

ID	Metric April	Goal	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	Iul 2012	Aug 2012	Con 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	lan 2012	Eab 2012	Mar 2012
ם	Metric	Goal	F112 AVg	F115 AVg	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	3ep 2012	OCI 2012	NOV 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Len 5012	IVIAI ZUIS
Goa	11: Create a safer transportation experience	e for everyo	ne										
Obje	ctive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system use	rs.											
1.1.1	SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.23	3.59	5.90	4.85	5.09	5.98	5.60	5.26	4.81	7.24	8.33	
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	SFPD does not cu	irrently coll		We are e	valuating al	ternative n	netrics.					
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		34	36	36	42	39	27	40	31	44	29	33
Obje	ctive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security.												
1.2.1	Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	14.9	16.6	15.1	14.2	17.9	13.0	15.0	18.0	13.7	13.7		
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)		13.8	15.8	16	11	16	12	20	19	16	14	18
1.2.3	Lost work days due to injury		3,764	3,912	4,242	4,535	3,495	3,779	3,646	3,773			
Obje	ctive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system	n.											
1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.48	4.98	5.08	5.12	4.91	4.67	6.42	4.45	5.00	4.32	5.71	
1.3.2a	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists	Awaiting 2012 re	sults.										
1.3.2b	Collisions involving taxis	Awaiting 2012 re	sults.										
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.53	4.41	5.03	4.65	5.09	4.28	3.58	4.30	4.49	3.87	
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		173	152	158	179	166	173	129	123	155	147	137
1.3.5	Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.40									
Goa	I 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, rid	esharing &	carshar	ing the									
Obje	ctive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications).											
	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									
	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			2.81									
	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.54									
		This is proving ch	allenging to	quantify. W	e are evalu	uating alter	native metr	rics.					
2.1.6	Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		87%	93%	89%	92%	88%	94%	89%	95%	96%	97%	
2.1.6	Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2.1.6	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		84%	80%	82%	84%	81%	86%	63%	79%	80%	82%	87%
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		78%	73%	69%				76%				
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		98%	97%	98%	94%	99%	97%	97%	97%	95%	99%	97%

Color Legend

Outperforms Underperforms Equal to FY12 Avg FY12 Avg FY12 Avg



ID	Metric	Goal	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 14 days (60 days for ADA violations)		87%	88%	91%	93%	87%	86%	93%	82%	82%	87%	
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	5.3%	7.0%	6.9%	7.0%	8.0%	7.7%	7.6%	6.5%	6.5%	6.2%	6.6%	6.6%
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network	13.9%	18.5%	18.0%	19.1%	20.2%	19.0%	18.8%	17.0%	18.5%	16.5%	17.0%	15.7%
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes	85%	61.0%	58.7%	60.0%	57.1%	56.7%	57.5%	58.9%	59.0%	60.0%	59.1%	60.3%
2.2.3	Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time	98.5%	96.3%	96.3%	95.3%	94.0%	95.7%	96.2%	96.7%	96.0%	97.8%	96.7%	98.4%
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	85%	77.4%	73.0%	76.4%	70.0%	70.2%	71.1%	73.1%	72.8%	74.5%	73.6%	75.0%
2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Results reporting	to begin in	FY13 Q4.									
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance	85%	60.4%	58.5%	59.0%	55.6%	56.0%	56.6%	58.9%	59.0%	60.5%	59.8%	60.7%
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points		6.5%	7.7%	7.5%	7.7%	8.5%	9.4%	7.8%	7.1%	6.6%	7.6%	7.4%
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		7.2%	7.7%	7.7%	10.1%	8.5%	8.9%	6.7%	8.0%	6.4%	5.9%	7.0%
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		2,909	3,266	2,820	3,087	2,815	2,877	3,071	3,197	3,631	3,723	4,170
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,208	3,791	4,211	3,358	3,657	3,660	3,910	3,167	3,927	4,440	
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		1,898	2,690	2,454	6,566	2,200	2,144	1,990	1,891	1,958	2,316	
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		3,998	3,717	4,571	6,202	4,248	2,386	4,244	2,624	2,649	2,811	
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered	Please see 2.2.3.											
2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled trips completed	Measure in deve	lopment										
2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		491,553	496,201	486,628	505,681	517,675	515,379	484,577	=-	467,267		
2.2.12	Percentage of time that elevators are available		94.4%	96.4%	96.8%	96.8%	98.9%	96.2%	96.9%	91.7%	96.5%	95.8%	98.4%
2.2.13	Percentage of time that escalators are available		91.8%	87.2%	84.5%	87.1%	87.1%	89.3%	87.3%	84.1%	85.7%	87.0%	93.0%
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	Mode Sha	are Survey)
Obje	ctive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parkir	ng demand.											
2.4.1	Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces (median district rate)	Ī	62.3%	65.5%	61.5%	58.9%	60.2%	61.9%	64.0%	67.4%	72.0%	66.3%	65.7%
2.4.2	Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces (median garage rate)		99.7%	99.7%	99.7%	100.0%	100.0%	99.8%	99.8%	98.2%	99.5%	99.5%	99.8%
2.4.3	# of secure on street bicycle racks												2739
2.4.3	# of secure off street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)												475
2.4.4	On-street payment compliance (median district rate)			56.9%	56.7%	56.5%	57.4%	56.9%	56.4%	57.0%	57.2%	57.9%	57.8%

Color Legend

_		
Outperforms	Underperforms	Equal to
FY12 Avg	FY12 Avg	FY12 Avg



ID	Metric	Goal	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013
Coo	13: Improve the environment and quality o	flife in Can	Francis	20									
						<u> </u>							
	tive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation sy		e consum	ption, emis	sions, wa	ste, and n	ioise.						
	Metric tons of CO2e 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 emissions												94%
3.1.3	% biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA												2% (FY11)
3.1.4	Number of electric vehicle charging stations												31
3.1.5	Citywide gasoline consumption rate											149,156,3	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)												13 (CY09)
3.1.7	Agency recycling production (tonnes)											į	534 (CY09)
3.1.7	Agency waste production (tonnes)											į	592 (CY09)
Obje	tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive in	npact to the ec	onomy.										
3.2.1	Customer rating: Business satisfaction with transportation network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	Survey is being d	leveloped.	Results will	be reporte	d for FY13	Q4.						
Obje	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.												
3.3.1		Results reporting											
3.3.2	% of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase	Results reporting	to begin in	FY13 Q4.									
3.3.3	% of all capital projects delivered in-scope by phase	This is proving ch	allenging to	o quantify. W	e are evalu	uating alter	native met	rics.					
Obje	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently.												
3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$184	\$194										
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses		70										
3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip		\$2.75										
3.4.4	Pay hours: platform hours ratio		1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.13					
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio		30.8%										
Obje	tive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits	5.											
	Operating and capital structural deficit				\$70M additional needed for operations, \$260M additional needed for State-of-Good Repa (SOGR) and \$1.7B 5-Year shortfall for bike, pedestrian, facilities and transit (FY12								
Goa	4: Create a workplace that delivers outsta	nding servic	e										
	tive 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)	Survey distribution will begin this month. Results will be reported for FY13 Q4.											
4.1.2	% of employees that complete the survey	Survey distribution	on will begi	n this month	. Results w	ill be report	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
	Employee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals/objectives and how they contribute to Agency success	Survey distribution	on will begi	n this month	. Results w	ill be report	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received praise for my work in the last month	Survey distribution	on will begi	n this month	. Results w	ill be report	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					

Color Legend

Outperforms Underperforms Equal to FY12 Avg FY12 Avg FY12 Avg



ID	Metric	Goal	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013
4.1.5	Employee rating: Communication between leadership and employees has improved	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	II be repor	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
4.1.6	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are acted upon quickly and appropriately	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	ll be repor	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
4.1.7	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	ll be repor	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
Obje	ctive 4.2: Create a collaborative and innovative work env	vironment.											
4.2.1	Employee rating: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	Survey distributi	on will beg	in this mont	h. Results v	vill be repo	orted for FY	′13 Q4.					
4.2.2	Employee rating: My opinions seem to matter to my manager	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	II be repor	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
4.2.3	Employee rating: Conflicts are resolved collaboratively	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	II be repor	ted for FY13	3 Q4.					
4.2.4	Employee rating: Employees in my division consistently look for more efficient/effective ways of getting the job done	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	ll be repor	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively	Survey distribution	on will begir	this month	. Results wi	3 Q4.							
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	3 Q4.								
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment	Survey distribution	Survey distribution will begin this month. Results will be reported for FY13 Q4.										
Obje	ctive 4.3: Improve employee accountability.												
4.3.1	% of employees with performance completed/appraisals conducted	Results will be a	vailable at t	he end of th	e fiscal yea	ar.							
4.3.2	% of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year												
4.3.3	% of employees who have received feedback on their work	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	II be repor	ted for FY13	3 Q4.					
4.3.4	% of divisions/units that report metrics	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	II be repor	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
4.3.5	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		8.7%	8.8%	9.4%	10.5%	9.3%	6.6%	7.0%	9.0%	8.9%	10.3%	8.5%
4.3.6	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives	Survey distribution	on will begir	n this month	. Results wi	ll be repor	ted for FY1	3 Q4.					
Obje	ctive 4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with o	ur stakeholders	5.										
		Survey is being o		Results will	be reporte	d for FY13	Q4.						