STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2015

SFMTA
Municipal
Transportation
Agency

ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Monthly Trend
Goal 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone																				
Objective 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																				
1.1.1	**SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles**	3.1	3.8	7.6	9.5	8.2	9.3	8.5	8.0	9.9	8.2	6.8	8.0	8.5	9.2	9.2	7.3	7.3		
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]			3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3		3.3			3.2			3.3			3.4		
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)[1]			3.1	3.2	3.2	3.2		3.2			3.0			3.2			3.2		
1.1.3	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes[2]		3	3.9	4.3	36.6	8	37	39	39	32	42	41	36	33	35	26	43		
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)[3]		41.6	36.4	28.7	36.8	37	31	39	51	32	25	31	40	38	45	41	28	41	
Objective 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security																				
1.2.1	**Workplace injuries/200,000 hours**	13.1	16.2	13.8	12.0	10.9	12.3	8.6	9.4	12.5	13.0	10.9	12.2	12.6	10.7	9.5	10.5	10.1		
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)[4]		11.3	12.1	9.9	8.0	11	9	7	11	9	7	9	5	6	8	8	9		
1.2.3	Lost work days due to injury		16,445																	
1.2.4	Employee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.2	3.3															
Objective 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																				
1.3.1	**Muni collisions/100,000 miles**	4.1	5.0	5.2	5.9	6.5	6.0	5.4	6.3	7.5	6.5	5.8	7.1	6.2	6.6	7.2	6.4	6.6		
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists[5]		3,235 (CY12)																	
1.3.2	Collisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)																	
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.7	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.5	3.8	4.9	4.0	5.2	4.7	3.8	4.4	4.3	4.9	3.8	4.2		
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311[3]		179.1	157.3	174.2	178.5	145	148	179	214	206	209	142	161	173	205	164	170	170	
1.3.5	Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]			3.7	3.74	3.7	3.7		3.7			3.6			3.8			3.7		
Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & carsharing the preferred means of travel																				
Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications																				
2.1.1	**Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]**				3.0	3.1	2.9		3.0			2.9			3.0			3.1		
2.1.2	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]				2.5	2.7	2.5		2.6			2.5			2.7			2.8		
2.1.3	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]				2.8	2.9	2.8		3.0			2.8			3.0			2.9		
2.1.4	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]				3.5	3.3	3.3		3.3			3.2			3.1			3.4		
2.1.5	Customer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]				2.8	2.8	2.8		2.8			2.7			2.8			2.8		
2.1.6	Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86.4%	93.3%	93.7%	67.8%	92.7%	62.1%	50.8%	41.9%	26.0%	34.5%	70.8%	89.0%	93.5%	84.7%	89.7%	91.3%		
2.1.6	Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99.0%	100.0%	99.4%	98.2%	94.1%	100.0%	100.0%	96.2%	96.4%	95.7%	97.6%	100.0%	94.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
2.1.6	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85.0%	82.4%	75.6%	59.0%	45.0%	71.9%	63.0%	71.0%	71.0%	62.9%	62.5%	39.2%	67.4%	48.8%	55.4%	52.8%		
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81.0%	79.1%	53.8%	40.4%	31.8%		29.1%			33.7%			52.2%			56.1%		
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97.0%	96.9%	96.8%	96.8%	94.7%	97.7%	94.0%	100.0%	94.4%	95.9%	95.5%	96.7%	96.4%	96.8%	98.1%	98.1%	99.2%	
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87.0%	90.0%	78.6%	82.6%	86.9%	88.7%	90.1%	80.6%	73.9%	74.4%	84.4%	86.1%	78.9%	85.6%				
2.1.8	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]				2.7	2.7	2.7		2.8			2.6			2.7			2.8		
2.1.9	Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)[1]				2.6	2.6	2.6		2.6			2.5			2.5			2.5		
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																				
2.2.1	**Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network[6,7]**	2.9%	5.3%	5.6%	5.8%	6.4%	5.5%	6.1%	6.2%	6.6%	7.4%	6.6%	7.6%	5.9%	5.9%	6.2%	6.3%	6.4%	6.6%	
2.2.1	**Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network[6,7]**	10.2%	18.5%	18.0%	18.2%	17.4%	21.1%	19.2%	19.3%	19.0%	19.8%	18.2%	19.4%	16.6%	16.0%	15.9%	15.7%	15.1%	15.7%	
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes[7]	85%	61.0%	59.6%	59.0%	56.8%	57.8%	58.4%	56.5%	55.3%	53.4%	55.4%	53.7%	56.9%	57.4%	58.0%	57.8%	59.0%	59.4%	
2.2.3	Percentage of scheduled trips delivered	98.5%	96.7%	97.0%	96.3%	97.6%	91.0%	95.1%	95.2%	96.2%	96.7%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.3%	99.3%	99.4%	99.4%	99.5%	
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals[7]	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	72.3%	72.3%	72.1%	71.0%	70.1%	67.7%	71.3%	69.5%	73.2%	74.1%	73.9%	74.5%	75.5%	74.1%	
2.2.5	Running time performance	Measure in development.																		
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance[7]	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	57.1%	57.2%	57.5%	56.3%	55.4%	53.1%	55.6%	53.3%	57.8%	58.4%	58.7%	58.9%	60.4%	59.0%	
2.2.7	Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points[8]		5.9%	7.4%	7.4%	5.0%	6.4%	5.2%	6.3%	7.2%	9.3%	5.4%	3.9%	4.9%	3.4%	3.6%	4.6%	3.1%		
2.2.7	Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points[8]		7.1%	8.6%	8.3%	5.9%	9.0%	6.4%	7.4%	8.0%	7.8%	6.9%	4.8%	5.7%	4.0%	5.8%	5.1%	4.3%		

Color Legend

Outperforms Previous FY Average	Underperforms Previous FY Average	Equal to Previous FY Average

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

ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Monthly Trend
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																				
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	4,632	5,523	5,707	6,202	5,941	6,260	4,947	5,216	3,463	5,670	5,847	6,318	5,701	6,087		
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,164	4,278	4,061	3,988	4,146	4,233	3,954	4,921	4,687	4,683	3,896	4,281	4,248			
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	1,913	1,758	1,888	1,924	1,515	2,425	2,405	1,476	1,740	2,090	2,331	1,788			
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,835	4,734	4,817	5,770	8,080	12,839	3,538	23,706	3,044	2,998	3,317	4,182	4,173	5,771			
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.7%	97.0%	96.2%	97.6%	90.7%	94.9%	95.3%	96.1%	96.5%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.4%	99.3%	99.4%	99.5%	99.5%	
2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure in development.																		
2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)[9]		490,514	495,311	504,162	487,913	498,616	485,225	495,899	549,058	519,179	481,093	444,945	466,975	476,425	481,938	481,362	484,944		
2.2.11	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)		70,423	72,948	73,522	73,932	68,066	69,362	69,591	73,517	75,908	74,132	71,318	73,145	74,485	66,395	73,167	73,163	72,733	
2.2.12	Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		93.6%	96.3%	94.4%	93.0%	91.4%	97.0%	86.0%	97.2%	96.4%	91.7%	91.7%	92.2%	97.0%	92.5%	89.4%	93.5%		
2.2.13	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	91.8%	93.0%	96.5%	94.9%	96.3%	96.3%	90.8%	86.5%	85.4%	88.5%	90.8%	90.6%	92.1%		
Objective 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes																				
2.3.1	**Non-private auto mode share (all trips)**	**50%**		**50%**	**54%**	**52%**														
2.3.2	Average daily bikeshare trips (Weekday)			885	1,050	1,099	1,076	1,151	1,158	1,213	1,008	685	1,039	1,082	1,164	1,191				
2.3.3	Average daily taxi trips	Measure in development.																		
Objective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand																				
2.4.1	**Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SF*park* pilot areas[10]**		**40.5%**	**52.2%**	**66.2%**	**60.3%**	56.5%										60.3%			
2.4.2	Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a)[11]		81.2%	81.3%	80.7%	80.9%	80.0%	80.8%	81.5%	79.3%	78.9%	82.9%	84.1%	80.9%	80.0%	79.8%	80.0%	81.6%	80.2%	
2.4.2	Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird)[12]		85.2%	85.3%	84.4%	86.0%	84.3%	85.0%	85.8%	84.9%	85.1%	87.6%	89.0%	86.0%	85.7%	84.9%	84.9%	86.0%	84.9%	
2.4.3	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces[13]					6,500														
2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)[13]					120														
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	**SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons C02e)**		48,556	45,455																
3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions			37.0%																
3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94.0%	94.0%	98.0%															
3.1.3	Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent)		14.0%	19.3%																
3.1.4	Number of electric vehicle charging stations		33	63	63															
3.1.6	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)		124,120,362	122,809,359																
3.1.6	Agency gas consumption (therms)		436,707	415,308																
3.1.6	Agency water consumption (gallons)		20,201,299	20,116,592																
3.1.7	Agency waste diversion rate		36.4%	38.1%	37.1%															
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)**			$3.7	$2.8	$2.0	$2.8	$1.8	$1.9	$2.3	$2.0	$1.8	$2.5	$1.5	$1.6	$2.2				
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																				
3.3.1	**Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase[14]**					77.3%					64.9%	65.4%		66.9%	67.1%	82.0%	81.1%	77.7%	90.0%	
3.3.2	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase[14]					43.9%					20.0%	22.9%		16.7%	21.6%	38.5%	40.4%	36.5%	39.3%	
Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently																				
3.4.1	**Average annual transit cost per revenue hour[15]**	**$187**	**$207.33**	**$207.50**	**$222.68[16]**															
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses		68	67	67[16]															
3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip[15]		$2.90	$2.91	$3.13[16]															
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio		32.2%	33.7%	29.8%[16]															
3.4.6	Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall	Measure in development.																		
3.4.7	Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month[17]		205	158	147	539	24	31	34	39	56	56	56	56	57	80	37	37	55	
Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits																				
3.5.1	**Structural operating budget deficit**	**$35M**	**$70M**	**$70M**	**$35M**															
3.5.1	**Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)**	**$130M**	**$260M**	**$260M**	**$260M**															

Color Legend

Outperforms Previous FY Average	Underperforms Previous FY Average	Equal to Previous FY Average

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

ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Monthly Trend
Goal 4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service																				
Objective 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)**			3.5	3.5															
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)**			3.4	3.5															
4.1.2	Percentage of employees that complete the survey			34.6%	28.3%															
4.1.3	Employee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals/objectives and how they contribute to Agency success.			3.4	3.5															
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days.			3.1	3.1															
4.1.5	Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved.			2.9	3.0															
4.1.6	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.			3.4	3.5															
Objective 4.2: Create a collaborative and innovative work environment																				
4.2.1	**Employee rating: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)**			3.4	3.4															
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.			2.9	3.0															
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.			3.9	3.9															
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.			3.3	3.4															
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively			3.7	3.8															
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.			3.6	3.7															
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.			3.7	3.8															
Objective 4.3: Improve employee accountability																				
4.3.1	**Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year**			20.3%	62.5%	31.3%														
4.3.1	**Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans**			18.8%	62.5%															
4.3.2	Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported			73.0%	93.2%	92.3%														
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.4%	7.7%	11.8%	8.8%	9.0%	8.6%	8.4%	7.1%	7.5%	7.5%	7.4%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	7.0%	⟍⟍
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.6	3.6															
4.3.5	Employee commendations to 311[3]		127.1	112.2	104.0	103.0	95	99	83	107	110	81	79	98	100	118	104	120	137	⟋⟍⟋
Objective 4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with our stakeholders																				
4.4.1	**Stakeholder rating: satisfaction with SFMTA decision-making process/communications; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)**	Results reporting to begin August 2015.																		

[1] 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.

[2] Beginning with FY2015, includes all taxi, TNC, and black car service-related incidents reported to SFPD. Reporting for prior months includes "defrauding taxi driver", "operating taxi without a permit", and "overcharging taxi fare" incidents only.

[3] Due to a previous calculation error that resulted in the over-reporting of 311 cases, some monthly values between May 2012 and Dec 2014 were re-calculated and revised in this document.

[4] Includes assaults and threats on operators.

[5] Injury collisions.

[6] <1 min for headway of 5 min or less.

[7] 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.

[8] Due to a prevous calculation error, monthly FY14 results were incorrectly reported in previous Metrics reports and have been corrected in this document.

[9] Due to a reporting error, previous Metrics reports stated average Saturday ridership for December 2014 instead of weekday. This document reports the correct weekday figure.

[10] Increase in percent of metered hours with no rate change indicates achievement of price point and parking availability goals. Note: sensor based rate adjustments were limited to SFpark pilot blocks with 50% or more parking sensor coverage through February 2014. Sensor Independent Rate Adjustments (SIRA) based on meter payment data started in June 2014 and include all SFpark pilot area blocks including those that fell below the 50% parking sensor threshold. These blocks have not approached their price point yet, which lowers the baseline for this metric. Moving forward, June 2014 will be considered the new baseline for SIRA.

[11] Shift in utilization from peak to off-peak indicates successful mitigation of congestion on city streets.

[12] Shift in utilization to hourly from early bird and monthly indicates garages are used more for short trips that benefit nearby businesses and less for commute trips by auto.

[13] Running total of SFMTA-installed facilities.

[14] Data collection began in October 2014. No data were collected in December 2014.

[15] Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY14 dollars.

[16] Based on preliminary undaudited figures.

[17] FY Total rather than FY Average.

Color Legend

Outperforms Previous FY Average	Underperforms Previous FY Average	Equal to Previous FY Average

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