



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

## **METROACCESS COMPLAINT RESOLUTION REPORT – AUGUST 2012**

### **Accessibility Advisory Committee Public Comment: August 6, 2012**

#### **Customer #1**

**Comment/Complaint:** The customer commented she had yet to receive a response from written correspondence forwarded to the Office of MetroAccess Service regarding service concerns and policy questions.

**Resolution:** A written response has been sent to the customer.

### **MetroAccess Subcommittee Public Comment: August 20, 2012**

#### **Customer #1**

**Comment/Complaint:** The customer commended the MetroAccess program. She stated she had filed a complaint some time ago reporting a service incident. The customer stated the complaint was investigated and she received complaint resolution information via a voicemail message left on her contact phone number. However, the customer was not in agreement with the findings and reports the Customer Relations Investigator left an incorrect contact phone number and she was not able to inquire further on the matter.

**Resolution:** Ms. Elizabeth Godfrey, MV Transportation, Customer Service Trainer spoke with the customer at the conclusion of the meeting to obtain more information concerning the customer's comment. Ms. Godfrey reviewed the original complaint, contacted the customer via phone, and addressed the customer's inquiry. Additionally, Ms. Godfrey informed the customer that the Customer Relations Investigator assigned to her complaint did provide the correct contact phone number. However, a short time later it was found that the Investigator's phone extension was experiencing technical difficulties that resulted in a disruption of in-bound calls.

#### **Customer #2**

**Comment/Complaint:** The customer inquired about MetroAccess policy pertaining to weekend travel. The customer reported she was unable to travel to certain locations that she had been able to access in the past. Additionally, the

customer reported that she has used posey belts that were not clean and left stains on her clothing.

**Resolution:** Mr. Omari June, Operations Manager – Operations Control Center, Office of MetroAccess, addressed the customer and explained the MetroAccess policy regarding the service area and “grandfathering”. He also informed the customer that documented information regarding this policy was located in the MetroAccess Customer Service Guide. Ms. Allison Anderson, Customer Relations Director, MV Transportation contacted the customer via phone and re-iterated the information provided on the service area. Ms. Anderson also advised the customer that based upon her report, the procedures on posey belt cleaning and vehicle storage were under review and corrective action would be taken if found necessary. The customer expressed appreciation for the follow-up.

### **Customer #3**

**Comment/Complaint:** The customer reported her mother’s EZ-Pay balance is off by 10 to 20 cents based upon the information she received from a reservation agent when she booked trips for her mother recently. The customer also reported an incident on August 20, 2012 where the operator refused to stop at the Jackson Graham Building when she requested to speak with a supervisor. Lastly, the customer reported she was wrongly given a No Show for a trip she scheduled on August 3, 2012.

**Resolution:** Ms. Anderson conducted a review of the customer’s EZ-Pay account and found her balance to be correct. Upon review of the reservation call placed by the customer, the reservation agent did initially communicate a fare of \$4.20 instead of the correct fare charged of \$4.10. Upon question from the customer, the agent corrected herself and communicated the correct fare charged. Ms. Anderson reviewed her findings with the customer and assured her that the correct fare had been charged for the scheduled trips and communicated her current balance.

Ms. Anderson informed the customer that should an emergency or safety issue take place on a MetroAccess vehicle and the customer requests the involvement of a MetroAccess Road Supervisor the operator is to stop the vehicle in a safe location and inform dispatch of the situation. Dispatch will then provide the operator with further instructions.

Ms. Anderson conducted a review of the No Show designation applied to the August 3<sup>rd</sup> reported trip. Ms. Anderson found the No Show designation to be valid. Upon review of collected data, the MetroAccess vehicle was on site for the

pick-up, however, a recorded phone call conversation reveals the customer was not at the outermost exterior door and present for boarding at the start of her scheduled pick up window. Data shows the applicable No Show procedure was conducted and the vehicle departed the pickup location upon authorization from dispatch after the five minute waiting period had expired. The customer was informed of the investigation findings.

#### **Customer #4**

**Comment/Complaint:** The customer asked the Office of MetroAccess Service to consider his request for pick-up at his home location even though the address lies outside of the MetroAccess service area. The customer communicated the pick-up location he had been using poses a safety hazard to him.

**Resolution:** Mr. Frank Roth, Director, Office of Eligibility Certification and Outreach, addressed the customer and communicated that MetroAccess service cannot be provided outside of the designated service area. Mr. Roth stated his office would be more than happy to examine the location in question and assist in identifying a safe pick-up point within the MetroAccess service area that would be convenient to the customer's home address. Mr. Roth followed up with the customer and provided this information.

#### **Customer #5**

**Comment/Complaint:** The customer commended Ms. Anderson on assisting him with the service issue raised during Public Comment at the previous MetroAccess Subcommittee Meeting July 2012.

**Resolution:** Ms. Anderson thanked the customer for his commendation.