



600 Fifth Street NW
Washington, DC 20001
202-962-6060

Accessibility Advisory Committee

METROACCESS COMPLAINT RESOLUTION REPORT – SEPTEMBER 2012

Accessibility Advisory Committee Public Comment: September 4, 2012

No public comment brought forth regarding MetroAccess Service.

MetroAccess Subcommittee Public Comment: September 17, 2012

Customer #1

Comment/Complaint: The customer recommended MetroAccess vehicles post a list of consumer rights which would include the right of a customer to refuse to wear the posey belt. The customer stated concern for fellow customers when the route is delayed due to her refusal to wear the posey belt and the communication process that follows between the driver and dispatch.

Resolution: Mr. Christian Kent, Assistant General Manager, Access Services addressed the customer and communicated MetroAccess Operators are to honor her request not to wear a posey belt if she has her own safety belt and it meets applicable MetroAccess safety standards for transport. Mr. Leland Petersen, MetroAccess Project Manager, MV Transportation also informed the customer that all MetroAccess Operators were in the process of wheelchair securement re-certification and that this re-certification includes review of the posey belt policy. Cheryl O'Konek, Operations Manager, Office of Eligibility Certification stated she would consult with IT and explore potential work around solutions to note client records should they choose to refuse the posey belt prior to transport.

Customer #2

Comment/Complaint: The customer commented she has had no problems with her MetroAccess service and appreciates the program.

Resolution: The MetroAccess Subcommittee thanked the customer for her comment.

Customer #3

Comment/Complaint: The customer reported on her August 31st morning trip the MetroAccess Operator failed to provide door-to-door service. The customer stated when she requested that the air conditioning be turned on, the operator turned the vents on her head. The customer alleged that the DriveCam was activated to record the exchange. The customer reported that her trip to Metro

headquarters appeared circuitous. The customer also asked to reverse the decision that removed customer phone numbers from the vehicle manifest.

Resolution: Ms. Allison Anderson, Customer Relations Director, MV Transportation conducted an investigation of the August 31st morning trip. She inquired about the alleged DriveCam footage and found none existed for this incident. The operator in question no longer works for MetroAccess. MetroAccess does not condone rude or unprofessional behavior on the part of personnel. A review of the pick-up location reported found it to be door-to-door serviceable under normal circumstances. Mr. Petersen apologized to the customer for the incident and informed her that Road Supervisors conduct door-to-door observations. He also informed the customer that the vehicle operator is responsible for maintaining a comfortable vehicle temperature for customers aboard.

Ms. Anderson reviewed the routing of the customer's trip. She did find the routing was circuitous. The dispatch agent who managed the routing at this time was identified and corrective action taken in regards to the routing scenario.

Mr. Dan O'Reilly, Director, Office of MetroAccess Services addressed the customer and informed her that the customer contact policy would not be modified from current parameters.

Ms. Anderson informed the customer of the investigation findings. She also reiterated the answers to operation policy questions brought forth during the meeting.

Customer #4

Comment/Complaint: The customer stated she enjoyed the ride in the MV1 MetroAccess vehicle. The customer requested to know the policy regarding trip movement. The customer reported that on her trip to the meeting, the vehicle she was aboard was re-routed to pick up another customer.

Resolution: Ms. Anderson investigated the customer report and concluded the trip insertion placed on the customer's route was the only viable solution to execute a timely pick-up for the other customer. The customer had an appointment time request of 4:00pm and arrived at the Jackson Graham Building at 3:58pm. Neither passengers' travel time was excessive based upon the comparable fixed route equivalent, however it was concluded that both were circuitous. Ms. Anderson contacted the customer to communicate the investigation findings.

Customer #5

Comment/Complaint: The customer commended the MetroAccess operators who have provided transportation to her. The customer stated she has overheard dispatchers being rude to operators. The customer reported she has been incorrectly No Showed. The customer wants to know why she gives a contact number to be reached at these locations but then no one looks for her. The customer feels MetroAccess is a wonderful service for those who need it.

Resolution: Upon investigation of the customer report, Ms. Anderson found both incidents had previously been reported to MetroAccess Customer Relations. Records indicate the complaints were researched and the customer was contacted

Ms. Anderson contacted the customer to review the investigation findings for these two cases and along with re-iterating the no show policy and procedure.

Customer #6

Comment/Complaint: The customer inquired as to how a person can have a subscription trip but have their trip moved to a different vehicle during the day of travel. The customer wanted clarification on how the MetroAccess fare is calculated. The customer also wanted to know how she could obtain her trip history. The customer questioned the 5 minute vehicle boarding policy for customers.

Resolution: Ms. Anderson contacted the customer to explain the trip movement process and why it occurs. Ms. Anderson also provided clarification on the MetroAccess fare policy and how fares are calculated. Ms. Anderson informed the customer that she is able to obtain her trip history by making a request in writing to the Office of Eligibility Certification. Ms. Anderson explained the No Show policy and procedure. A review of the customer's trip performance was performed and it was found that her on time performance did not meet the standard. Ms. Anderson requested the MetroAccess Scheduling Manager review the routing of the customer's subscription trips and these trips will be monitored in the short term.