



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Draft METRO PARATRANSIT MEDICAID WAIVER FUNDING & POLICY REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE

Monday, March 20, 2017

5:00 PM

30 W. Mifflin Street, Room 1007 (10th floor)

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Staff: Ann Schroeder, Nancy Senn, Crystal Martin

Guests: Doug Hunt

Co-Chair Kaysen called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

Present: 7 - Rebecca Kemble; Tim Gruber; Margaret Bergamini; Ken Golden; Carl D. DuRocher; Mary E. Jacobs and L. Jesse Kaysen

Excused: 1 - James D. Cobb

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Golden moved approval of the minutes; Kemble seconded. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

3. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

There were no public appearances.

4. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals.

5. REPORT OF MEMBERS

Golden mentioned he has a contact who used to work with IRIS. He will be having lunch with the person and see if he is able to get information.

6. [46573](#) Paratransit Choices

Attachments: [Paratransit Choices.pdf](#)

Senn said we've talked about these issues many different ways. The document for this item was in response to the committee wanting a little more material about it. There is also a handout of a spreadsheet with some numbers. If there is additional information people want, staff can supply that. The numbers relate to the material in the narrative which is language from the ADA. Then it shows how we've talked about the choices of particular aspects.

Some things are not present – for example oversize wheelchairs – because looking at equipment purchases, the standard equipment will accommodate oversize devices, so there is no need to discuss this.

Golden asked the cost difference between an accessible ride and a taxi ride. Those are currently lumped together, but MCOs could ask for those to be separated. Martin said there isn't a formula for that. Staff can break down the contracted costs. For directly operated service, there is probably a way to come up with something. Doing exclusively ambulatory rides, it would be necessary to think about how to arrange that number for contingency so capacity isn't a problem.

Golden said basically Metro is receiving the federal share of the cost of an average ride. That should not be confused with the full cost of a ride. If Metro is accepting people who are not eligible for ADA, there is no reason it should be paying the full cost of the ride. Martin said the \$34 ride cost comes from a final annual audit broken down by mode for the cost of paratransit divided by number of rides minus depreciation.

Golden said the origin of this funding arrangement was first negotiated with Dane County many years ago. Marin said Metro still gets reimbursed the sixty percent. Golden said the 40% match is also fair game for the exceptional rides program. Metro's cost is well over \$50 a ride. The reason Metro does this is a pass through situation, that federal money is 60% of the ride. The other 40% of the ride is being covered by the \$3.9 million from Metro. If the numbers document had another line showing "cost of ride" the number would be well over \$50.

Senn said origin to destination service shows the ADA requirements and then curb to curb mode and then door to door mode. She shows what would be required to put each into place. She only listed the number of door to door trips because that is nearly all of Metro's trips for 2016. Trips for last year were almost 280,000 and door to door were 260,000. Metro would have to identify everyone as door to door and ride productivity would be reduced.

Kaysen asked what the magnitude of the ride increase could be. Martin said there is some experience in Wausau. They went from offering door to door to only curb to curb, and there was a 50% decrease. It's a different community, probably not the level of job coach service, but it was a significant decrease.

Gruber asked why increased staff would be necessary. Nancy said you would need staff to do an analysis of each person to see who really needed door to door service. Bergamini said so then you would go off cycle on re-evaluations for service, maybe get your entire ridership in during the first 6 months or year. Senn said I tried to envision how to go about that – tackle that separately, invite people in to say they need it, contract it out. She doesn't yet have a full vision of how that would work. DuRocher said that 50% from Wausau is quite shocking. Does leave attended play into that? Martin said they don't offer that either.

Golden agreed that someone needs to evaluate folks, but why Metro? If the person has no agency attachment, it has to be Metro. But if a person were

hooked in with a system of some sort, that should be the agency's responsibility. Martin said agencies currently have the option for riders to us door to door service, so it might not be appropriate to have them make that assessment. Golden said it would make sense from a liability perspective; it's the agency's responsibility to let Metro know if the person needs door to door service. Martin said it's Metro's responsibility to make that determination. Golden said he's trying to figure other ways. Just build it into the annual certification? That wouldn't necessarily add costs. Senn said those things need to be considered to understand budget implications.

Senn said hours and days of service first shows language from the regulations. There hasn't been any discussion about changes to the paratransit service area. She shows what would be entailed. The current operations offer weekday, weekend and holiday service. Paratransit doesn't come into play for commuter service. Any change in fixed route service means paratransit is modified as well. That would impact costs. An option in trying to cut back expenses would be to make fixed route service changes. Related to MA Waiver funding, \$3.9 M that is the amount that needs to be addressed. Fixed route changes could include reducing or eliminating service on holidays, then weekends, and the associated amounts are shown on the spreadsheet. Fixed route weekend service is \$2.9 million; that doesn't even cover the full \$3.9 million.

Bergamini said at the next TPC there will be a service change public hearing. Just to train TPC, Senn come and present how those changes affect paratransit – service, savings, etc.

Senn said there hasn't been discussion about trip reservation and response time and a lot of other little caveats. There has been discussion about the desire to do more/enhance service. The one item that would have been an enhancement is same day service. Kaysen said another thing is negotiated pick up times. Martin said Metro does a little bit of that now because there is a scheduler position. Martin mentioned adversarial negotiated pick up times which is awful. Senn said discussion of those items would become important if capacity issues are a problem.

Senn said again for fares she showed what is in the regulation and then the discussion about increasing to the maximum allowed. Any change would require a public hearing and input, so there would be time involved. The spreadsheet shows what would happen with an increase of seventy-five cents.

Golden said assuming it could be distinguished who could be left off at the curb and who would need to be taken inside, could there be a premium for that in addition to the fare? Senn said yes that is allowed. There was discussion at an earlier meeting whether there should be a premium fare that covers every premium, some combination, etc. It becomes complex with training drivers. Martin said there was previous discussion of an agency fare just for agencies or overall where agencies and individuals can purchase premium fares. Golden said it has to be at or below the cost of a ride. Martin said staff can keep this in mind; last time it seemed people liked agency fares but not premiums. Senn said premium fares would be a disincentive for agencies to have an agency fare.

Gruber asked if there could be an honor system. Let people inform drivers if they are a PCA or an accompaniment. Metro doesn't charge for either now. Could there be the same concept of using the honor system for door to door? Martin said Metro doesn't currently evaluate for this. It's more of a security blanket for no shows. DuRocher said drivers get it on the manifest; riders don't have to declare. Metro doesn't want drivers making eligibility determinations on the fly. Senn said that whole analysis of whether the person needs a PCA requires intervention from staff.

The agency fare agreements Metro has now expire at the end of this year. There is not the opportunity to renew those. Senn listed some items that might be available in a negotiated agency fare – advance purchase of tickets, leave attended and incident reporting.

Senn said at this time there will be no changes due to capacity issues. She did list things Metro will have to monitor to make sure there aren't capacity constraints. Then going over to subscriptions service, you can see how Metro can put parameters around this service. Metro can do these things as long as there are no capacity constraints. If there are capacity issues, subscription trips are limited to 50%. (In the past, Senn had quoted that limit as 60%.) Sixty-five – 70% of Metro's trips are subscription trips.

Bergamini said since Metro is subcontracting so many rides, in practical and legal terms, how is capacity determined for the purposes of getting toward the legal portion of the subscription vs. non-subscription, particularly if contractors have more capacity. Senn said the FTA asks about denial rate. It used to be percentages, such as a 1% denial rate. Then the federal guideline is there shouldn't be any denial rate. Once a system is having consistent denials, that's a problem. Reporting of that happens through regular audits – triennial reviews or a complaint could trigger that as well. Bergamini said Metro has a little breathing room then because the triennial review was just last year.

7. [46575](#) Existing Agencies with Agreements

Attachments: [Existing Agencies with Agreements.pdf](#)

Senn said the committee has seen a sample of agency agreements including the annual renewal for those. In this packet, there is a little more information. She shared prices, agencies that have agreements, and added the term because they all expire at the end of the year. Also the revenue is on the spreadsheet listed as agency. Trips are an estimate based on number of tickets sold; we don't know the number of rides taken. There are 1300 trips. That's a little bit of a decrease from 2015. Martin said these are standard 2 – 3 page agreements. Metro just needs to reissue those. Metro will probably want them to look like what is negotiated with the MCOs for ease, including automatic renewal clauses.

8. [46576](#) MA Waiver Waiting Lists

Attachments: [MA Waiver Waiting Lists.pdf](#)

Senn said the committee has seen a sample of agency agreements including the annual renewal for those. In this packet, there is a little more information. She shared prices, agencies that have agreements, and added the term because they all expire at the end of the year. Also the revenue is on the spreadsheet listed as agency. Trips are an estimate based on number of tickets sold; we don't know the number of rides taken. There are 1300 trips. That's a little bit of a decrease from 2015. Martin said these are standard 2 – 3 page agreements. Metro just needs to reissue those. Metro will probably want them to look like what is negotiated with the MCOs for ease, including automatic renewal clauses.

9. Family Care RFP for MCOs Update

Senn said on March 10th the RFP for Family Care for the MCOs was cancelled. The intent is to reissue the RFP as two separate requests. She verbally asked about the capitated rate, and then sent written question about the way the RFP reads. It requires the proposers to work with state or county run transportation programs and verify that they've made contact by sharing that written communication. Her question is whether that is only state or county and if it is, can local municipality be added. They were supposed to be issuing written questions and answers on the 16th, but then they cancelled the RFP. Maybe they found a flaw. It would be good news, because they had 4 service areas in the RFP originally, if they put the others in one RFP and put Dane County in the other RFP.

Golden asked Senn to ask in another written question how the two RFPs are organized – by disability, geographic area, etc. Senn said they expect to be re-issuing in a matter of weeks.

Senn verified that the capitation rate would not be released until the proposals are in. They give the numbers in proposals to an actuary and run real capitated rates. Senn said they had resources to develop costs, but there was no data for Dane County. There is a question about how proposers will build cost estimates. They said that is where it becomes competitive. Golden said but they have the CIP data. They have to deal with the fact that Dane County is so much more expensive due to better service.

Bergamini said it's a fiscal problem for them and a political problem. If they're really thinking about the capitation rates in line for services being offered now in this county, this will be a much larger contract. If Dane is averaged in with other counties, that skews the numbers. This is in the middle of a state budget debate and a nationwide health care debate. Martin said what Metro can control is what this committee is doing, Metro service and service level.

Golden asked if IRIS was covered by the original RFP. Senn said it wasn't excluded. The committee hasn't really discussed IRIS yet. Golden will try to find out from his IRIS contact if Metro can have someone from state staff come talk to this group. Martin said the way to deal with agency fares with IRIS is to have an agreement with fiscal agents. Senn said there is also an RFP out for fiscal agent and a whole new computer system for managing that.

10. Other

Martin said the operating budget for Metro is due July 15th. Staff needs to submit an idea of what the budget impact of this will be. So going into next week's meeting, the committee needs to look at the multiple pages of choices and start going through an exercise of each service and what options should be considered. In a worst case scenario, how low Metro is willing to take the service levels to roll back service and make up for lost revenue. Alternatively, ideas for new revenue to make up the shortfall. Staff needs to have some idea of how this affects the budget and the best approach. Staff needs a recommendation to take to the TPC.

Bergamini said she wouldn't be able to answer those questions without a better analysis – like the breakouts for ambulatory vs. non-ambulatory, analysis for different providers. Perhaps staff could work with the finance department to do more financial analysis of the ramifications of different scenarios. How many people are affected? What's the impact of a 5 cent fare increase, etc. More detailed numbers would be helpful.

The group decided to cancel the 3/27 meeting and have a 4/3 meeting instead.

Senn said the question was asked about going into closed session. John Strange said it is inappropriate at this time to do that. Only when the city is right in front of a negotiation would that happen, and it would probably be the TPC. Bergamini suggested at that point, this committee could meet jointly with the TPC

11. ADJOURNMENT

DuRocher moved adjournment; Gruber seconded. The meeting adjourned at 6:11 PM.