## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | August 2013



ID	Metric	Goal	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013	Jul 2013
Goa	11: Create a safer transportation experienc	e for every	one														
Obje	ctive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system use	ers.															
1.1.1	SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.05	7.56	11.02	4.85	5.09	5.98	5.65	5.26	4.81	7.24	9.44	10.68	9.24	11.37	11.01	11.02
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		2.95														
	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or station); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		2.89														
	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes		4	4	1	2	10	6	3	4	2	1	6	2	6	2	4
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		38	39	36	42	39	27	40	40	44	29	35	40	34	47	39
Obje	ctive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security.																
1.2.1	Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	13.1	13.8		14.2	17.9	13	15	18	13.7	13.7	12.8	11.3	12	13.9	10.4	
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)		12		9	10	10	6	10	11	21	12	19	11	13	8	
1.2.3	Lost work days due to injury		3,912		4,242	4,535	3,495	3,779	3,646	3,773							
1.2.4	Employee rating: Feel safe and secure while working																
Obje	ctive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation																
1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.07	5.16		5.12	4.91	4.67	6.42	4.45	5.05	4.23	5.81	5.05	6.16	5.45	4.6	
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists	Awaiting 2012 r	esults.														
1.3.2	Collisions involving taxis	Awaiting 2012 r															
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.15		4.94	4.6	4.99	4.24	3.49	4.3	4.4	3.92	2.97	4.29	3.7	3.96	
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		159	172	158	179	166	173	138	132	158	152	156	178	172	148	172
1.3.5	Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		3.40														
Goa	12: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ric	lesharing 8	carsha	iring													
Obje	ctive 2.1: Improve customer service and																
2.1.1	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		2.48														
	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													:	3.20 (FY13)
2.1.6	Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		93%		89%	92%	88%	94%	89%	95%	96%	97%	97%	92%	99%	91%	
2.1.6	Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2.1.6	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		82%	86%	82%	84%	81%	86%	63%	79%	80%	82%	87%	86%	87%	84%	86%
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		79%			69%			76%			82%			89%		
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97%	99%	98%	94%	99%	97%	97%	97%	95%	99%	97%	93%	98%	98%	99%



## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | August 2013

ID	Metric	Goal	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013	Jul 2013
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		90%		91%	93%	87%	86%	93%	82%	82%	87%	94%	97%	96%	92%	
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														
Obje	ctive 2.2: Improve transit performance.																
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network (<1 min for headways of 5 min or less)	2.9%	5.5%	5.9%	5.3%	6.3%	6.0%	6.2%	5.1%	5.2%	4.8%	5.1%	5.1%	5.4%	5.7%	5.9%	5.9%
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network	10.2%	17.6%	16.9%	19.1%	20.3%	19.1%	18.8%	17.0%	19.1%	16.6%	17.0%	15.7%	15.2%	16.8%	16.9%	16.9%
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes	85%	59.5%	62.4%	60.0%	57.2%	56.9%	57.6%	59.1%	59.2%	60.0%	59.2%	60.4%	62.0%	61.6%	61.3%	62.4%
2.2.3	Percentage of scheduled service delivered	98.5%	96.8%	98.0%	95.3%	94.0%	95.7%	96.2%	96.7%	96.0%	97.8%	96.7%	98.4%	99.2%	97.9%	97.6%	98.0%
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	85%	73.5%	75.0%	76.4%	70.0%	70.2%	71.1%	73.1%	72.8%	74.5%	73.6%	75.0%	76.1%	75.0%	74.4%	75.0%
2.2.5	Average Muni system speed																
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance	85%	58.9%	59.8%	59.0%	55.6%	56.0%	56.6%	58.9%	59.0%	60.5%	59.8%	60.7%	61.3%	60.4%	59.6%	59.8%
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points		7.5%	6.4%	7.5%	7.7%	8.5%	9.4%	7.8%	7.1%	6.6%	7.6%	7.4%	7.0%	6.7%	5.4%	6.4%
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		7.7%	8.1%	7.7%	10.1%	8.5%	8.9%	6.7%	8.0%	6.4%	5.9%	7.0%	7.6%	7.3%	7.1%	8.1%
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,310	3,921	2,820	3,087	2,815	2,877	3,071	3,197	3,631	3,723	4,170	3,712	3,427	3,771	3,921
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,673		4,211	3,358	3,657	3,660	3,910	3,167	3,927	4,440	3,984	3,655	2,806		
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,224		2,454	6,566	2,200	2,144	1,990	1,891	1,958	2,316	1,620	2,530	2,025		
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		3,735		4,571	6,202	4,248	2,386	4,244	2,624	2,649	2,811	4,814	5,488	4,979		
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered																
2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered																
2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		495,311		486,497	505,630	517,674	515,379	484,545	500,121	467,267	488,616	493,484	501,281	504,740	478,503	
2.2.11	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)																
2.2.12	Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		96.3%	96.2%	96.8%	96.8%	98.9%	96.2%	96.9%	91.7%	96.5%	95.8%	98.4%	96.7%	96.8%	93.7%	96.2%
2.2.13	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		88.1%	93.6%	84.5%	87.1%	87.1%	89.3%	87.3%	84.1%	85.7%	87.0%	93.0%	88.2%	88.0%	95.7%	93.6%
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 Sha	re Survey)
Obje	tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage																
2.4.1	Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces		71.9%	76.6%	69.4%	67.8%	67.3%	66.6%	69.6%	72.9%	78.9%	74.5%	72.7%	73.3%	74.0%	76.0%	76.6%
	Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces		97.7%	98.0%	99.2%	98.7%	99.0%	98.8%	96.8%	93.2%	97.7%	98.2%	98.4%	96.8%	96.8%	98.6%	98.0%
2.4.3	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces		6,822														
2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)		896														
2.4.4	On-street payment compliance (SFpark pilot areas only)		53.3%	53.6%	53.7%	53.7%	52.9%	52.9%	51.8%	52.4%	53.2%	54.4%	54.7%	53.3%	52.9%	53.4%	53.6%



## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | August 2013

ID	Metric	Goal	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013	Jul 2013
Goa	<b>I 3:</b> Improve the environment and quality o	f life in Sar	Francis	sco							-						
Obje	ctive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system	stem's resour	ce consur	nption, ei	missions	, waste, a	nd noise.										
3.1.1	Metric tons of C02e for the transportation system	1,515,000														2,155,0	000 (2010)
3.1.2	% of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero																0.40/
	emissions																94%
3.1.3	% biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA																2% (FY11)
3.1.4	Number of electric vehicle charging stations																33
3.1.5	Citywide gasoline consumption rate															149,156,2	104 (2009)
3.1.6	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)															123,746,	104 (FY11)
3.1.6	Agency gas consumption (therms)															579,	043 (FY11)
3.1.6	Agency water production (gallons)															21,301,	010 (FY11)
3.1.7	Agency compost production (tonnes)																14 (CY09)
3.1.7	Agency recycling production (tonnes)															I.	535 (CY09)
3.1.7	Agency waste production (tonnes)															Ľ,	593 (CY09)
Obje	ctive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive in	mpact to the e	conomy.	-													1
3.2.1	Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)		\$50M				·										
Obje	ctive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.																
3.3.1	% of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase																
3.3.2	% of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase																
Obje	ctive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently.																
3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$178														\$	195 (FY12)
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses																70 (FY12)
3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip															\$2	2.77 (FY12)
3.4.4	Pay hours: platform hours ratio		1.12	1.11	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.13	1.12	1.13	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.10	1.11
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio															30	.8% (FY12)
Obje	ctive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural																
3.5.1	Operating and capital structural deficit							\$70M a	additional n	eeded for					tate-of-Goo trian, facilit	• •	•
Goa	I 4: Create a workplace that delivers outsta	nding															
Obje	ctive 4.1: Improve internal communications.																
4.1.1	Employee rating: Information needed to do the job? Informed																
	about agency issues, challenges and current events?; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)																
4.1.2	% of employees that complete the survey																
4.1.3	Employee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's																
	goals/objectives and how they contribute to Agency success																

## STRATEGIC DI ANI METRICS REDORT | August 2013

ID	Metric	Goal	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013	Jul 2013
4.1.4	Employee rating: Communication between leadership and employees has improved																
4.1.5	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile																
Obje	ctive 4.2: Create a collaborative and innovative work																
4.2.1	Employee rating: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)																
4.2.2	Employee rating: Concerns, comments and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately																
4.2.3	Employee rating: Conflicts are resolved collaboratively																
4.2.4	Employee rating: Employees in my division consistently look for more efficient/effective ways of getting the job done																
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively																
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'																
1.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment																
Obje	ctive 4.3: Improve employee accountability.																
4.3.1	% of employees with performance completed/appraisals conducted																
4.3.2	% of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year																
4.3.3	Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days																
4.3.4	% of divisions/units that report metrics																
4.3.5	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		8.6%	8.8%	9.4%	10.5%	9.3%	6.6%	7.0%	9.0%	8.9%	10.3%	8.5%	6.9%	8.3%	9.0%	8.8%
4.3.6	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives																
Obje	ctive 4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with our	r															
1	Stakeholder rating: satisfaction with SEMTA decision making																

4.4.1 Stakeholder rating: satisfaction with SFMTA decision-making process/communications; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)

