

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	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013		
Goa	11: Create a safer transportation experience	e for every	vone															
Obje	ctive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system user	·s.																
1.1.1	SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.39	3.77	7.56	4.85	5.09	5.98	5.65	5.26	4.81	7.24	9.44	10.68	9.24	11.37	11.01		
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		3	4	1	2	10	6	3	4	2	1	6	2	6	2		
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		46	33	36	42	39	27	40	31	44	29	33	25	26	25		
Obje	ctive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security.																	
1.2.1	Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	14.6	16.2	14.1	14.2	17.9	13.0	15.0	18.0	13.7	13.7	12.8	11.3	12.0	13.9			
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)		11	12	9	10	10	6	10	11	21	12	19	11	13			
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	۱.																
	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.53	5.03	5.22	5.12	4.91	4.67	6.42	4.45	5.00	4.27	5.76	5.05	5.99	5.45			
1.3.2a	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists	Awaiting 2012	results.															
1.3.2b		Awaiting 2012																
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.65	4.17	4.94	4.60	4.99	4.24	3.49	4.26	4.36	3.87	2.92	4.25	3.70			
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		179	147	158	179	166	173	129	123	155	147	137	145	126	124		
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 8	& carsha	ring the	•													
	ctive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications			Ŭ														
	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														
	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.54														
2.1.5	Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers	This is proving	challenging	to quantify. \	Ne are eva	aluating alt	ernative m	etrics.										
2.1.6	Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		87%	93%	89%	92%	88%	94%	89%	95%	96%	97%	97%	92%	99%			
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%	100%	100%		
2.1.6	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85%	82%	82%	84%	81%	86%	63%	79%	80%	82%	87%	86%	87%	84%		
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81%	79%	69%			76%				82%			89%			
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97%	97%	98%	94%	99%	97%	97%	97%	95%	99%	97%	93%	98%	98%		



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	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 14 days (60 days for ADA violations)		87%	90%	91%	93%	87%	86%	93%	82%	82%	87%	94%	97%	96%	
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												
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance.																
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network	5.3%	7.1%	7.0%	7.0%	8.0%	7.7%	7.6%	6.5%	6.5%	6.3%	6.5%	6.6%	6.9%	7.1%	7.3%
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network	13.9%	18.5%	17.6%	19.1%	20.3%	19.1%	18.8%	17.0%	18.6%	16.6%	17.0%	15.7%	15.2%	16.8%	16.9%
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes	85%	61.0%	59.5%	60.0%	57.2%	56.9%	57.6%	59.1%	59.2%	60.0%	59.2%	60.4%	62.0%	61.6%	61.3%
2.2.3	Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time	98.5%	96.6%	96.8%	95.3%	94.0%	95.7%	96.2%	96.7%	96.0%	97.8%	96.7%	98.4%	99.2%	97.9%	97.6%
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	85%	76.9%	73.5%	76.4%	70.0%	70.2%	71.1%	73.1%	72.8%	74.5%	73.6%	75.0%	76.1%	75.0%	74.4%
2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Results reportin	ng to begin i	n FY13 Q4.												
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance	85%	60.1%	58.9%	59.0%	55.6%	56.0%	56.6%	58.9%	59.0%	60.5%	59.8%	60.7%	61.3%	60.4%	59.6%
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points		6.4%	7.5%	7.5%	7.7%	8.5%	9.4%	7.8%	7.1%	6.6%	7.6%	7.4%	7.0%	6.7%	5.4%
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		7.1%	7.7%	7.7%	10.1%	8.5%	8.9%	6.7%	8.0%	6.4%	5.9%	7.0%	7.6%	7.3%	7.1%
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	2,820	3,087	2,815	2,877	3,071	3,197	3,631	3,723	4,170	3,712	3,427	3,771
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	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)		2,055	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)		2,936	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	Please see 2.2.3	3.													
2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled trips completed	Measure in dev	elopment.													
2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		490,514	496,839	486,497	505,630	517,674	515,379	484,545	500,121	467,267	488,616	493,484	501,281	504,740	
2.2.12	Percentage of time that elevators are available		93.6%	96.3%	96.8%	96.8%	98.9%	96.2%	96.9%	91.7%	96.5%	95.8%	98.4%	96.7%	96.8%	93.7%
2.2.13	Percentage of time that escalators are available		94.2%	88.1%	84.5%	87.1%	87.1%	89.3%	87.3%	84.1%	85.7%	87.0%	93.0%	88.2%	88.0%	95.7%
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 Share	e Survey)											
Objective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand.																
2.4.1	Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces (Marina District)		48.8%	58.3%	61.5%	55.1%	53.9%	47.2%	45.4%	51.2%	64.8%	58.3%	58.3%	60.6%	59.4%	63.0%
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%	100.0%	99.8%	100.0%
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 (median district rate)			56.6%	56.7%	56.5%	57.4%	56.9%	56.4%	57.0%	57.2%	57.9%	57.8%	56.3%	54.7%	56.5%
							•									



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	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013
Goa	I 3: Improve the environment and quality of	f life in San	Francis	CO												
	tive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation sys				ssions, w	aste, and	l noise.									
	Metric tons of C02e for the transportation system	1,515,000		, ,	,	,									2.155.	000 (2010)
3.1.2	% of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero	,- ,,													,,	
	emissions															194%
3.1.3	% biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA															2% (FY11)
3.1.4	Number of electric vehicle charging stations															32
3.1.5	Citywide gasoline consumption rate														149,156,	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)															534 (CY09)
3.1.7	Agency waste production (tonnes)															592 (CY09)
Obje	tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive ir	npact to the e	conomy.													
	Customer rating: Business satisfaction with transportation network;			n FY14.												
-	scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)															
Obje	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively.															
3.3.1	% of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase	Results reportin	ng to begin i	n FY14.												
3.3.2	% of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase	Results reportin	ng to begin i	n FY14.												
3.3.3	% of all capital projects delivered in-scope by phase	This is proving o	hallenging t	to quantify. V	Ne are eva	aluating alt	ernative m	etrics.								
Obje	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently.															
3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$184	\$195													
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses		70													
3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip		\$2.77													
3.4.4	Pay hours: platform hours ratio		1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.13	1.12	1.13	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.10
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio		30.8%													
Obje	tive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits															
3.5.1	Operating and capital structural deficit						\$70M a	additional	needed for						od Repair (
C	A Croate a workplace that delivers eviteter	ading corri								Ş1./I	s s-rear sh	ortiali for	like, pede	strian, facili	ties and tra	isit (FT12)
	I 4: Create a workplace that delivers outsta	iung servi	ce													
	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)	Results will be reported for FY13 Q4.														
4.1.2	% of employees that complete the survey	Results will be reported for FY13 Q4.														
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 for FY13 Q4.														
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received praise for my work in the last month	Results will be r														



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	Apr 2013	May 2013	Jun 2013
4.1.5	Employee rating: Communication between leadership and employees has improved	Results will be r	eported for	FY13 Q4.												
4.1.6	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are acted upon quickly and appropriately	Results will be r	eported for	FY13 Q4.												
4.1.7	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile	Results will be r	eported for	FY13 Q4.												
Obje	tive 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 distribu	tion will beg	gin this mon	th. Result	s will be re	ported for	FY13 Q4.								
4.2.2	Employee rating: My opinions seem to matter to my manager	Results will be r	reported for	FY13 Q4.												
4.2.3	Employee rating: Conflicts are resolved collaboratively	Results will be r	reported for	FY13 Q4.												
4.2.4	Employee rating: Employees in my division consistently look for more efficient/effective ways of getting the job done	Results will be r	reported for	FY13 Q4.												
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively	Results will be reported for FY13 Q4.														
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'	Results will be reported for FY13 Q4.														
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment	Results will be reported for FY13 Q4.														
Obje	tive 4.3: Improve employee accountability.															
4.3.1	% of employees with performance completed/appraisals conducted	Results will be	available af	ter the end	of the fisc	al year.										
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	Results will be r	eported for	FY13 Q4.												
4.3.4	% of divisions/units that report metrics	Results will be r	reported for	FY13 Q4.												
4.3.5	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.4%	10.5%	9.3%	6.6%	7.0%	9.0%	8.9%	10.3%	8.5%	6.9%	8.3%	9.0%
4.3.6	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives	Results will be reported for FY13 Q4.														
Obje	tive 4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with out	ur stakeholder	·s.													
4.4.1 Stakeholder rating: satisfaction with SFMTA decision-making process/communications; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) Survey will be conducted in FY14.																