## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | December 2014



ID Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Monthly Trend
Goal 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyon	e																		
Objective 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																			
1.1.1 SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.1	3.8	7.6	9.5	8.6	7.7	8.2	7.5	10.0	8.8	8.5	8.2	9.3	8.5	8.0	9.9	8.2		$\sim \sim$
1.1.2 Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1				3.2	3.2	3	.3		3.2			3.3			3.2				
(low) to 5 (high) <sup>2</sup> Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or				-	-														
1.1.2 station): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				3.1	3.2	3	.2		3.1			3.2			3.2		┥────		
1.1.3 SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes <sup>2</sup>		3	3.9	4.3	36.8	1	2	3	10	8	2	3	8	37	39	39	32	42	~~~~
1.1.4 Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		42	37.8	28.6	35.4	28	22	30	20	23	27	23	37	31	39	51	32	24	$\sim \sim$
Objective 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security																			-
1.2.1 Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	13.1	16.2	13.8	12.1	14.7	13.6	9.0	9.3	10.3	11.1	14.7	10.5	12.3	8.6	9.4	12.5	13.0		$\sim$
1.2.2 Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) <sup>3</sup>		11.3	12.1	9.9	9.0	12	6	10	6	5	12	8	11	9	7	11	9		$\sim \sim \sim$
1.2.3 Lost work days due to injury		16,445 (CY 20	13)																
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															
Objective 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																			
1.3.1 Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.1	5.0	5.9	5.9	6.4	6.8	4.7	5.7	5.0	4.8	6.2	6.7	6.0	5.3	6.3	7.4	6.3		$\sim\sim$
1.3.2 Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists <sup>4</sup>		3,235 (CY12)																	
1.3.2 Collisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)																	
1.3.3 Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.7	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.0	4.1	5.3	4.7	4.5	4.8	4.5	3.8	4.9	4.0	5.1		$\sim \sim \sim$
1.3.4 "Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		179	159.3	179.6	204.2	185	161	174	157	204	179	159	144	157	188	232	242	202	$\sim$
1.3.5 Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				3.7	3.7	3	.8		3.7	_		3.7			3.7	-			
Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	arsharin	g the pref	ferred me	ans of tra	vel														
Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications																			
Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5				3.0	3.0	3	.1		3.0			2.9		3.0					
(high) <sup>1</sup> Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5 2.1.2				2.5	2.7	2	.5	2.5			2.5			2.7					
(high)* Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network: scale of 1 (low) to 5				-				-			-								
2.1.3 (high) <sup>1</sup>				2.8	2.9	2	.7	2.7			2.8			2.9					
2.1.4 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				3.5	3.2	3	.6		3.5		3.3			3.2					
2.1.5 Customer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				2.8	2.8						2.8			2.8					
2.1.6 Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86%	93.3%	93.7%	50.7%	89.4%	92.0%	100.0%	98.9%	97.6%	93.8%	99.0%	92.7%	62.1%	50.8%	41.9%	26.0%		
2.1.6 Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99%	100%	99%	98.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	94.1%	100.0%	100.0%	96.2%	96.4%		$\sim$
2.1.6 Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85%	82.4%	75.6%	68.6%	84.0%	83.9%	76.0%	73.0%	75.0%	85.2%	73.2%	45.0%	71.9%	63.0%	71.0%	71.0%		$\sim \sim$
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81%	79.1%	53.8%	29.0%	68.			25.7%			31.8%			29.1%				
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97%	96.9%	96.8%	96.4%	95.0%	98.0%	97.0%	94.0%	97.7%	96.1%	97.5%	94.7%	97.7%	94.0%	100.0%	94.4%	95.9%	$\sim \sim \sim \sim$
2.1.7 Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		87%	90.0%	78.6% 2.7	89.4% 2.7	56.0%	57.0%	59.0%	75.7%	89.5%	83.8%	94.9%	86.9%	88.7%	90.1% 2.7	80.6%	73.9%		
Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1				2.7	2.7	2			2.6		2.7			2.7					
(low) to 5 (high) <sup>2</sup>					-														
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance			F 644	E 00/	0.004	6.004				5.000	E 00/	F 644		6.444	6.004	6.694	-	0.004	~
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network <sup>5,6</sup>	2.9%	5.3%	5.6%	5.8%	6.6%	6.0%	5.4%	4.9%	5.5%	5.2%	5.3%	5.6%	5.5%	6.1%	6.2%	6.6%	7.4%	6.6%	~
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network5, <sup>6</sup>	10.2%	18.5%	18.0%	18.2%	19.1%	17.5%	17.7%	17.5%	17.1%	17.1%	18.4%	20.7%	21.1%	19.2%	19.3%	19.0%	19.8%	18.2%	$\approx$
2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes <sup>6</sup>	85%	61.0%	59.6%	59.0%	55.6%	57.9%	58.3%	59.6%	60.1%	60.1%	59.1%	57.0%	57.8%	58.4%	56.5%	55.3%	53.4%	55.4%	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
2.2.3 Percentage of scheduled trips delivered	98.5%	96.7%	97.0%	96.3%	96.2%	98.6%	96.7%	96.3%	97.5%	96.9%	95.6%	94.6%	91.0%	95.1%	95.2%	96.2%	96.7%	97.8%	$\sim$
2.2.4 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals <sup>6</sup>	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	70.3%	73.5%	73.5%	74.7%	75.4%	75.3%	74.0%	72.1%	72.3%	72.1%	71.0%	70.1%	67.7%	71.3%	$\sim$
2.2.5 Running time performance	Measure in 85%	development	E0.0%	EQ.00/	FF 50/	F7 00/	E0.0%	60.2%	60.4%	60.5%	59.5%	57.6%	F7 20/	57.5%	EC 20/	55.4%	F2 10/	FF (%	$\sim$
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance <sup>6</sup> Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	55.5%	57.8%	58.6%						57.2%		56.3%		53.1%	55.6%	$\overline{\Lambda}$
2.2.7 points Percentage of hus trins over canacity during PM peak (5:00n-5:59n, outhound) at may load		5.9%	7.4%	6.9%	5.8%	6.1%	4.9%	7.8%	6.0%	7.2%	6.3%	5.8%	6.9%	4.2%	4.9%	6.3%	7.8%	5.4%	$\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{$
2.2.7 points		7.1%	8.6%	6.9%	5.7%	7.2%	4.7%	6.6%	6.4%	5.7%	7.2%	7.0%	7.3%	5.2%	5.6%	6.3%	6.3%	5.2%	$\sim \sim$

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | December 2014



212       Mark during binder blue (plot)       1.117       3.071       3.08       4.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       4.08       3.08       4.08 <th>ID Metric</th> <th>Target</th> <th>FY12 Avg</th> <th>FY13 Avg</th> <th>FY14 Avg</th> <th>FY15 Avg</th> <th>Nov 2013</th> <th>Dec 2013</th> <th>Jan 2014</th> <th>Feb 2014</th> <th>Mar 2014</th> <th>Apr 2014</th> <th>May 2014</th> <th>Jun 2014</th> <th>Jul 2014</th> <th>Aug 2014</th> <th>Sep 2014</th> <th>Oct 2014</th> <th>Nov 2014</th> <th>Monthly Trend</th>	ID Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Monthly Trend
121       Model decisions shares black [bi]       1,100       3,100       4,200       5,200	Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																			
212       Mark during binder blue (plot)       1.117       3.071       3.08       4.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       4.08       3.08       4.08       4.08       3.08       4.08 <td></td> <td></td> <td>3.300</td> <td>3.310</td> <td>4.632</td> <td>5.657</td> <td>4.021</td> <td>4.661</td> <td>5.209</td> <td>4,747</td> <td>5.675</td> <td>5.920</td> <td>5.881</td> <td>5.707</td> <td>6.202</td> <td>5.941</td> <td>6.260</td> <td>4.947</td> <td>5.216</td> <td><math>\sim\sim</math></td>			3.300	3.310	4.632	5.657	4.021	4.661	5.209	4,747	5.675	5.920	5.881	5.707	6.202	5.941	6.260	4.947	5.216	$\sim\sim$
222       Non-startic shower have relation (bela)       2,358       3,358       4,78       3,80       4,80 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>3,137</td><td>3,571</td><td>3,164</td><td>4,067</td><td>3,222</td><td>3,101</td><td>3,562</td><td>3,083</td><td>4,045</td><td>3,182</td><td></td><td>4,061</td><td></td><td>4,146</td><td>4,233</td><td>3,954</td><td></td><td></td></td<>			3,137	3,571	3,164	4,067	3,222	3,101	3,562	3,083	4,045	3,182		4,061		4,146	4,233	3,954		
2>0       consign of advandaminang advandamin	2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	1,906	2,653	2,215	1,923	1,682	3,235	2,132	1,795	1,758	1,888	1,924	1,515	2,425		$\langle \rangle$
22.20       Contrage of should and again generation       Meteory in performance       Part of the performance	2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,835	4,734	9,983	4,315	6,850	4,307	3,196	3,465	4,026	9,076	5,770	8,080	12,839	3,538	23,706		$\sim \sim$
2131       Besting landow time, energy entring, unange	2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.7%	97.0%	96.2%	96.1%	98.4%	96.6%	96.0%	97.3%	96.6%	95.1%	93.9%	90.7%	94.9%	95.3%	96.1%	96.5%	97.8%	$\langle$
12.11       International process weeksion)       17,248       77,248       77,248       77,258       77,278	2.2.10 Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure in	development																	
12.11       promage day plant blackstores and allogeneration       91.46       94.28       94.26       91.25       96.06       94.76       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       92.76       96.26       97.26       96.26       97.26       96.26       97.26       96.26       97.26       97.26       97.26       97.6 <td< td=""><td>2.2.11 Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)</td><td></td><td>490,514</td><td>495,311</td><td>504,162</td><td>484,245</td><td>497,653</td><td>482,111</td><td>495,529</td><td>502,172</td><td>512,759</td><td>513,835</td><td>515,109</td><td>498,616</td><td>484,245</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><math>\langle</math></td></td<>	2.2.11 Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		490,514	495,311	504,162	484,245	497,653	482,111	495,529	502,172	512,759	513,835	515,109	498,616	484,245					$\langle$
12.10       Percurage of up that exclusion       Image of up that	2.2.11 Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)		70,423	72,948	73,522	76,537	61,629	69,959	73,169	76,694	70,031	67,990	77,236	68,066	69,488	69,659	73,578	75,974	74,148	$\langle$
Objective 32: Increase use of all non-private automodes         Image of all non-private a	2.2.12 Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		93.6%	96.3%	94.4%	93.6%	89.1%	94.6%	97.3%	95.5%	96.0%	94.7%	90.3%	91.4%	97.0%	86.0%	97.2%	96.4%	91.7%	$\leq$
12.1.1       Segments and marks have in wordshare into the segment.       1<	2.2.13 Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	95.0%	90.5%	95.3%	96.1%	95.4%	93.5%	97.5%	95.4%	93.0%	96.5%	94.9%	96.3%	96.3%	90.8%	$\sim \sim \sim$
23.3       Average darky bischart right       Messure in development.       Image darky bischart right       Image darky bischart r	Objective 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes																			
23.3       Merge daily tax injo       Merge daily cax injo       Merge daily cax injo       Merge daily cax	2.3.1 Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%	45% (2011 M	ode Share Surv	rey)															
Objective 24: improve parking utilization and manage parking demand         I        I         I         I	2.3.2 Average daily bikeshare trips	Measure in	n development																	
24.1       Priority and and structure of speeds       Priority and and speeds	2.3.3 Average daily taxi trips	Measure in	n development																	
24.2       Descriptionality of SMR games gaves       97.8k       97.8k       97.8k       97.8k       97.8k       97.8k       98.4k       98.0k       10.0k	Objective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand																			
2.1       al source strete body gaving space <sup>1</sup> Image: market body gaving space <sup>1</sup>	2.4.1 Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces <sup>7</sup>		70.0%	71.9%	75.2%		72.1%	70.0%												$\setminus$
24.3       indicator off-street blockle parking:       indicator       indicator	2.4.2 Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces		97.8%	97.7%	97.8%	98.3%	97.3%	93.7%	97.7%	97.7%	97.7%	98.2%	98.4%	98.4%	99.0%	98.0%	98.4%	98.5%	97.7%	$\sim$
24.4       On-street payment compliance (Spack plat areas only)       Image: Spack plat areas only)	2.4.3 # of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces <sup>8</sup>					6,500														
Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco       Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emission s, wate, and noise       Improve the Agency's and the agency tresource agency method system's	2.4.3 # of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) <sup>8</sup>					120														
Objective 3.1: Beduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, watche and noise       Image: Construction of the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions       Image: Construction of the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions       Image: Construction of the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions       Image: Construction of the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions       Image: Construction of the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions       Image: Construction of the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions       Image: Construction of the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions       Image: Construction system's resource consumption system's resource c	2.4.4 On-street payment compliance (SF <i>park</i> pilot areas only) <sup>7</sup>			53.3%	53.5%		52.8%	52.9%												/
31.1       SMA carbon bottymin metric from CO20       48,556       37,0%       0	Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San F																			
31.2       Precentage of SMTA non-reveue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alternative fuel/zero emissions       Image: mail of the state match is alterna	Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource	ns, waste, ar	id noise																	
31.12       Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       94.0%       94.0%       98.0%       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that tay fluct tay	3.1.1 SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons CO2e)		48,556	45.455																
31.12       Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       94.0%       94.0%       98.0%       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that is alternative flue/zero emissions       Image: Procentage of SFMTA tay fluct that tay fluct tay	3.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions			37.0%																
31.3       Procentage biodisate to disaset used by SFMTA (blend equivalent)       14.0%       19.3%       Columbra       C			94.0%		98.0%															
31.4       Number of electric vehicle charging stations       33       63					50.070															
3.16       Agency electricity consumption (Wh)       124,1262,122,809,329       I <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>63</td> <td></td>					63															
31.6       Agency gas consumption (therms)       415,308       Image of the second o					00															
1.1.6       Agerry water consumption (gallons)       20,201,299       20,116,592       Image: Consumption (gallons)			, .,	,,																
3.1.7       Agency waste diversion rate       Measure in development.       Image: Construction of the service delay (Monthy SM)       Measure in development.       Image: Construction of the service delay (Monthy SM)       Image: Construle delay (Monthy SM) </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>20.201.299</td> <td></td>			20.201.299																	
Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economyS3.7S2.8S3.3S2.2S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.4S2.1S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.3S2.2S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.4S2.1S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.3S2.2S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.4S2.1S2.8S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.3S2.2S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.3S2.2S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.6S2.8S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S3.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.7S2.8S2.8S2.8S2.8S		Measure in																		
3.2.1       Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM)       i       \$3.7       \$2.8       \$3.3       \$2.2       \$2.6       \$2.6       \$2.4       \$2.1       \$2.8       i </td <td></td>																				
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Image: c		,		\$3.7	\$2.8		\$3.3	\$2.2	\$2.5	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$2.4	\$2.1	\$2.8						
3.1       Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase       Results reporting to begin in FY15.       Image: Control of the synthesis of the synthesynthesis of the synthesis of the synthesis of the sy				<i>\$</i> 3.7	Υ <u></u> Σ.0		<b>J</b> 3.3	<i><b>YL</b>.<b>L</b></i>	.J	Υ <u></u>	<b>72.0</b>	Υ <u></u>	72.1	Υ <u></u>						~ ~
3.3.2Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phaseResults reporting to begin in FY15.III		Boculto ror	orting to hogi	in in EV1E																
Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficientlyImage: Services efficiently<																				
A.1Average annual transit cost per venue hour\$185\$202.50202.67 $and beta beta beta beta beta beta beta beta$		nesuits lep	or this to begin																	
3.4.2Passengers per revenue hour for buses6.86.7		¢105	6202 FC	202.67																
3.4.3       Cost per unlinked trip       52.90       \$2.91       Cost		\$185																		
3.4.5       Farebox recovery ratio       32.2%       34%       Image: Constraint of the system of the																				
3.4.6       Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall       Measure in development.       Image daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall       Measure in development.       Image daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall       Image daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall       Measure in development.       Image daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall       Image daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall       Measure in development.       Image daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall       Measure in development.       Image daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall       Image daily Transit Operator surplus or s																				
3.4.7       Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month?       205       158       147       216       0       14       0       10       28       21       23       24       31       34       39       56       56         Objective 3.5:       Reduce capital and operating structural deficits       570M       \$70M       \$35M       Concernent of the structural deficit       Concernent of the structural deficit       Concernent of the structural deficit       S70M       \$35M       Concernent of the structural deficit       Concernent of the structural deficit       Concernent of the structural deficit       S70M       \$35M       Concernent of the structural deficit       Concernent of the structural deficit       Concernent of the structural deficit       S70M       \$35M       Concernent of the structural deficit       S70M       \$70M       \$35M       Concernent of the structural deficit       Co		Measure in																		
Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits       Image: Constraint operating structural deficit		ivicasul e ll			147	216	0	14	0	10	28	21	23	24	31	34	39	56	56	
3.5.1       Structural operating budget deficit       \$35M       \$70M       \$35M       \$35M       \$1			205	130	147	210	U	14	U	10	20	21	25	24	21	54	59	30	50	~
	Objective 5.5. Reduce capital and operating structural deficits																			
3.5.1 Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR) \$130M \$260M \$260M \$260M	3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit	\$35M	\$70M	\$70M	\$35M															
	3.5.1 Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)	\$130M	\$260M	\$260M	\$260M															

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | December 2014



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Monthly Trend
Goa	4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service																			
Obied	tive 4.1: Improve internal communications																			
	Employee rating: I have the Information and tools I need to do my job; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)			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)			3.4	3.5															
4.1.2	Percentage of employees that complete the survey			34.6%	28.3%															
4.1.3	Employee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals/objectives and how they contribute to Agency success.			3.4	3.5															
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days.			3.1	3.1															
4.1.5	Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved.			2.9	3.0															
4.1.6	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.			3.4	3.5															
Objec	tive 4.2: Create a collaborative and innovative work environment																			
4.2.1	Employee rating: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.4	3.4															
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.			2.9	3.0															
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.			3.9	3.9															
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.			3.3	3.4															
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively			3.7	3.8															
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.			3.6	3.7															
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.			3.7	3.8															
	tive 4.3: Improve employee accountability																			
	Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year			20.3%	62.5%	30.5%														
	Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans			18.8%	62.4%															
	Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported			73.0%	93.2%	87.2%														
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.4%	8.4%	9.1%	10.3%	10.5%	7.4%	8.1%	9.3%	9.6%	11.8%	8.8%	9.0%	8.6%	8.4%	7.1%	$\sim$
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.6	3.6															
4.3.5	Employee commendations to 311		128.6	113.7	105.3	95.8	112	76	116	90	108	86	94	95	99	83	106	110	81	$\sim\sim\sim$
Objec	tive 4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with our stakeholders																			
4.4.1	Stakeholder rating: satisfaction with SFMTA decision-making process/communications; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	l in FY15.			(1) 0															

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Includes assaults and threats on operators.

<sup>4</sup> Injury collisions.

<sup>5</sup> <1 min for headway of 5 min or less.

<sup>6</sup> Due to a NextBus/schedule data syncing issue, results are not available for 6/21/2014-6/30/2014; June 2014 averages reflect data from 6/1/2014-6/20/2014 only.

<sup>7</sup> Due to street sensor removal, occupancy-based parking measures will not be reported after Dec 2013. Parking program staff are currently developing an alternative metric.

<sup>8</sup> Running total of SFMTA-installed facilities.

<sup>9</sup> FY Total rather than FY Average