyder (Chair, Montgomery County)  
Aline Stone (Fairfax County)  
Lillian White (City of Alexandria)

The following members of the RAC were not present during any part of the May RAC meeting:

Kelsi Bracmort (District of Columbia)  
Denise Brown (Prince George's County)  
Justin Chittams (District of Columbia)  
Armando Cortinez (At-Large)  
Nancy Iacomini (Arlington County)

II. Public Comment Period

Mr. Snyder then asked for any public comments. There were no comments from the public.

III. Approval of April 4, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Dr. Conn moved to accept the April minutes and was seconded by Ms. Stone.

The RAC voted to 8-0-3 to approve the minutes, as amended.

*In favor:* Ms. Blyther, Mr. Cerny, Dr. Conn, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Sandler, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Snyder, Ms. White

*Opposed:* None

*Abstentions:* Ms. Daniels, Mr. Erviti, Mr. Moore

IV. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Snyder read through the agenda and asked for a motion to approve the agenda as read.

Mr. Jaffe and Mr. Maxit arrived at 6:34 p.m.

Mr. Erviti moved to approve the agenda, as read. This motion was seconded by Mr. Moore. The RAC voted 14-0-0 to approve the agenda, with all members present voting in favor of the motion.

Ms. Holland arrived at 6:36 p.m.

V. Presentation “Bridging the Gap – Connecting Riders to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority”:

Cali Ence and Daniel Paepke, graduate students at the George Washington University, gave a presentation on their research on the RAC and other riders’ councils at public transit agencies across the country, and presented their recommendations on how the RAC can improve the formation and tracking of its recommendations to the Metro’s Board of Directors. These recommendations were:

1. To use Metro’s Customer Relations Management (CRM) software to keep track of the RAC’s recommendations
2. To use the “RAC Track,” a document that asks for specific information on a suggestion made by the RAC in order to have it evaluated by Metro staff.

Dr. Conn noted that, in New York, the chair of their Citizens’ Advisory Council sits on the MTA’s Board of Directors and asked if there were any other agencies where this is the case. Mr. Paepke replied that this is the case in New York City, but not in any of the other transit authorities that he and Ms. Ence studied.

Ms. White asked how much funding each of the various riders’ councils receives. Mr. Paepke replied that this wasn’t something that they looked at in their report. He said that, since New York has the longest-established group, having been established in 1977, and also having the support of the state legislature. Ms. White noted that the RAC doesn’t have much of a budget. Ms. Ence said that, if the RAC had suggestions on how to improve its functionality, then it should make these recommendations. Ms. Ence said that the RAC is taking steps to get its suggestions evaluated and responded to by Metro, but that this wouldn’t happen all at once.

Mr. Jaffe asked about the information that is being gathered and how it is responded to by the Authority – he asked how the RAC would see the status of responses to its suggestions and inquiries. Ms. Ence and Mr. Paepke explained how CRM software tracks customer communications and responses from staff, with Mr. Paepke noting that staff responses are captured in the system. Mr. Jaffe said that showing staff responses is what “pulls the system together.” Mr. Snyder said that the RAC could get a demonstration of the CRM system. Ms. White asked if complaints could be broken out

by category. Mr. Paepke said that such classification is within the capabilities of the CRM system.

Ms. Holland asked if this would be taking the place of Metro's Customer Service office. Mr. Snyder said that the RAC's comments would be using the same system, but that suggestions from the RAC would be classified in a different way. Mr. Pasek said that customer service calls would continue to be handled by Metro's Customer Service staff. Ms. White said that she would like to see the RAC's system and the customer service system integrated. Mr. Jaffe said that this is intended to open up files for the RAC to submit suggestions, as a customer, to Metro, and track the progress of those suggestions. Dr. Conn said that there is not resolution to customer complaints. Mr. Snyder replied that the RAC will be able to have access to the system through its staff coordinator to check on initiatives' progress.

Mr. Snyder and the RAC thanked the students for coming and moved to the next item on the agenda.

VI. Recommendation from Rules Committee:

Mr. Cerny read the content of the proposed Rules Committee motion to adopt a policy of allowing non-RAC members to serve in a non-voting capacity on RAC subcommittees, including the following components

- Appointments would be voted on by the RAC at a monthly RAC meeting;
- Applications would be circulated to RAC members the week prior to the RAC's monthly meeting;
- Criteria for appointing a non-RAC member to a subcommittee shall include but not require:
  - The ability to commit to the monthly Subcommittee meeting schedule;
  - Commitment to and interest in strengthening the regional transit system;
  - Knowledge of particular areas; and
  - Ability to devote time and effort to the work of the Subcommittee;
- Appointments would last for one calendar year;
- Appointees would need to sign and adhere to the RAC's Standards of Conduct;
- There would not be a need to maintain jurisdictional balance of appointees;
- Each applicant must receive the support of a majority of the members of the Subcommittee that he or she wishes to join and be recommended to the RAC Chair by the Chair of that Subcommittee;
- An application for appointment, similar to the application for membership on the RAC must be filled out; the inclusion of a résumé is optional;
- The respective Subcommittee Chair shall discuss with the applicant, in advance of his or her appointment, the expectations for his or her participation; and
- Information about the appointees shall be submitted to the Metro Board of Directors.

Ms. White moved the motion as read and Mr. Jaffe seconded this motion. Mr. Moore asked if these people would vote on RAC Subcommittees, to which Mr. Snyder replied that they would not.

Ms. Holland asked the difference between a non-voting member and a member of the general public, since all of the RAC meetings are public meetings. Mr. Snyder said that these non-voting members would sit at the table with RAC members and have agreed to be active participants in the Subcommittee's business along with agreeing to help the Subcommittee with its work. Mr. Snyder added that these people would also be able to ask questions at any time. In response to another question from Ms. Holland, Mr. Snyder said that the names of these individuals would be submitted to Metro's Board of Directors for their information.

Ms. Sandler said that she wanted to make a couple of points on this issue, and said that she isn't sure why the RAC is doing this – all members are volunteers, they all applied, all went through the application process and all devote time to improving Metro. She said that this is adding another layer of bureaucracy to the process. She said that she understands the idea but doesn't see where the need is. She said that she thinks that the RAC was appointed to do a job, there is opportunity for public comment at every meeting, the RAC has held public workshops on budget and rail issues, and isn't sure why the RAC need to go this extra step. She said that she thinks that this adds unnecessary complications to the RAC, noting that it's currently difficult for the RAC to conduct meetings with twenty-one members

Mr. Jaffe said that he had two things to say in response – that this isn't an additional layer, it's additional members of existing subcommittees. He said value to the RAC is the opportunity to tap into potential knowledge and energy of the public. He said that the RAC doesn't currently have a significant amount of participation by individual members doing “nitty-gritty” work at this time and would benefit from help with this.

Ms. Sandler said that, while she understands Mr. Jaffe's point, that Metro chose the RAC members and it has to deal with the RAC, as appointed. Ms. Sandler said that, if this goes forward, the RAC should perhaps suggest that the RAC have input into future application processes or to suggest to Metro to look at different ways to screen applications. Mr. Jaffe said that he thinks that there's merit to Ms. Sandler's idea and that the two items aren't mutually exclusive. He added that having additional members helps develop additional talent for the RAC. He said that the primary issue that may need to be looked at is the amount of time individual RAC members spend in getting involved with “nitty-gritty” work to affect change at Metro.

Mr. Cerny said that his main interest is the ability to tap into “technocrats” – and to have these people offer an alternative viewpoint to technical recommendations that are gotten from WMATA. He felt that these viewpoints would be helpful to the Rail and Bus subcommittees.

Ms. Holland asked why individuals, if they are committed to the goals of the RAC wouldn't continue to come to the meetings, even if not appointed as non-voting subcommittee members. Mr. Erviti said that being members of the subcommittee allows them to participate in meetings. Ms. Sandler added that there is already a dialogue in place between members of the public and RAC members at meetings.

Mr. Moore said that, at Budget Subcommittee meetings, members of the public get all of the participation that they want, regardless of their status. He said that based on his experience, this isn't needed.

Ms. Blyther said that, perhaps there need to be more opportunities for public participation as part of Subcommittee meetings. Mr. Snyder responded that the RAC advertises its meetings to try and get participation. Ms. Stone clarified that there should be more opportunities for participation for members of the public who show up at meetings.

Dr. Conn noted that many boards and committees have honorary members that serve on them. She added that many of the comments made by members of the public at RAC meetings are based on their personal experiences, and said that she isn't opposed to having members of the public serve on subcommittees. Dr. Conn said that the important criterion for participation is commitment. She noted that she has attended many RAC subcommittee meetings that didn't have a quorum, and reiterated that if members of the public were willing to commit to the RAC subcommittee and abide by the conditions set forth, then she has no problem with their participation.

Mr. Jaffe said that the difference between non-voting members and members of the public making comments is the perception of "being a part of something" and the expectation that they would come to meetings, etc. He said that he isn't sure how many people will be interested but that he thinks that there is energy out there that the RAC can tap into. He asked if there was something that could be done to condition this motion that would allay people's concerns, such as doing this for one year. He also said that he suggests that the RAC not automatically vote for everyone who applies, should this proposal be approved.

Ms. White said that the RAC needs more rider input and that there needs to be more monitoring of the stations and railcars, since this is an overwhelming task to be done by the nine members of the Rail Subcommittee. She said that she hopes that this generates interest.

Mr. Snyder closed discussion on this topic and called for a vote. The RAC then voted on the motion as put forward, with the vote as follows:

*In favor:* Mr. Cerny, Dr. Conn, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Erviti, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Snyder, Ms. White

*Opposed:* Ms. Blyther, Ms. Holland, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Moore Ms. Sandler, Ms. Stone

*Abstentions:* Mr. Maxit

The motion passed (8-6-1)

Mr. Snyder noted that participation by non-members is up to the individual committees and that this lays out a framework for that, if they decide to allow it. Mr. Snyder asked that resumes be sent to the RAC as soon as possible.

Dr. Conn clarified that the RAC ultimately votes on the participation of non-members in subcommittees. Mr. Snyder responded that her statement is correct, but that recommendations come from the individual subcommittees.

VII. Budget Workshop Recommendations:

Mr. Snyder said that next Thursday, May 10, the RAC has been invited to do a Power Point presentation to the Board of Directors' Finance, Administration and Oversight Committee on its policy recommendations for Metro's FY08 budget. He noted that the Jurisdictional Coordinating Committee (JCC) and Mr. Catoe will also make presentations at this meeting. He noted that the RAC has two policy recommendations that it has approved and two more to move forward – one from the Communications Subcommittee and two from the Budget Subcommittee.

*Late Night Service:*

Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Moore to present the recommendation on Late Night Service, which Mr. Moore then read. The recommendation was:

“The RAC urges Metro to investigate using shuttle-type service and implementing demand-responsive type routes as ways to provide more cost-efficient transit during late-night operations and other periods of low demand.”

Mr. Moore moved that this language be approved as a recommendation from the RAC to Metro's Board. Ms. Stone seconded this motion. Mr. Erviti asked whether this is a recommendation for rail or bus. Mr. Moore said that this is “shuttle-type service” in place of some rail service. Mr. Snyder said that, actually, this shuttle service would be in place of late-night bus service, which would save money versus running empty 40-passenger buses on fixed routes.

Mr. Snyder noted that this proposal came out of a comment by Rick Harcum, Metro's budget director, who said that, in some cases, it would be cheaper to hire a taxi for each passenger than to provide service to buses carrying only a very few passengers.

Ms. Holland asked whether paratransit vehicles would be used. Mr. Snyder and Mr. Moore said that the decision on vehicles to use would be up to Metro. She said that she had concerns about wear and tear on paratransit vehicles.

Mr. Jaffe asked Mr. Pasek whether he thought that this motion was specific enough for Metro staff to react to.

Mr. Snyder said that there was significant Metro participation at the budget workshops, so they are aware of the specifics of this proposal. Mr. Pasek said that he thinks that the

language is specific enough, but noted that Mr. Erviti had interpreted the language differently, which may mean that the RAC should make the recommendation more explicit.

There was then discussion among RAC members as to how to best modify the motion to make it as clear as possible. During this discussion Ms. White noted that, at the budget workshops, there was discussion of using smaller vehicles. Mr. Moore said that it's not necessarily the size of the vehicle that's important, but the manner in which it's operated.

Mr. Jaffe asked Mr. Pasek about the language

Mr. Moore read the recommendation as revised:

*Amended:* The RAC urges Metro to investigate using shuttle-type service and implementing demand-responsive type routes as ways to provide more cost-efficient transit during late-night *bus* operations and other periods of low demand.”

Mr. Snyder called for a vote on this recommendation.

*In favor:* Ms. Blyther, Mr. Cerny, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Maxit, Mr. Moore, Ms. Sandler, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Stone, and Ms. White

*Opposed:* none

*Abstentions:* Dr. Conn, Mr. Jaffe

The motion passed (13-0-2).

*Advertising Policy:*

Ms. Stone read the recommendation regarding Metro's advertising policy that was passed by the Communications Subcommittee:

“If Metro recommends an increase in advertising, the RAC supports an Advertising Policy that opens up additional inventory to advertisers, provided that at least 15% of the space on each medium is reserved for public service announcements (such as community groups or Metro information), and it directly benefits riders through fare containment.

Additionally, all ‘temporary signage’ (including advertising, maps, schedules and emergency procedures) throughout the system must have the following two numbers displayed: Metro Police 202-962-2121; Customer Information: 202-637-7000.

All buses that are wrapped must be clearly distinguishable as a Metrobus from both the front and side. If the Metro logo is covered, a replacement must be included in the wrap, and this advertising must follow the 15% public service announcement reserved rule as well.”

The motion was seconded by Ms. Daniels. Mr. Snyder called for discussion on the motion.

Mr. Jaffe said that he had discussed with Mr. Catoe, Metro's General Manager, the issue of making the Metro Police phone number visible. Mr. Jaffe said that Mr. Catoe thought that the Metro should have one phone number, and only one phone number, to be used for all public contact. Mr. Jaffe said that he isn't sure if Metro has decided on a phone number to use for this, but he agrees with the idea of Metro having only one number, provided that it's made clear that the number is for both customer service and police issues. He said that he thinks that police should be listed as a contact on temporary signage, but that there should only be one number provided for all customer contact.

Dr. Conn said that hasn't used the Police number, but her assumption is that it's not a menu-driven number. She said that she's concerned with the time required for customers with an emergency to navigate a menu-driven phone number.

Mr. Moore said that for the RAC to mandate that the "public service" threshold be met in a certain way is constraining to Metro. He said that Metro doesn't sell its own advertising, that it has limited ability to refuse ads, and that to restrict adspace based on mode of travel (15% on bus, on electronic ads, etc.) is way too constraining. He said that he objects to the RAC including those specifics in its recommendation.

Ms. Stone said that the space would be "reserved" for public ads, but wouldn't be required. Mr. Moore said that Metro already has a percentage dedicated to public service announcements. He added that, for Metro to require each mode of transit to have 15% set aside for public service announcements, could reduce Metro's ability to sell available space.

Ms. Johnson said that having one number doesn't make sense, as she has had trouble in the past being connected to the police through the Customer Service office.

Ms. Holland asked if the number referenced was the emergency or non-emergency Metro Police number. She was told that there isn't this distinction with the Metro Transit Police's phone number.

Mr. Jaffe said that the reason he brought up with Metro the idea of making the Metro Transit Police phone number more widely available is because, while passengers will call 911 in an emergency, there are many non-emergency situations that the Transit Police should be made aware of, but people don't know how to contact them, and so won't contact anyone. He said that, if riders knew the Metro Transit Police's phone number, they may contact Metro Transit Police related to issues that they don't feel merit a call to 911.

Mr. Jaffe asked if the RAC knew the current percentage of advertising space reserved for public service announcements. Mr. Snyder replied that it does not.

Mr. Jaffe said that, generally, the RAC shouldn't submit a recommendation with a specific number if it doesn't know the current practice and without finding out from Metro staff what they think the impact of the proposal would be. He also had a question

on Metro's policy for receiving payment for public service announcements. Mr. Moore said that groups have to meet certain criteria to receive free space. He added that his concern as related to bus wraps was about who would be responsible for paying for the actual wrapping of the bus, which costs money. Mr. Jaffe said that this is another piece of information that should be obtained before submitting this proposal.

Mr. Moore said that he is opposed to the language "direct benefit to riders through fare containment." Mr. Moore said that his understanding is that there is a current policy whereby advertising revenues don't directly accrue to the operating budget, meaning that advertising doesn't currently benefit riders by containing fares. He said that the RAC needs clarification on this policy. He said this would put the RAC at odds with current policy.

Dr. Conn said that it was her understanding from the budget workshops that non-fare revenue, such as from advertising, was put forward as a way to contain fares. Mr. Moore said that he agreed with her but that he doesn't think that this is current practice.

Ms. White said that she would like to table recommendation this until the next meeting until the questions that have been raised can be answered. She moved to table this item, and was seconded by Mr. Erviti.

Mr. Snyder called for a vote on tabling the discussion on advertising policy. The vote was as follows:

*In favor:* Ms. Blyther, Mr. Cerny, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Maxit, Mr. Moore, Ms. Sandler, Mr. Sheehan, Ms. White

*Opposed:* Dr. Conn, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Stone

*Abstentions:* none

The motion passed (12-3-0)

Mr. Moore said that this means, that there won't be an advertising policy recommendation when the RAC makes its report to the Board's Finance Committee. Ms. Sandler said that this is something that can be developed later. In response to a question from Ms. White, Mr. Snyder said that he was disappointed that the RAC tabled this item, but that he would abide by the RAC's decision. Mr. Snyder said encouraged members interested in this topic to participate in the next Communications Subcommittee meeting so that it can make a recommendation for the RAC to consider at its next meeting.

*Retail/Rental Policy:*

Ms. White said that, as part of the budget workshops, actions for raising revenue from sources other than fares were discussed. She said that some other recommendations coming from the workshops had to do with retail at and rental of Metro facilities. She said that she put together proposals which would permit greater use of WMATA space for retail and rental purposes. She said that she was going to go through all six of the proposals listed and ask for the RAC to discuss them and then vote them up or down.

Ms. White moved the first recommendation (“Renting WMATA facilities for events, such as business or community meetings, e.g. the headquarters building.”). Mr. Erviti seconded this motion.

Mr. Jaffe asked if there were any questions that needed to be raised regarding different rates for non-profit organizations or any overtime issues this proposal may present. Mr. Snyder said that this issue was discussed at the Budget Subcommittee meeting, and Metro staff said that Metro currently doesn’t charge for use of its facilities. Ms. White said that this proposal would encourage Metro to rent out its facilities.

Mr. Jaffe said that it would be in the public interest and strengthen support for transit if community groups were allowed to use facilities without paying. Mr. Snyder asked whether Mr. Jaffe wanted to make an amendment to this motion. After discussion, Mr. Jaffe said that he’d prefer to have community groups omitted from the list of groups that Metro would rent facilities to.

Mr. Snyder suggested a revised motion:

“Renting WMATA facilities for event such as business, commercial and private functions.”

All members present voted in favor of this recommendation, with the exception of Mr. Moore, who abstained. (14-0-1)

Ms. White then moved the next recommendation:

“Permitting non-food retail in the rail system and/or on WMATA property: dry cleaners, gift shops, Metro transit shops.” Mr. Erviti seconded this motion.

Dr. Conn asked about the inclusion of newsstands or gift shops, which generally sell food, in Ms. White’s recommendation. Mr. Snyder said that when this was discussed, the recommendation was that if any food items were sold in these locations, the items be sealed so that people wouldn’t have open food or drink items in the rail system.

Mr. Moore said that Metro has already investigated this and that there is little interest in opening retail location on Metro property if one can’t sell food. Ms. White said that the RAC would consider food sales later in this discussion. Ms. White said that she had talked the Alexandria city government and to friends who were enthusiastic about the idea of a gift shop or dry cleaners opening at a Metro station. Ms. White said that gift shops may be left off of the list of places that fall into the “non-food retail” category because they often do sell food items.

Ms. Holland asked if this opened up a potential crime scenario with people robbing these businesses. Ms. White said that based on Metro’s experience with ATMs that have been recently placed in Metro stations, there hasn’t been much experience with crime.

Ms. Daniels said that she wanted to add the lottery and recommend that flower shops also be included. Mr. Moore said that he thinks that the RAC is being a little too specific in

making its recommendations on types of retailers which should be allowed to locate on Metro property, and suggested asking Metro staff to investigate what types of retail sales what kind of services riders want. Mr. Jaffe suggested adding “what is desirable to riders” to the end of the motion. There was discussion regarding Metro’s need to do a market study to determine riders’ interests.

After further discussion, Mr. Moore suggested that any motion made would need to state that whatever would be allowed would not detract from Metro’s primary mission, which is providing transit service. Mr. Jaffe moved to amend the motion to read: *“Permitting non-food retail in the rail system and/or on WMATA property, reflecting riders’ demonstrated interests, not impeding passenger flow, not adversely affecting Metro’s ability to provide transit service, and not significantly increasing costs or exposing riders to potential crime.”*

Mr. Moore said that this would effectively kill any retail facilities from locating at Metro facilities. Ms. White said that she wouldn’t accept Mr. Jaffe’s suggested substitute motion because it was too complicated and restrictive.

Mr. Moore moved to substitute remaining motions that Ms. White had provided, which differentiated between retail establishments selling food, drinks and non-food items with: “The RAC urges Metro to investigate allowing retail sales of food and non-food items within the transit system.”

Ms. White said that this substitute was acceptable to her, and noted that she had initially separated out food and drink because RAC members may have differing opinions on food sales as opposed to drink sales.

Dr. Conn clarified that the RAC is discussing retail opportunities at Metro facilities, not Metro’s food and drink policy and noted that these are two separate issues. Mr. Moore said he doesn’t see these as two separate issues. Mr. Jaffe said that selling food or drink on Metro property would increase the number of people who brought these items into the system.

Ms. Blyther asked for clarification of the current policy and said that there’s already a problem with food and drink containers on the Metro. She said that enforcement has been lax and that she hasn’t seen signs spelling out Metro’s food and drink policy on buses.

Ms. White asked to call the question, because her motion only talked about non-food retail.

Ms. Johnson left the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

Mr. Snyder said that Mr. Moore’s motion would combine the food and non-food retail into one recommendation. In response to Ms. White’s request, Mr. Moore read his motion again. Ms. White said that she’d accept the amendment. She said that she had wanted to separate them out because it’s unlikely Metro’s food and drink policy would

change, but if the motion is just to ask Metro to investigate the recommendation, then she would accept it.

Mr. Jaffe said that this would be a major policy change, investigation notwithstanding. He said that his experience suggests that people are intensely opposed to adding food to the train system. He said that it would behoove the RAC to be listening more to Metro's ridership on this subject before making any recommendations.

Mr. Snyder asked what the process is to take a vote on this kind of issue. He said that, if the majority of the RAC doesn't want to discuss food, this isn't something that should be pursued.

Mr. Moore said that the RAC isn't making a recommendation for Metro to change its policy, only to investigate the potential to permit such retail opportunities. There was discussion about what it means for the RAC to recommend that Metro "investigate" something and whether or not that constitutes endorsement. Mr. Moore said that asking Metro to investigate something doesn't mean that it puts the RAC on the record as being in favor of it. Ms. Daniels said that she disagreed. She said that she feels that food should be eliminated and that Metro should leave the policy as it is now.

Ms. Sandler said that the policy as it currently stands isn't enforced and that the RAC needs to look at increased enforcement of the food policy. Ms. Sandler said that she agreed with Mr. Jaffe that by asking Metro to investigate allowing food implies that the RAC supports this.

Mr. Jaffe suggested going back to separating food and non-food retail. Mr. Jaffe said that a public discussion is needed on the issue of allowing food in the rail system.

Ms. White said that this is why she broke this issue out into separate parts.

After discussion of the motions made by Ms. White and Mr. Moore with respect to their status, Mr. Jaffe moved to table discussion the current amended motion that speaks to both food and non-food retail. He said that this would allow the original motion to come back to the floor.

*In favor:* Ms. Blyther, Mr. Cerny, Mr. Erviti, Ms. Holland, Mr. Jaffe, Ms. White

*Opposed:* Dr. Conn, Mr. Moore, Mr. Sheehan, Ms. Stone

*Abstentions:* Ms. Sandler, Mr. Snyder

Mr. Jaffe's motion passed (7-4-2) and discussion was tabled.

Mr. Jaffe suggested that, because Ms. White had accepted Mr. Moore's substitute motion, that she resubmit her original motion to the RAC for a vote.

Ms. White then moved that the RAC recommend to Metro that it "Permit non-food retail in the rail system and/or on WMATA property." Mr. Maxit seconded this motion.

Mr. Moore asked whether the RAC was endorsing this proposal or asking for information about it. Mr. Snyder said that this motion “urges Metro to investigate” it. Mr. Jaffe said that this motion reads to “permit” retail, meaning that the RAC would be in favor of it.

*In favor:* Ms. Blyther, Mr. Cerny, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Erviti, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Maxit, Ms. Sandler, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Stone, Ms. White

*Opposed:* Dr. Conn, Ms. Holland, Mr. Moore

*Abstentions:* none

This motion passed (11-3-0)

Dr. Conn and Ms. Sandler left the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

Ms. White then said that she wanted to move on to recommendation #5 to discuss food items. Mr. Snyder said that there isn’t time to discuss this at this meeting.

VIII Adjournment:

Mr. Moore moved to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Ms. Holland.

Mr. Snyder adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.