



Madison Metro Transit System

Catherine Debo, Transit General Manager

1101 East Washington Avenue

Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Administrative Office: 608 266 4904

Customer Information: 608 266 4466

TDD/Device for Deaf: 608 267 1143

Memo to : Members of the Transit and Parking Commission
 From : Ann Gullickson, Transit Service Manager
 Date : June 6, 2005
 Subject : Behavior and Security Issues on Buses and at Transfer Points

Six months ago staff began developing a policy concerning misbehavior on buses in order to clarify for drivers what was expected of them in certain types of circumstances. The goal is to maintain a safe, welcoming environment for passengers through creation of a banning procedure similar to that of the Madison public library. The policy has been reviewed for the last several months by the city attorney's office. The draft is attached in Appendix A for discussion at this TPC meeting.

Recently, there have been reports in the media concerning violence and threats of violence on buses and at the transfer points, particularly involving youth. The perception that this is not a secure environment can affect many peoples' decisions to use the transit system. Anxiety can cause drivers to adopt a guarded, less service-oriented interaction with passengers. Bus operator Georgian Springen attended the TPC meeting last month, requesting that the issue of security be placed on the TPC agenda.

In order to help TPC members gauge the extent of the type of incidents we have experienced, I have prepared a summary of incidents for the past 16 months, at the General Manager's request, based on review of driver incident reports, customer feedback, and police records. A breakdown by type of behavior is shown in Appendix B.

January 1 2004 – April 30, 2005	Disruptive Behavior	Physical Assault*
Driver Incident Report – Fixed Route	216	67
Driver Incident Report – Supplementary School Service	210	78
Customer Feedback	50	8

Note:* this covers a wide variety of behaviors from spitting to fighting. See detail in Appendix B.

The Madison Police Department (MPD) has provided the following information concerning the number of calls they responded to at the four transfer points during 2004.

	Police Calls 2004
South Transfer Point	187
East Transfer Point	83
North Transfer Point	41
West Transfer Point	0

The MPD has clearly identified the South Transfer Point as the Transfer Point where the greatest level of incidence of misbehavior occurs, particularly by youth, and where the types of behavior are of greatest concern.

Strategies Currently Employed to address behavior issues on buses and at the South Transfer Point

- Bus operator training was instituted in 2002, using a program developed by the National Transit Institute teaching operators skills and techniques for maintaining a safe environment on their buses.
- Supervisory responsibilities at Metro have been re-assigned. Customer feedback, driver incident reports, and security issues are now assigned to one specific Operations Supervisor to monitor daily, report to staff, and respond as applicable.
- Staff has been working with the MPD and Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD) to address youth conduct on the buses, at the transfer points, and in the vicinity of bus stops. Metro staff has participated in numerous meetings over the past three years with the police department, school district, and joint meetings of all three groups.
- Staff worked to develop a misbehavior policy, with banning component, for discussion at TPC.

This year, and particularly this spring, the South Transfer Point became the location where high school students met after school to "hang-out" and in some cases to settle their differences. In response to these new developments, specific strategies were developed through discussions with MPD for maintaining order:

- Transit Road Supervisors have been assigned to monitor the South Transfer Point during the late afternoon and evening hours, supplemented by random visits during other times of the day. We are not able to provide a continual presence, as these supervisors are also called upon to respond to accidents, incidents occurring on buses, and other customer service issues.
- Police officers patrolling the South Side are familiar with the pulsing schedule of buses at the transfer point, and are driving through five minutes after the buses leave.
- Alder Tim Bruer has introduced an ordinance that prohibits loitering at the transfer points without intention of riding a bus. This will provide a tool to the MPD to deal with persons "hanging-out" at the site.

Additionally, staff recommends the following for improvement of safety at the South Transfer Point:

- Adding increased candlepower in existing perimeter lighting.
- Adding two additional perimeter lights (included in the 2006 Capitol Improvement Program).
- Adding security cameras at the South Transfer Point. See further discussion below.

Surveillance Security Measures

Metro staff proposes the installation of digital recording equipment at the South Transfer Point, on five buses that are primarily used in supplemental school service, and on ten buses used primarily in fixed route service. We recommend this additional strategy of video surveillance in order to provide passengers and drivers a greater sense of security. The primary objective is prevention; a conspicuous system with signage alerting customers will be a deterrent to disruptive behavior. Secondly, if an event occurs, surveillance records can be useful in documenting what did transpire. And finally, in case of personal injury accidents, a video record validates the facts. Deciding whether or not to have cameras on the buses is a policy decision, not a mandatory subject of bargaining.

We would like guidance from the TPC on these two policy issues before spending additional staff time on the options:

- (1) The misbehavior policy including provisions for banning;
- (2) Installation of digital recording equipment at the South Transfer Point and on the specified rolling stock

Incidents by Categories

Physical Assaults	# of Fixed Route Incidents	# of Supplemental Service Incidents
physical fighting between passengers	44	65
threw object(s) at driver*	8	2
struck or pushed driver	6	1
spit on driver	4	-
passenger assault on another passenger	4	1
shots fired at bus	2	-
weapon (scissors, fire crackers, matches, knife, pepper spray)	-	6
start fire	-	2

Disruptive Behavior	# of Fixed Route Incidents	# of Supplemental Service Incidents
vulgar language	74	32
verbal harassment	59	-
disruptive moving around**	24	119
threatening behavior	22	6
damage to bus	20	32
intoxication/drug activity	10	-
suspect on bus removed by police	7	-
smoking	-	-
shoplifting	-	6
throwing objects (in bus / at window / out window)	-	1
		14

Notes:

* These incidents were categorized as Physical Assaults when the object(s) actually hit the driver.

**This category includes a variety of behaviors including: banging on bus seats/windows, touching passengers, disturbing passenger belongings, pulling stop requests repeatedly and not getting off the bus, running around, jumping on or over seats, urinating on bus, entering bus through back door or window, hitting or throwing things at the bus from outside once off the bus, or behavior generally known as "unruly" or "rowdy."

Electronic Surveillance Technology on Transit Vehicles Madison Metro Transit Survey Results

7/6/05

This survey was based on a national survey done by the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP). Our statewide survey was sent to sixteen Wisconsin Urban & Rural Transit Association (WURTA) member agencies (as well as neighboring Duluth). Our purpose was to discover which transit systems in Wisconsin use camera surveillance on their buses and whether they are pleased with the results. Other information regarding electronic surveillance was gathered and is presented below. Of the sixteen systems surveyed, eleven responded. Those agencies are:

- 1) Appleton
- 2) Duluth
- 3) Eau Claire
- 4) Fond du Lac *
- 5) Janesville
- 6) LaCrosse
- 7) Merrill
- 8) Milwaukee
- 9) Racine
- 10) Sheboygan
- 11) Stevens Point *

*Of the 11 respondents, only these two systems do not currently use electronic surveillance.

1. How many revenue buses does your agency operate?

Totals: 687

Total respondents: 11

2. How many annual unlinked passenger boardings do you provide?

Totals: 62,916,400

Total Respondents: 11

3. Does your agency use a surveillance system on board revenue vehicles?

Yes: 9

No: 2

4. What is the format of the camera system?

Digital: 3

Analog: 5

One system used both analog and digital equipment.

5. What is the make/model of the surveillance equipment your agency has purchased?

4 - REI Bus Watch - (3 digital and one mixed analog/digital)

1 - VCR - Sanyo SRT-2400 "Real Time" Video Recorder; Safety Vision BNC SV-TB-2 CAM Video Switcher; Safety Vision "Observer" SVCC3-6 Color Camera (2 per bus). Safety Vision

1 - Safety Vision and REI mixed equipment

1 - Sony Z-Box

1 - Prima-Facia Model #4000

1 - Kalatel Mobile View II without transmission capabilities. It also has sound capabilities.

6. What equipment options does your camera system have?

Multi-camera system -	8	Power filter or conditioner -	2
24-hour recording -	3	Secondary power source -	1
Automatic emergency digital transmission -	0	Vandal-proof housing -	6
		Auto-start -	8
Multiplexing -	1	Color images -	3
Surge protection -	2		

7. Is the vehicle equipped with an indicator that informs the driver if the surveillance system becomes incapacitated in any way?

Yes: 1 No: 8

8. Since the installation of the surveillance system, has there been a measurable reduction in:

Vandalism

Yes: 6 No: 3

Number of assaults

Yes: 3 No: 6

Fraudulent claims

Yes: 5 No: 4

9. Since the installation of the surveillance system, has there been a measurable increase in:

Rider perceptions of security

Yes: 5 No: 4

Operator perceptions of security

Yes: 5 No: 4

10. Rate how effective (overall) you feel the surveillance system has been at reducing crime.

(1 is most effective; 7 is least effective.)

- 1 - one system
- 2 - four
- 3 - zero
- 4 - two
- 5 - one
- 6 - zero
- 7 - zero

11. For what other purposes has your agency used the system?

- Complaint Resolution - 8
- Other: *Police investigation/ID suspects - 6
- Employee Monitoring - 5
- Fare Dispute Mediation - 3
- Accident investigation - 3

12. Rate how effective you feel the system has been for these purposes. (1 is most effective, 7 is least effective, and N/A indicates that the system is not used for this purpose.)

Fare Dispute Mediation:

- 1 - two systems
- 2 - one
- 3 - one
- 4 - zero
- 5 - zero
- 6 - one
- 7 - zero
- N/A - four

Complaint Resolution:

- 1 - four systems
- 2 - one
- 3 - one
- 4 - one
- 5 - two
- 6 - zero
- 7 - zero
- N/A - zero

Employee Monitoring:

- 1 - three systems
- 2 - zero
- 3 - one
- 4 - zero
- 5 - one
- 6 - zero
- 7 - two
- N/A - two

Other (Please describe):

- 1 - four systems (Two responses where "other" is accident investigation; two responses where "other" is suspect identification.)
- 2 - zero
- 3 - zero
- 4 - one (One response where "other" is accident investigation.)
- 5 - zero
- 6 - zero
- 7 - zero
- N/A - four

13. Has your agency ever used recordings to attempt to prove claims against the system are fraudulent?

Yes: 8 No: 3

14. Rate the effectiveness of the system at reducing fraudulent claims against the system. (1 is most effective, 7 is least effective, and N/A indicates that system is not used for this purpose.)

- 1 - three systems
- 2 - three
- 3 - one
- 4 - zero
- 5 - one
- 6 - one
- 7 - zero
- N/A - zero

15. If your agency currently uses, or plans to use, on-board surveillance technology in conjunction with covert security operations, what types of operations are in use (or planned)?

On-board undercover security personnel - 1
Undercover trailing vehicle - 1
Other - 0

16. Does your agency archive recordings made on revenue vehicles?

Yes: 6 No: 3

16a. If "yes," how long do the recordings remain in the archives?

*until situation is resolved - 4

*48 hours unless the incident is on tape, then as long as needed - 1

*video clips of incidents are stored indefinitely on CD - 1

17. What percentage of your fleet is outfitted with surveillance devices?

Less than 25%	- 0	51 - 75%	- 1
25 - 50%	- 2	76 - 100%	- 6

Note: In the national survey conducted by TCRP, 48% of respondents reported surveillance in less than 25% of vehicles.

18. If less than 100%, which vehicles were chosen to be outfitted with surveillance technology?

a. Vehicles on high crime routes - 0 b. Newer vehicles - 4
c. Vehicles transporting large numbers of juveniles - 0
d. Other - 0

Note: In the national survey conducted by TCRP, 48% of respondents indicated they outfitted vehicles transporting large numbers of juveniles; 62% of respondents indicated they outfitted newer vehicles.

19. If your agency does not use on-board surveillance technology, are you considering procuring such a system?

Yes: 2 N/A: 9 (already using surveillance)

19a. If "yes," what type of surveillance system(s) are you considering?

cameras - 2	Audio Pickup - 1
Black Boxes - 0	Other - 0

19b. If "no," why not?

Unnecessary - 1	Legal issues - 0
Too expensive - 0	Other - 0

19c. If "no," under what circumstances would your agency consider purchasing on-board surveillance technology?

Reduction in cost - 1	Increased surveillance need - 1
Resolution of legal issues - 0	Other - 0

20. Are privacy issues related to on-board surveillance technology a significant concern or problem for your agency?

Yes: 0 No: 9 (of the 9 respondents currently using surveillance)

21. Does your agency use, or plan to use, signage which notifies the riding public of the use of on-board surveillance technology?

Yes: 6 No: 3

21a. If "yes," what information will the signage convey?

The possibility of surveillance - 4
The certainty of surveillance - 2

22. If employees at your agency belong to a union, do you solicit input from union representatives on the subject of on-board surveillance?

Employee privacy concerns: Yes: 5 No: 4
Employee safety: Yes: 7 No: 2
Employee liability: Yes: 7 No: 2
Other - 1 *use of tapes for discipline

23. Has your agency enlisted community support for on-board surveillance?

Yes: 2 No: 7

23a. If "yes," how was the support enlisted?

- a. Advertisement campaign - 1
- b. On-board and/or station signage - 0
- c. Other - 1 *City Council hearings

24. How did your agency obtain the funds to pay for the surveillance system?

FTA grant program - 7 State grant program - 1
Local funds - 4 Internal funding source - 0
Other - 0

25. What was the purchase price of the on-board surveillance system?

(RESPONSE OPTIONAL)

- *\$4036 per vehicle - 1
- *\$4267.50 per vehicle - 1
- * 1997 prices \$6394 per vehicle; \$814 labor; \$5000 per viewing station - 1

26. Was installation included in the purchase price?

(RESPONSE OPTIONAL)

Yes: 7 No: 1

27. As new vehicles come on-line, are they outfitted with on-board surveillance?

Yes: 9 No: 0

27a. If "yes," what is the cost of outfitting each vehicle with surveillance equipment?

(RESPONSE OPTIONAL)

*\$4036 per vehicle - 1

*4000 per vehicle - 1

*\$3300 - 1

*\$20,00 for full AVL system (no break out price for cameras alone) - 1

27b. Is installation included in this cost? Yes: 7 No: 0 (two no response)

28. What are the approximate monthly costs associated with the system?

(RESPONSE OPTIONAL)

a. maintenance:

*\$400 - 1

*minimal - 1

*20 hours a month - 1

b. training:

*minimal - 1

*N/A - 1

c. vehicle downtime:

*negligible - 1

*N/A - 1

d. archiving:

*minimal - 1

*N/A - 2

e. management:

*\$100 - 1

*Average 1 hour a day - 1

29. What effect does on-board surveillance have on fleet availability?

No effect - 7

Some effect - 0

Minimal effect - 2

Considerable effect - 0

30. What are the most significant weaknesses of the system?

a. 3 - Picture quality (explain):

*not great quality with analog - 1

*quality requires a large hard drive - 1

*older system, limited storage results in only one frame per second

b. 4 - Maintenance requirements (explain):

*Periodic cleaning/re-programming of VCR's, adjustments to cameras that get out of alignment due to vibration, etc.

*VCR tapes need to be replaced often.

*Tape recorders reviewed frequently for tape readiness and shop personnel needed to exchange recorded tapes

*Parts availability

*Requirement to daily re-wind tapes, weekly check to ensure that camera systems are functioning properly. Tapes need to be replaced several times annually. *(This comment was put with archiving requirements, but applies more to maintenance.)*

c. 4 - Tape archiving requirements (explain):

*Just time consuming

*Numerous requests from Police

d. 0 - Downtime

e. 0 - Cost

31. If another transit system, similar to your own, asked whether they should install an on-board surveillance system on their fleet would you advise them to do so?

Yes: 9 No: 2

Comments:

*Absolutely! It's the best thing we've ever done. Our incidents have declined significantly. We can fight bogus claims and have proof when parents tell us, "Our child would never do that!" It does require significant management time to pull tapes, watch them, follow-up, etc. Well worth the time!

*We believe that this system has been instrumental in reducing vandalism and behavior problems on our buses. The two camera system is probably the minimum required to be effective; future purchases will have additional [cameras]. Our current systems are analog, however our experience has convinced us that all new systems will be digital, and if funding is available, we will probably convert our current systems to digital as well. Primary reasons are increased on-board data storage, eliminating daily tape switching, and the maintenance hassles involved with tape-based systems. Our 2 camera system doesn't cover the farebox area very well (distance of camera from farebox and automatic switching doesn't allow us to focus on what's happening there.) We do not systematically monitor tapes for employee performance - "spying" was a big fear on the part of the employees when we installed the systems. However, if we receive a customer complaint that indicates something that may have been "picked-up" by the cameras, we will review, and have used the results for instructional purposes with the employee - and yes, occasionally to "de-bunk" the complaint! Also, we occasionally notice things when doing routine reviews of tapes to check camera operation, and will bring these to the employee's attention. As a note, with current bus designs with enclosed or semi-enclosed drivers areas, unless a camera was mounted over the drivers area or over the entrance door pointing at the driver, it's virtually impossible to see what the driver is doing.

*Very helpful possible claims and passenger complaints.

*Fast, accurate information. Excellent training device. Great for consultations; good and bad. Merrill procured the digital camera system into their (5) bus purchase. The 4 camera system views passengers from the front and rear as well as the front threshold and front traffic view. (We have no rear doors). We have had minor passenger mishaps as well as passenger complaints that have been resolved quickly and honestly. It does create a little animosity with the operators; however, it has made a positive difference in the way they treat customers and situations on board. We highly recommend them! TMI is currently working on a suggested policy as to how long we hang on to the archives, but currently I will hold them until they are resolved at TMI.

*Single most effective means of controlling passenger conduct and protecting interests of company and bus operator and safety of passengers. On-board accident /incident claims are now minimal. Provides excellent record for hearings on all matters related to on board activities. The cameras were the best capital investment we have made in terms of reducing claims and complaints.

*Benefits of documented events outweigh costs, etc.

* We put a four camera system in as part of our AVL system. They have only been up and running since March 1. In that time we had a fatality bike hit bus, bike rider killed. The on board cameras were very effective in showing the time line of the incident, the actions of the bike rider as he came into view of the inside cameras and the actions of the driver. We also have provided camera data for a hit and run accident not involving a bus. The bus was turning, a car cut in front of the bus, hit a motorcycle and sped off. Our on board camera data was provided to the police as part of the investigation.

I am not sure what the verdict will be overall. Our drivers, of course, were concerned that we would use the cameras to spy on them. With these two incidents, they are starting to come around to see that the cameras can be a positive tool in defending their actions, as well as a tool for showing them how to improve. I think the cameras have been a valuable addition to our fleet and system, and would highly recommend them to anyone.

* All future bus purchases will be outfitted with on board surveillance.



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Text File

File Number: 01481

Introduced: 6/15/2005

Current Status: Filed

Version: 1

Matter Type: Report

..Fiscal Note

n/a

..Title

Report dated June 15, 2005 re: surveillance cameras in Metro facilities.

..Body

At its meeting on 6/14/05, the Transit and Parking Commission unanimously adopted the following motion by Golden/Radomski: That the Transit and Parking Commission send a report to the Common Council indicating the TPC's intent to develop and implement a plan for security and safety in Metro facilities that may involve the use of video surveillance cameras, and the TPC seeks the Council's concurrence with that strategy. The plan is not yet developed but the TPC wants to know whether the Council supports the use of video cameras. Approval of this report will be taken by the TPC as authorization to proceed with consideration and possible implementation of security cameras. (This motion constitutes the report to be sent to the Council.)

COMMON COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes - Draft

June 21, 2005

82. 01481 Report dated June 15, 2005 re: surveillance cameras in Metro facilities.

with the following recommendation(s): The council agrees that the Transit & Parking Commission should develop a security and safety plan and that said plan may propose the use of video surveillance cameras (consistent with the Ad Hoc Committee on Surveillance Cameras recommendations regarding "Electronic Image Recording Guidelines"). While adoption of this motion does not approve the report or any specific application of cameras, the council does not object to cameras per se. The council's action also requires the Transit & Parking Commission to submit the report for reviews and approval by the council prior to implementation, Golden/Bruer: carry.