## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2014



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	########	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Monthly Trend
Goa	1: 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	7.55	9.45	11.18	10.24	11.34	12.15	7.74	8.19	7.53	9.97	8.82	8.50	8.22	9.26		$\sim \sim$
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1				3.25					3.25			3.19			3.30			
1.1.2	(low) to 5 (high) Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or		-		3.23					5.25			5.15			5.50			
1.1.2	station): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				3.13					3.16			3.08			3.16			
1.1.3	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes <sup>1</sup>		3	3.9	4.3	5	2	5	2	1	2	3	10	8	2	3	8	44	$\sim \sim$
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		42	37.8	28.6	39	27	39	29	28	22	30	20	23	27	23	36	26	$\sim$
Objec	tive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security																		
1.2.1	Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	14.6	16.2	13.8	12.1	12.0	17.6	12.1	12.2	13.6	9.0	9.3	10.3	11.1	14.7	10.5	12.3		$\sim \sim$
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) <sup>2</sup>		11.3	12.1	9.9	9	16	15	9	12	6	10	6	5	12	8	11		$\sim \sim \sim$
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)			3.23															
Objec	tive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																		
1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.53	5.03	5.85	5.88	5.59	6.64	5.56	7.06	6.75	4.62	5.74	4.89	4.78	6.12	6.50	6.02		$\sim \sim \sim$
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists <sup>3</sup>		3,111 (CY11)																
	Collisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)				1												
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.65	4.23	4.48	4.07	4.35	4.68	4.49	4.50	3.92	4.13	5.28	4.57	4.45	4.77	4.51		$\sim \sim$
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		179	159.3	179.6	177	197	222	210	185	161	174	157	204	170	155	144	151	$\sim \sim$
1.3.5	Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>4</sup>				3.73					3.76			3.74			3.69			
Goa	<b>12:</b> Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	rsharing	the prefe	erred mea	ns of tra	vel													
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) <sup>4</sup>				3.02					3.12			3.02			2.93			
2.1.2	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.49					2.54			2.47			2.46			
2.1.3	(high) <sup>4</sup> Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.76					2.73			2.74			2.80			
2.1.4	(high) <sup>4</sup> Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1				3.50					3.64			3.52			3.33			
	(low) to 5 (high) <sup>4</sup> City Survey rating: Communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.20	5.50														
				5.20	2.76											2.76			
	Customer rating: Communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>4</sup>		86%	93.3%	93.7%	98%	87%	90%	88%	89%	92%	100%	99%	98%	94%	99%	93%		$\sim \sim$
	Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99%	93.3%	99%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%	~
	Percentage of nazardous trainc sign reports addressed within 24 hours Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		99% 85%	82.4%	75.6%	86%	56%	87%	86%	84%	84%	76%	73%	75%	85%	73%	94% 45%	72%	$\sim \sim$
	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		85%	82.4%	53.8%	00%	79%	0/70	00%	<u>84%</u> 68%	0470	70%	26%	/5%	0070	32%	43%	1270	• \
	Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97%	96.9%	96.8%	99%	98%	97%	98%	95%	98%	97%	94%	98%	96%	98%	95%	98%	~~~~
	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		97% 87%	90.0%	78.6%	90%	92%	85%	71%	56%	57%	59%	76%	90%	84%	95%	87%	5070	
_	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		0770	50.070	2.70	5070	5270	0370	/1/0	2.80	5770	5570	2.62	5070	0470	2.69	0770		
	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1		1		2.64					2.75		2.61			2.57				
2.1.9	(low) to 5 (high)				2.64					2.75	2.61					2.57			

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2014



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	*****	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Monthly Trend
Objec	tive 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>5,6</sup>	4.0%	5.3%	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%	5.8%	6.5%	6.2%	6.0%	5.4%	4.9%	5.5%	5.2%	5.3%	5.6%	5.5%	6.1%	$\sim$
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network <sup>6</sup>	13.9%	18.5%	18.0%	18.2%	16.7%	17.6%	19.1%	18.8%	17.5%	17.7%	17.5%	17.1%	17.1%	18.4%	20.7%	21.1%	19.2%	$\sim$
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes <sup>6</sup>	85%	61.0%	59.6%	59.0%	62.5%	60.2%	58.6%	57.5%	57.9%	58.3%	59.6%	60.1%	60.1%	59.1%	57.0%	57.8%	58.4%	$\langle$
2.2.3	Percentage of scheduled service delivered	98.5%	96.7%	97.0%	96.4%	98.1%	96.4%	97.3%	98.2%	98.6%	96.7%	96.3%	97.5%	96.9%	95.6%	94.6%	91.0%	95.1%	$\sim$
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals <sup>6</sup>	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	75.3%	74.3%	73.4%	72.7%	73.5%	73.5%	74.7%	75.4%	75.3%	74.0%	72.1%	72.3%	72.1%	$\langle \rangle$
2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Measure in o	development.																
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance <sup>6</sup>	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	60.0%	59.2%	58.0%	57.4%	57.8%	58.6%	60.2%	60.4%	60.5%	59.5%	57.6%	57.2%	57.5%	$\sim$
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points		5.9%	7.4%	6.9%	5.5%	7.3%	9.7%	9.0%	6.1%	4.9%	7.8%	6.0%	7.2%	6.3%	5.8%	6.9%	4.9%	$\sim \sim$
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		7.1%	8.6%	6.9%	8.0%	7.4%	8.7%	8.0%	7.2%	4.7%	6.6%	6.4%	5.7%	7.2%	7.0%	7.3%	6.5%	$\sim \sim$
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	4,632	3,914	3,876	3,735	4,040	4,021	4,661	5,209	4,747	5,675	5,920	5,881	5,707		
-	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,164	2,714	2,434	2,453	2,710	3,222	3,101	3,562	3,083	4,045	3,182	5,450	4,061		
-	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	2,211	1,417	2,917	1,787	2,653	2,215	1,923	1,682	3,235	2,132	1,795	1,758	-	$\sim\sim\sim\sim$
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,835 96.8%	4,734	3,992 98.2%	5,600	4,797 97.5%	5,540	4,315 98.4%	6,850	4,307	3,196 97.3%	3,465	4,026	9,076	5,770	04.00/	$\approx$
	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered	Maagurain	96.7%	96.8%	96.3%	98.2%	96.8%	97.5%	98.2%	98.4%	96.6%	96.0%	97.3%	96.6%	95.1%	93.9%	90.7%	94.9%	
	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)	Measure in o	490,514	495.311	504,667	483,554	504,439	527,096	517,076	497,653	482,111	495,529	502,172	512,759	513,835	515,109	498,616		
	Ridership (rubber ure, average weekday) Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)		490,514 58,232	495,311 59,809	60,746	483,554 59,740	56,412	60,085	517,076	50,015	56,347	495,529 53,737	57,571	512,759	63,362	59,378	60,615	60,735	<u> </u>
	Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		93.6%	96.3%	94.4%	96.2%	95.3%	98.1%	93.9%	89.1%	94.6%	97.3%	95.5%	96.0%	94.7%	90.3%	91.4%	97.0%	$\sim \sim$
	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	93.5%	91.8%	92.6%	90.0%	90.5%	95.3%	96.1%	95.4%	93.5%	97.5%	95.4%	93.0%	96.5%	~~~
	tive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes		5112/0	00.170	55.670	551570	51.070	52.070	50.070	501570	33.370	50.170	331170	55.570	571570	55.170	55.676	50.570	
	Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%	45% (2011 M	ode Share Su	rvev)														
	tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand																		
	Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces <sup>7</sup>		70.0%	71.9%	75.2%	76.8%	79.4%	79.6%	73.0%	72.1%	70.0%								
	Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces		97.8%	97.7%	97.8%	98.0%	99.0%	98.9%	98.5%	97.3%	93.7%	97.7%	07 7%	97.7%	98.2%	98.4%	98.4%	98.9%	
-	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces <sup>8</sup>		5,095	5,768	6,546	6,252	6,292	6,408	6,430	6,528	6,620	6,624	6,624	6,624	6,678	6,736	6,736	6,748	<u> </u>
-	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) <sup>8</sup>		32	32	71	32	32	32	56	56	56	56	56	120	120	120	120	120	
-	On-street payment compliance (SFpark pilot areas only) <sup>7</sup>		52	53.3%	53.5%	53.6%	53.5%	53.8%	54.1%	52.8%	52.9%	50	50	120	120	120	120	120	$\leq$
	<b>3:</b> Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fra	ancisco	I	55.570	55.570	33.070	33.370	55.070	54.170	52.070	52.570								6
	tive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource c				noise						-							-	
	Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system	1,515,000	2,155,000 (20	)10)															
	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94% (taxi)															-	
	Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent)		19.3%																
	Number of electric vehicle charging stations Citywide gasoline consumption rate		33 149,156,104	(2000)															
3.1.5	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)		124,120,362	,															
3.1.6	Agency gas consumption (therms)			415.308															
3.1.6	Agency water consumption (gallons)			20,116,592															
-	Agency compost production (tons)		14 (CY09)					1											
3.1.7	Agency recycling production (tons)		535 (CY09)																
3.1.7	Agency waste production (tons)		593 (CY09)		İ		l												
Objec	tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the econ	omy																	
	Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M)			\$3.7	\$3.0	\$3.5	\$2.2	\$3.1	\$4.7	\$3.3	\$2.2	\$2.5	\$2.6	\$2.6	*	*	*		$\sim \sim$
_	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively								İ										
	· · ·	Results repo	orting to begin	in FY15.															
	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase		rting to begin i																
Objec	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently																		
	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$192	\$202.50	202.67 <sup>9</sup>															
	Passengers per revenue hour for buses	<b></b> -	68	67															1
	Cost per unlinked trip		\$2.90	\$2.91 <sup>9</sup>			1		1										
	Pay hours: platform hours ratio		32.90 1.12	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.10	1.10	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	
	Farebox recovery ratio		32%	34%9															- 1
	tive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits		52/0	5 170															
-		Make progr	ess towards cl	osing onerativ	ng and	\$35M ba	seline gan	for current	services \$	260M addi	tional neer	ed for Stat	e-of-Good	Repair (SO	GR) and \$1	.7B 5-Year	shortfall fo	r bike, ner	lestrian, facilities
3.5.1			ical capital str			999141 Da	senne Bah	.or carrelli	ci vices, 3						eny ana 91				ind transit (FY14)

Color Legend

Outperforms Previous Underperforms Previous Equal to Previous

FY Average FY Average FY Average

Note: Reported results are subject to change as data quality improves or new data become available.

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2014



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	#########	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Monthly Trend
Goa	Goal 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%	9.4%	8.8%	10.0%	8.9%	8.8%	9.1%	10.3%	10.5%	7.4%	8.1%	9.3%	9.6%	11.8%	8.8%	$\sim$
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.55															
Obje	Objective 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 b	e conducted i	n 2014.															

<sup>1</sup> Beginning with FY2015, includes all taxi, TNC, and black car service-related incidents reported to SFPD. Data for prior years includes "defrauding taxi driver", "operating taxi without a permit", and "overcharging taxi fare" incidents only.

<sup>2</sup> Includes assaults and threats on operators.

<sup>3</sup> Injury Collisions.

<sup>4</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>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.

<sup>8</sup> Running Total.

<sup>9</sup> Based on preliminary unaudited financials.

\* Data forthcoming.