

1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000 San Diego, CA 92101-7490 (619) 231-1466 • FAX (619) 234-3407

# Agenda Item No. <u>45</u>

## MEETING OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

October 24, 2013

SUBJECT:

YEAR END OPERATIONS REPORT (WAYNE TERRY, BILL SPRAUL AND DENIS DESMOND)

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Board of Directors receive a report for information.

Budget Impact

None.

**DISCUSSION:** 

MTS Board Policy No. 42 establishes a process for evaluating existing transit services to achieve the objective of developing a customer-focused, competitive, integrated, and sustainable system. Additionally, federal Title VI guidance requires that certain performance measures be evaluated and reported to the Board periodically. The analyses, included in the attachment to this report, show trends for the current fiscal year and help to track performance throughout the year.

Staff from the Planning Department and the Rail and Bus Operating Divisions will provide a summary of fiscal year 2013 service performance.

Paul C. Jablonski Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Sharon Cooney, 619.557.4513, sharon.cooney@sdmts.com

Attachment: A. Service Performance Monitoring Report



1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000, San Diego, CA 92101-7490 • (619) 231-1466 • www.sd**mts**.com

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) is a California public agency comprised of San Diego Transit Corp., San Diego Trolley, Inc., San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway Company (nonprofit public benefit corporations), and San Diego Vintage Trolley, Inc., a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation, in cooperation with Chula Vista Transit. MTS is the taxicab administrator for seven cities. MTS member agencies include the cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, San Diego, Santee, and the County of San Diego.

## Page 1 of 9

#### San Diego Metropolitan Transit System POLICY 42 PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT PERIOD: JULY 2012 - JUNE 2013

## **OBJECTIVE | Develop a Customer-Focused and Competitive System**

The following measures of productivity and service quality are used to ensure that services are focused on providing competitive and attractive transportation that meets our customers' needs.

Total Passengers							
	EX 0044			# Chg.	# Chg.	% Chg.	% Chg.
Route Categories	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY11-	FY12-	FY11-	FY12-
				FY12	FY13	FY12	FY13
Premium Express	300,330	310,455	308,912	10,125	(1,543)	3.4%	-0.5%
Express	2,146,895	2,329,041	2,366,370	182,146	37,329	8.5%	1.6%
Light Rail	31,612,877	32,674,616	29,699,366	1,061,739	(2,975,250)	3.4%	-9.1%
Rapid (SuperLoop)	-	-	1,557,568	-	1,557,568	-	-
Urban Frequent	36,672,454	38,311,741	38,457,861	1,639,287	146,120	4.5%	0.4%
Urban Standard	12,791,167	13,647,404	11,984,646	856,237	(1,662,758)	6.7%	-12.2%
Circulator	807,117	841,764	773,698	34,647	(68,066)	4.3%	-8.1%
Rural	37,828	41,819	45,180	3,991	3,361	10.6%	8.0%
Demand-Responsive	358,646	355,300	379,415	(3,346)	24,115	-0.9%	6.8%
System Total Passengers	84,727,314	88,512,140	85,573,016	3,784,826	(2,939,124)	4.5%	-3.3%
Fixed-Route Bus Ridership	52,755,791	55,482,224	55,494,235	2,726,433	12,011	5.2%	0.02%

<u>NOTES</u>: Fixed-route bus ridership is consistent for FY13 compared to FY12. Overall, MTS system ridership has decreased -3%, primarily due to lower Trolley ridership. There was wet weather through November and December, and a sharp drop in gasoline prices in late 2012.

The decline that appears in the Trolley ridership data is primarily attributed to the program that estimates the number of passengers. The estimation methodology relies on the number of one-way tickets sold, which dropped significantly when Day Passes replaced transfers. Staff believes that the quantity of one-way tickets sold is no longer sufficient to provide an accurate basis for ridership estimation. Aside from the disconnect with bus ridership, Trolley fare revenues are up slightly, indicating that the drop in passengers is not accurate. This estimation issue is reflected in several of the ridership-related performance metrics.

MTS is transitioning Trolley ridership data from SANDAG's estimation program to Automatic Passenger Counters (APCs), which will increase accuracy and provide a clearer picture of Trolley ridership trends. The preliminary data from the APC program shows that Trolley ridership is higher overall than indicated by the estimation program, and that the trends are much closer to those of the bus system.

Average Weekday Passengers								
Route Categories	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	# Chg. FY11- FY12	# Chg. FY12- FY13	% Chg. FY11- FY12	% Chg. FY12- FY13	
Premium Express	1,181	1,221	1,214	40	(7)	3.4%	-0.6%	
Express	7,760	8,422	8,631	662	209	8.5%	2.5%	
Light Rail	94,217	97,401	87,955	3,184	(9,446)	3.4%	-9.7%	
Rapid (SuperLoop)	-	-	4,862	-	-	-	-	
Urban Frequent	120,416	125,394	125,383	4,978	(11)	4.1%	0.0%	
Urban Standard	43,505	46,467	41,228	2,962	(5,239)	6.8%	-11.3%	
Circulator	3,435	3,582	2,966	147	(616)	4.3%	-17.2%	
Rural	209	265	227	56	(38)	26.8%	-14.3%	
Demand-Responsive	1,334	1,302	1,367	(32)	65	-2.4%	5.0%	
System Avg. Wkdy. Pass.	272,057	284,054	273,833	11,997	(10,221)	4.4%	-3.6%	
FR Bus Avg. Wkdy. Pass.	176,506	185,351	184,511	8,845	(840)	5.0%	-0.5%	

<u>NOTES</u>: The total average weekday passenger statistics show how many passengers ride MTS on a typical weekday. For FY13, there is a -3.6% decrease in systemwide average weekday riders, a loss of -10,221 passengers per average weekday. Most of the decrease is a result of a decrease of -9,446 Trolley passengers per average weekday (-9.7%). Fixed-route bus ridership had a slight decline of -0.5% (840 passengers per average weekday). The largest fixed-route percentage increase was the Express category with a 2.5% increase in average weekday riders (209 passengers per average weekday).

#### Passengers Per Revenue Hour

Route Categories	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	% Chg. FY11- FY12	% Chg. FY12- FY13
Premium Express	22.4	21.9	21.3	-2.2%	-2.7%
Express	31.5	33.9	32.2	7.6%	-5.0%
Light Rail	181.9	187.7	160.6	3.2%	-14.4%
Rapid (SuperLoop)	-	-	34.3	-	-
Urban Frequent	36.2	37.5	37.0	3.6%	-1.3%
Urban Standard	28.0	29.6	28.0	5.7%	-5.4%
Circulator	15.9	16.5	15.4	3.8%	-6.7%
Rural	8.7	9.4	9.4	8.5%	0.0%
Demand-Responsive	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0%	0.0%
System Riders Per Rev. Hour	43.4	45.0	42.3	3.7%	-6.0%
FR Bus Riders Per Rev. Hour	32.9	34.3	33.5	4.3%	-2.3%

<u>NOTES</u>: MTS operated 3% more revenue hours in FY13 than the same period in FY12. The 'passengers per revenue hour' metric shows how the revenue hours (in-service hours plus layover hours) that were added or removed relate to ridership increases or decreases. Increasing riders per revenue hour would indicate that the system is more efficient—carrying more passengers with the same number of buses, for example. For FY13, all MTS services carried 42.3 passengers per revenue hour, a decrease of -6.0% (-2.7 riders per revenue hour). The change in riders per revenue hour figure on MTS' fixed-route bus services was a more moderate decrease of -2.3%. For FY13, Trolley passengers per revenue hour.

#### Passengers Per In-Service Hour

The 'passengers per in-service hour' measure is related to the above 'passengers per revenue hour,' but shows how many passengers are carried while the vehicle is in-service picking up passengers, <u>excluding</u> layover time. Analyzing this figure helps MTS to understand how effective it is at providing the right level of service, instead of how effective MTS is at grouping trips and breaks together for a vehicle to operate (revenue hours).

				% Chg.	% Chg.
Route Categories	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY11-	FY12-
				FY12	FY13
Premium Express	24.7	24.0	23.5	-2.8%	-2.1%
Express	38.3	41.0	40.4	7.0%	-1.5%
Light Rail	215.1	222.4	209.2	3.4%	-5.9%
Rapid (SuperLoop)	-	-	46.8	-	-
Urban Frequent	44.7	45.7	45.1	2.2%	-1.3%
Urban Standard	37.4	39.5	37.9	5.6%	-4.1%
Circulator	25.0	25.7	22.3	2.8%	-13.2%
Rural	7.9	10.1	8.5	27.8%	-15.8%
Demand-Responsive	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
System Riders/In-Svc. Hour	57.7	60.3	56.9	4.5%	-5.6%
FR Bus Riders Per In-Svc. Hour	41.3	42.7	42.0	3.4%	-1.6%

<u>NOTES</u>: Compared FY12, MTS' system-wide figure decreased -3.4 passengers per in-service hour to 56.9 (-5.6%). For FY13, fixed-route bus passengers per in-service hour was nearly flat at 42.0 passengers per in-service hour.

#### **On-Time Performance**

On-time performance is defined as departing within 5 minutes of the scheduled time. It is measured by service change period in order to show the results of scheduling changes. MTS' goal for on-time performance is 85% for Urban Frequent bus routes, and 90% for Trolley and all other bus route categories.

Bouto Cotogorios	Service Change						
Route Categories	Jan. 2012	June 2012	Sept. 2012	Jan. 2013	June 2013*	GOAL	
Premium Express	98.1%	99.5%	92.1%	98.4%	98.8%	90.0%	
Express	80.7%	73.4%	86.1%	81.0%	81.8%	90.0%	
Light Rail	89.1%	86.4%	88.3%	94.0%	95.2%	90.0%	
Rapid (SuperLoop)	-	95.2%	95.2%	91.2%	90.0%	85.0%	
Urban Frequent	83.6%	81.7%	82.3%	83.6%	79.7%	85.0%	
Urban Standard	86.0%	80.7%	84.9%	84.9%	83.5%	90.0%	
Circulator	86.5%	95.5%	96.1%	87.4%	91.6%	90.0%	
Rural	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Demand-Responsive	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
System On-Time Performance	86.0%	83.4%	86.0%	85.6%	84.2%		

<u>NOTES</u>: Overall, on-time performance has remained around 85%. Following the January 2013 service change, five route categories have met their goal while two categories did not. Each route is continually evaluated to determine if performance below the target is a result of issues that MTS controls, such as driver performance or scheduling, or situations outside MTS' direct control, such as construction, traffic congestion, and passenger issues. Trolley on-time performance has been impacted by Trolley Renewal construction activities and is expected to increase as the project wraps up next year. Performance of Urban Frequent bus routes, which by far carry the greatest number of passengers, is heavily impacted by construction, stop signs and stop lights, and traffic as they typically go through high density corridors. (\*June 2013: June - August data available at time report created. Complete figures will be reported in FY 14, Quarter 2 Performance Monitoring Report.)

#### Preventable Accidents Per 100,000 Miles

Operator	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	1.58	1.47	1.42
MTS Contract Services	0.96	0.89	1.13
MTS Trolley	0.00	0.04	0.04

<u>NOTES</u>: MTS Directly-Operated Bus preventable accidents are slightly down for FY13 compared to FY12. MTS Contract Services preventable accidents are up primarily due to a revision in contract service's accident classification. MTS Trolley reported three preventable accidents in the first nine months of FY13. Accidents deemed "preventable" by MTS' definition may not be violations of the California Vehicle Code (CVC). No Trolley accidents in FY13 have involved a CVC violation by our Trolley operator. For bus and Trolley operations, continued operator retraining and safety awareness programs are held throughout the year to improve the operator average for this safety metric.

#### Mean Distance Between Failures (MDBF)

Operator	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	6,781	9,706	11,167
MTS Contract Services	13,751	10,908	10,190
MTS Trolley	318,705	476,369	325,354

<u>NOTES</u>: MTS Directly-Operated continued improvement is related to a preventive maintenance program, which takes a proactive approach at catching defects before buses begin revenue service. For Trolley, more than half of the failures were related to the new SD8 vehicle. It is not uncommon with new vehicle deployments for MDBF to decrease as the agency works with the manufacturer to integrate new vehicles into revenue service, particularly with the advanced software components involved in the new SD8 vehicles. There are also refinements to the vehicle performance as it is integrated into the specifics of an individual property's operation (e.g. topography, mixed-consist compatibility, etc.)

#### Complaints Per 100,000 Passengers

Operator	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	% Chg. FY11- FY12	% Chg. FY12- FY13
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	7.8	5.7	5.8	-27.2%	1.8%
MTS Contract Svcs. FR Bus	7.4	8.3	8.7	11.2%	4.8%
MTS Trolley	1.8	1.4	3.0	-19.9%	112.2%
General System	-	0.8	1.0	-	29.2%

<u>NOTES</u>: MTS Bus and MTS Contract Services has an increase in the number of complaints. MTS Trolley saw an increase in the number of passenger complaints, mostly due to the realignment of the Blue, Orange, and Green Lines in September 2012. Complaints related to the MTS System, rather than an individual operator, are now tracked separately. These complaints are in addition to any complaints that the operators receive and are related to planning issues, website problems, and general MTS policies and procedures. For FY13, the MTS General System received 1.0 complaint per 100,000 passengers.

#### **OBJECTIVE | Develop a Sustainable System**

The following measures are used to ensure that transit resources are deployed efficiently and do not exceed budgetary constraints.

#### **Revenue Hours**

Operator	Actual	Budget	# Diff	% Diff
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	786,899	794,003	(7,104)	-0.9%
MTS Contract Svcs. FR Bus	872,439	882,122	(9,683)	-1.1%
MTS Trolley	472,314	464,285	8,029	1.7%
System	2,131,652	2,140,410	(8,758)	-0.4%

<u>NOTES</u>: Service levels have slightly increased from the last fiscal year. The increases have come from service adjustments to deal with high load factors and the restoration of some previously reduced service levels, especially on weekends.

Revenue Miles				
Operator	Actual	Budget	# Diff	% Diff
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	8,556,934	8,636,516	(79,582)	-0.9%
MTS Contract Svcs. FR Bus	9,353,715	9,462,775	(109,060)	-1.2%
MTS Trolley	7,758,089	7,559,212	198,877	2.6%
System	25,668,738	25,658,503	10,235	0.0%

<u>NOTES</u>: Service levels have slightly increased from last fiscal year. The increases have come from service adjustments to deal with high load factors and the restoration of some previously reduced services, especially on weekends.

#### Weekday Peak-Vehicle Requirement

This measure shows the maximum number of vehicles that are on the road at any time in order to provide the levels of service that have been scheduled.

Operator	June 2012	June 2013	# Chg. FY12- FY13
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	199	210	11
MTS Contract Svcs. FR Bus	246	260	14
MTS Trolley	93	96	3

<u>NOTES</u>: Peak vehicles have seen an increase for MTS Bus and MTS Contract fixed-route services. These increases are mainly due to the increased service implemented in FY13. Trolley's peak car requirement due to the new operating plan implemented in September 2012.

#### In-Service Bus Speeds (MPH) (Weekday)

Operator	June 2012	June 2013	% Chg. FY12- FY13
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	13.3	13.5	1.5%
MTS Contract Svcs. FR Bus	14.0	14.1	0.7%
MTS Trolley	17.9	18.2	1.7%

<u>NOTES</u>: In-service speeds have remained relatively flat year-over-year.

#### In-Service/Total Miles

The 'in-service miles per total miles' ratio is only calculated for MTS in-house bus operations, as contractors are responsible for bus and driver assignments (run-cutting) for MTS Contract Services.

Operator	June 2012	June 2013	% Chg. FY12- FY13
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	87.3%	85.9%	-1.4%
MTS Contract Svcs. FR Bus	N/A	N/A	N/A
MTS Trolley	98.8%	99.7%	0.9%

NOTES: Ratios have remained practically steady over the two service periods reported for MTS bus and Trolley operations.

#### In-Service/Total Hours

As with the mileage statistic, in-service hours per total hours can only be calculated for MTS in-house bus operations.

Operator	June 2012	June 2013	% Chg. FY12- FY13
MTS Directly-Operated Bus	76.9%	75.9%	-1.0%
MTS Contract Svcs. FR Bus	N/A	N/A	N/A
MTS Trolley	98.5%	99.4%	0.9%

NOTES: Efficiency of scheduling has kept the ratio generally consistent over time, with only a minor changes from FY12 to FY13.

#### Farebox Recovery Ratio

This metric measures the percent of total operating cost recovered through fare revenue. Transportation Development Act (TDA) requirement of 31.9 percent system wide for fixed-route (excluding regional routes that have a 20 percent requirement). Percent of total operating cost recovered through fare revenue.

Operator	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	% Chg. FY11- FY12	% Chg. FY12- FY13
MTS FR (No Premium Exp.)	36.3%	36.7%	39.6%	1.1%	7.9%
MTS Premium Express	49.2%	46.0%	46.5%	-6.4%	1.1%
MTS Rail	58.9%	57.2%	55.3%	-2.9%	-3.3%
General System	43.0%	42.8%	42.6%	-0.5%	-0.5%

For both system-wide and Premium Express services, farebox recovery ratios continue to exceed the Transportation Development Act (TDA) target but have slightly decreased year over year.

#### Subsidy Per Passenger

MTS's goal is to improve route-category average year-over-year. This metric is the amount of public subsidy required to provide service for each unlinked boarding (measured as total operating cost minus fare revenue divided by total passengers).

Operator	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	% Change FY11- FY12	% Change FY12- FY13
Premium Express	\$3.89	\$4.44	\$4.73	14.0%	6.5%
Express	\$2.42	\$2.33	\$2.51	-3.8%	7.5%
Light Rail	\$0.77	\$0.81	\$0.97	5.3%	19.8%
Rapid	-	-	\$2.11	-	-
Urban Frequent	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.44	0.0%	-4.0%
Urban Standard	\$1.31	\$1.24	\$1.39	-5.6%	12.1%
Circulator	\$2.66	\$2.23	\$2.00	-16.2%	-10.3%
Rural	\$14.48	\$12.91	\$13.17	-10.9%	2.0%
Demand-Responsive	\$31.04	\$32.56	\$32.55	4.9%	0.0%
System Total Passengers	\$1.37	\$1.37	\$1.47	0.0%	7.6%
Fixed-Route Bus Ridership	\$1.52	\$1.50	\$1.51	-1.7%	0.7%

Overall, system wide subsidy per passenger was even at \$1.47 in FY13 (with only a negligible increase). For fixed route bus service, subsidy per passenger increased from \$1.50 to \$1.51 in FY13 (0.7%). Light rail increased from \$0.81 to \$0.97 over the last year, which is a 19.8% increase.

## **Title VI Compliance**

The indicators below are required by the FTA to be monitored by and reported to the MTS Board. They measure the quantity and quality of service that MTS provides to minority and non-minority populations, as defined in FTA Circular 4702.1B (2012). The circular defines a minority route as "a route that has at least 1/3 of its total revenue mileage in a Census block or block group, or traffic analysis zone(s) with a percentage of minority population in the transit service area."

#### Route Headway, On-Time Performance, and Passenger Load Factor

Category/Mode*	On-Time Performance Standard	Headway Standard (Base Weekday) P - Peak B - Base	Vehicle Load Factor (Standard = No more than 20% of trips exceed factor)	Minority Route Y- Yes N - No
Premium Express				
Goal	90%	30 min.	1.00	
Routes	00%	Actual		X
810	96%	15	-	Y
820	97%	20	-	N
850 860	95%	30 20 P / 30 B	-	N N
880	97%	20 P 7 30 B 50	-	Y
Express	-	UU	-	1
Goal	90%	30 min.	1.50	
Routes	3070	Actual		
20	82%	15 P / 20 P / 30 B	-	Ν
50	86%	15 P / 30 P / 60 B	-	Ň
150	82%	15 P / 30 P / 60 B	-	N
210	93%	15	-	Y
870	43%	90	-	Ν
960	97%	20	-	Y
Light Rail				
Goal	90%	15 min.	3.00	
Routes		Actual		
Blue	89%	7.5 P / 15 B	-	Y
Orange	88%	15	-	Y
Green	97%	15	-	N
Rapid	05%		4.50	
Goal	85%	15 min.	1.50	
201	91%	Actual 10 P / 15 B		Y
201	91%	10 P / 15 B	-	Y Y
202	91%	10 P / 15 B	-	Y
Urban Frequent	0170		-	I
Goal	85%	15 min.	1.50	
Routes		Actual		
1	85%	15	-	Y
2	85%	11 P / 15 B	-	Y
3	78%	15	-	Y
5	85%	15	-	Y
6	79%	15	-	N
7	78%	12	-	Y
8	90%	20 P / 30 B	-	N
9	88%	20 P / 30 B	-	N
10	80%	15	-	Y
11	81%	10 P / 15 B	-	Y
13	82%	15	-	Y

Page 7 of 9

## San Diego Metropolitan Transit System POLICY 42 PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT PERIOD: JULY 2012 - JUNE 2013

Category/Mode*	On-Time Performance Standard	Headway Standard (Base Weekday) P - Peak B - Base	Vehicle Load Factor (Standard = No more than 20% of trips exceed factor)	Minority Route Y- Yes N - No
Goal	85%	15 min.	1.50	
Routes   15   30   41   44   120   701   709   712   901   906/907   929   932   933/934   955   961   992	84% 85% 80% 88% 83% 90% 85% 92% 75% 80% 79% 79% 79% 80% 80% 80% 83% 80% 83% 80%	Actual 12 P / 15 B 15 P / 30 B 8 P / 15 B 8 P / 15 B 15 15 15 P / 30 B 15 12 P / 15 B 15 10 P / 15 B 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Y N N Y N Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N
Urban Standard				
Goal Routes	90%	30 min. Actual	1.50	
$\begin{array}{c} 4\\ 14\\ 27\\ 28\\ 31\\ 35\\ 105\\ 115\\ 703\\ 704\\ 705\\ 707\\ 815\\ 816\\ 832\\ 833\\ 834\\ 844\\ 845\\ 832\\ 833\\ 834\\ 844\\ 845\\ 855\\ 855\\ 856\\ 856\\ 856\\ 864\\ 871/872\\ 874/875\\ 904\\ 905\\ 916/917\end{array}$	90% 97% 85% 88% 79% 90% 85% 89% 74% 77% 90% 93% 83% 84% 68% 82% 89% 96% 90% 79% 90% 79% 93% 90% 78% 76% 63% 74% 90% 90% 90% 90%	30 60 30 15 P / 30 B 30 15 B / 30 P 30 30 N/A 30 60 45 60 45 60 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 30 60 30 30 60 60 30 30 30 50 60 60 30 30 30 50 60 60 30 30 30 50 60 60 30 30 30 30 50 60 60 30 30 30 30 50 60 60 30 30 30 50 60 60 30 30 30 30 30 50 60 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 3		Y N N N Y N N Y Y Y Y Y N N N N N Y N Y

Page 8 of 9

## San Diego Metropolitan Transit System POLICY 42 PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT PERIOD: JULY 2012 - JUNE 2013

Category/Mode*	On-Time Performance Standard	Headway Standard (Base Weekday) P - Peak B - Base	Vehicle Load Factor (Standard = No more than 20% of trips exceed factor)	Minority Route Y- Yes N - No
Goal	90%	30 min.	1.50	2.50
Routes		Actual		
921	73%	30	-	Y
923	77%	30	-	N
928	82%	30	-	N
936	74%	30	-	Y
962	69%	30	-	Y
963	85%	30	-	Y
967	96%	60	-	Y
968	96%	60	-	Y
Circulator				
Goal	90%	60 min.	1.50	
Routes		Actual		
18	96%	30	-	N
25	74%	60	-	N
83	96%	60	-	N
84	100%	60	-	N
88	94%	30	-	N
851	94%	30	-	Y
964	76%	30 P / 60 B	-	Y
965	-	30	-	Y
972*	No missed trips.	~30	-	Y
973*	No missed trips.	~30	-	Y
978*	No missed trips.	~30	-	Y
979*	No missed trips.	~30	-	Y

\*Load standard is 1.0 for routes operated with a minibus. Routes 972, 973, 978, are 979 are timed to the Coast schedule and wait for passengers to transfer from the selected Coaster trips. Rural and Demand Responsive services have no specific goals for on-time performance, headway, or load standard. Minority Route statistics based on 2010 Census.

#### Service Availability

- > 80% of residents or jobs within  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of a bus stop or rail station in urban areas.
- > 100% of suburban residences within 5 miles of a bus stop or rail station.
- > One return trip at least 2 days/week to destinations from rural villages

Goal			
80% of residents or jobs within ½ mile of a bus stop or rail station in urban area	% of residents within 1/2 mile of a bus stop or rail station in urban areas % of jobs within 1/2 mile of a bus stop or rail station in urban areas		
	100.0%	98.2%	
100% of suburban residences within 5 miles of a bus stop or rail station.	% of suburban residents within 5 miles of a bus stop or rail station		
	100.0%		
	Available Service		
One return trip at least 2 days/week to destinations from rural villages. (Lakeside and Alpine)	a week and Route	Lakeside seven days e 864 serves Alpine lys a week.	

See attached map entitled 'Urban Boundary, Suburban Boundary, and Rural Villages within MTS Service Area'.

Updated: 10/23/2013

ROUTE	Annual Passengers	Avg. Weekday Passengers	Passengers/ revenue Hour	Subsidy Per Passenger	Farebox Recovery
Blue Line	13,886,619	42,665	199.8	\$0.55	68.5%
Orange Line	6,310,548	19,579	112.7	\$1.88	38.9%
Green Line	9,502,199	25,711	159.9	\$0.97	55.2%
1	1,574,532	5,186	33.3	\$2.38	29.0%
2	1,497,096	4,831	40.5	\$1.77	35.5%
3	1,811,156	6,212	39.1	\$0.14	87.9%
4	877,068	2,818	38.1	\$1.96	32.8%
5	941,544	3,178	50.6	\$1.25	43.4%
6	617,842	1,976	34.4	\$2.28	29.9%
7	3,844,273	11,867	47.9	\$1.36	41.7%
8	674,421	1,818	35.3	\$2.15	31.3%
9	506,548	1,488	29.9	\$2.74	26.2%
10	1,574,423	5,143	42.3	\$1.66	37.2%
11	2,552,953	8,619	34.0	\$2.32	29.5%
13	2,183,660	7,211	47.9	\$1.36	41.5%
14	85,362	337	11.5	\$8.79	9.8%
15	1,698,433	5,503	41.1	\$1.74	35.9%
18	51,335	202	17.9	\$1.67	41.9%
20	1,221,437	4,118	31.0	\$2.62	27.2%
25	115,884	458	18.2	\$1.80	36.2%
27	257,927	949	17.8	\$2.02	33.4%
28	439,257	1,449	34.7	\$0.17	85.8%
30	2,175,504	6,901	31.2	\$2.55	28.8%
31	120,264	473	26.0	\$3.33	22.8%
35	587,090	1,779	30.9	\$0.16	86.3%
41	1,386,464	4,582	40.4	\$1.74	37.2%
44	1,334,100	4,511	36.1	\$2.11	31.7%
50	252,059	991	22.9	\$3.93	19.9%
83	45,840	180	14.1	\$2.60	28.5%
84	35,506	140	11.8	\$3.28	24.3%
88	122,763	427	29.3	\$2.84	25.7%
105	353,995	1,212	23.6	\$3.76	20.8%
115	350,739	1,275	23.6	\$2.09	33.6%
120	997,681	3,212	29.8	\$2.77	26.0%
150	698,600	2,759	42.1	\$1.65	38.4%
201	793,881	2,569	43.9	\$1.40	44.7%
202	608,901	1,854	34.3	\$2.13	34.7%
204	154,786	440	16.2	\$5.73	16.1%
210	81,296	319	30.0	\$2.78	25.8%
701	609,233	2,131	24.8	\$1.47	36.0%
703	40,344	-	27.1	\$1.81	35.9%
704	603,863	2,069	29.7	\$1.27	39.8%
705	345,489	1,177	30.4	\$0.83	50.0%
707	63,819	233	23.6	\$2.06	29.4%
709	1,100,200	3,773	42.0	\$0.69	54.9%
712	936,060	3,209	38.2	\$0.67	55.4%
810	160,994	634	26.7	\$4.13	50.3%
815	369,972	1,157	33.5	\$0.25	80.9%
816	326,782	1,289	31.2	\$0.85	55.9%
820	49,587	195	21.0	\$5.28	43.0%
832	55,262	194	14.9	\$2.07	33.7%
833	140,016	463	20.5	\$1.49	40.5%
834	20,605	82	17.6	\$3.75	22.1%
844.845	186,786	702	13.7	\$2.75	26.9%
848	421,157	1,364	29.4	\$1.01	51.4%
850	36,852	144	21.9	\$5.40	42.9%
851	100,637	397	21.9	\$1.32	43.6%
854	192,658	731	26.3	\$1.43	41.8%
855	291,488	1,007	32.8	\$0.73	59.2%
856	701,049	2,586	30.7	\$1.30	44.8%
860	37,119	146	21.7	\$5.88	40.4%
864	441,445	1,454	19.7	\$3.06	26.1%
870	14,871	59	11.7	\$3.33	23.8%
871.872	121,868	466	21.8	\$1.44	42.3%
874.875	472,261	1,611	26.8	\$1.25	45.8%
880	24,360	95	16.5	\$4.84	46.9%
888	2,346	22	4.2	\$36.59	7.2%

## REVISED

ROUTE	Annual	Avg. Weekday	Passengers/	Subsidy Per	Farebox
ROUTE	Passengers	Passengers	revenue Hour	Passenger	Recovery
891	1,240	22	3.4	\$47.10	3.9%
892	1,352	23	3.9	\$40.35	4.7%
894	40,242	159	11.3	\$9.84	21.9%
901	1,053,935	3,384	25.9	\$2.13	32.2%
904	30,901	98	10.8	\$1.72	38.8%
905	632,196	2,247	40.4	\$0.93	56.2%
906.907	1,596,071	5,205	40.3	\$0.02	97.6%
916.917	263,679	933	23.0	\$1.86	34.7%
921	409,261	1,528	27.1	\$1.18	46.9%
923	266,967	1,025	18.8	\$1.62	38.8%
928	403,665	1,452	29.3	\$1.34	42.8%
929	2,504,302	7,991	36.4	\$0.59	63.0%
932	1,308,994	4,449	32.9	\$0.82	54.7%
933.934	1,862,023	6,226	32.9	\$1.15	46.6%
936	656,536	1,952	33.0	\$0.60	63.1%
955	1,672,336	5,468	39.7	\$0.38	72.1%
960	98,107	385	26.1	\$3.18	23.6%
961.962.963	1,332,934	4,660	29.8	\$0.93	52.0%
964	89,258	352	15.9	\$2.22	31.4%
965	80,732	289	17.3	\$1.94	34.6%
967	58,380	217	13.2	\$2.98	25.2%
968	63,561	239	14.3	\$3.18	24.1%
992	444,077	1,311	22.8	\$1.04	50.5%
SVCC	131,743	521	24.9	\$2.26	Note N
MTS ACCESS	379,415	1,367	2.1	\$32.55	13.2%

SERVICE CATEGORY	Annual Passengers	Avg. Weekday Passengers	Passengers/ revenue Hour	Subsidy Per Passenger	Farebox Recovery
Premium Express	308,912	1,214	21.3	\$4.73	46.5%
Express	2,366,370	8,631	32.2	\$2.51	28.4%
Light Rail	29,699,366	87,955	160.6	\$0.97	55.3%
Rapid	1,557,568	4,862	34.3	\$2.11	34.8%
Urban Frequent	38,457,861	125,383	37.0	\$1.44	40.4%
Urban Standard	11,984,646	41,228	28.0	\$1.39	42.1%
Circulator	773,698	2,966	15.4	\$2.00	33.1%
Rural (Note O)	45,180	227	9.4	\$13.17	17.1%
Demand-Responsive	379,415	1,367	2.1	\$32.55	13.2%
MODE	Annual Passengers	Avg. Weekday Passengers	Passengers/ revenue Hour	Subsidy Per Passenger	Farebox Recovery
Light Rail	29,699,366	87,955	160.6	\$0.97	55.3%
Fixed-Route Bus Ridership	55,449,055	184,284	33.6	\$1.52	39.8%
Demand-Responsive	379,415	1,367	2.1	\$32.55	13.2%
Rural (Note O)	45,180	227	9.4	\$13.17	17.1%
System	85,573,016	273,833	42.3	\$1.47	42.6%

A. After federal JARC grant, Route 30 subsidy/passenger is \$2.48.

B. After Rural 5311 grant, Route 864 subsidy/passenger is \$2.70.

C. Route 880 subsidy is fully funded by the 4S Ranch Transit Fund. Funding runs out in June 2014.

D. After Rural 5311 grant, Route 888 is \$20.27.

E. After Rural 5311 grant, Route 891 is \$30.91.

F. After Rural 5311 grant, Route 892 is \$26.39.

G. After Rural 5311 grant, Route 894 is \$4.87.

H. After federal JARC grant, Route 905 subsidy/passenger is \$0.54.

I. After federal JARC grant, Route 929 subsidy/passenger is \$0.00.

J. After federal JARC grant, Route 932 subsidy/passenger is \$0.98.

K. After federal JARC grant, Route 955 subsidy/passenger is \$0.26.

L. After federal JARC grant, Route 960 subsidy/passenger is \$0.87.

M. After federal JARC grant, Route 967.968 subsidy/passenger is \$2.31.

N. Fares and one-half of the subsidy are paid for by NCTD resulting in a 72% farebox recovery.

O. After Rural 5311 grants, subsidy/passenger is \$7.03.

P. Routes 201, 202, & 204, SANDAG reimburses MTS for the net operating cost (operating cost less fare revenue) using TransNet funds.