

1
YORK REGION TRANSIT
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACTOR REPORT CARD
FOR Q4 - 2006

The Transit Committee recommends the following:

1. The presentation by Ann Marie Carroll, Assistant Manager Operations, York Region Transit, regarding 'Operations and Maintenance Contractor Report Card', be received; and
2. The recommendations contained in the following report, May 1, 2007, from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, be adopted:

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. This report be received for information.
2. Future Operations and Maintenance Contractor Report Card reports be submitted semi-annually.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide the results of York Region Transit's Operations and Maintenance Contractor Report Card for the fourth quarter of 2006.

3. BACKGROUND

The Contractor Report Card provides an enhanced management tool to review, compare and analyze the performance of contractors who operate conventional and Viva bus rapid transit services in the Region.

The Contractor Report Card has been presented to Transit Committee and Regional Council on a quarterly basis. The 2006 fourth quarter results are attached (see *Attachment 1*).

4. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

4.1 Report Card

The Contractor Report Card measures contractor performance in the following key areas:

- Schedule adherence.
- Vehicle maintenance.
- Safety.
- Customer satisfaction.
- Personnel training and appearance.
- Reporting requirements.

Each key area has several performance measures that are used to score and rank each contractor.

4.2 Customer Satisfaction Survey

In November 2006, York Region Transit (YRT) conducted the biennial Customer Satisfaction Survey for both conventional and Viva services. The applicable portions of the survey results have been included in the fourth quarter report card. The five survey categories that are directly related to the contractors' actions are listed below:

Drivers

- Drive safely
- Knowledgeable about overall system
- Friendly and helpful

Vehicles

- In good condition
- Clean

The 2004 Customer Satisfaction Survey measured the contractors against these same five categories. In 2004, the scores of three of the four contractors fell below the required minimum score of 70% of the customers surveyed rating the service "satisfactory" or better. The exception was Laidlaw Transit with a score of 75%. Viva service commenced in 2005 and was not part of the 2004 survey. The results of the 2006 survey scores, as shown in Table 1, indicate that all of the operating contractors rank well above the minimum required score.

Table 1
Customer Satisfaction Survey Results – 2004 to 2006 Comparison

Contractor	2004 Results	2006 Results	Improvement
Laidlaw	75%	84%	9%
Miller – Markham	65%	85%	20%
Miller – Richmond Hill	69%	85%	16%
Tokmakjian (CanAr Coach)	63%	83%	20%
Veolia	n/a	91%	n/a

The positive outcome for 2006 is attributed to:

- Establishment of the Performance Based Contract.
- Financial incentive/disincentives assigned to the contractors under the Performance Based Contract.
- Contractor's willingness to make the necessary improvements.
- Improved communications between YRT and contractor staff.
- Implementation of improved process and procedures associated with the quarterly Contractor Report Card.
- Improved driver and maintenance staff training.

4.3 2006 Q4 Contractor Report Card

4.3.1 Scoring

Scores are illustrated by a percentage, percentage range, or pass or fail. The performance benchmarks determine whether or not the contractor exceeds, meets or falls below the standard. Scoring of the performance measures is done using 1, 2, or 3 scores. The lower the total score, the better the overall performance.

1. Exceeds standard = total score of 20
Contractor's score is greater than the benchmark score.
2. Meets standard = total score of 37
Contractor's score is equal to or falls within the required percentage range.
3. Below standard = total score of >37
Contractor's score is less than the benchmark score.

Performance measures scoring three (below standard) are the primary focus. YRT and contractor staff work jointly to resolve issues and raise substandard scores.

4.3.2 Division 2 - Laidlaw Transit

Laidlaw ranked first with a score of 32, scoring 1 or 2 in 81% of the performance measurements.

Laidlaw has scored "exceeds standard" in nine areas:

- Missed trips
- In-service wheelchair lift/ramp failures
- In-service air conditioning/heating
- Preventative maintenance
- Accident damage repairs completed within 20 days
- Exterior bus clean
- Customer complaints
- Bus operator appearance
- Management Reports and TW CARES tickets

Laidlaw has consistently performed well throughout 2006. Three areas have been identified where improvement is needed. They are:

- **Operating ahead of schedule**
YRT and Laidlaw staff are reviewing service running times to identify scheduling issues. It may be necessary to adjust running times to prevent bus operators from operating ahead of schedule. Only one observation of a bus operating ahead of schedule results in the contractor scoring 3. During the fourth quarter, 7 of 105 (6%) observations identified a Laidlaw driver operating ahead of schedule.
- **Kilometres between road calls**
Laidlaw received five new 30' Eldorado buses in December 2006. It is anticipated that with a lower average fleet age, an increased spare ratio and a continuing high level preventative maintenance program, the need for road calls will be reduced. Improvement has been made in this area since the Q3 report card.
- **Diesel Technician training**
Laidlaw staff is experiencing difficulty achieving the training standard required under the contract. YRT staff are assisting Laidlaw in seeking out correct diesel training to ensure compliance to the contract training requirements.

4.3.3 Division 4 - Tokmakjian Transit (CanAr)

Tokmakjian (CanAr) ranked second with a score of 33, scoring 1 or 2 in 77% of the performance measurements. Tokmakjian was the only contractor to elect to have a facility audit conducted by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation resulting in a carrier safety rating of "satisfactory – audited" in 2006.

Tokmakjian has scored "exceeds standard" in eight areas:

- Missed trips.
- Kilometres between road calls.
- In-service air conditioning/heating.
- Accident damage repairs completed within 20 days.
- Commercial Vehicle Operator's Registration (CVOR).
- Customer complaints.
- Bus operator appearance.
- Management Reports and TW CARES tickets.

Tokmakjian has consistently performed well in 2006. Three areas have been identified where improvement is needed. They are:

- **Operating ahead of schedule**
During the fourth quarter, 5 of 104 (4%) observations identified a Tokmakjian driver operating ahead of schedule.
- **In-service Vehicle Damage Observation**
YRT and the contractor's fleet staff are consulting to ensure that minor vehicle repairs are being completed in a timely manner.
- **Interior Bus Clean**
The contractor's cleaning schedule and methods are being reviewed by YRT staff. Options to improve the bus cleaning process are being discussed.

4.3.4 Division 1 - Miller Transit

Miller Transit ranked third overall with a score of 36, scoring a 1 or 2 in 72% of the performance measures.

Miller has scored "exceeds standard" in seven areas:

- Missed trips.
- Kilometres between road calls.
- In-service air conditioning/heating.
- Accident damage repairs completed within 20 days.
- Customer complaints.
- Bus operator appearance.
- Management Reports and TW CARES tickets.

Miller has performed consistently well in 2006. Four areas have been identified where improvement is needed. They are:

- **Operating ahead of schedule**
During the fourth quarter, 4 of 97 (4%) observations identified a Miller driver operating ahead of schedule.
- **Interior bus clean**
The contractor's cleaning schedule and methods are being reviewed by YRT staff. Options to improve the bus cleaning process are being discussed.
- **Preventative maintenance**
Miller's management staff is aware of the deficiency in their preventative maintenance program. They are making the necessary changes to improve their performance. It is anticipated that a substantial improvement will be made by Q2, 2007. Although Miller has not performed well under this performance standard, some improvement has been made from the third quarter report card. The number of inspections completed on vehicles requiring preventative maintenance has increased from 57% to 63%.
- **Diesel Technician training**

Miller staff is experiencing difficulty achieving the training standard required under the contract. YRT staff are assisting Miller in seeking out correct diesel training to ensure compliance to the contract training requirements.

4.3.5 Division 7 - Veolia Transportation

Veolia is now being scored on 19, as opposed to 18 in Q3, 2006, of the 22 key performance areas with the completion of the 2006 Customer Satisfaction Survey. The overall results for Veolia still exclude schedule adherence. Schedule adherence will be scored for the first time in the first quarter 2007 Contractors Report Card.

Veolia scored 1 or 2 in 100% of the 19 key areas measured during the fourth quarter 2006 Contractor Report Card.

In the Q3 report card, the performance standard requiring improvement was 'interior bus clean'. Veolia staff are now ensuring that the interior of Viva buses are properly cleaned prior to entering service.

YRT staff will continue to work with Veolia to ensure that their service remains at this exemplary level.

Table 2 below outlines contractor performance for the entire 2006 year. The statistics are cumulative averages, meaning that the scores for each quarter incorporate the results of the previous quarter(s).

Table 2
Contractor Performance Trend – 2006 (Cumulative Averages)

Contractor	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Laidlaw	24	30	31	32
Miller	32	35	37	36
Tokmakjian (CanAr Coach)	34	36	35	33
Veolia	n/a	n/a	22	21

Note: Fewer performance standards were measured in Q1, making the total scores lower than in the subsequent quarters. For 2006, Veolia cannot be compared to the conventional contractors as they are scored on 19 measures as opposed to 22. Veolia will be scored on the 22 measures in 2007.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications with the Contractor Report Card program.

6. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

Transit customers from the local municipalities will benefit from the Contractor Report Card program as service will continually be monitored and a mechanism provided to identify areas in need of improvement.

7. CONCLUSION

The Contractor Report Card provides staff with another management tool to continually monitor the performance of transit operations and maintenance contractors, and identify opportunities for quality improvement.

The Q4 Contractors Report Card is attached as *Attachment 1*.

Quarterly reporting does not fluctuate significantly, more so because the results are cumulative averages over the calendar year. It is suggested that performance be reported semi-annually in the future.

For more information on this report contact Ann-Marie Carroll, Assistant Manager, Operations (Ext. 5677) or Rick Takagi, Manager, Operations (Ext. 5624), of the Transit Branch in the Transportation and Works Department.

The Senior Management Group has reviewed this report.

(The attachment referred to in this clause is attached to this report.)