## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | June 2014



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Monthly Trend
Goo	   1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone															
		-														
	tive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users															_
1.1.1	SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.39	3.77	7.55	9.47	10.24	11.34	12.15	7.74	8.19	7.53	9.97	8.82	8.50	8.31	<b>~~</b>
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				3.19				3.17			3.21				
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)				3.09				3.08			3.10				
1.1.3	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes <sup>1</sup>		3	3.9	3.9	2	5	2	1	2	3	10	8	2	3	$\langle$
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		42	37.8	27.8	27	39	29	28	22	30	20	23	27	22	<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	12.2	17.6	12.1	12.2	13.6	9.0	9.3	10.3	11.1	14.7		$\overline{}$
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) <sup>2</sup>		11.3	12.1	10.0	16	15	9	12	6	10	6	5	12		~~/
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)		, ,	3.23												
Obje	ctive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system															
1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.53	5.03	5.18	5.80	6.64	5.56	7.06	6.75	4.62	5.74	4.89	4.78	6.12		{
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists <sup>3</sup>		3,111 (CY11)													
1.3.2	Collisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)													
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.65	4.23	4.41	4.35	4.68	4.49	4.50	3.92	4.13	5.28	4.57	4.45		}
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		179	159.3	182.7	197	222	210	185	161	174	157	204	169	154	<b>\</b>
1.3.5	Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>4</sup>				3.71				3.67			3.75				
Goa	12: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	rsharing	the prefe	erred me	ans of tra	avel										
Obje	ctive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications															
244	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5				3.04				3.05			3.02				
2.1.1	(high) <sup>4</sup>				3.04				3.05			3.02				
2.1.2	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.49				2.49			2.49				
2.1.3	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.71				2.66			2.75				
2.1.4	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>4</sup>				3.54				3.55			3.52				
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		86%	93.3%	93.3%	87%	90%	88%	89%	92%	100%	99%	98%	94%		
2.1.6	Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
2.1.6	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85%	82.4%	78.5%	56%	87%	86%	84%	84%	76%	73%	75%	85%	73%	<u></u>
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81%	79.1%	58.1%	79		0070	68%	0.70	7070	26%		33,0		•
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97%	96.9%	97.0%	98%	97%	98%	95%	98%	97%	94%	98%	96%	98%	~~~
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87%	90.0%	76.2%	92%	85%	71%	56%	57%	59%	76%	90%	84%		<u></u>
2.1.8	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				2.68				2.73			2.63				
2.1.9	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				2.65				2.69			2.60				

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | June 2014



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Monthly Trend
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) <sup>5</sup>	4.0%	5.3%	5.6%	5.6%	5.8%	6.5%	6.2%	6.0%	5.4%	4.9%	5.5%	5.2%	5.3%	5.6%	>
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network	13.9%	18.5%	18.0%	18.0%	17.6%	19.1%	18.8%	17.5%	17.7%	17.5%	17.1%	17.1%	18.4%	20.7%	$\langle$
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes	85%	61.0%	59.6%	59.2%	60.2%	58.6%	57.5%	57.9%	58.3%	59.6%	60.1%	60.1%	59.1%	57.0%	$\left( \right.$
2.2.3	Percentage of scheduled service delivered	98.5%	96.7%	97.0%	97.0%	96.4%	97.3%	98.2%	98.6%	96.7%	96.3%	97.5%	96.9%	95.6%	94.8%	$\left\langle \right.$
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	85%	76.9%	73.7%	74.0%	74.3%	73.4%	72.7%	73.5%	73.5%	74.7%	75.4%	75.3%	74.0%	72.1%	$\left\langle \right\rangle$
2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Measure in c	levelopment.													
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance	85%	60.1%	59.0%	59.0%	59.2%	58.0%	57.4%	57.8%	58.6%	60.2%	60.4%	60.5%	59.5%	57.6%	$\left\langle \right\rangle$
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points		5.9%	7.4%	7.5%	8.8%	11.0%	9.2%	6.7%	5.5%	7.9%	7.1%	7.4%	7.1%	5.9%	<u></u>
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		7.1%	8.6%	8.3%	9.3%	10.9%	9.0%	8.0%	5.2%	8.1%	7.6%	6.4%	8.7%	10.1%	<b>~~</b>
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	4,341	3,876	3,735	4,040	4,021	4,661	5,209	4,747	5,675	5,920	5,881	
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,104	2,434	2,453	2,710	3,222	3,101	3,562	3,083	4,045	3,182	5,450	
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,092	1,417	2,917	1,787	2,653	2,215	1,923	1,682	3,235	2,132		~~~
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,835	4,921	5,600	4,797	5,540	4,315	6,850	4,307	3,196	3,465	4,026		<b>\</b>
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.7%	96.8%	97.1%	96.8%	97.5%	98.2%	98.4%	96.6%	96.0%	97.3%	96.6%	95.1%	94.1%	$\langle$
2.2.10		Measure in c	<del></del>													
	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		490,514	495,311	502,749	504,439	527,096	517,076	497,653	482,111	495,529	502,172	515,109			$\langle$
	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)	Measure in c														
	Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		93.6%	96.3%	94.7%	95.3%	98.1%	93.9%	89.1%	94.6%	97.3%	95.5%	96.0%	94.7%	90.3%	$\sim$
	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	91.8%	92.6%	90.0%	90.5%	95.3%	96.1%	95.4%	93.5%	97.5%	95.4%	$\sim$
Obje	ctive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes															
2.3.1	Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%	45% (2011 N	lode Share Su	rvey)											
Obje	ctive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand															
2.4.1	Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces <sup>6</sup>		70.0%	71.9%	75.2%	79.4%	79.6%	73.0%	72.1%	70.0%						1
2.4.2	Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces		97.8%	97.7%	97.8%	99.0%	98.9%	98.5%	97.3%	93.7%	97.7%	97.7%	97.7%	98.2%	98.5%	_
2.4.3	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces <sup>7</sup>		6,470	6,634	7537	7300	7416	7443	7541	7681	7685	7685	7685	7685		
2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) <sup>7</sup>		567	771	799	783	783	807	807	807	807	807	807	807		
2.4.4	On-street payment compliance (SF <i>park</i> pilot areas only) <sup>6</sup>			53.3%	53.5%	53.5%	53.8%	54.1%	52.8%	52.9%						$\overline{}$
	Il 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fr	ancisco		1 22:272	55.572	001070	001070	0.112,0	0 = 10,1	02.070						
Obje	ctive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource	consumptio	n, emissior	ıs, waste, an	d noise											
3.1.1	Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system		2,155,000 (2													
3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions	,	94% (taxi)	1										1		
3.1.3	Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent)		19.3%	†												
3.1.4	Number of electric vehicle charging stations		33	1												
3.1.5	Citywide gasoline consumption rate		149,156,104	(2009)										t		
3.1.6	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)			122,809,359												
3.1.6	Agency gas consumption (therms)		436,707	415,308												
3.1.6	Agency water consumption (gallons)		20,201,299	20,116,592										1		
3.1.7	Agency compost production (tons)		14 (CY09)	1										1		
3.1.7	Agency recycling production (tons)		535 (CY09)													
3.1.7	Agency waste production (tons)		593 (CY09)													
	bjective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy															
_	Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M)	,		\$3.7	\$3.0	\$2.2	\$3.1	\$4.7	\$3.3	\$2.2	\$2.5	\$2.6	\$2.6			$\wedge$
	ctive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively			73.7	75.0	7 = 1 =	, - · -	7	72.0	7 - · · ·	7=10	72.0	72.0			
3.3.1																
3.3.2	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase		rting to begin													
2																

Color Legend

Outperforms Previous
FY Average

Underperforms Previous
FY Average
FY Average
FY Average
FY Average

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | June 2014



																Agency
ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Monthly Trend
Obje	ctive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently															
3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$192	\$202.50	202.67 <sup>8</sup>												
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses		68	67												
3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip		\$2.90	\$2.91 <sup>8</sup>												
3.4.4	Pay hours: platform hours ratio		1.12	1.12	1.11	1.10	1.10	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.12	1.12	
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio		32%	34% <sup>8</sup>												
Obje	ctive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits															
3.5.1	Operating and capital structural deficit  Make progress towards closing operating and spiral structural deficit  Make progress towards closing operating and spiral structural deficit  Make progress towards closing operating and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral structural deficit shortfall shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and spiral shortfall shortfall shortfall shortfall shortfall											•				
Goa	4: 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)			3.45												
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)			3.40												
4.1.2	Percentage of employees that complete the survey			34.6%												
4.1.3	Employee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals/objectives and how they contribute to Agency success.			3.44												
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days.			3.14												
4.1.5	Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved.			2.92												
4.1.6	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.			3.42												
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)			3.36												
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.			2.94												
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.			3.89												
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.			3.34												
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively			3.67												
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.			3.58												
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.			3.68												
Obje	ctive 4.3: Improve employee accountability															
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year			20.3%	62.5%											
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans			18.8%												
4.3.2	Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported			73.0%	93.2%											
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.2%	10.0%	8.9%	8.8%	9.1%	10.3%	10.5%	7.4%	8.1%	9.3%	9.6%	$\sim$
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.55												
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)			e conducted i	in 2014.											_	