

## **Summary of Performance Measure Sub Group July 15, 2010**

### **Participants:**

Task Force Members: Chris Eggen, Rob Johnson, Steve Marshall, Tom Rasmussen, Jim Stanton

County Staff: Victor Obeso, Jim Jacobson, Jill Krecklow, John Resha

Other Participants: Bill Bryant (SDOT), Karen Goroski (SCA), Bill Greene (King County DOT), John Howell (Task Force facilitator), Tim Payne (Nelson Nygaard), Norm Schwab (Seattle City Council staff)

This was the third meeting of the Performance Measures sub group. The agenda focused on two topics: 1) presentation of a revised sources and uses document, and 2) discussion of a revised performance measures matrix.

### **Sources and Uses**

Metro presented a revised summary of sources and uses statements that shows major sources of operating revenues and expenses for the entire system. The draft also shows the following data in graphic form:

- Major revenue sources for different types of service provided by Metro (fixed route, Access, Vanpool, and contracted services - Sound Transit and Streetcar)
- Farebox recovery by type of fixed route service (frequent arterial, peak commuter, local and hourly), and revenues and costs by sub area.

It was noted that there is approximately \$76 million in revenue that is not attributable to any one sub area (i.e., reserves, preventative maintenance, federal stimulus, capital transfers, operating grants, etc.). By default, this is used to support services in the west sub area.

There was a question about whether the information in these documents was standard and replicable. Staff responded that this data is derived from the same information used to report to the National Transit Database (NTD), however, these documents show more detailed categories and are rolled up by service type and subarea, not by mode (rail, motorbus, trolleybus) as in the NTD reports. Metro wants to create a “template” that can be used for senior managers, elected decision makers, and the public to monitor Metro performance and assist in making decisions about Metro services. Metro is getting a good start on the development of that template through the work of the task force, but work will continue beyond the task force to create the final products. It was suggested that this work should remain consistent with the NTD reporting that Metro prepares.

Staff presented two different types of draft performance metrics: one for each type of fixed route service (frequent arterial, peak/commuter, hourly, and local), and another for system performance. The draft of the performance measures by service type included the current performance on several metrics and a column for targets for each type of service. No draft targets were proposed. That remains a work in progress.

The committee then looked at the draft performance measures for the entire system. Two proposals were presented, one from Metro staff and another from the City of Seattle. There was quite a bit of similarity between the two. There was agreement that staff would review both and look for ways to merge ideas from both into one performance measure document.

The sub group suggested dividing the performance measures into three categories: 1) measures that would be consistent with the National Transit Database that would allow for comparison with peer agencies across the country, 2) measures that would allow for analysis of performance of individual routes by service type (i.e., comparing peak commuter routes with one another), and 3) measures that would allow for an understanding of how the entire system was doing supporting the policy objectives articulated by the key factors outlined in the Council's guidance to the task force – i.e. land use, social equity and environmental justice, financial sustainability, geographic equity, economic development, productivity and efficiency, and environmental sustainability.

It was suggested by a task force member that a useful metric for judging environmental sustainability might be to measure the percentage of transit miles traveled as a percentage of total miles traveled.

Staff will prepare a revised performance measures template and circulate it to the sub group for review. Then it will be sent to the full task force. It was suggested that the draft performance measure document could be included in the task force report as a work in progress.

Task force members felt that Metro staff are making excellent progress.