Minnesota Regional Transit Board: Records.

Version 3
August 20, 2018

Shreber
L. Prohnik
M. Peterson

ga
fh
le
th
fhe
ek

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: 10/27/87

BOARD OR COMMITTEE P. H. 10/27/87

MEMBER NAME	PRESENT	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE
Chairman	✓					
Doris Caranicas	✓					
Ruth Franklin						
Carole Faricy						
Alison Fuhr	✓					
Rochelle Graves	✓					
George Isaacs						
Paul Joyce	✓					
Edward Kranz	✓					

METRO MOBILITY HEARING SCRIPT

Good evening, I'd like to welcome you to this evenings public hearing.

The Regional Transit Board is holding the hearing to receive comments on the issues of Metro Mobility standards for provider eligibility, selection, performance, compliance and evaluation, the terms of the contracts with the service administrator and related contract management policies and procedures of the board, fare policies, service areas, hours, standards and procedures and similar matters relating to implementation of Metro Mobility service.

Tonight the RTB will receive your written and verbal comments concerning Metro Mobility. Your written testimony will be inserted in the record following your comments during the hearing. If you have written material please gives us a copy for the records and then summarize those comments or add to them during your testimony. The purpose of this public hearing is to receive your comments, not to debate issues.

RTB staff member Linda Ehlers will briefly discuss the doccuments attached to the public hearing notice.

(LINDA EHLERS COMES TO THE MICROPHONE)

Sharon Hardy

No limits please

Now, I'd like to explain the process we'll be using for the public hearing.

We'll begin by taking comments from people who have scheduled time for their presentation.

Next, we'll take testimony from those of you who have signed on the sign-in sheet on a first come, first served basis.

Following those people, we'll take testimony from anyone in the audience who did not schedule time or signed up on the sign-in sheet.

This hearing is being recorded. When you come to the microphone, please state your name, the organization you represent, address and phone number.

The record will remain open until the close of business, Friday, November 27, 1987.

Leading off today's hearing is Sharon Hardy. Ms. Hardy will you please come to the microphone.

(Sharon Hardy)

(NOW CALL THE NAMES FROM THE SCHEDULED TIME SHEET FOR THEIR TESTIMONY)

Write these people for written testimony

7:15--Mary O'Hara Anderson

7:30--Don Fisch

8:00--Rosanne Severance

8:15--Christi Anderson

8:30--Bruce Anderson

~~8:45--Francis Strong~~

Sign In

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

REGISTRATION FORM

DATE: 10/27/87 LOCATION: Henn. Co. Gov't Center

(PLEASE PRINT)

NAME	ADDRESS	REPRESENTING	PHONE	WISH TO TESTIFY?
Ed KRANZ	HASTINGS	RTB		NO
Frances Strong	4556 Lake Dr. #304 Robbinsdale, 55422	self	535-9059	yes
PAMELA SPENCE	814 IGLEHART AVE ST PAUL 55104	TRANSIT ACCESS COALITION		NO
Gary Wingrove	1300 82nd Ave N Brooklyn Park, MN 55444	Med Kab	827 0155	NO
Bill Juergens	4015 STINSON BLVD MPLS	MED KAB	827-0155	NO
CHARLES Mitchell	4521 LARAMIE TR MTKA 55345	Code Publishing Co	935-9261	NO
Jerry Ehlenmann	433 S 7th St Mpls, MN 55415	MCIL & MN State Council	339-1074	YES

Sign-In

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

REGISTRATION FORM

DATE: 10/27/87 LOCATION: Henn. Co. Govt. Center

(PLEASE PRINT)

NAME	ADDRESS	REPRESENTING	PHONE	WISH TO TESTIFY?
Jill Silverman	6221 Shingle Creek Pkwy, Brooklyn C. 55430	Transit Action Coalition	561-4985	MAYBE
Judy Soderberg	4908 Merilee Dr. Mtka. Mn. 55343	Multiple Sclerosis Achievement Center	721-9600	Yes
Janet Kupe	Mayor's Office City Hall	Co-chair, Mpls. Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities	348-3100	no
Lee Perish	2100 Bloomington Apt 307 mpls MN 55406	FIND, INC	333-0907 Voice	YES
Jan Biletta	1130 Lowry A/NE Mpls Mn. 55413	Transit Access Coalition	788-5720	no
John L. Miller	7326 Penn. Richfield 50	Miller Transportation Miller Medical	866-1566	?
Tom Zosel	1821 University Av St. Paul	United Handicapped Federation	645 8922	no
Mary Lundgren	2749 11th Av S mpls 55407	Twin Cities Services, Inc	870-4325	No

beef, swine and dairy exhibitors.

(Metro) or 1-800-362-3667.

like to extend a special thanks to

team placed first in the state in the

Regional Transit Board to hear public comment

(Write them a letter

The Regional Transit Board (RTB) will have two hearings to receive public comment on Metro Mobility.

The first public hearing is scheduled for Oct. 26 in the Metropolitan Council Chambers, 300 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, beginning at 11:30 a.m. The second hearing is scheduled for Oct. 27 at the Hennepin County Government Center. Jury Assembly Room, 300 S. Sixth Street in Minneapolis beginning at 7 p.m.

The hearings are to address the issues of Metro Mobility standards for provider eligibility, selection, performance, compliance and evaluation; the terms of provider contracts; the contract with the service administrator and related contract management policies and procedures of the board; fare policies; service areas, hours standards and procedures; and similar matters relating to implementation of service.

Metro Mobility is a demand-responsive, door-through-door service for individuals who, because of a disability, are unable to use regular route transit services. Metro Mobility is a riders choice system where passengers call any of the19 certified providers, currently under contract with the RTB, to schedule rides.

The public comment period for Metro Mobility will remain open until Nov. 27. Anyone interested in submitting a statement on Metro Mobility may send their written comments to the Regional Transit Board, 270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.

The RTB is responsible for transit planning, policy making and administration in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

For more information on the Metro Mobility issues that will be discussed at the public hearing or if you would like to be placed on the schedule to present testimony, call 292-8789.

~~497-9969~~ 497-3777

Involved in youth athletics? We will print your results and league standings. Just compile the information (typed, please) and send it to us by the 5 p.m. Friday deadline.

HA

Honover City Hall

In Sept 22, 1987 issue of Crow River News

Exhibit A
10/26/87

UNITED HANDICAPPED FEDERATION
and
The Friends of Handicapped People Association

Griggs/Midway Bldg.
Suite 284 South
1821 University Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55104
645-8922 645-3269 TTY

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF THE UNITED HANDICAPPED FEDERATION, SUBMITTED TO THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD AT THE OCTOBER 26, 1987 PUBLIC HEARING

Dear Members of the RTB:

The United Handicapped Federation(UHF) is pleased to have this opportunity to comment on the progress of the Metro Mobility system which has been in place the past 12 months. While consumers have expressed general satisfaction with the service and the availability of rides, a number of issues remain unresolved.

The dramatic increase in demand for rides has created a situation where the RTB, as Metro Mobility's administrative arm, has chosen to propose limits on the use of the system. The RTB in its legislative charter has the duty of expanding this service and should use its resources to the fullest to ensure that the demand for rides can be met, without any further discussion of cutting back in any area. Metro Mobility has begun to come of age because people want to use it. Do not propose any more limitations.

Rather, the RTB should be focusing its attention on issues like the expansion of service hours. UHF recommends that hours be set at 6:00 a.m. - 11:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, for all communities Metro Mobility serves. Fares may differ, depending on the provider, but there should be no restrictions placed on riders in a system which claims to be truly expanded. Consistent hours throughout the service area should be top priority for Metro Mobility.

Another important priority is the need for an integrated computer system between the Metro Mobility Administration Center(MMAC) and all the providers. With no way to chart data on daily ridership and destinations, Metro Mobility will not have the ability to realize any cost savings through more efficient trip planning. Nor will the MMAC have any data on categories of certification to see just who is actually using the system. The computer network must be installed without further delay, and let the MMAC do its job. Until this is done, Metro Mobility will continue to be subject to unnecessary limitations, mostly at the expense of the rider.

Another recommended improvement to the MMAC would be to grant them more enforcement power in handling complaints. For instance, the RTB could set fines for violations which the MMAC could collect. The MMAC could also be given the authority to remove unsafe vehicles from service long enough for the RTB to investigate the complaint. Their office needs to have this kind of authority, free from RTB supervision,to improve its own mechanism for consumer complaints and assure the rider that he/she can get action on a problem.

Continued - - - -

By helping the consumer make informed, educated choices, a comprehensive, updated riders' guide would be an economical means of avoiding complaints altogether. At very least, the guide should offer a complete, detailed breakdown on all vehicles and equipment each provider has available. The MMAC would also benefit from this information in determining fleet size and the availability of back-up vehicles.

Of course, UHF was among the supporters of the legislation which prompted today's hearing. We are in full support of the efforts of the MnDOT Operating Standards Committee, which is currently reviewing applications of the statute. We also support provisions in drivers' training programs which would include sensitivity training.

The RTB should also investigate the following:

- the need for an additional certification category for 3-wheel "Amigo" users
- TTY/TDD service with all providers
- Car seats for children under 5, available by request

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Exhibit B
10/26/87

SISTER KENNY INSTITUTE
a division of Abbott Northwestern Hospital

October 26, 1987

Regional Transit Board
Metro Mobility Public Comment

Mary R. Bensman
Director, Public Relations
Sister Kenny Institute

On behalf of the patients, staff and other clientele of Sister Kenny Institute, I appreciate this opportunity to commend the Regional Transit Board on its excellent delivery of transportation services to people with disabilities through your Metro Mobility service. As you continue to expand the service areas, improve the quality of providers and fight to keep this service affordable, you can be proud of the development of a transportation system for people with disabilities that can be held up as a model for other cities in the country.

Sister Kenny Institute provides inpatient and outpatient services for people who have sustained brain injuries, spinal cord injuries, strokes and other traumatic conditions that restrict major physical functions. As part of our mission at Sister Kenny Institute, we believe that safe, affordable and reliable transportation is necessary for people with disabilities

- to receive essential medical treatment and therapy,
- to obtain competitive employment, and
- to maintain their independence and quality of life.

Comments collected from our patients and staff, both able bodied and those with disabilities, indicate that the level of satisfaction with the service has generally increased over the past year with the expansion of the service. However, we would like to suggest a few areas for improvement.

- **A temporary permit system should be established** for people who are still inpatients in a rehabilitation facilty or for each facility to use for its inpatients. The six to eight week wait for permits does not allow our staff to train patients to use the system and effects discharge planning when we know patients will not be able to get to outpatient therapy or other services until they receive a permit.

-more-

- **Driver training should include an emphasis on maintaining a professional manner and appearance.** Many of our elderly and vulnerable patients report a hesitancy to use the system because of the driver's manner and appearance. The age and expectations of the riders should be considered during hiring and training of drivers.

- **Greater availability of service in the evening hours** would allow people to pursue second shift employment opportunities and increase their options for competitive employment.

- **The daily trip limit is still too restrictive.** Our riders report that the providers are usually booked by 11:00 a.m. even though the reservation period is supposed to be open until 2:30 p.m. It also makes trips that must be made on short notice, such as job interviews, virtually impossible.

Exhibit C

MINNESOTA STATE COUNCIL FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Metro Square, 7th & Robert St., Suite 208 • St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612-296-6785
1-800-652-9747 — Toll-free Statewide
Voice & TTY

TESTIMONY OF THE MINNESOTA STATE COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

CONCERNING ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROVIDER CONTRACTS

FOR METRO MOBILITY

October 26, 1987

Good afternoon. My name is Kurt Strom and I'm the Community Program Specialist for the Minnesota State Council on Disability. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input concerning new contracts with the Metro Mobility Administrative Center (MMAC) and with Metro Mobility providers.

Many of the problems faced by Metro Mobility during the past year are in part due to inadequacies of contract language. I would like, therefore, to suggest improvements - first in the MMAC contract and then in the provider contracts. I also have some comments on contract administration.

MMAC Contract

1. Under Services, there should be a paragraph specifying what support services the MMAC will give providers through the computer system. For example, if the RTB expects the system to allow providers to print much of the information on a trip voucher, that expectation should be clearly stated. In this regard, is the MTC supplying printers to the providers? If so, that fact should be stated.

2. Under the same heading, there should be language empowering the MMAC to require a provider to remove a vehicle from operation for a period of time not to exceed 72 hours when, in the judgement of the MMAC manager, the vehicle poses a hazard to the safety of passengers. During this time the RTB can investigate the situation and determine what additional measures are necessary. Giving the MMAC this authority will enable the prompt action that may be needed to protect passenger safety.

3. Paragraph (c) of this section should be amended to require a monthly newsletter for users. A quarterly newspaper is simply not often enough to keep users abreast of developments affecting Metro Mobility.

4. Paragraph (h) should give more detail about expectations for monitoring provider performance. How often is "periodic"? At a minimum, what percentage of trips should be monitored?

5. Paragraph (l) should set a maximum of 2 weeks for processing applications for Metro Mobility certification.

6. Finally, there should be an additional paragraph in this section requiring the MMAC to develop a list of current provider vehicle specifications and disseminate them to users.

7. Under Hours of Service, paragraph (b) should be amended to clarify that the term "emergency" in this context includes a late vehicle. Also, the MMAC must be given the responsibility to publicize the emergency off-hours phone number. The number is useless if people don't know about it.

8. Under Reports, Records and Documentation, there needs to be a paragraph requiring the MMAC to inform the RTB of any reported incident resulting in personal injury or damage to personal property. This paragraph should specify that the MMAC will so inform the RTB as soon as feasible, but in no event later than 1 working day after receiving notice of the incident.

9. Under the same heading, the RTB should be required to give a monthly report to the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC).

10. Under Equal Employment Opportunity, discrimination on the basis of disability must be prohibited.

11. The heading Termination and Suspension should be retitled Sanctions for Contract Noncompliance. The body of this section should provide for a greater range of penalties, depending on the nature of the contract violation. The current language seems to allow only two penalties - suspension or termination. In some situations, these sanctions may be too severe. Consequently, the RTB may be inclined to impose no penalties at all, even when some sanction is clearly warranted.

Provider Contracts

1. Paragraph (p) under Services should be amended to reflect the fact that Minn. Rules Sections 8840.5100-8840.6300, the operating standards for special transportation services, now apply to all vehicles providing Metro Mobility service. The language of this paragraph should make it very clear that any requirements imposed by these laws and rules must be met even if they go beyond or conflict with contract provisions. Also, a copy of all cited laws and rules should be furnished to the provider.

2. The driver criteria listed under Personnel should be amended to parallel the requirements of the revised statewide operating standards. Since those standards may not be in force by the time this contract takes effect, it is not appropriate to incorporate the requirements by reference. Rather, they must be spelled out. This will of course require close monitoring of preliminary drafts of the operating standards.

3. There must be a section in the contract listing minimum vehicle specifications. These specifications must include provisions on vehicle headroom, securement devices, lift and ramp criteria and required safety equipment. Prior to developing these specifications, the RTB should do research to determine if there is currently on the market any device capable of safely securing an occupied three-wheel wheelchair or scooter. If so, each provider who transports people in wheelchairs must be required to have at least one vehicle with at least one of those securement devices. In developing these specifications, the RTB should monitor the development of similar specifications in the special operating standards so there are no unnecessary differences between them.

4. Each provider must be required to have a Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD). Otherwise, mobility-impaired persons who are hearing impaired will not have the range of choice available to other persons. TDD's are not so expensive as to make this requirement prohibitive.

5. Under Reports, Records and Documentation, the provider must be required to report to the MMAC any accident resulting in injury to a passenger or damage to a passenger's property. The report must be made within 1 day.

6. Under Operating Subsidy, there needs to be a reconsideration of the reimbursement rate. The current structure does not work well; it discourages providers from accepting requests for a lengthy trip, and it favors group trips over individual trips. Additional discussions with providers and users are needed before a specific alternative can be recommended. It seems obvious, however, that a new reimbursement structure must take two factors into accounts: (1) significant differences in trip length; and (2) differences in amount of assistance required.

7. Paragraph (j) of the same section must be amended to allow providers only 2 weeks to request payment for a trip provided. A longer delay is not necessary and only increases the difficulty of monitoring ridership levels and the budget.

8. The section entitled Equal Employment Opportunity must be amended to forbid discrimination on the basis of disability.

9. The heading Termination and Suspension should be retitled Sanctions for Non-Compliance With Contract Provisions. The body of this section must be entirely rewritten to set forth a range of penalties to cover various infractions of contract provisions. The draft of penalty provisions developed by the MMAC is a good step in the right direction, but doesn't go far enough. First of all, it is not clear what types of contract violations are Level I and which are Level II. Second, Level I violations (which presumably would include those creating a hazard) are not penalized to a degree commensurate with their seriousness. Indeed, under some circumstances it would be possible for a provider to have six Level I violations in one year and not even trigger the probation sanction. Clearly much remains to be done.

Contract Administration

1. Since each provider makes a different number of vehicles available for Metro Mobility and no community is serviced by all providers, the RTBmust closely monitor the situation to assure that no community is being consistently underserved because of a lack of available vehicles. If such a problem arises, the RTB must attempt either to renegotiate with existing providers or to find new ones who will provide service in the underserved community.

2. The RTB and the MMAC must revise the current disability codes in the certification numbers to better reflect differences in functional limitations. For example, people who use a scooter rather than a standard-design wheelchair should have a separate code number. Likewise, semi-ambulatory people who cannot climb steps and need a lift or ramp to enter a vehicle should have a distinct code. Providers need accurate information about a user's requirements, and that information is best conveyed by a well designed set of disability codes.

The three-month extension of the current contracts gives the RTB the opportunity to carefully weigh these recommendations and the others it receives and to do additional research to resolve some of the issues raised. The Minnesota State Council on Disability stands ready to provide any assistance necessary to assure that these contracts will safeguard the quality and safety of the Metro Mobility system.

AFL/CIO Spielman

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMITTEE RESOLUTION NO. 1 Ex. D

SUBJECT: METRO MOBILITY SERVICE FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS

WHEREAS: Metro Mobility transportation for the handicapped of the Twin Cities metro area, presently served by private contractors, is not adequately serving a growing portion of the handicapped community, namely those riders who have 3-wheel wheelchairs which have been approved and paid for by Medicare and provide versatile mobility not only within the home, but outside the home, in all public areas accessible to them; and

WHEREAS: The private providers have inadequate equipment, with lifts too short to accomodate the 3-wheel wheelchairs safely and improper tie-down facilities; and

WHEREAS: These private providers have failed to equip their vans with the longer lift platforms which are available, or made any adjustment for adequate tie-down facilities which are also available; and

WHEREAS: Many private providers have filled their fleets with old, make-shift equipment inadequate for the needs of the handicapped. Those providers now are proposing to cut off from Metro Mobility services those handicapped persons who have 3-wheel wheelchairs, claiming they are unsafe, when in reality the providers' equipment is inadequate to give "safe" service; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the 30th Constitutional Convention of the Minnesota AFL-CIO go on record urging that the providers be required to obtain adequate lifts and tie-downs for all riders, including the 3-wheelers, a growing segment of the handicapped community; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Regional Transit Board prohibit cut-off of Metro Mobility service to handicapped riders who have 3-wheel wheelchairs; and, be it finally

RESOLVED: That the Regional Transit Board require each van company having a Metro Mobility contract to have an adequate number of electric or hydraulic lift vans capable of handling the 3-wheel electric wheelchairs to meet the needs of those handicapped riders.

The Committee recommends concurrence.

...Motion passed to adopt Public Service Committee Resolution No. 1.

Ex E

find

FUNCTIONAL INDEPENDENCE TRAINING, INC.

630 CEDAR AVENUE SOUTH #2104, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55454 • 333-0907 (VOICE) • 333-1610 (TDD)

Good Evening My Name is Lee Parish address is 2100 Bloomington - ~~I am Represen~~ I was asked this afternoon to Represent FIND INC - an organization serving the needs of Deaf/Blind Persons.

The needs of the D/B are very special. Many have a various levels of hearing impairment, ~~from~~ ~~or~~ ~~Completely Deaf~~ w/limited Vision and other physical ~~dis~~ disabilities.

there is a ~~special~~ need for special sensitive training to include this group in ~~the~~ the Metro Mobility system. There is also a need for More service providers & the Metro Mobility Office to have TDDS.

Also there is a need to expand the weekend hours. Working for Find entitles occasionally ~~Work~~ that I ~~show up for~~ be at work by ~~at~~ 8AM to Cover a shift. at this I have had use either Cabs or find private transportation.

also More flexibility is needed. In many Case Clients & staff don't know 24 hours in advance about changes in schedules or

needs that occur

Thank you

Ex F

METROPOLITAN CENTER FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING INC

1619 Dayton
Suite 303
St. Paul, MN 55104
612/ 646-8342 Voice or TDD

METRO MOBILITY TESTIMONY
OCTOBER 27, 1987

My name is Mary O'Hara - Anderson; I am Executive Director of the Metropolitan Center for Independent Living. I have both written and oral testimony for you this evening.

First of all, I want to thank the members of the RTB who are trying to resolve the concerns many people have about Metro Mobility. I have personally been encouraged by the efforts of your Executive Director, Mr. Greg Andrews.

Metro Mobility is working very well for some people. It is not working for other people. We must look back to the legislative intent of Metro Mobility and ask ourselves with the scarce dollars why in the month of September were 75% of the rides for persons who are ambulatory and only 25% for persons in wheelchairs. Yes, there has been an increase in ridership but are the people riding really the people Metro Mobility was intended to serve?

Difficult questions must be asked. I don't expect answers tonight, but I do ask you to consider my questions:

Are those being served really in need of this specialized service or is there alternative transportation they could be using?

is the present Metro Mobility application form really screening out those persons who are not eligible for the service? Is the verification form required of doctors, and other qualified persons, not specific enough so that it is likewise not screening out people? Do persons verifying the forms have knowledge about disabilities and sufficient knowledge about the system to assure that those verifications are credible?

How many people on regular route service have to give their name, age, Social Security number, annual income and destination, and then have to arrange their lives around the availablity of vehicles? Non-disabled persons wouldn't submit to this humiliation so why are we supporting a double standard?

Why are Metro Mobility drivers permitted to drive unlimited hours?

Why aren't providers being required to purchase TDD's so that they can provide service to persons with dual disabilities? (I just leased a TDD, installed in my home at the rate of $5.29 a month)

Why aren't the Riders Rights and Responsibilities published yet? These were promised last February and THAC approved them at its regularly scheduled meeting in July.

Why is there still no regular communication with the ridership? Where is the revised Metro Mobility guide?

Why is there no separate number for calling in complaints? The only phone number available is the general number, which is answered "Metro Mobility."

How is it determined what calls are registered as "official" complaints? How is it determined who receives a written response to a complaint and what is contained in that response? Is rider satisfaction with the response really considered?

These questions are difficult, but they do need to be answered before the beginning of the 1988 legislative session. Only then can we deal with the issue that should be first and foremost on all of our agendas - quality transportation for everyone.

I have a few brief comments about the provider system. It has some advantages and could be closer to an ideal system if it truly was capable of provider choice. It's a fantasy to promote the idea that if you are unhappy with one provider that there are others who are able to provide a quality service. The reality is that many people are finding that providers are simply not coming to their area.

I believe there should be an open bidding system for providers. The RTB needs to have criteria for selecting providers who are qualified and capable of providing a quality service - a service that all people would feel safe and comfortable in using.

Ex 6.

METROPOLITAN
CENTER FOR
INDEPENDENT
LIVING INC

1619 Dayton
Suite 303
St. Paul, MN 55104
612/ 646-8342 Voice or TDD

TESTIMONY RTB PROVIDER CONTRACTS
AND RELATED ISSUES
OCTOBER 27, 1987

My name is Mary Jo Nichols. I am the Support Service Coordinator with the Metropolitan Center for Independent Living. The first year of the reorganized Metro Mobility system has shown itself to work well for some people. It could no doubt work well for a greater number of people if there was concerted effort to recognize the on-going problems we have struggled with for the past year and a willingness to make a firm commitment to resolve them now.

Today we want to present to you the problem areas we have identified in the provider contracts, the MMAC contract and the provider guidelines. In addition, we are offering you solutions to those problems.

Re: Provider contracts

1. Problem: There are far too many late trips even though contracts specify pick ups shall be within 10 minutes of scheduled times. Riders cannot rely on the system to meet their time commitments.

   Solution: A computer system would assure efficient routing, scheduling and tracking of providers. It could also allow for filling in the gaps due to cancellations and possibly shorten the 24 hours response time.

2. Problem: Trips that are unreasonably long and bear no direct relationship to the distance traveled.

   Solution: Clarify the intent of the 90 minute trip length provision to those trips which are legitimately lengthy due to legitimate distance.

3. Problem: Absence of a provision for safety policies, procedures and inspections.

   Solution: Add a provision that clearly specifies what is required under current rules and regulations in each of those areas and clearly distinguish between those authorities, and those policies which the RTB has independently adopted and for which the RTB holds providers accountable.

4. Problem: Absence of a complaint mechanism.

   Solution: Add a provision that clearly defines the procedure for handling, reporting, and following-up on user complaints. This must include a timely response and assurance that users are satisfied with the resolution.

5. Problem: Vouchers are not being completed, riders are not always signing for trips and providers are no longer required to indicate requested time and actual time for pickups.

   Solution: Require that vouchers be used for the purpose intended and that riders sign for each trip taken. This is one control measure that could serve to show where trip delays are occurring and individual drivers who are responsible for those delays.

6. Problem: Only three providers have TTY/TDD equipment. Persons who are hearing impaired have no choice of providers. For those who are wheelchair users, the system is totally inaccessible in 50% of the communities presently being served this is a 504 violation.

   Solution: Add a provision requiring that each provider have such equipment and be trained in its use. The monthly phone charge for a business who chooses to lease this equipment is $12.85; at current rates this would amount to $154.20 per year.

7. Problem: No provision for probation and no definition for suspension.

   Solution: Add a provision for probation, clearly define the terms probation and suspension, and clearly state where under what circumstances those sanctions may be implied, what is expected of a provider on probation or suspension and how the RTB intend's to monitor providers.

Re: Provider guidelines:

1. Problem: Absence of measurable and relevant criteria for selecting providers.

   Solution: Adopt such criteria well in advance of contract renewals, and include provider performance standards, provider policies relating to passenger safety, labor and hiring practices, qualifications of driver applicants, existing maintenance and safety record programs, and financial and service related reporting procedures.

2. Problem: Absence of mechanism to scrutinize provider performance and assure a quality system.

   Solution: Adopt quality assurance standards, enforce these standards during the contract year end critically assess provider performance against these standards prior to contract renewal.

Re: Metro Mobility Administrative Center contract:

1. Problem: No clear delineation of authority and responsibility between the RTB and MMAC which results in delaying disciplinary action against providers.

   Solution: The MMAC is responsible for daily operations and administrative service. As such, it must be granted authority to make whatever decisions may be necessary to perform those functions. If more formal approval by the RTB is required, then make provision for that. Delays that place people at risk are inexcusable and not consistent with sound public policy.

2. Problem: No regular communication with certified riders.

   Solution: The present contract provides for a quarterly newsletter that doesn't exist. System and provider changes that have occurred during the past year demand that riders be frequently informed of these changes and in advance of their occurrence.

3. Problem: Lack of a reliable back up system that is capable of responding to riders who experience a late vehicle as well as one that doesn't show.

   Solution: This must include more than a functioning phone number. Not only must a system be in place, but there must be assurance that it is capable of responding to riders and that riders are fully aware of the assistanace that is available during off hours.

Ex H

International Institute on Mental Retardation, Inc.

Oklahoma Benedictine Institute on Mental Retardation
St. Gregory's College
1900 MacArthur Street West
Shawnee, Oklahoma 74801-2499, U.S.A.
Telephone: (405) 273-9870

(Rev.) Paul J. Zahler, O.S.B., Ph.D., President

Central Institute and Information Centre on Mental Retardation
"RUPA" Hindi Prachara Sabha Jn.
Trivandrum, 695014 INDIA
Telephone: 65508

(Rev.) Thomas Felix, C.M.I., M.A., Director

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Mn. 55101

October 8, 1987

Dear Members of the Board,

We, the undersigned, are writing in response to the article in the September 9, 1987 Crow River News inviting comment on use of Metro Mobility Services.

In our program, The St. Michael Foundation Project, we work to increase independence among participants who are mentally handicapped. Several are young adults who are moving toward competitive employment. The job training and often the work is in the Metro area. This is inaccessible to them due to transportation problems. Without transportation many have been left in Day Activity Centers where there is little challenge or preparation for employment; or they stay at home.

Having a carrier or two in this growing area of Roger-St. Michael-Hanover would greatly increase opportunities for these handicapped adults. It would enable them to have job training fit for their needs, to grow in independence and to have the opportunity to be active, contributing members in our society.

Sincerely,

Members of the
St. Michael Foundation
Project - a Model
Program of IIMR, Inc.
101 Central Ave.
St. Michael, Mn. 55376

Sister Kathleen Roehl, cj.
Project Coordinator

Ruth Ende
Ruthie Peterson
Phyllis Greninger
Mary Becker
Dorothy Falender
Janelle Vetsch
Maren Scheuber
Betty Zahler
Glen R Dalenden
Marian Meyer

Oct. 19, 1987

Ex I

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Bldg.
St. Paul, MN 55101

Transit Board,

Per your article published in the 9/22/87 Crow River News, I am writing to comment on the needs of the disabled in our area of St. Michael, Albertville and Hanover. This certain part of Hennepin County does not receive services from Metro Mobility or MTC. I also realize Albertville & St. Michael are in Wright County, but you must realize that the eastern edge of Wright County is more & more becoming part of the metro area. The amount of money that the mentally handicapped & other disabled persons make on the few jobs there are for them, does not even come close to paying for regular transportation.

Please take this area into consideration by providing Metro Mobility Transportation to the Handicapped.

Thank you

Janelle Vetsch
9701-35th St.
St. Michael, MN 55376

ROBERT & JANELLE VETSCH
9701-35TH ST. N.E.
ST. MICHAEL, MN 55376

MINNEAPOLIS MN
PM
19 OCT
1987
B
55404

Ed —
add to
CROW RIVER
TRANS

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Bldg.
St. Paul, MN 55101

Ex J

605 Main St. So.
St. Michael, Mn. 55376
October 14, 1987

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Mn. 55101

Dear Transit Board,

I am writing in regards to your article published in the September 22, 1987 issue of the Crow River News regarding the needs of the disabled in the Rogers and Hanover area.

This part of Hennepin County does not receive services from Metro Mobility or MTC.

The mentally retarded and other handicapped people that live in this area do not have any kind of transportation to get to jobs, etc.

It sure would be nice if these cities could also take advantage of this service.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Betty Zahler

Mrs. Betty Zahler

Ex. K

October 21, 1987

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Re: Metro Mobility

Dear Sir:

My sister is a mentally handicapped individual due to Down Syndrome. She is, however, able to contribute to her own well being at a reduced level. Recently she has acquired employment for a company in St. Louis Park, MN. Since she lives with my parents near Hanover, MN, in Northwestern Hennepin County, it has been very difficult for her to get transportation to and from work.

It is my understanding that Metro Mobility provides transportation for people with difficulties of this nature. The problem for my sister is that Metro Mobility does not provide services to Hanover. Since my tax dollars are used in part for these services, I suggest that the Metro Mobility service area be expanded to include all of Hennepin County and not just the immediate Metro Area.

Hopefully this request will be given due consideration. I would appreciate information in written form as to the action taking place to solve a problem that affects many people in Hennepin County. Thank You.

Very Truly Yours,

Roger N. Bechtold

Roger N. Bechtold

cc. St. Senator Clarence Purfeerst
St. Rep. Henry Kalif

Ex L

George B. Stubbs
8665 10th St NE
St. Michael, Minnesota
55376

October 1st, 1987

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Transit Board,

As per your article published in the 9/22/87 edition of the Crow River News North Addition, I would like the following information entered into the records for your consideration.

First a little background: I am a member of the American Legion Post 567 of St. Michael, Minnesota and started to look into the aide and assistance that we as a Post could provide the handicapped children in our area. This area includes the cities of Albertville, Hanover, Rogers, and St. Michael. As a starter we provided two grants of $500.00 each to graduating handicapped seniors so that they could get a start in becomming productive citizens. One of these came to the Post seeking assistance in getting a job of some kind, for which a state agency would provide a job coach and help pay the employer to get the individual started. We as a Post tried to assist but without any luck.

This individual came back to us with a thank you speech in mid September and informed us that she had gotten a job at North Star Printing a RISE Site location. She had been able to work out transportation to General Mills with a local individual which worked out fine to start with. She received a ride on Metro Mobility from there to work and back to General Mills. The only thing wrong was that there was about an hour and a half that she had to wait after work in the lobby at General Mills with nothing to do, whereupon she would drop off to sleep. Her sleeping in the lobby caused the officials to put a stop to this possibility for a ride to work.

She therefore had to stop work, about the first of September, until she could find some other means to get to work. Her job was safe, but she was unable to obtain any assistance in getting to work thru the normal agencies, because she lived in the northwest corner of Hennepin County in Hanover where there was no arranged MTC bus, Metro Mobility or Kare Cab routes.

At the Post meeting I offered to provide transportation into Long Lake, Minnesota where I work, if she could arrange transportation from there. She was able to get back to work on September 21st, after about three weeks off. I have no problem with these arrangements, but there has to be some other arrangements for the times when I go on vacation or for the times which I have to work very late hours, which my job sometimes requires.

I do not know how thinly populated the handicapped are in this area of Hennepin County, but feel that the county should look at the total population of handicapped and make every effort possible to provide the WHOLE county with the assistance that is needed. The persons who seek this help wish to be useful citizens and do not wish to be a total drain on the community. When we help them to be useful citizens we are helping ourselves in more ways then can be added up.

I do not know the area that is served by the Regional Transit Board, but if it goes beyoud the city limits of Minneapolis and Saint Paul, then the whole region should be served not just those in the Metro area where MTC, Metro Mobility handles the major problems in transportation of the handicapped.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely;

George B. Stubbs

cc. Bob McEachern, Tad Jude, and Dale Clauznitzer

Ex M

Sept. 30, 1987
10827 Rosedale Ave. N.
Loretto, Mn. 55357

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Bldg.
St. Paul, Mn. 55101

Dear Transit Board,

As per your article published in the 9/22/87 Crow River News- I am writing to comment on the needs of the disabled in our area - Hanover and St. Michael, Mn.

This part of Hennepin County does not receive services from Metro Mobility or MTC.

The mental retarded and other handicapped do not have any kind of transportation to commute to jobs, workshops and other day programs. We have no workshops or vocational on the job training programs in our area. The closest is RISE & Opportunity Workshop and both are 25-29 miles from Hanover.

The Assn. for Retarded Citizens sets up principals that should guide public policy toward families of children with developmental disabilities...and the action of states and agencies when they become involved with families. Kindly see ARC NEWS vol. 36, No. 4 - Aug/Sept 1987 issue-page 2 on this statement.

In the case of our daughter - she has a job/ on the job training program in Minneapolis, but no transportation. Metro Mobility issued her certification, but will not pick her up from her home in Hanover.

If she is lucky enough to find private transportation to Mpls. How will she get to work when this private trans. has sick leave, vacation time or an emergency? Will RTB and Metro Mobility provide a back up transportation? We need this guarantee so she can continue working.

Then what about the 50 or more retarded children/adults/elderly living in the Hanover/St. Michael area that have to sit at home with out a program because of no transportation.

Kindly take this area into consideration.

Sincerely

Elaine Bechtold

Elaine Bechtold
Wilfred Bechtold

CC: Henn. ARC
Minn. ARC
Rep. D. Clausnitzer
Sen. Tad Jude

Ex N

Sept. 29, 1987
10777 Rosedale Ave. N.
Loretto, Mn. 55357

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minn. 55101

Dear Transit Board,

As per your article published in the 9/22/87 Crow River News I am writing to comment on the needs of the disabled in our area - Hanover and St. Michael.

This part of Hennepin County does not receive services from Metro Mobility or MTC.

The mental retarded and other handicapped do not have any kind of transportation to commute to jobs, workshops and other day programs.

The Assn. of Retarded Citizens sets up principals that should guide public policy toward families of children with developmental disabilities...and the action of states and agencies when they become involved with families. Kindly see ARC NEWS Vol. 36-No. 4 - Aug/Sept 1987 issue page 2 on this statement.

Please take this area into consideration by providing Metro Mobility transportation in this part of Hennepin County.

Thank you,

Mr. & Mrs. Clyde Bechtold

Mr & Mrs. Clyde Bechtold

Ex O

Oct 12, 1987
Rogers, Mn 55374

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St Paul, Mn 55101

Dear Transit Board,

As per your article published in the Crow River News I am writing to comment on the needs of the disabled in our area, Hanover, Rogers, St Michael, Corcoran.

We do not receive services from Metro Mobility or MTC Nothing at all

The mental retarded, other handicapped do not have any transportation to jobs workshops and other programs.

Please take this area into consideration by providing Metro Mobility transportation in this part of Hennepin County

Thank you
Sincerely
Rubie Peterson
23495 Co Rd 10
Rogers Mn

Ex P.

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Re: Testimony for Public Hearing on Metro Mobility
October 27, 1987

I would like to know why Metro Mobility doesn't pick up before 8:00 a.m. on weekends because of the fact that every other weekend I have to be to work at 8:00 a.m. and I'd like to get the rule changed. If Metro Mobility wont change the rule, they can pay me $12 an hour for every half or hour I am late. I've been riding with Ebenezer Society out to my job and back home and on weekends, when I ride with them, they were picking me up at 7:30 a.m. but then Metro Mobility called Ebenzer and told them they would not be reimbursed for the rides on the weekends when they picked me up before 8:00 a.m.

I have a complaint against both Ebenezer and Metro Mobility. I have a standing order to be picked up on Mondays at 7:00 a.m. On October 5 I was awakened by a call at 5:55 a.m. and was told I would be picked up at 6:30 instead of 7:00 a.m, which did not allow time for showering and personal grooming. I feel that since I have an answering machine turned on 24 hours a day, if Metro Mobility requires a day's advance notice, the least they could do is give 10 hours notice of a change in pickup time.

Sincerely,

Don Fisch

Don Fisch
630 Cedar Avenue South
Apt. 2007
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55454

DF/mf

Ex Q

UNITED HANDICAPPED FEDERATION
and
The Friends of Handicapped People Association

Griggs/Midway Bldg.
Suite 284 South
1821 University Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55104
645-8922 645-3269 TTY

November 24, 1987

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square
St. Paul, MN 55101

Dear Members of the RTB:

Submitted herewith are addenda to our comments of October 26, 1987, from the Regional Transit Board Public Hearings on Metro Mobility performance and evaluation.

In addition to our suggestions and recommendations to improve Metro Mobility operation, we at the United Handicapped Federation also want to point out the following:

-The need for a monthly newsletter for the riders. Current news of changes in providers' policies or service areas are crucial to having an informed ridership which can make educated consumer choices. Riders should not be expected to wait three months to learn of new developments in the system.

-The need for a clearer definition of "periodic" monitoring of service delivery. The RTB and the Metro Mobility Administrative Center (MMAC) must agree on a reasonable percentage of trips that can be observed.

-The telephone number for emergency service should be readily available to the rider and the MMAC be responsible for calling out a late vehicle, if necessary.

-The mechanism for reporting complaints and safety violations, as we had remarked in our earlier testimony, needs to be better defined. We recommend that any incident which results in personal injury or damage to property be reported to the RTB by the MMAC within one full working day.

-All provider contracts must be changed to reflect the statutory requirements of the new operating standards for special transportation services as soon as those requirements take effect.

Continued - - - -

-The need to reconsider how the formula for operating subsidy works; review the structure for reimbursement of providers.

-Sanctions against providers should be established to deal with contract violations, the level of which can be set relative to the seriousness of the reported infraction. A comprehensive set of checks and balances needs to be put in place in order to hold the provider fully accountable.

-A possible revision of user certification codes may be in order at this time. We had mentioned the issue of "Amigo" certification in our earlier statement, but it appears that other categories also need to be revised. A clearer, more comprehensive set of disability codes needs to be drafted for use in all future contracts with providers.

As always, the United Handicapped Federation is willing to work closely with the RTB and the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC) in helping to design the best and most responsive system of delivering Metro Mobility service. We would also like to request at this time that a two-week maximum limit be placed on the rider certification process, as not to deter prospective riders from applying. Plus, we ask that special attention to non-discrimination on the basis of disability be included whereever Equal Employment Opportunity appears in contract language.

We would welcome any feedback you or your staff may have on these issues.

Sincerely,

Steve Bertrand

Steve Bertrand, Co-Chair
Task Force on Accessible Transit

SB/db