## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2013

SFMTA Municipal Transportation Agency
--

ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	Monthly Trend
Goa	11: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone	5												
Objec	tive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users.													
1.1.1	SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.39	3.77	7.56	10.73	7.24	9.44	10.68	9.24	11.37	11.01	11.18	10.28	$\sim$
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.95										
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or station); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.89										
1.1.3	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes		3	3.8	3.5	2	1	6	2	6	2	5	2	$\sim \sim \sim$
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		42	36.3	32.5	44	29	35	40	34	38	39	26	$\searrow$
Objec	ctive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security.													
1.2.1	Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	14.6	16.2	13.8	11.7	13.7	12.8	11.3	12.0	13.9	10.4	11.7		$\langle$
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)		11	11.7	12	21	12	19	11	13	8	12		$\sim$
1.2.3	Lost work days due to injury		3,764	3,912										
1.2.4	Employee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	Results will b	pe reported	to the SFN	/ITA Board i	in Octobei	r.							
Objec	ctive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system.													
1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.53	5.03	5.23	5.72	4.27	5.81	5.18	6.20	5.41	5.19	5.72		$\sim\sim$
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists	Awaiting 201	2 results.											
1.3.2	Collisions involving taxis	Awaiting 201	L2 results.											
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.65	4.24	4.15	4.40	3.97	2.97	4.29	3.70	4.82	4.15		$\langle$
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		179	157	182	158	152	156	179	163	148	175	189	$\langle$
1.3.5	Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.40										
	12: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	irsharing	the pre	ferred	means	of trave	el							
Objec	tive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications.													
2.1.1	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.48										
2.1.2	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.48										
2.1.3	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.81										
2.1.4	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.54										
2.1.5	City Survey rating: Communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.20										
2.1.6	Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		87%	93.3%	98%	96%	97%	97%	92%	99%	91%	98%		$\sim$
2.1.6	Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
2.1.6	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85%	81.8%	71.1%	80%	82%	87%	86%	87%	84%	86%	56%	
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81%	79.1%			82%			89%				
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97%	96.8%	98.7%	95%	99%	97%	93%	98%	98%	99%	98%	$\sim$
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87%	90%	90%	82%	87%	94%	97%	96%	92%	90%		
2.1.8	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.39										
2.1.9	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.47										



## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2013

ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	Monthly Trend
Obje	tive 2.2: Improve transit performance.													
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network (<1 min for	4.0%	5.3%	5.5%	5.8%	4.8%	5.1%	5.1%	5.4%	5.7%	5.9%	5.9%	5.8%	
2.2.1	headways of 5 min or less)	4.0%	5.3%	5.5%	5.6%	4.6%	5.1%	5.1%	5.4%	5.7%	5.9%	5.9%	5.6%	$\sim$
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network	13.9%	18.5%	17.6%	17.1%	16.6%	17.0%	15.7%	15.2%	16.8%	16.9%	16.9%	17.2%	$\sim$
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes	85%	61.0%	59.5%	61.4%	60.0%	59.2%	60.4%	61.9%	61.6%	61.3%	62.4%	60.3%	$\overline{}$
2.2.3	Percentage of scheduled service delivered	98.5%	96.6%	96.8%	97.5%	97.8%	96.7%	98.4%	99.2%	97.9%	97.6%	98.0%	96.9%	$\sim$
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	85%	76.9%	73.5%	75.0%	74.5%	73.6%	75.0%	76.1%	75.0%	74.4%	75.0%	75.0%	$\checkmark$
2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Results will b												
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance	85%	60.1%	58.9%	59.9%	60.5%	59.8%	60.7%	61.3%	60.4%	59.6%	59.8%	60.1%	$\checkmark$
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points		6.4%	7.5%	7.4%	6.6%	7.6%	7.4%	7.0%	6.7%	5.4%	6.4%	8.4%	$\sim$
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		7.1%	7.7%	8.5%	6.4%	5.9%	7.0%	7.6%	7.3%	7.1%	8.1%	8.9%	$\checkmark$
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	3,921	3,631	3,723	4,170	3,712	3,427	3,771	3,921		$\langle$
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,673		3,927	4,440	3,984	3,655	2,806				
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,224		1,958	2,316	1,620	2,530	2,025				$\sim$
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,735		2,649	2,811	4,814	5,488	4,979				$\langle$
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered	Please see 2	.2.3.											
2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure in a	developme	nt.										
2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		490,514	495,311		467,267	488,616	493,484	501,281	504,740	478,503			$\langle$
2.2.11	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)	Results will b	pe reported	l in Octobe	r.									
2.2.12	Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		93.6%	96.2%	96.2%	96.5%	95.8%	98.4%	96.7%	96.8%	93.7%	96.2%	95.3%	$\langle$
2.2.13	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.7%	93.6%	85.7%	87.0%	93.0%	88.2%	88.0%	95.7%	93.6%	91.8%	$\langle$
Obje	tive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes.													
2.3.1	Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%				45% (2011 Mode Share				re Survey)				
Obje	tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand.													
2.4.1	Parking reliability rate of SF <i>park</i> spaces		70.0%	71.9%	78.2%	78.9%	74.5%	72.7%	73.3%	74.0%	76.1%	76.9%	79.4%	$\langle$
2.4.2	Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces		97.8%	97.7%	98.5%	97.7%	98.2%	98.4%	96.8%	96.8%	98.6%	98.0%	99.0%	$\langle$
2.4.3	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces		5,732	6,792	6,820	6,366	6,372	6,456	6,558	6,632	6,720	6,792	6,820	
2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)		846	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	
2.4.4	On-street payment compliance (SF park pilot areas only)			53.3%	53.6%	53.2%	54.4%	54.7%	53.3%	52.9%	53.4%	53.6%	53.5%	$\langle$
	<b>I 3:</b> Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fr													
	tive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource	•	on, emissi	ons, wast	e, and no	ise.								
	Metric tons of C02e for the transportation system	1,515,000										2,155,	000 (2010)	
3.1.2	% of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions												94%	
3.1.3	% biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA												2% (FY11)	
	Number of electric vehicle charging stations												33	
-	Citywide gasoline consumption rate											, ,	104 (2009)	
3.1.6	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)											, ,	104 (FY11)	
3.1.6	Agency gas consumption (therms)											,	043 (FY11)	
3.1.6	Agency water consumption (gallons)											21,301,	010 (FY11)	
3.1.7	Agency compost production (tonnes)												14 (CY09)	
	Agency recycling production (tonnes)												535 (CY09)	
	Agency waste production (tonnes)												593 (CY09)	
	tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the eco	nomy.												
3.2.1	Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)			\$50M										
Obje	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.													
		<b>D</b>		alia lia EV4.4										
3.3.1	% of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase	Results repo	orting to be	gin in F¥14										



## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2013

ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	Monthly Trend
Obje	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently.													
3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$187	\$195									\$	195 (FY12)	
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses		70										70 (FY12)	
3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip		\$2.77									\$2	2.77 (FY12)	
3.4.4	Pay hours: platform hours ratio		1.12	1.12	1.11	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.10	1.11	1.10	Ś
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio		30.8%									30	.8% (FY12)	
Obje	tive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits.													
3.5.1	Operating and capital structural deficit					\$70 <b>Ⅳ</b>	l additiona		•					od Repair (SOGR) nd transit (FY12)
Goa	I 4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service													
Obje	tive 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)	Results will be reported to the SFMTA Board in October.												
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)	Results will be reported to the SFMTA Board in October.												
4.1.2	% of employees that complete the survey	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFM	ИTA Board i	in October	•							
4.1.3	Employee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals/objectives and how they contribute to Agency success.	Results will be reported to the SFMTA Board in October.												
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days.	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFM	/ITA Board i	in October								
4.1.5	Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved.	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFN	ATA Board i	in October	-							
4.1.6	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFM	/ITA Board i	in October								
Obje	ctive 4.2: Create a collaborative and innovative work environment.													
4.2.1	Employee rating: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFM	ИTA Board i	in October								
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFN	/ITA Board i	n October								
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFM	/ITA Board i	in October								
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.	Results will I	be reported	to the SFM	ATA Board i	in October								
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFN	ATA Board i	in October	-							
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFN	/ITA Board i	n October								
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFM	/ITA Board i	in October								
Obje	tive 4.3: Improve employee accountability.													
4.3.1	% of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year			20.3%										
4.3.1	% of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans			18.8%										
4.3.2	% of divisions/units that report metrics	Results will I	pe reported	in Octobe	r.									
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.4%	8.9%	10.3%	8.5%	6.9%	8.3%	9.0%	8.8%	10.0%	$\sim$
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.	Results will I	pe reported	to the SFM	ATA Board i	in October								
Obje	ctive 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)	Survey will I	oe conducte	ed in FY14.										