STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | February 2013



Goal 1: Create a Safer transportation experience for everyone		•	•													•	тапора	runsportution Agenc
Description Continue	Goa	1: Create a safer transportation experience	e for every	one														
Description Continue	Objec	tive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system us	sers.															
1.1.1 Str. Column returns to executive of that or the specimes 3.28 3.39 3.57 3.77 3.16 3.00 3.40 3.39 4.40 3.59 5.00 5.98 5.00 5.20 4.85				FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	Jun 2012	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013
13.13 Part-Preparent sear-related attems	1.1.1	SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.23	3.59	5.27	3.27					4.43	4.85	5.09	5.98	5.60	5.26	4.81	
1.1.1 Montplex injuries 2000.00 hours 14.9 16.6 15.3 17.1 15.1 14.8 18.0 12.9 10.0 12.0 17.7 18.1 18	1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience	Surveying initiate	ed. In proc	ess of build	ing a suffici	ently large	sampling fr	ame to rec	eive surveys	on a quart	erly basis.	First results	s to be repo	rted in Apr	2013.		
Description Company	1.1.3	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes	SFPD does not co	urrently col	lect this dat	ta. We are	evaluating	alternative	metrics.									
13.1 More dispose holymerte/2000,000 miles 1.0	1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		34	36	27	46	38	30	41	24	36	42	39	27	39	30	42
13.2 College Processing College September	Objec	tive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security.																
1.32 Locationer statisfy of the transportation system.	1.2.1	Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	14.9	16.6	15.3	17.1	15.1	14.3	20.4	21.9	10.8	14.2	17.9	13.0	15.0	18.0	13.7	
Depictive L3: Improve the safety of the transportation system.	1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel	Collecting Agenc	ywide data	. First resul	ts to be re	orted in A	or 2013.										
13.11 Main collisions/procedure proteints, performance proteints proteints and procedure Asserting 2012 results Assetting 2012 results Ass	1.2.3	Lost work days due to injury		3,764	3,912	2,191	3,557	4,552	4,246	3,985	4,055	4,242	4,535	3,495	3,779	3,646	3,773	
13.26 Collisions involving attains Awaiting 2012 results.	Objec	tive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation syste	em.															
13.25 Collisions involving assists Awarding 2012 results.	1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.48	4.98	5.11	4.2	5.58	4.48	6.07	4.31	5.21	5.12	4.91	4.67	6.42	4.45	5.01	
13.3 Munifishes noward/100/000 miles 4.5.3 4.41 4.69 4.09 5.32 4.37 4.62 4.00 4.94 4.40 4.99 4.15 3.49 1.28 1.23 1.33 1.34 **Unsafe operation** Municrompliants to 311 1.73 1.54 1.51 1.00 1.33 1.67 1.78 1.86 1.79 1.86 1.79 1.86 1.79 1.80 1.28 1.23 1.33 1.35 Customer rating. Safety of transit finding experience **Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & carsharing the preferred means of travel** **Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications.** 10 Metric **Goal 1: PY12 Avg PY13 Avg PY13 Avg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Avg 2012 Jun 2012 Jun 2012 Avg 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jan 2013 1.2.1 Customer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with transit surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. 1.2.2 Customer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with transit surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. 1.2.3 Customer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network, scale of 1 (both 5: 5 (high) a customer satisfaction with bicycle network, scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with bicycle network, scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with bicycle network, scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with pedestrian environments. Scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with pedestrian environments. Scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with pedestrian environments. Scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with pedestrian environments. Scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with pedestrian environments. Scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with pedestrian environments. Scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a customer satisfaction with pedestrian environments. Scale of 1 (both 5: 6 (high) a cust	1.3.2a	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists	Awaiting 2012 re	esults.														
13.4 Unsafe operation* Munic complaints to 311 173 154 151 100 193 167 178 186 179 166 173 128 123 133 135 Customer rating Settly of transful fing experiences Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013.	1.3.2b	Collisions involving taxis	Awaiting 2012 re	esults.														
Last Castamer rating. Safety of transit riding experience. Social 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & carsharing the preferred means of travel Dijective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications. ID Metric Social 9: FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Ayr 2012 Mar 2012 Jul 2012 Aug 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jan 2013 Lostomer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with transit survivelying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Lostomer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with transit survivelying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Lostomer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with blind in Apr 2013 Survivelying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Last of the process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Last of the process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Last of the process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Last of the process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Last of the process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Last of the process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Last of the process of building a suff	1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.53	4.41	4.69	4.09	5.32	4.37	4.62	4.06	4.94	4.60	4.99	4.15	3.49	4.26	
Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & carsharing the preferred means of travel Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications. In Metric Goal FY12 Mg [FY13 Mg] Jan 2012 Feb 2012 [Mar 2012 [Mar 2012 [Mar 2012] Mar 2012] Jul 2012 Jul 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jan 2013 Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Lact Customer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with belove network. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Lact Customer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with pedestram services much such as a survey of the process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Lact Customer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with pedestram services much such as a survey of the process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Lact Customer rating. Overall networks addressed According to Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly	1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		173	154	151	160	193	167	178	186	158	179	166	173	128	123	153
Dejective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications. Goal FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Ian 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Mar 2012 Mar 2012 Mar 2012 Jul 2012 Jul 2012 Jul 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jul 2013	1.3.5	Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience	Surveying initiate	ed. In proce	ess of build	ing a suffici	ently large	sampling fr	ame to rec	eive surveys	on a quart	erly basis.	First results	to be repo	rted in Apr	2013.		
Dejective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications. Goal FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Ian 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Mar 2012 Mar 2012 Mar 2012 Jul 2012 Jul 2012 Jul 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jul 2013	Goa	2. Make transit walking hicycling taxi rig	desharing &	carchar	ing the	nreferr	ed mea	ns of tra	wel									
Netric Goal FY12 Awg FY13 Awg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Apr 2012 Mar 2012 Jul 2012 Jul 2012 Jul 2012 Aug 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jul 2013 Jul 2012 Jul 2013 Jul		, , ,		Tarsnar	Ing the	preteri	I	113 01 112	IVCI									
2.1.1 Sustomer attaing: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; seale of 1 (low to 5 (high) 2.1.2 Sustomer attaing: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low to 5 high) 2.1.3 Customer attaing: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low to 5 high) 2.1.4 Sustomer attaing: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low to 5 high) 2.1.5 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.7 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.8 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Average of Color Curb Requests Addressed According to Board approved standards 2.1.6 Average of Hazardous Traffic Sign Reputs Addressed According to Board approved standards 2.1.6 Average of Paking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board approved standards 2.1.6 Board approved standards 2.1.7 Average of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board approved standards 2.1.8 Average of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board approved standards 2.1.7 Average of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board approved standards 2.1.8 Average of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Boa			1															
Services, scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)									_			Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013
2.12 (sustomer rating: Overall customer statisfaction with basis availability: scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) 2.13 (sustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network: scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) 2.14 (sustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian evincement; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) 2.15 Average time to communicate of 1 (low) to 5 (high) 2.16 Percentage of Color Curb Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.16 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.16 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.16 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.16 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.17 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.18 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.19 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.10 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.11 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.12 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.13 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.14 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.15 Percentage of Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.16 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.17 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.18 Quitage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.19 Quitage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.19 Quitage of Traffic Signal Requests Addre	2.1.1	——————————————————————————————————————																
2.1.2 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network, scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) 2.1.4 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment, scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) 2.1.5 Average time to communicate Muniservice advisories to customers 2.1.6 Percentage of Color Curb Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Muniser Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Muniser Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Muniser Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Muniser Muni	2.1.2	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability;																
State of 1 (low) to 5 high)		scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		•						•	•	•						
2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Miles Proving Challenging to quantify. We are evaluating alternative metrics. 2.1.6 Percentage of Hazardous Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Miles Proving Challenging to Quantify. We are evaluating alternative metrics. 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Miles Proving Challenging to Quantify. We are evaluating alternative metrics. 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Farific Sign Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.7 Percentage of Farific Sign Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.8 Percentage of Farific Sign Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.9 Percentage of Farific Sign Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.1 Percentage of Farific Sign Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.1 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.1 Percentage of Farific Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.2 Percentage of Farific Sig	2.1.3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Surveying initiate	ed. In proc	ess of build	ing a suffici	ently large	sampling fr	ame to rec	eive surveys	on a quart	erly basis.	First results	s to be repo	rted in Apr	2013.		
Environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	2.1.4		Surveying initiate	ed. In proc	ess of build	ing a suffici	ently large	sampling fr	ame to rec	eive survevs	on a quart	erly basis.	First results	s to be repo	rted in Apr	2013.		
2.1.5 Average time to communicate Muni service advisories to customers 2.1.6 Percentage of Color Curb Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Hazardous Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.7 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.0 Source vehicles		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Sarveying initiat	ca. III proci	233 01 54114	ing a same	citity large	Jumping in	unic to rec	cive surveys	on a quare	city busis.	i ii st i esait.	o to be repe	rica iii ripi	2013.		
approved standards	2.1.5		This is proving ch	hallenging t	o quantify.	We are eva	luating alte	ernative me	trics.									
approved standards	216	Parcentage of Color Curb Requests Addressed Asserting to Board		070/	000/	070/	000/	700/	010/	010/	020/	000/	020/	000/	0.40/	000/		
2.1.6 Percentage of Hazardous Traffic Sign Reports Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.7 Percentage of According to Board-approved standards 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance. Diamonth Pril Pri	2.1.0			0/70	90%	0/70	6970	76%	8170	91%	95%	89%	92%	00%	94%	89%		
Language Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards Sample	216	**		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
2.1.6 Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed	2.1.0			10070	10070	10070	10070	10070	10070	10070	10070	10070	10070	10070	10070	10070		
2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic and Parking Control Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.7 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.8 Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 14 days (60 days for ADA violations) 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) 2.1.9 Metric 2.2 Improve transit performance. D Metric D Metric Goal FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Apr 2012 May 2012 Jun 2012 Jul 2012 Aug 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jan 2013 2.2.1 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network 13.9% 18.5% 18.5% 19.5% 17.6% 17.3% 18.5% 19.0% 59.3% 95.4% 95.3% 94.0% 95.7% 96.2% 96.7% 96.0% 97.8% 2.2.2 Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time 98.5% 96.3% 96.0% 96.7% 98.4% 96.8% 95.1% 95.3% 95.4% 95.3% 94.0% 95.7% 96.2% 96.7% 96.0% 97.8%	2.1.6	Percentage of Parking Meter Malfunctions Addressed According to		84%	79%	82%	81%	83%	87%	88%	84%	82%	84%	81%	86%	63%	79%	80%
According to Board-approved standards 2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.7 Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 14 days (60 days for ADA violations) 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) 2.1.9 Dipoctive 2.2: Improve transit performance. Dip Metric	2.1.6	· ·		78%	69%		77%			78%			69%					
2.1.6 Percentage of Traffic Signal Requests Addressed According to Board-approved standards 2.1.7 Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 14 days (60 days for ADA violations) 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) 2.1.9 Description 2.2: Improve transit performance. D Metric Goal FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Apr 2012 Mar 2012 Jun 2013 Jun 2013 Jun 2013 Jun 2013 Jun 2013 Jun 2014 Jun 2015 Jun 2015	2.1.0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		7070	0370		7770			7070			0370					
approved standards 2.1.7 Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 14 days (60 days for ADA violations) 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) Dipoctive 2.2: Improve transit performance. D Metric Goal FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Apr 2012 Jul 2012 Aug 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jan 2013 2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with +5 min gaps on Rapid Network 13.9% 18.5% 19.5% 17.6% 17.3% 18.5% 19.0% 59.6% 60.0% 57.1% 56.7% 57.5% 58.9% 59.0% 59.9% 2.2.3 Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time 98.5% 96.3% 96.0% 96.7% 98.4% 96.8% 95.1% 95.3% 95.4% 95.3% 94.0% 95.7% 96.2% 96.7% 96.0% 97.8% 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) D Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. D Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. D Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. D Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. D Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. D Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. D Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large	2.1.6	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		98%	97%	96%	97%	97%	99%	99%	98%	98%	94%	99%	97%	97%	97%	95%
within 14 days (60 days for ADA violations) 2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance. D Metric Goal FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Apr 2012 May 2012 Jul 2012 Aug 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Dec 2012 Jan 2013 2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network 13.9% 18.5% 19.5% 17.6% 17.3% 18.5% 19.0% 19.3% 19.1% 20.2% 19.0% 18.8% 17.0% 18.5% 19.9% 2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes 85% 61.0% 58.4% 61.7% 61.7% 61.7% 61.9% 60.9% 60.4% 59.6% 60.0% 57.1% 56.7% 57.5% 58.9% 59.0% 59.9% 2.2.3 Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time 98.5% 96.3% 96.0% 96.7% 98.4% 96.8% 95.1% 95.3% 95.4% 95.3% 94.0% 95.7% 96.2% 96.0% 97.8%		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·																
2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles 2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys on a quarterly basis. First results to be reported in Apr 2013. Surveying initiated. In process of building a sufficiently large sampling frame to receive surveys o	2.1.7	· ·		87%	90%	93%	86%	86%	87%	82%	86%	91%	93%	87%	86%	93%	82%	
2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators) Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance. Descriptive 2.2: Improve transit performance. Descriptive 2.2: Improve transit performance. Descriptive 3.2: Descriptive 4.2: Descripti		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		<u> </u>			L	L					L	L				\vdash
Escalators Price		· ·																
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance. Goal FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Apr 2012 Jul 2012 Aug 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Jan 2013 2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network 13.9% 18.5% 19.5% 17.6% 17.3% 18.5% 19.0% 19.3% 19.1% 20.2% 19.0% 18.8% 17.0% 18.5% 16.7% 2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes 85% 61.0% 58.4% 61.7% 61.7% 61.9% 60.9% 60.4% 59.6% 60.0% 57.1% 56.7% 57.5% 58.9% 59.0% 59.9% 2.2.3 Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time 98.5% 96.3% 96.0% 96.7% 98.4% 96.8% 95.1% 95.3% 95.3% 94.0% 95.7% 96.0% 97.8%	2.1.9		Surveying initiate	ed. In proc	ess of build	ing a suffici	ently large	sampling fr	ame to rec	eive surveys	on a quart	erly basis.	First results	s to be repo	rted in Apr	2013.		
ID Metric Goal FY12 Avg FY13 Avg Jan 2012 Feb 2012 Mar 2012 Apr 2012 May 2012 Jun 2012 Jul 2012 Aug 2012 Sep 2012 Oct 2012 Nov 2012 Jun 2013	Obie		<u> </u>															
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network 13.9% 18.5% 19.5% 17.6% 17.3% 18.5% 19.0% 19.3% 19.1% 20.2% 19.0% 18.8% 17.0% 18.5% 16.7% 2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes 85% 61.0% 58.4% 61.7% 61.7% 61.9% 60.9% 60.4% 59.6% 60.0% 57.1% 56.7% 57.5% 58.9% 59.0% 59.9% 2.2.3 Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time 98.5% 96.3% 96.0% 96.8% 95.1% 95.3% 95.3% 94.0% 95.7% 96.0% 97.8%			1 .															
2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes 85% 61.0% 58.4% 61.7% 61.7% 61.9% 60.9% 60.4% 59.6% 60.0% 57.1% 56.7% 57.5% 58.9% 59.0% 59.9% 2.2.3 Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time 98.5% 96.3% 96.0% 96.7% 98.4% 96.8% 95.1% 95.3% 94.0% 95.3% 94.0% 95.7% 96.2% 96.7% 96.0% 97.8%									_									
2.2.3 Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time 98.5% 96.3% 96.0% 96.7% 98.4% 96.8% 95.1% 95.3% 95.4% 95.3% 94.0% 95.7% 96.2% 96.7% 96.0% 97.8%																		
	2.2.2	rercentage of on-time performance for non-kapid Network routes	85%	61.0%	58.4%	61./%	61./%	61.9%	60.9%	60.4%	59.6%	60.0%	57.1%	56.7%	57.5%	58.9%	59.0%	59.9%
2.2.4 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 85% 77.4% 72.6% 77.3% 77.6% 78.6% 77.9% 76.7% 76.2% 76.4% 70.0% 70.2% 71.1% 73.1% 72.8% 74.5%	2.2.3	Percentage of service pulled out at scheduled time	98.5%	96.3%	96.0%	96.7%	98.4%	96.8%	95.1%	95.3%	95.4%	95.3%	94.0%	95.7%	96.2%	96.7%	96.0%	97.8%
	2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	85%	77.4%	72.6%	77.3%	77.6%	78.6%	77.9%	76.7%	76.2%	76.4%	70.0%	70.2%	71.1%	73.1%	72.8%	74.5%

Color Legend

Outperforms Underperforms Equal to FY12 Avg FY12 Avg FY12 Avg

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | February 2013



	T			T										T	1						
ID	Metric	Goal				Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	Jun 2012	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013				
2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Results reporting			li .																
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance	85%	60.4%	57.9%	60.6%	61.0%	61.9%	60.5%	59.8%	58.6%	59.0%	55.6%	56.0%	56.6%	58.9%	59.0%	60.5%				
2.27	Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a,		6.5%	7.8%	5.6%	6.2%	6.9%	5.9%	7.1%	7.0%	7.5%	7.7%	8.5%	9.4%	7.8%	7.1%	6.6%				
2.2.7	inbound) at max load points Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p,		7.2%	8.0%	5.9%	7.00/	6.0%	8.2%	7.8%	8.4%	7.7%	10.1%	8.5%	8.9%	6.7%	0.00/	6.4%				
2.2.7	outbound) at max load points		7.2%	8.0%	5.9%	7.0%	6.0%	8.2%	7.8%	8.4%	7.7%	10.1%	8.5%	8.9%	6.7%	8.0%	6.4%				
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		2,909	3,071	2,707	2,883	2,683	2,952	3,230	2,998	2,820	3,087	2,815	2,877	3,071	3,197	3,631				
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Rail)		2,922	3,650	2,834	2,262	2,852	3,183	3,249	3,153	3,945	3,880	3,504	3,464	3,457	3,137	3,031				
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered	Please see 2.2.3.	2,322	3,030	2,034	2,202	2,032	3,103	3,243	3,133	3,343	3,000	3,304	3,404	3,437						
	Percentage of scheduled trips completed	Measure in deve	lonment																		
	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)	IVICUSUIC III UCVC	491,553	501,988	473,146	496,294	481,998	504,555	504,632	488,692	486,628	505,681	517,675	515,379	484,577						
	Percentage of time that elevators are available		94.4%	96.3%	91.4%	92.0%	94.1%	93.6%	99.2%	95.8%	96.8%	96.8%	98.9%	96.2%	96.9%	91.7%	96.5%				
	Percentage of time that escalators are available		91.8%	86.4%	94.5%	93.8%	86.8%	89.1%	93.9%	92.9%	84.5%	87.1%	87.1%	89.3%	87.3%	84.1%	85.7%				
	ctive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes.		31.070	00.470	34.370	33.070	00.070	03.170	33.370	32.370	04.570	07.170	07.170	03.370	07.570	04.170	03.770				
_	Non-private auto mode share when traveling to work	50%													6	2% (2011 C	oncue ACS				
															0.	2/0 (2011 C	elisus ACS				
	ctive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parki																				
2.4.1	% occupancy of SFPark spaces	Data forthcomin																			
2.4.2	% occupancy of SFMTA garage spaces	Data forthcoming	g. I																		
2.4.3	# of secure on street bicycle racks																2,739				
2.4.3	# of secure off street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)																475				
2.4.4	Parking regulation compliance	Data forthcoming	g.																		
Goa	I 3: Improve the environment and quality of	of life in San	Franciso	co																	
Obje	ctive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation s	system's resource	ce consum	nption, en	nissions, v	vaste, and	noise.														
ID	Metric	Goal	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	Jun 2012	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013				
3.1.1	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																94%				
	emissions																				
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															149,156,104 (2009					
3.1.6	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)															, ,	,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 produciton (tonnes)																13 (CY09				
3.1.7	Agency recycling produciton (tonnes)																534 (CY09				
3.1.7	Agency waste produciton (tonnes)																592 (CY09				
_	ctive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive																				
3.2.1	Customer rating: Business satisfaction with transportation network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	Survey is being d	eveloped.	Results wi	l be report	ed for FY13	Q4.														
Ohio																					
_	ctive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively. % of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase																				
3.3.1	% of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase																				
3.3.2	% of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase	Results reporting																			
	% of all capital projects delivered in-scope by phase	This is proving ch	allenging to	o quantify.	We are eva	luating alte	rnative me	trics.													
3.3.3																					
	ctive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently.																				
Obje		\$184															\$194				
Obje	ctive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently.	\$184															\$194 70				
Object 3.4.1	ctive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently. Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$184																			
Object 3.4.1 3.4.2	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour Passengers per revenue hour for buses	\$184	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.13	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.13			70				

Color Legend

Outperforms Underperforms Equal to FY12 Avg FY12 Avg FY12 Avg

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | February 2013



Goal 4: Create a Objective 4.1: Impro 4.1.1 Employee rating: about agency issu (low) to 5 (high) 4.1.2 % of employees tf 4.1.3 Employee rating: goals/objectives a 4.1.4 Employee rating: month 4.1.5 Employee rating: upon quickly and: upon quickly and: 4.1.7 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.1.8 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.1.9 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.1.1 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.1.2 Employee rating: S (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: 4.2.3 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.2.4 Employee rating: S (high) 4.2.5 Employee rating: accomplishment 4.2.6 Employee rating: uponions, even if the decomplishment 0 Employee valig: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro Objective 4.3: Impro Objective 4.3: Impro Objective 4.3. Impro	e a workplace that delivers outstopove internal communications. ag: Information needed to do the job? Informed ssues, challenges and current events?; scale of 1	anding service Survey distribute	CE on will beg					•	\$70N	Л additiona	I needed fo	or operatio	ns, \$260M	additional r	needed for	State-of-Go	
Goal 4: Create a Objective 4.1: Impro 4.1.1 Employee rating: about agency issus (low) to 5 (high) 4.1.2 % of employees tf 4.1.3 Employee rating: goals/objectives a 4.1.4 Employee rating: month 4.1.5 Employee rating: employees has im 4.1.6 Employee rating: upon quickly and: upon quickly and: 4.1.7 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.1.8 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.1.9 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.1.1 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.1.2 Employee rating: S (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: upon quickly and: 4.2.3 Employee rating: 5 (high) 4.2.4 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.5 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro Objective 4.3: Impro Objective 4.3.1 Mpro Objective 4.3.2 % of employees w year	capital structural deficit e a workplace that delivers outstance internal communications. In a communication in the communication in	anding service Survey distribute	ion will beg	in this mon	th. Results	will be rea			\$701			•					ood Repair
Objective 4.1: Impro 4.1.1 Employee rating: about agency issu (low) to 5 (high) 4.1.2 % of employees the 4.1.3 Employee rating: Improve a first in the firs	prove internal communications. Ig: Information needed to do the job? Informed ssues, challenges and current events?; scale of 1 Ig: Information needed to do the job? Informed ssues, challenges and current events?; scale of 1 Ig: I have a clear understanding of my division's s and how they contribute to Agency success	Survey distributi	ion will beg	in this mon	th. Results	will be ren				(SOGF	R) and \$1.7I	3 5-Year sh	ortfall for b	oike, pedest	rian, facilit	ies and trai	
Objective 4.1: Impro 4.1.1 Employee rating: about agency issu (low) to 5 (high) 4.1.2 % of employees th 4.1.3 Employee rating: goals/objectives a 4.1.4 Employee rating: month 4.1.5 Employee rating: upon quickly and 4.1.6 Employee rating: performance are Objective 4.2: Creat 4.2.1 Employee rating: 5 (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: 4.2.3 Employee rating: more efficient/eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.7 Employee rating: compliance of the problems of 4.2.8 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.9 Employee rating: Solve problems ef 4.2.1 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.2 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.3 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.4 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.7 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.8 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.9 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.1 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.2 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.3 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.4 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.7 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.8 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.9 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.1 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.2 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.3 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.4 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.7 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.8 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.9 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.1 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.2 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.3 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.4 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.7 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.8 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.9 Employee rating:	prove internal communications. Ig: Information needed to do the job? Informed ssues, challenges and current events?; scale of 1 Ig: Information needed to do the job? Informed ssues, challenges and current events?; scale of 1 Ig: I have a clear understanding of my division's s and how they contribute to Agency success	Survey distributi	ion will beg	in this mon	th. Results	will be ren										ics and trai	nsit (FY12)
4.1.1 Employee rating: about agency issu (low) to 5 (high) 4.1.2 % of employees th 4.1.3 Employee rating: goals/objectives a Employee rating: month 4.1.5 Employee rating: employees has im 4.1.6 Employee rating: upon quickly and performance are Objective 4.2: Creat 4.2.1 Employee rating: 5 (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: 4.2.3 Employee rating: more efficient/eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.7 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w year	g: Information needed to do the job? Informed ssues, challenges and current events?; scale of 1 (a) (b) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	Survey distributi		in this mon	th. Results	will be ren											
about agency issu (low) to 5 (high) 4.1.2 % of employees the 4.1.3 Employee rating: I goals/objectives a simulation of the properties of t	sthat complete the survey g: I have a clear understanding of my division's s and how they contribute to Agency success	Survey distributi		in this mon	th. Results	will be ren											ĺ
4.1.3 Employee rating: goals/objectives a 4.1.4 Employee rating: month 4.1.5 Employee rating: employees has im 4.1.6 Employee rating: upon quickly and upon qui	g: I have a clear understanding of my division's s and how they contribute to Agency success		on will begi	vey distribution will begin this month. Results will be reported for FY13 Q3.													
goals/objectives a 4.1.4 Employee rating: month 4.1.5 Employee rating: employees has im 4.1.6 Employee rating: upon quickly and 4.1.7 Employee rating: performance are v Objective 4.2: Creat 4.2.1 Employee rating: 5 (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: 4.2.4 Employee rating: more efficient/eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: 4.2.7 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w year	s and how they contribute to Agency success	Survey distributi	~CBI	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	rted for FY1	13 Q3.									
month 4.1.5 Employee rating: employees has im 4.1.6 Employee rating: upon quickly and 2.2 Employee rating: fighth for the performance are volume are volum	g: I have received praise for my work in the last		y distribution will begin this month. Results will be reported for FY13 Q3.														
employees has im 4.1.6 Employee rating: upon quickly and. 4.1.7 Employee rating: performance are volume for the following performance for the following performan		Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	rted for FY1	13 Q3.									
upon quickly and a 4.1.7 Employee rating: performance are v Objective 4.2: Creat 4.2.1 Employee rating: 5 (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: more efficient/eff 4.2.3 Employee rating: solve problems eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems eff 4.2.6 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w year	g: Communication between leadership and improved	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	orted for FY1	13 Q3.									
performance are v Objective 4.2: Creat 4.2.1 Employee rating: 5 (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: 4.2.3 Employee rating: 4.2.4 Employee rating: more efficient/eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	g: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are acted appropriately	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	orted for FY1	13 Q3.									
4.2.1 Employee rating: 5 (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: 4.2.3 Employee rating: 4.2.4 Employee rating: more efficient/eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	g: Discussions with my supervisor about my re worthwhile	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	orted for FY1	13 Q3.									
5 (high) 4.2.2 Employee rating: 4.2.3 Employee rating: 4.2.4 Employee rating: more efficient/eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	ate a collaborative and innovative work e	environment.															
4.2.3 Employee rating: 4.2.4 Employee rating: 4.2.5 Employee rating: 4.2.6 Employee rating: 4.2.7 Employee rating: 4.2.8 Employee rating: 4.2.9 Metric 4.3.1 % of employees we conducted 4.3.2 % of employees we year	g: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to	Survey distribut	ion will beg	in this mon	th. Results	will be rep	orted for F	Y13 Q3.									
4.2.4 Employee rating: more efficient/eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	g: My opinions seem to matter to my manager	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	rted for FY1	13 Q3.									
more efficient/eff 4.2.5 Employee rating: solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	g: Conflicts are resolved collaboratively	Survey distributi															
solve problems ef 4.2.6 Employee rating: lopinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: laccomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	g: Employees in my division consistently look for effective ways of getting the job done	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	orted for FY1	13 Q3.									
opinions, even if t 4.2.7 Employee rating: accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	g: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to efficiently/effectively	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	rted for FY1	13 Q3.									
accomplishment Objective 4.3: Impro ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	g: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and if they're different than others'	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	orted for FY1	13 Q3.									
ID Metric 4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	g: My work gives me a feeling of personal at	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	orted for FY1	13 Q3.									
4.3.1 % of employees w conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year	prove employee accountability.																1
conducted 4.3.2 % of employees w year		Goal	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	Jun 2012	Jul 2012	Aug 2012	Sep 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013
year	s with performance completed/appraisals	Results will be a	vailable at	the end of t	the fiscal ye	ear.											
4 3 3 % of employees w	s with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal																
4.5.5 70 of employees W	s who have received feedback on their work	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	rted for FY1	13 Q3.									
4.3.4 % of divisions/uni	units that report metrics	Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	h. Results v	will be repo	rted for FY1	13 Q3.									
4.3.5 Unscheduled abse	osence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		8.7%	8.7%	8.2%	7.2%	7.7%	9.5%	9.8%	9.9%	9.4%	10.5%	9.3%	6.6%	7.0%	9.0%	8.9%
4.3.6 Employee rating: written objectives		Survey distributi	on will begi	n this mont	th. Results v	will be repo	orted for FY1	13 Q3.									
Objective 4.4: Impro	g: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my ves	our stakeholder	rs.														
4.4.1 Stakeholder ratin process/commun			developed.														