3/2/2023 Executive Committee Meeting Written Public Comment Submissions

Submissions

Sound Transit Executive Committee Meeting

March 2, 2023

Public Comment on Motion # M2023-16

Adopting Goals & A Compensation Range for ST CEO

I read the motion and accompanying materials regarding and have the following comments.

- The two strategic priorities – passenger experience (external – customer focused) and transform culture (internal – employee focused) – do not appear to be weighted, or by default, are of equal value.
  - Most organizations place a greater value on external facing activities because if there are no customers, internal goals become moot.
  - Thus, suggest an 80/20 weighting of the two priorities
- Under each priority, there are objectives, and then each objective is further refined by goals.
  - Ideally, each of the objectives under the priority should have a weight that signals to the executive which objectives are relatively more important in the current environment.
    - For example, there are three objectives listed under the strategic priority of passenger experience – passenger journey upgrades, improve safety, and construction/maintenance of the operation.
      - I believe if you asked most ST riders, safety would receive the highest priority, and thus should be awarded a higher weight or focus. Anecdotally, I know several individuals that no longer ride the bus/train or use it a lot less because of fear and uncertainty.
- Finally, the rubber hits the road, if you will, with goals.
  - As noted above, each of the goals should, in most instances, have different weights/priorities.
  - Each goal, as stated, has verbiage that makes it a qualitative goal when language such as enhance, maintain, launch, is used. In turn, any assessment can be viewed as somewhat arbitrary.
    - For example, one stated goal is to "launch PIMS to better provide real-time arrival returns…."
      - If PIMS is "launched" but there are several software glitches how is that viewed? Does that meet the definition of "launch" – some would say yes, others may say no.

- - Or, how much better should real-time arrival returns be? Is 1% acceptable, or is it 10% or ?.
  - Most organizations employ some form of S.M.A.R.T* goal setting process to take as much of the arbitrariness of goal evaluation out of the equation. This is not an easy task, and takes work to refine. However, the benefit is that it provides clarity as to what is important, and how to evaluate on the back-end.   The likelihood of performance disputes or misunderstandings is materially diminished.
    - * Goals should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound.
  - Finally, the Performance Goals Payment Schedule is based on a quantitative "% of Goals Achieved" table.
    - Thus, the goals should be structured in such a manner that's it's as transparent as possible as to how achievement is measured.
    - For example, the committee should be able to differentiate between 30% achievement and 50%, a priori.

If I was sitting on this committee, I would advocate that more work needs to be done.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Struck, Mercer Island, WA