## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | FY 2018 Year-End



ID Metric	Target	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	FY17 Avg	FY18 Avg	Jul 2017	Aug 2017	Sep 2017	Oct 2017	Nov 2017	Dec 2017	Jan 2018	Feb 2018	Mar 2018	Apr 2018	May 2018	Jun 2018	
<b>Goal 1:</b> Create a safer transportation experience for everyone																				
Objective 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																				
1.1.1 SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	5.3	7.6	9.4	8.2	6.5	4.6	4.2	5.3	4.6	4.5	4.7	3.8	4.1	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.7	3.1	2.8	~~
Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle): scale of 1			3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5														-
(low) to 5 (high)			3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5														
1.1.2 Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or station);			3.1	3.2	3.2	3.2														
scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)*  1.1.4 Security complaints to 311 (Muni)*		36	29	37	29	37	38	56	35	43	44	43	34	34	30	35	44	34	27	\ <u> </u>
Objective 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security		30	23	37	23	37	30	30	33	43	44	73	34	34	30	33	44		27	
1.2.1 Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	11.3	13.8	12.0	11.0	12.8	12.4	12.9	13.0	13.1	11.2	13.2	17.5	9.8	13.0	15.7	12.0	13.5	13.2		~^~
1.2.2 Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)*		12	10	8	13	11	11	12	12	10	13	17	11	15	9	15	7	8	9	~~~
1.2.3 Lost work days due to injury		16,445 (CY13)	15,221 (CY14)	13,625 (CY15)	15,992 (CY16)	21,745 (CY17)														_
1.2.4 Employee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2													
		3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2													
Objective 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																				_
1.3.1 Muni collisions/100,000 miles	3.5	5.1	5.9	6.4	6.6	6.8	6.0	5.4	5.9	7.6	7.1	5.7	6.3	4.8	6.0	5.8	6.2	5.2	5.9	^~~
1.3.2 Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists		3,049 (CY13)	2,995 (CY14) 4.4	3,046 (CY15)	4.5	4.2	2.2	2.0	2.5	3.7	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.6	2.7	2.2	2.6	2.2	2.2	~~~
1.3.3 Muni falls on board / 100,000 miles*		4.2 157	174	4.4 179	4.5 183	179	3.3 169	3.0 157	3.5 194	179	3.3 215	3.1 196	3.8 168	3.6 172	2.7 145	3.3 172	3.6 144	3.3 147	3.3 139	~~~
1.3.4 "Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311*  1.3.5 Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)*		137	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9	105	13/	154	1/3	213	150	100	1/2	143	1/2	144	147	133	
Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & cars	haring +l	o proform			3.0	3.3														
Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications	liailiig ti	le preferre	u illealis o	luavei																
Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services: scale of 1 (low) to 5																				
2.1.1 (high)	3.4		3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2														
2.1.2 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5			2.5	2.7	3.0	3.2														
2.1.3 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.8	2.9	2.9	3.0														
2.1.4 (Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)*			3.5	3.3	3.2	3.2														
2.1.5 Customer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)*			2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9														
2.1.6 Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		93.3%	93.6%	69.9%	96.6%	95.8%	94.4%	100.0%	96.1%	100.0%	100.0%	98.3%	98.5%	97.7%	99.1%	97.2%	94.1%	76.1%	73.2%	
2.1.6 Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		100.0%	99.5%	98.0%	98.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
2.1.6 Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		82.4%	75.6%	60.0%	82.5%	91.2%	87.8%	97.7%	92.9%	84.0%	78.9%	84.8%	84.0%	98.6%	78.8%	87.3%	89.0%	89.1%	88.5%	<u> </u>
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		79.1%	53.8%	40.4%	54.7%	82.1%	85.5%		76.9%			90.6%			89.6%			85.4%		
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		96.9%	96.8%	96.8%	97.5%	97.9%	99.0%	100.0%	99.3%	98.0%	98.8%	97.7%	98.3%	98.5%	99.7%	97.5%	99.5%	99.6%	100.0%	~~~
Percentage of actionable 311 Muni operator conduct complaints addressed within 28 business		93.5%	89.8%	89.5%	57.5%	74.3%	86.3%	84.7%	87.8%	89.4%	60.8%	85.4%	91.2%	96.9%	97.0%	94.1%	93.4%	85.7%	72.6%	$\sqrt{}$
days  2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)*			2.7	2.7	2.9	3.0														V
Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations elevators escalators): scale of 1 (low)																				
2.1.9 to 5 (high)*			2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5														
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																				
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network	1.8%	4.0%	4.0%	4.8%	5.4%	5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	6.8%	7.7%	5.8%	6.0%	5.6%	5.0%	5.6%	5.2%	5.4%	5.6%	5.9%	^
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network	8.8%	17.8%	18.6%	17.2%	16.9%	18.1%	16.9%	17.1%	16.9%	17.5%	19.2%	18.0%	17.0%	16.2%	15.0%	15.2%	15.9%	17.1%	18.6%	$\sim$
2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes	85%	59.9%	59.6%	57.4%	60.5%	59.5%	57.3%	57.7%	57.1%	57.8%	56.7%	56.3%	56.5%	58.4%	58.5%	58.2%	57.2%	57.2%	55.5%	$\sim$
2.2.4 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals*	85% 85%	73.7% 59.0%	73.9% 58.9%	72.2% 57.0%	75.3% 59.8%	75.0% 57.3%	75.3% 57.3%	74.3% 57.7%	73.4% 57.1%	74.2% 57.5%	73.5% 56.7%	73.8% 56.5%	74.7% 56.9%	77.1% 58.4%	77.4% 58.5%	77.2% 58.4%	76.3% 57.2%	76.1% 57.2%	75.1% 54.6%	$\approx$
Percentage of on-time performance     Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load     2.2.7	83%	7.4%	7.4%	4.3%	4.9%	57.5%	12.2%	7.8%	9.6%	14.6%	14.3%	12.4%	9.7%	11.9%	13.6%	13.9%	11.6%	14.3%	12.6%	///
points  Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load noints'		8.6%	8.3%	3.0%	3.3%		10.4%	8.4%	10.6%	12.3%	9.4%	7.5%	8.8%	10.0%	9.8%	9.1%	12.1%	11.5%	15.0%	^~~
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																				. ~
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,310	4,632	5,650	5,416	5,155	7,407	8,079	7,528	5,982	7,388	6,492	6,652	6,027	8,409	7,786	8,447	8,135	9,702	<b>~~~</b>
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,571	3,164	4,517	5,547	5,218	5,204	5,008	5,591	3,895	5,246	5,911	5,464	5,256	4,479	5,520	5,272	6,289	5,228	<b>~~~</b>
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,179	2,045	1,797	1,971	2,865	2,512	2,952	2,610	2,577	2,382	2,346	2,346	1,807	2,745	2,525	3,384	2,700	2,618	~~~
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Cable)		3,835	4,734	5,200	4,412															-
2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		97.0%	96.2%	97.7%	99.0%	98.1%	97.5%	99.0%	98.0%	98.6%	97.5%	98.9%	98.6%	98.1%	97.7%	97.9%	97.0%	95.7%	93.3%	
2.2.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday)*		495,341	504,205	510,844	519,462	507,333	508,850	486,780	516,200	546,920	536,920	494,230	487,910	475,600	518,830	497,170	519,670	522,520	503,450	$\sim\sim$
2.2.11 Ridership (LRV, average weekday)		145,700 23,210	155,800 22,521	157,841 20,988	171,598 19,750															
2.2.11 Ridership (Historic, average weekday) 2.2.11 Ridership (Cable, average weekday)		23,210 18,960	20,640	20,988 19,070	19,750															
2.2.11 Ridership (Cable, average weekday) 2.2.11 Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)		18,960 74,054	74,137	19,070 75,967	70,307	70,236	64.865	65,350	64.482	67,464	65,804	63,357	62,109	65,562	68.056	67,336	68,920	66,769	65,171	$\sim$
2.2.11 Ridership (taregate entries, average weekday) 2.2.12 Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		96.3%	94.4%	93.3%	94.4%	97.0%	98.0%	91.7%	97.0%	99.4%	98.9%	97.5%	100.0%	98.9%	98.5%	97.8%	98.9%	99.2%	98.6%	~~~
2.2.12 Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation  2.2.13 Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		88.1%	93.8%	91.9%	86.5%	91.4%	92.6%	83.8%	94.1%	95.6%	94.2%	95.8%	98.3%	95.7%	93.6%	90.8%	85.6%	89.6%	94.2%	
1	1	00.170	33.070	31.370	50.570	31.170	32.070	03.070	31.270	33.073	34.273	33.073	30.373	33.773	33.073	50.073	05.075	05.073	34.273	,

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | FY 2018 Year-End



ID	Metric	Target	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	FY17 Avg	FY18 Avg	Jul 2017	Aug 2017	Sep 2017	Oct 2017	Nov 2017	Dec 2017	Jan 2018	Feb 2018	Mar 2018	Apr 2018	May 2018	Jun 2018	
Ohio	ective 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes																				
_	Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%	50%	54%	52%	54%	57%														
	Average daily bikeshare trips (Weekday)	30,0	5070	885	1.089	1.023	984														
	ective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand			503	1,003	1,023	304														
	Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas*		52.2%	66.2%	60.3%	64.7%	71.8%	87.1%	80.1%							89.9%			91.3%		
2.4.2	Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a)*		81.3%	80.7%	80.9%	80.6%	80.7%	80.9%	82.2%	79.8%	80.1%	79.6%	81.7%	85.3%	79.9%	80.1%	80.2%	79.4%	80.9%	80.3%	\_ ^_ ~
	Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird)		85.3%	84.4%	85.9%	84.7%	84.2%	83.6%	82.2%	83.9%	81.8%	82.8%	84.8%	88.2%	82.6%	82.6%	83.0%	83.0%	84.2%	83.6%	<del></del>
	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces				7,958	8,925															
	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)*				1,329	1,429															
	al 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Franci	isco																			
	ective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consu		missions was	ste and noise																	
	SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons CO2e)	17.434	46,272	45.244	43,499	24.146	3.483	4.022													
	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions	,	28.0%	28.1%	28.5%	42.2%	29.8%	29.8%													
	Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94.0%	98.0%	98.0%	94.6%	94.6%	94.6%													
	Number of electric vehicle charging stations		63	63	63	63	63	63													
3.1.6			9,790,994	9.944.080	9,783,200	9,957,470	9,928,945	9,759,227	9,936,073	10,133,623	9,498,167	9,870,792	9,715,727	9,743,530	9,795,661	9,018,609	9,939,720	9,679,172	10,141,946	9,637,700	~~~
	Agency gas consumption (therms)*		32,049	23,057	19,265	21,108	24,260	26,272	14,501	11,615	10,956	7,065	14,467	30,040	45,786	54,393	40,846	37,773	26,034	21,789	<del>_</del>
	Agency water consumption (gallons)*		1,476,801	1,903,909	1,735,422	1,503,979	1,431,516	1,526,914	1,237,329	1,375,218	1,341,976	1,171,439	2,382,053	1,216,688	1,940,466	1,392,176	1,409,616	1,319,573	1,694,977	1,841,440	~~~
	Agency waste diversion rate		37.9%	37.1%	34.5%	35.1%	33.3%	37.7%	31.8%	36.7%	37.2%	44.9%	42.1%	36.2%	37.8%	37.3%	37.0%	38.3%	33.8%	38.5%	<del>/~~</del>
Obio	ective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy																				•
	Muni average weekday boardings		683,211	703.160	708.733	726,303	714.910	711.015	702,280	725.070	753.320	735.730	698.400	666,400	663,610	723,750	706.460	728,520	733,730	713.240	~~
_	ective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively			100,200		,	,			,	,	,	,	,	000,020	,	100,100		,	120,210	
	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase*				65.6%	81.3%	92.3%														
	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase				59.2%	97.8%	84.3%														
	ective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently					011071															
	Transit passengers per Hour							63.6	62.7	64.6	67.1	65.5	62.2	59.9	60	64.4	62.8	64.8	65.3	63.4	~~
	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour*	\$203	\$224.54	\$224.73	\$242.35	\$240.89	\$236,83	\$220.39	02.7	04.0	07.1	03.3	02.2	33.3	00	04.4	02.0	04.0	03.3	05.4	
	Cost per unlinked trip*	3203	\$3.22	\$4.00	\$3.29	\$3.48	\$3.49	\$3.54													
	Farebox recovery ratio		32.0%	33.7%	30.4%	29.5%	26.2%	24.5%													
	Average daily Transit Operator shortfall		35	43	25	10	17	12	13	27											
-	Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month		158	147	594	295	249	157		29		14		30	42		42		42		
	ective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits						-														
	Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)					\$229M (As of O4)	\$278M (As of Q4	)													
	al 4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service					\$225H (745 01 Q4)	\$270m (1.50m Q1)	/													
	,																				
Obje	ective 4.1: Improve internal communications																				
4.1.1	Employee rating: I have the Information and tools I need to do my job; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5													
4.1.1	Employee rating: I have access to information about Agency accomplishments, current events, issues and challenges; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)*	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.6																
4.1.1	Employee rating: I feel as though the Agency communicates current events, issues, challenges and accomplishments clearly; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)*	3.9				3.2	3.1	3.1													
4.1.2	Percentage of employees that complete the survey		32.9%	29.6%	27.2%	29.7%	31.5%	29.0%													
4.1.3	Employee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals/objectives and how they contribute to Agency success.		3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5													
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days.		3.2	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0													
4.1.5	Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has		2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8													
4.1.6			3.4	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.3													
L			1	1	1	1	1	1									1	1			

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | FY 2018 Year-End



ID	Metric	Target	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	FY17 Avg	FY18 Avg	Jul 2017	Aug 2017	Sep 2017	Oct 2017	Nov 2017	Dec 2017	Jan 2018	Feb 2018	Mar 2018	Apr 2018	May 2018	Jun 2018	
Obje	ective 4.2: Create a collaborative and innovative work environment																				
4.2.1	Employee rating: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	3.9	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.3													
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.		3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9													,
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.		3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9													
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.		3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3													
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively		3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.5													
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.		3.6	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.3													
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.		3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6													
Obje	ective 4.3: Improve employee accountability																				
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year	100%	20.3%	62.5%	31.3%	59.1%	43.8%														
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans	100%	18.8%	62.5%	54.2%	58.9%	58.7%														
4.3.2	Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported		73.0%	92.3%	93.6%	96.1%	96.1%	96.1%													
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)	-	8.6%	9.4%	7.7%	8.6%	8.1%	9.1%	8.0%	8.0%	7.9%	9.4%	8.1%	8.4%	9.0%	9.2%	8.3%	9.8%	10.4%	11.9%	
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.		3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5													
4.3.5	Employee commendations to 311°		112	104	104	152	181	110	131	138	126	108	102	83	94	101	97	97	125	119	$\overline{}$
Obje	ective 4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with our stakeholders																				
4.4.1	Stakeholder rating: satisfaction with SFMTA management of transportation in San Francisco; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				2.9																

## Notes

- 1.1.2 / 1.3.5 / 2.1.1 / 2.1.2 / 2.1.3 / 2.1.4 / 2.1.5 / 2.1.8 / 2.1.9 Results are based on a non-probability sample from opt-in SFMTA online panel surveys and have been weighted to reflect the geographic distribution of the San Francisco population. Survey program was discontinued after June 2017
  - 1.1.3 Beginning with FY2015, includes all taxi, TNC, and black car service-related incidents reported to SFPD. Reporting for prior months includes "defrauding taxi driver", "operating taxi without a permit", and "overcharging taxi fare" incidents only.
  - 1.2.2 Includes assaults and threats on operators.
  - 1.3.2 Injury collisions reported in the calendar year
  - 2.1.7 Due to a calculation error, the reported figures for FY2017 were revised.
  - 2.2.1 <1 min for headway of 5 min or less.
  - 2.2.1/2.2.2/2.2.4/2.2.6 Effective April 2015, the Muni Rapid Network is defined as routes/lines J, K, L, M, N, 5R, 7R, 9R, 14R, 28R, and 38R. This report reflects the updated Rapid Network.
    - January and February 2017 on-time performance, gaps or bunching cannot be reported due to a network issue that limited NextBus predictions and prevented systemwide on-time performance data from being collected.
    - 2.2.7 Due to the transition to a new Automatic Passenger Counter (APC) technology deployed on the newer Muni bus fleet, there was insufficient coverage of operational APC data collection and processing during FY17 to produce reportable estimates of crowding.
    - 2.2.9 September 2016 figures have been revised to account for a prior reporting error.
    - 2.4.1 Increase in percent of metered hours with no rate change indicates achievement of price point and parking availability goals. Note: sensor based rate adjustments were limited to SFpark pilot blocks with 50% or more parking sensor coverage through February 2014.

      Sensor Independent Rate Adjustments (SIRA) based on meter payment data started in June 2014 and include all SFpark pilot area blocks including those that fell below the 50% parking sensor threshold. These blocks have not approached their price point yet, which lowers the baseline for this metric. Moving forward, June 2014 will be considered the new baseline for SIRA.
    - 2.4.2 Shift in utilization from peak to off-peak indicates successful mitigation of congestion on city streets.
    - 2.4.2 / 2.4.3 Shift in utilization to hourly from early bird and monthly indicates garages are used more for short trips that benefit nearby businesses and less for commute trips by auto.
      - 2.4.3 Running total of SFMTA-installed facilities.
      - 3.1.3 Upon the adopted use of renewable diesel for the Muni fleet in January 2016, the SFMTA no longer reports metric 3.1.3 (Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA).
      - 3.1.6 Resource consumption data for facilities leased by the SFMTA is not reflected in the current reporting.
      - 3.2.1 Reported figures for average weekday boardings have been modifed to correct for a prior reporting error.
    - 3.3.1 / 3.3.2 Figures reflect estimate at completion-weighted % of projects on or under budget (including contingency) for all projects delivered by the SFMTA's Capital Projects & Construction division. Reported results currently exclude projects in the Sustainable Streets

      Division portfolio. Due to data extraction and integration issues following the City's implementation of the Financial System Project (F\$P), no data for reporting project delivery performance is available on or after June 2017.
      - 3.4.1 Historical figures have been slightly revised to account for a prior reporting error.
    - 3.4.2 / 3.4.3 Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY17 dollars. FY18 figures were not available at the time of publication.
      - 3.4.6 Reporting of this metric has been discontinued as of September 2017.
      - 3.4.7 FY Total rather than FY Average.
      - 3.5.1 Due to data extraction and integration issues following the City's implementation of the Financial System Project (F\$P), no data for reporting SOGR budget deficit is available on or after June 2017.
      - 4.1.1 Employee rating of "I have access to information about Agency accomplishments, current events, issues and challenges" has been reworded to "I feel as though the Agency communicates current events, issues, challenges and accomplishments clearly" in the 2016 employee satisfaction survey.