STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2014



_			1	1	1								1					1
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	May 2014	Jun 2014	Monthly Trend
Goa	1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone	9																
Obje	ctive 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	9.27	$\left\{ \right.$
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				3.25					3.25			3.19			3.30		
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or station): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				3.13					3.16			3.08			3.16		
1.1.3	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes ¹		3	3.9	4.3	5	2	5	2	1	2	3	10	8	2	3	8	$\sim\sim$
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		42	37.8	28.4	39	27	39	29	28	22	30	20	23	27	23	34	~~~~
Obje	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	\ \
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) ²		11.3	12.1	9.5	9	16	15	9	12	6	10	6	5	12	4		\ \
1.2.3	Lost work days due to injury		16,445 (CY 20	13)														
1.2.4	Employee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.23														
Obje	ctive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																	
1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.53	5.03	5.85	5.80	5.59	6.64	5.56	7.06	6.75	4.62	5.74	4.89	4.78	6.12	6.50		~~~
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists ³		3,111 (CY11)															
1.3.2	Collisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)															
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.65	4.23	4.46	4.07	4.35	4.68	4.49	4.50	3.92	4.13	5.28	4.57	4.45	4.77		~~
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	143	~~~
1.3.5	Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ⁴				3.73					3.76			3.74			3.69		
Goa	12: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	ırsharing	the prefe	erred mea	ans of tra	avel												
Obje	ctive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications																	
2.1.1	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5				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	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ⁴				2.76					2.73			2.74			2.8		
2.1.4	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ⁴				3.50					3.64			3.52			3.33		
2.1.5	City Survey rating: Communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.20														
2.1.5	Customer rating: Communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ⁴				2.76										U Company	2.76		
2.1.6	Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86%	93.3%	93.7%	98%	87%	90%	88%	89%	92%	100%	99%	98%	94%	99%		~~
2.1.6	Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%	
2.1.6	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85%	82.4%	75.6%	86%	56%	87%	86%	84%	84%	76%	73%	75%	85%	73%	45%	~
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81%	79.1%	53.8%		79%			68%			26%			32%		
2.1.6	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%	~~~
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87%	90.0%	78.0%	90%	92%	85%	71%	56%	57%	59%	76%	90%	84%	95%		~
2.1.8	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				2.70					2.80			2.62			2.69		
2.1.9	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				2.64					2.75			2.61			2.57		

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2014



Dept. Dept	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	May 2014	Jun 2014	Monthly Trend
2.1 Processing of trains life joint in Fall Members and Service (i.e. and trains of the minute of the minute (i.e. and trains (i.e. and tr	Ohie	tive 2.2: Improve transit performance																	
2.12 Increasing of the rice legals 1.56 1.50 1.5	مرده																		$\overline{}$
2.22 Developed of uniter performance for concluded sevent delivered 8.5 % 6.7 m 5.9 m 5.9 m 5.9 m 5.0	2.2.1		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%	[→] √~
2.1.2 Presentage of indevoled service reference 95.5% 99.7%	2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network ⁶	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%	\
2.1.5 Average of the three department from terminal*	2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes ⁶	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%	
2.2.5 Procurage Maint partners ages Measure in development.	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%	
2.2.6 Processing of unitine performance* 2.2.7 Processing of the perfo	2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals ⁶	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%	\setminus
2.72 Presentage of trips over capacity furning PM peak (\$0.06 5.5%), enhancing in maximal based 5.5% 7.4% 6.9% 6.9% 6.9% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 6.9% 7.8%	2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Measure in	development.															
Symbol S	2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance ⁶	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%	\langle
An in the process An i	2.2.7			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%	/ ~~
2.88 Mean distance between failure (LMV)	2.2.7			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%	<>
2.25 Man distance between failure (incline)	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		· '	-/	4,632	3,914	3,876	,	,	4,021	4,661				-,-		5,707	
2.8 Mean distance between failure (Cable)	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,104	2,714	2,434	2,453	2,710	3,222	3,101	3,562	3,083	4,045	3,182	5,450		
229	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		· '		,			,	,						•	,		<->
2.21 Serioritage of scheduled mileage delivered Measure in development.	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936					,										~~ <u>`</u>
2.11 Indership (rubber tire, warrage weekday)	_	ŭ .			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%	\sim
Measure in development. Measure in development. Section Se		· ·	Measure in																
2.12 Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation 93.6% 96.3% 93.4% 93.5%		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			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		
22.11 Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation 94.2% 88.1% 93.8% 93.5% 93.5% 90.0% 90.5% 95.3% 96.1% 95.4% 93.5% 97.5% 9		11 0 1 0 11	Measure in																
Objective 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes Solution Solu		ů ,																	
1.3.1 Mortx in soft 20x et he Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to discelled used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to mission begin in FY14. 1.3.1 Parking relative to mission by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.3.1 Parking relative to mission begin to the economy 1.3.1 Parking relative to mission begin to the economy 1.3.1 Parking relative to the experiment completion (splind) 1.3.1 Parking relative to the economy 1.3.1 Parking relative to the experiment parking space 1.3.1 Parking relative to the economy		,		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%	~~
Objective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand 70.0% 71.9% 75.2% 76.8% 79.4% 79.6% 73.0% 72.1% 70.0% 72.2% 70.0% 73.0% 72.1% 70.0% 72.2% 70.0% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0% 73.0% 72.2% 73.0%	Obje	ctive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes																	
2.4.1 Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces' 70.0% 71.9% 75.2% 76.8% 79.8% 97.8% 97.8% 98.0% 98.5% 97.8% 93.7% 97.7% 97.7% 97.8% 98.2% 98.4% 98.5% 2.4.2 Parking reliability of SFMTA garges spaces 97.8% 97.7% 97.8% 97.8% 98.0% 98.9		, , , ,	50%	45% (2011 M	ode Share Su	rvey)													
2.4.2 Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces 97.8% 97.7% 97.8% 97.8% 98.0% 99.0% 88.9% 98.5% 93.5% 93.7% 97.7% 97.7% 97.7% 98.2% 98.8% 98.5% 98.5% 98.2% 98.5%	Obje	ctive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand																	
2.4.3 # of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces.* 2.4.3 # of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking).* 3.2 32 71 32 32 32 56 56 56 56 56 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120	2.4.1	Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces ⁷		70.0%	71.9%	75.2%	76.8%	79.4%	79.6%	73.0%	72.1%	70.0%							(
2.4.3 of secure off-street brycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) ¹ 32 32 71 32 32 32 56 56 56 56 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120	2.4.2	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%	97.7%	97.7%	98.2%	98.4%	98.5%	\
2.4.4 On-street payment compliance (5/Fpork pilot areas only)* Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise 3.1.1 Merit tons of CO2e for the transportation system	2.4.3	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces ⁸		5,095	5,768	6568	6274	6314	6430	6452	6550	6642	6646	6646	6646	6700	6758	6758	
Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise 3.1.1 Metric tons of C02e for the transportation system 1,515,000 [2,155,000 [2010) Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions 1,3.1 Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent) 1,9.3% 1,1 Number of electric vehicle charging stations 1,3.1 Chywide gasoline consumption rate 1,49,156,104 [2009) 1,1.5 Clywide gasoline consumption (RWh) 1,1.5 Clywide gasoline consumption (RWh) 1,1.6 Agency electricity consumption (RWh) 1,1.6 Agency gas consumption (Herms) 1,20,10,209 [20,10,299] [20,116,592] 1,1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons) 1,20,201,299 [20,116,592] 1,1.7 Agency recycling production (tons) 1,1.7 Agency master production (tons) 1,1.7 Agency waster production (tons) 1,2.1 Agency aster production (tons) 1,3.1 Agency aster production (tons) 1,3.1 Agency aster production (tons) 1,4 (CY09) 1,5 Agency aster production (tons) 1,5 Agency aster production (tons) 1,6 Agency aster production (tons) 1,7 Agency aster production (tons) 1,8 Agency aster production (tons) 1,9 Agency aster production (tons) 1,1.7 Agency aster production (tons) 1,1.7 Agency aster production (tons) 1,1.7 Agency aster production (tons) 1,2 Agency aster production (tons) 1,3 Agency aster production (tons) 1,4 (CY09) 1,5 Agency aster production (tons) 1,5 Agency aster production (tons) 1,5 Agency aster production (tons) 1,5 Agency aster product	2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) ⁸		32	32	71	32	32	32	56	56	56	56	56	120	120	120	120	
Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise 3.1.1 Metric tons of C02e for the transportation system 3.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions 94% (taxi) 3.1.3 Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent) 3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations 3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate 3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh) 3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (kWh) 3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms) 436,707 415,308 3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tons) 3.1.8 Agency compost production (tons) 3.1.9 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.0 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.1 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.2 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM) 93.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM) 93.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase 1,515,000 (2010) 1,515,000 (2,115,000) 2,115,000 (2,115,000) 3.1.7 Agency according to the security of the se	2.4.4	On-street payment compliance (SF <i>park</i> pilot areas only) ⁷			53.3%	53.5%	53.6%	53.5%	53.8%	54.1%	52.8%	52.9%							~
3.11 Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system 1,515,000 2,155,000 (2010)	Goa	13: Improve the environment and quality of life in San F	rancisco																
3.11 Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system 1,515,000 2,155,000 (2010)	Obje	ctive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource	consumpti	on, emissior	ıs, waste, an	d noise													
3.1.3 Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent) 19.3% 19.3% 19.3% 19.3% 10.15 Citywide gasoline consumption rate 149,156,104 (2009) 1.16 Agency electricity consumption (kWh) 124,120,362 122,809,359 1.16 Agency gas consumption (therms) 1.16 Agency gas consumption (therms) 1.16 Agency gas consumption (therms) 1.17 Agency compost production (tons) 1.18 Agency compost production (tons) 1.19 Agency compost production (tons) 1.10 Agency expelling production (tons) 1.11 Agency expelling production (tons) 1.12 Agency waste production (tons) 1.13 Agency waste production (tons) 1.14 (CY09) 1.15 CYUNG Agency waste production (tons) 1.16 Agency waste production (tons) 1.17 Agency waste production (tons) 1.18 Agency waste production (tons) 1.19 Agency waste production (tons) 1.10 Agency waste production (tons) 1.11 Agency waste production (tons) 1.12 Agency waste production (tons) 1.13 Agency waste production (tons) 1.14 (CY09) 1.15 CYUNG Agency waste production (tons) 1.17 Agency waste production (tons) 1.18 Agency waste production (tons) 1.19 Agency waste production (tons) 1.19 Agency waste production (tons) 1.10 Agency waste production (tons) 1.11 Agency waste production (tons) 1.12 Agency waste production (tons) 1.13 Agency waste production (tons) 1.14 (CY09) 1.15 CYUNG Agency waste production (tons) 1.15 CYUNG Agency waste production (tons) 1.16 Agency waste production (tons) 1.17 Agency waste production (tons) 1.18 Agency waste production (tons) 1.19 Agency waste production (tons) 1.10 Agency waste production (tons) 1.11 Agency waste production (tons) 1.12 Agency waste production (tons) 1.12 Agency waste production (tons) 1.14 (CY09) 1.15 Agency waste production (tons) 1.15 Agency waste production (tons) 1.16 Agency waste production (tons) 1.17 Agency waste production (tons) 1.18 Agency waste production (tons) 1.19 Agency waste production (tons) 1.10 Agency waste production (tons) 1.11 Agency waste production (tons) 1.12 Agency waste prod																			
3.1.3 Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent) 19.3% 3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations 3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate 149,156,104 (2009) 3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh) 124,120,362 122,809,359 3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms) 3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms) 3.1.7 Agency waster consumption (gallons) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.8 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.9 Agency maste production (mass of the transportation system's positive impact to the economy 3.1.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M) 3.1.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue and taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94% (taxi)															
3.1.5 Citywide gasoline consumption rate	3.1.3			19.3%															
3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (kWh) 3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms) 3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.8 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.9 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.1 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.2 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM) 3.1.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	3.1.4	ŭ , , , , ,		33															
3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms) 3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency consumption (gallons) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 535 (CYO9) 535 (CYO9) 531.7 Agency waste production (tons) 535 (CYO9) 531.7 Sand Sand Sand Sand Sand Sand Sand Sand	3.1.5	Citywide gasoline consumption rate		149,156,104	(2009)														
3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons) 20,201,299 20,116,592	3.1.6	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)		124,120,362	122,809,359														
3.1.7 Agency compost production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency compost production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 535 (CY09) 593 (CY09) CObjective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy 53.7 \$3.0 \$3.5 \$2.2 \$3.1 \$4.7 \$3.3 \$2.2 \$2.5 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6	3.1.6	Agency gas consumption (therms)		436,707	415,308														
3.1.7 Agency recycling production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) 535 (CY09) 536 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 533.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M) 532 (Monthly \$M) 533 (Monthly \$M) 534 (Monthly \$M) 535 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 534 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 534 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 534 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 534 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 530 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 534 (CY09) 534 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 538 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 539 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 531 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 532 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 533 (CY09) 534 (CY09) 534 (CY09) 535 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 537 (CY09) 538 (3.1.6	Agency water consumption (gallons)		20,201,299	20,116,592														
3.1.7 Agency waste production (tons) Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy 3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M) Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively 3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	3.1.7	Agency compost production (tons)		14 (CY09)															
Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy 3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M) \$\frac{\f	3.1.7	Agency recycling production (tons)		535 (CY09)															
3.2.1 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 \$ Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively \$3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	3.1.7	Agency waste production (tons)		593 (CY09)															
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively 3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	Obje	ctive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the eco																	
3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.	3.2.1	Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M)	\$3.0	\$3.5	\$2.2	\$3.1	\$4.7	\$3.3	\$2.2	\$2.5	\$2.6	\$2.6				>			
	Obje	ctive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																	
	3.3.1	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase	Results repo	orting to begin															
		0 1 1 1																	

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	May 2014	Jun 2014	Monthly Trend
Objec	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently																	
3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour	\$192	\$202.50	202.67 ⁹														
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses	7-0-	68	67														
3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip		\$2.90	\$2.91 ⁹														
3.4.4	Pay hours: platform hours ratio		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	> ~~
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio		32%	34% ⁹														
Obied	tive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits																	
3.5.1	Operating and capital structural deficit		ess towards clo		_		\$35M bas	eline gap f	or current	services, \$2	260M addit	ional neede	ed for State	of-Good F				hortfall for bike, nd transit (FY14)
Goa	14: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service																	
Objec	tive 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														
Objec	tive 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														1
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														ı
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively			3.67														<u> </u>
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.			3.58														
	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.			3.68														
Objec	tive 4.3: Improve employee accountability																	
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year			20.3%	62.5%													
	Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans			18.8%														ı
4.3.2	Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported			73.0%	93.2%													
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.2%	8.8%	10.0%	8.9%	8.8%	9.1%	10.3%	10.5%	7.4%	8.1%	9.3%	9.6%	11.8%	
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.55														1
Objec	tive 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) Lackude: "defauding taxi driver" "poperating taxi without a permit" and "overcharging taxi of the communication of the communi	•	e conducted i	n 2014.														

¹ Includes "defrauding taxi driver", "operating taxi without a permit", and "overcharging taxi fare" incidents only.

Color Legend

Outperforms Previous Underperforms Previous Equal to Previous

FY Average FY Average FY Average

 $^{^{\}rm 2}\,$ Includes assaults and threats on operators.

³ Injury Collisions.

⁴ 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.

⁵ <1 min for headway of 5 min or less.

⁶ 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.

⁷ Due to street sensor removal, occupancy-based parking measures will not be reported after Dec 2013.

⁸ Running Total.

⁹ Based on preliminary unaudited financials.