



Accessibility Advisory Committee

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

METROACCESS COMPLAINT RESOLUTION REPORT – April 2016

Accessibility Advisory Committee Public Comment: April 4, 2016

Customer #1

Comment/Complaint: The customer stated she was the president of the Sligo Creek Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind. The customer stated her organization objected to WMATA using paratransit funds for Transportation Network Companies (TNC) services. The customer stated supplementing the paratransit operation with TNC services would result in a two-tier service that will only provide advantages to those customers who could afford to own smart phones.

Resolution: The customer was thanked for her comment.

Customer #2

Comment/Complaint: The customer stated she and a member of the AAC spent a day using WMATA's travel training program, and they were very impressed. The customer stated a travel trainer took them on the Metrorail and she was able to learn new accessibility features.

Resolution: The customer was thanked for her commendation.

Customer #3

Comment/Complaint: The customer requested information to complete the MetroAccess eligibility process for his family member.

Resolution: Ms. Cheryl O'Konek, Operations Manager, Office of Eligibility Certification & Outreach, gave the customer a MetroAccess application, explained the eligibility process, and provided her contact information to address any future questions.

MetroAccess Subcommittee Public Comment: April 18, 2016

Customer #1

Comment/Complaint: The customer stated he wished to commend his operators and thank them for their work. The customer inquired on the reason his fare varied for his trips.

Resolution: Ms. Allison Anderson, MetroAccess Operations Manager, stated someone would speak with the customer about this matter. Ms. Jennifer Weber, MTM Quality Assurance, reviewed the trips referenced in the complaint and confirmed the fares were correctly calculated. Ms. Weber identified a requested pick-up time that would provide the customer with a lower MetroAccess fare. Ms. Weber shared these findings and information about the MetroAccess fare policy with the customer on April 20, 2016.

Customer #2

Comment/Complaint: The customer stated she was pleased with the service provided by MetroAccess. The customer requested clarification on the refund process if a companion is scheduled to travel but does not ride on the day of the trip.

Resolution: Ms. Anderson stated fare should be collected for the companion only if the companion completes the trip with a customer. Ms. Weber spoke with the customer immediately following the meeting and the customer advised that this was a question of policy and did not reference a specific service issue encountered.

Customer #3

Comment/Complaint: The customer stated on April 15, 2016 she was picked up first, other passengers were picked up after her, and those passengers were delivered to their destination prior to her being dropped off. The customer stated this was unfair, and she missed her appointment time as a result. The customer stated her home address located in Centreville, VA fell outside the MetroAccess service area on the weekends. The customer requested this be changed so she could travel to church. The customer requested clarification on the subscription trip policy.

Resolution: Ms. Anderson stated an investigation would be performed on the customer's trips, and someone would review the customer's address to determine if it was outside the service area. Ms. Anderson stated customers must demonstrate they consistently travel to a location over a 30-day period in order to qualify for subscription service. An investigation was performed and it was determined the details provided by the customer did not match the April 15, 2015 service date referenced by the customer. The customer had two trips on April 13, 2016 that met the trip description details given. The trips on April 13, 2016 were both routed efficiently, and the customer arrived to her destination prior to the scheduled appointment time for her first trip. The customer's second trip was not

scheduled with an appointment time. It was confirmed the customer's address falls outside the service area on weekends. Ms. Weber contacted the Fairfax Area Mobility and Transportation Committee and confirmed they could assist the customer in locating alternate transportation resources on the weekends. Ms. Weber shared the investigation findings and agency contact information with the customer on April 21, 2016.

AAC Member #1

Comment/Complaint: The AAC member stated the geocoding at her work address was still incorrect. The AAC member stated that due to the inconsistencies with the phone system she was unable to confirm trip times or add funds to her EZ-Pay account. The AAC member stated these phone issues have been occurring more frequently. The AAC member also asked if there was a defined amount of time a customer should spend waiting for another customer while on board the vehicle.

Resolution: Ms. Janice Carpenter, MetroAccess Service Monitor, stated she rode on the MetroAccess vehicle to the AAC member's work address to better identify the directions that were provided to the operators through the mobile data terminal (MDT). Ms. Carpenter found the vehicle provided accurate directions when traveling in one direction; however, the MDT's directions were inaccurate when traveling in the opposite direction towards the address. Ms. Carpenter stated the MDT indicated the vehicle's arrival on the wrong side of the median. Ms. Anderson stated the system's maps were going to be upgraded in the coming months, and that would correct the geocoding issue. Ms. Anderson stated MetroAccess had been experiencing issues with the interactive voice response (IVR) system; the phones were placed into fail over mode when these interruptions occurred; and only basic operations were available at that time. Ms. Anderson stated the outages had not extended over a 24-hour period, but staff was working to resolve the issue as quickly as possible. Ms. Anderson stated there was not a defined amount of time in which a customer should have to wait at a location for another customer. Ms. Anderson explained that there are a number of factors that impact the amount of time the vehicle may dwell at a location.

AAC Member #2

Comment/Complaint: The AAC member stated she made several calls to the Reservations department but was unable to get through until later in the day. The AAC member stated that several reservations agents advised her they could only book trips for the next day. The AAC member stated that this inconvenience made it difficult for her to secure her trips for the week.

Resolution: Ms. Anderson stated she was aware of the Reservation department phone issues on the day mentioned, and staff was working to resolve it as quickly as possible. Ms. Anderson also stated that during the timeframe of a phone disruption, Reservations staff ensure all customers waiting in the phone queue receive assistance.

AAC Member #3

Comment/Complaint: The AAC member stated operators did not decide how much fare was collected, regardless of whether a companion was present or not. The AAC member stated the operators collected the fare amount listed on their manifest. The AAC member stated she attempted to call the Reservation department on April 17, 2016, but she was told the computers were down. The AAC member stated she spent several hours on the phone booking and changing her trips. The AAC member stated she was picked up at the same address as another customer who had a later window. The AAC member stated she waited on the vehicle until the other customer's window began. The AAC member suggested schedulers ride along in the MetroAccess vehicles to have a better understanding of routing in the service area.

Resolution: Ms. Anderson stated operators should contact the Dispatch department if the companion was not present for the trip, and the fare would be adjusted. Ms. Anderson stated there were system issues on April 17, 2016, and staff was working to resolve the problem as quickly as possible. Ms. Anderson stated someone would review the customer's trip and thanked the AAC member for her training suggestion for scheduling. An investigation was performed on the AAC member's trips; the customer provided Ms. Weber with two dates when she had to wait for another customer at a shared pick-up location. The investigation found that both trips were appropriately scheduled; however, for one of the trips, the No Show procedure was not followed by the operator and the assigned dispatcher, which resulted in an extended wait time for the customer. Appropriate management staff was advised for coaching and counseling of personnel involved. Ms. Weber shared the findings with the AAC member on April 21, 2016.

AAC Member #4

Comment/Complaint: The AAC member inquired about phone issues encountered in the MetroAccess Operations Control Center (OCC).

Resolution: Ms. Anderson stated staff was working diligently to resolve the current issues.

Customer #4

Comment/Complaint: The customer stated that she is finally receiving her arrival call on the correct phone number. The customer suggested staff responsible for monitoring trip routes should undergo additional training. The customer stated she had to wait two hours for her ride to arrive, and she was repeatedly told by Dispatch there were no available vehicles in her area. The customer stated she had to catch a cab so she would not miss her birthday party. The customer inquired on the reason dispatch agents contact the operator without checking their whereabouts in the system.

Resolution: Ms. Anderson stated the customer's trip would undergo investigation, and confirm the customer received a refund for her cancelled trip and a late trip credit. An investigation was performed; the operator arrived to the customer's pick-up location outside the window as a result of major traffic delays and the operator becoming lost. Appropriate management staff was advised for coaching and counseling of personnel involved. Ms. Weber shared the findings with the customer on April 21, 2016.

AAC Member #5

Comment/Complaint: The AAC member stated he encountered a problem when calling MetroAccess and selecting option four (4) to review his EZ-Pay balance. The AAC member stated there was not enough time to enter the card number before the caller was disconnected from the system.

Resolution: Ms. Anderson stated staff would review this issue. MetroAccess staff investigated the concern brought forth by the AAC Member and it was determined phone system adjustments were necessary. The timeframe allocated to input debit and credit card numbers in the IVR system was extended on April 22, 2016. Ms. Outlaw shared the findings with the AAC member on April 22, 2016.