## 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
Goa	1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone	9												
Obie	ctive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users.													
	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	~~
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		9	2.95	2011									
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	<b>\</b>
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		42	36.3	32.5	44	29	35	40	34	38	39	26	<b>\</b>
Obje	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		>
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)		11	11.7	12	21	12	19	11	13	8	12		<b>\</b>
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	be reported	to the SFI	MTA Board	in October	r.							
Obje	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		~~~
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists	Awaiting 20	12 results.											-
1.3.2	Collisions involving taxis	Awaiting 20	12 results.											
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles	<u> </u>	4.65	4.24	4.15	4.40	3.97	2.97	4.29	3.70	4.82	4.15		<b>&gt;</b>
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										
Goa	12: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	rsharing	the nre	ferred	means	of trave	اد							
	ctive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications.			l										
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%	
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)		1	2.39										
2.1.9	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.47										





Description	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
2.1.   Percentage of transit trips with -2 min brunching on played Network (1.1 min for large)   1.5 min or less)   1.5 min o	Obied	tive 2.2: Improve transit performance.													
Manufacyary of a fini or fees)   1.5		•	4.00/	F 20/	F F0/	F 00/	4.00/	F 10/	F 10/	F 40/	F 70/	F 00/	F 00/	F 00/	
Executage of un-dise performance for non-flaged Network routes	2.2.1	headways of 5 min or less)	4.0%											5.8%	
Part	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%	$\left. \right\rangle$
2.2.2.   Average Win stems speed   Restuts will be reported in Cobber.   Restuts will be reported in Cobber.   Restuts will stem speed   Restuts will be reported in Cobber.   Restuts	2.2.2			61.0%											<b>✓</b>
2.2.5   Serving with system speed   Results will be reported in Colcidor.	2.2.3	Percentage of scheduled service delivered		96.6%											<b>✓</b>
2.2.1 Percentage of misting entranger entrang							74.5%	73.6%	75.0%	76.1%	75.0%	74.4%	75.0%	75.0%	<b>✓</b>
2.7 Forentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during PM peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points poor capacity during peak (\$000 \$520, inbound) at max load points point	2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Results will b	oe reported	in Octobe										
Doctors	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%	<b>✓</b>
A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.	2.2.7			6.4%	7.5%	7.4%	6.6%	7.6%	7.4%	7.0%	6.7%	5.4%	6.4%	8.4%	
2.2.8   Mean distance between failure (LEV)	2.2.7			7.1%	7.7%	8.5%	6.4%	5.9%	7.0%	7.6%	7.3%	7.1%	8.1%	8.9%	<i></i>
2.2.2   Mean distance between failure (Historic)	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		<b>\</b>
Mean distance between failure (Cable)	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,673		3,927	4,440	3,984	3,655	2,806				
Please see 2.7.1.	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,224		1,958	2,316	1,620	2,530	2,025				<b>\</b>
2.2.10   Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered   Measure in development   2.2.11   Ridership (industries, average weekday)   Results will be reported in October.   2.2.12   Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)   Results will be reported in October.   2.2.12   Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation   93.6%   96.2%   96.2%   96.5%   95.8%   98.8%   99.8%   96.7%   96.8%   93.7%   96.8%   93.7%   96.2%   9	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,735		2,649	2,811	4,814	5,488	4,979				
2.2.11   Rifership (rubber tire, average weekday)   Results will be reported in October.	2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered	Please see 2.	.2.3.											
Results will be reported in October.	2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure in o	developme	nt.										
2.212   Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation   9.6.7%   96.2%   96.2%   96.2%   98.2%   9	2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		490,514	495,311		467,267	488,616	493,484	501,281	504,740	478,503			
Description	2.2.11	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)	Results will b	oe reported	in Octobe	r.									
Discritive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes.	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%	<b>\</b>
1.3.1   Non-private auto mode share (all trips)   50%	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%	\ \
Dispective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand.	Objec	tive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes.													
2.4.1   Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces   70.0%   71.9%   78.2%   78.9%   74.5%   72.7%   73.3%   74.0%   76.1%   76.9%   79.4%	2.3.1	Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%									45% (2011	Mode Sha	re Survey)	
2.4.2 arking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces 97.8% 97.7% 98.5% 97.7% 98.5% 98.4% 98.6% 98.6% 98.0% 99.0%	Obje	tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand.													
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 on-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)   846   882   882   882   882   882   882   882   882   2.4.4 On-street payment compliance (Fsprace) pilot areas only)   53,33%   53,6%   53,2%   54,4%   54,7%   53,3%   52,9%   53,4%   53,6%   53,5%    Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco  Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise.  3.1.1 Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system   1,515,000   2,155,000 (2010)   3.1.2 % of SmMT ann-revenue and tast fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions   2,46 (FY11)   3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations   33   3.1.5 Citychide gasoline consumption rich agency as consumption (kWh)   149,156,104 (2009)   3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (kWh)   123,746,104 (FY11)   3.1.7 Agency own exert consumption (gallons)   140,000 (1711)   3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes)   150,000 (2010)   3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes)   533 (CY09)   3.1.8 Similar de conomic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)   550M   3.1.1 Main and the service on-surface of Muni service delays (annualized)   550M   3.1.1 Main and the service on-surface of Muni service delays (annualized)   550M   3.1.1 Main and the service on-surface of Muni service delays (annualized)   550M   3.1.1 Main and the service on-surface on-budget by hase   Results reporting to begin in FY14.	2.4.1	Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces		70.0%	71.9%	78.2%	78.9%	74.5%	72.7%	73.3%	74.0%	76.1%	76.9%	79.4%	
2.4.3 # of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)	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%	$\langle$
2.4.4 On-street payment compliance (SFpark pilot areas only)  Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco  Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise.  3.1.1 Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system  1.515,000  3.1.2 % of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions  1.515,000  3.1.3 % biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA  3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations 3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption (RWh) 3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (Herms) 3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (Herms) 3.1.6 Agency one star consumption (gallons) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency maste production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.8 Sof all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  Results reporting to begin in FY14.	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	
Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco  Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise.  3.1.1 Metric tons of COZe for the transportation system  1,515,000  1,515,000  2,155,000 (2010)  3.1.2 % of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions  1,515,000  2,155,000 (2010)  3.1.3 % bloidese to diesel used by SFMTA  1,515,000  2,466,000  3,1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations  3,1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate  1,515,000  1,5	2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)		846	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	
Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise.	2.4.4	On-street payment compliance (SFpark pilot areas only)			53.3%	53.6%	53.2%	54.4%	54.7%	53.3%	52.9%	53.4%	53.6%	53.5%	$\langle$
3.1.1 Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system  1,515,000  1,2155,000 (2010)  3.1.2 % of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions  3.1.3 % biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA  1,2 We fy fy fy fy fill is alternative fuel/zero emissions  3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations  3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate  3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh)  3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms)  3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons)  3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes)  3.1.8 Agency compost production (tonnes)  3.1.9 Agency excycling production (tonnes)  3.1.1 Agency excycling production (tonnes)  3.1.2 Agency water production (tonnes)  3.1.3 Agency are production (tonnes)  3.1.4 Agency are production (tonnes)  3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption (allons)  3.1.6 Agency water production (tonnes)  3.1.7 Agency water production (tonnes)  3.1.8 Agency compost production (tonnes)  3.1.9 Agency excycling production (tonnes)  3.1.1 Agency water production (tonnes)  3.1.2 Is Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy.  3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.  3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  Results reporting to begin in FY14.		• • •													
3.1.2 % of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions 3.1.3 % biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA 3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations 3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate 3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh) 3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms) 3.1.6 Agency water consumption (therms) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.8 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.9 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) 3.1.1 Sof all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase 3.1.2 Results reporting to begin in FY14.		5 , , ,		on, emissi	ons, wast	e, and no	ise.								
3.1.3 % biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA  3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations  3.3.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate  3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh)  3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms)  3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms)  3.1.7 Agency water consumption (gallons)  3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes)  3.1.8 Agency recycling production (tonnes)  3.1.9 Agency recycling production (tonnes)  3.1.1 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.2 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.3 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.4 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.5 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.8 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.9 Agency expecting production (tonnes)  3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase	3.1.1	<u> </u>	1,515,000										2,155,	000 (2010)	
3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations 3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate 3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh) 3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms) 3.1.6 Agency water consumption (therms) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency water production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency water production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency water production (tonnes) 3.1.8 Agency water production (tonnes) 3.1.9 Agency compost production (tonnes) 3.1.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) 3.1.1 Agency capital projects delivered on-budget by phase 3.1.2 Results reporting to begin in FY14.	_	% of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions													
3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate  3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh)  3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms)  3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons)  3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes)  3.1.8 Agency recycling production (tonnes)  3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.8 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.9 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.1 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.1 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.2 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  3.1.1 Agency waste projects delivered on-budget by phase  3.1.2 Results reporting to begin in FY14.		,												2% (FY11)	
3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh)  3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms)  3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons)  3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes)  3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes)  3.1.8 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.9 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.1 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.1 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.1.2 Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy.  3.1.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  3.1.2 Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.  3.1.3 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  3.1.1 Results reporting to begin in FY14.	3.1.4	Number of electric vehicle charging stations													
3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms) 3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.8 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) 3.1.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) 3.1.2 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.3 Allocate capital resources effectively. 3.1.4 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.5 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.8 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.9 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.0 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.1 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.2 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.3 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.4 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.5 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste produ	3.1.5	Citywide gasoline consumption rate													
3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.8 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) 3.1.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) 3.1.2 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.3 Allocate capital resources effectively. 3.1.4 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.5 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste prod		• , , , , , ,													
3.1.7 Agency compost production (tonnes)  3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes)  3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes)  3.2.1 Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy.  3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  3.2.1 Allocate capital resources effectively.  3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  3.3.1 Results reporting to begin in FY14.														_ ,	
3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes) 535 (CY09) 593 (CY09)  Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy. 3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) 550M  Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively. 3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  Results reporting to begin in FY14.													21,301,		
3.1.7 Agency waste production (tonnes)  Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy.  3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.  3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  Results reporting to begin in FY14.															
Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy.  3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)  Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.  3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  Results reporting to begin in FY14.		<del>- 1 1 - 1 - 1</del>												. ,	
3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) \$50M  Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively. \$3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.														593 (CY09)	
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.  3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	Objec	tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the eco	nomy.												
3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized) \$50M														
3.3.1 % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	Objec	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.													
	_	. ,	Results repo	rting to be	gin in FY14										
J.J.2 1/8 of all capital projects delivered off-time by phase projects delivered off-time by phase projects delivered off-time by phase		% of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase	Results reporting to begin in FY14.												





ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Ave	lan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013	May 2013	lun 2013	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	Monthly Trend		
		Turget	TILL AUG	1113746	1114746	Juli 2013	100 2010	10101 2015	Apr 2010	Way 2015	Juli 2013	741 2013	Aug 2013	Tolonemy Tremu		
	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently.															
	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$187	\$195									\$	195 (FY12)	<b></b>		
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses		70										70 (FY12)			
	Cost per unlinked trip		\$2.77	4.40		4.40		1.11			4.40		2.77 (FY12)			
	Pay hours: platform hours ratio	1.12 1.12 1.11 1.12 1.11							1.11	1.11	1.10	1.11	1.10	$\longrightarrow$		
	Farebox recovery ratio	30.8%										30	.8% (FY12)			
Obje	tive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits.					6701				626004 - 1				1.0 (50.60)		
3.5.1	Operating and capital structural deficit					\$70IV	additiona	I needed for operations, \$260M additional needed for State-of-Good Repair (SOG and \$1.7B 5-Year shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and transit (FY1								
Goa	<b>14:</b> Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service															
Obje	ctive 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	d to the SFI	MTA Board	in Octobe	er.									
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 reporte	d to the SFI	MTA Board	in Octobe	er.									
4.1.2	% of employees that complete the survey	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	∕ITA Board	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 SFN	MTA Board	in October	·.									
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days.	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	∕/TA Board	in October										
4.1.5	Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved.	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	MTA Board	in October	·.									
4.1.6	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	∕ITA Board	in October	·.									
Obje	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)	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	VITA Board	in October	·									
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	MTA Board	in October	•									
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.	Results will	·.													
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	MTA Board	in October	r.									
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	MTA Board	in October	٠.									
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.	Results will	be reported	to the SFN	MTA Board	in October	•									
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.	Results will	to the SFN	VITA Board	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	be 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	MTA Board	in October	·											
Obje	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)	Survey will	be conducte	ed in FY14.												