STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | November 2013



| ID | Metric Target | et FY12 Avg | FY13 Avg | FY14 Avg | Jan 2013 | Feb 2013 | Mar 2013 | Apr 2013 | May 2013 | Jun 2013 | Jul 2013 | Aug 2013 | Sep 2013 | Oct 2013 | Monthly Trend |
|-------|--|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|
| Goa | I 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | tive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles 3.39 | 3.77 | 7.56 | 10.92 | 7.24 | 9.44 | 10.68 | 9.24 | 11.37 | 11.01 | 11.18 | 10.24 | 11.34 | | |
| 1.1.2 | Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 3.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1.2 | Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or station); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 2.90 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes | 3 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | ~~~ |
| 1.1.4 | Security complaints to 311 (Muni) | 42 | 36.3 | 32.8 | 44 | 29 | 35 | 40 | 34 | 38 | 39 | 27 | 39 | 26 | <u>~~~</u> |
| Objec | tive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2.1 | Workplace injuries/200,000 hours 14.6 | 16.2 | 13.8 | 14.2 | 13.7 | 12.8 | 11.3 | 12.0 | 13.9 | 10.4 | 11.7 | 16.5 | | | <u> </u> |
| 1.2.2 | Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) | 11 | 11.7 | 10 | 21 | 12 | 19 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 15 | | <u>~~~</u> |
| 1.2.3 | Lost work days due to injury | 3,764 | 3,912 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2.4 | Employee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 3.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objec | tive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3.1 | Muni collisions/100,000 miles 4.53 | 5.03 | 5.23 | 5.94 | 4.27 | 5.81 | 5.18 | 6.20 | 5.36 | 5.23 | 5.72 | 6.59 | 5.51 | | ~~~ |
| 1.3.2 | Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists Awaiting | 2012 results. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3.2 | Collisions involving taxis Awaiting | 2012 results. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3.3 | Muni falls on board/100,000 miles | 4.65 | 4.25 | 4.40 | 4.40 | 3.97 | 2.97 | 4.42 | 3.75 | 4.87 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.59 | | ~~~ |
| 1.3.4 | "Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311 | 179 | 157.1 | 188.3 | 158 | 152 | 156 | 179 | 164 | 148 | 176 | 190 | 212 | 175 | |
| 1.3.5 | Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 3.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Goa | 12: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & carsha | ring the pr | eferre | d means | of trav | vel | | | | | | | | | |
| Objec | tive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 2.55 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.2 | Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 2.52 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.3 | Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 2.76 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.4 | Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 3.58 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.5 | City Survey rating: Communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 3.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.6 | Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days | 87% | 93.3% | 91.8% | 96% | 97% | 97% | 92% | 99% | 91% | 98% | 87% | 90% | | ~~~ |
| 2.1.6 | Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours | 99% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| 2.1.6 | Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours | 85% | 81.8% | 71.1% | 80% | 82% | 87% | 86% | 87% | 84% | 86% | 56% | 87% | | |
| 2.1.6 | Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days | 81% | 79.1% | 79.2% | | 82% | | | 89% | | | 79% | | | |
| 2.1.6 | Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours | 97% | 96.8% | 98.1% | 95% | 99% | 97% | 93% | 98% | 98% | 99% | 98% | 97% | 98% | <u> </u> |
| 2.1.7 | Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days | 87% | 90% | 89% | 82% | 87% | 94% | 97% | 96% | 92% | 90% | 92% | 85% | | |
| 2.1.8 | Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 2.45 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.9 | Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | 2.54 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Outperforms Previous FY Average FY Average FY Average FY Average FY Average

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | November 2013



| ID | Metric | Target | EV12 Ava | EV12 Ava | EV14 Ava | lan 2012 | Eab 2012 | Mar 2012 | Apr 2012 | May 2012 | lun 2012 | Jul 2012 | Aug 2012 | San 2012 | Oct 2012 | Monthly Trand |
|--------|--|----------------|-------------|--|------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------|------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-------------|------------------|
| ID | wethe | Target | FY12 AVg | F113 AVg | F114 AVg | Jan 2013 | rep 2013 | Iviar 2013 | Apr 2013 | iviay 2013 | Jun 2013 | Jul 2013 | Aug 2013 | Sep 2013 | OCI 2013 | Monthly Trend |
| Obje | tive 2.2: Improve transit performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.1 | Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network (<1 min for headways of 5 min or less) | 4.0% | 5.3% | 5.6% | 6.7% | 4.8% | 5.1% | 5.1% | 5.4% | 5.7% | 7.4% | 5.6% | 5.9% | 6.4% | 9.3% | |
| 2.2.1 | Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network | 13.9% | 18.5% | 18.2% | 17.7% | 17.7% | 18.0% | 16.4% | 15.3% | 16.7% | 17.3% | 16.8% | 17.2% | 18.1% | 19.1% | \ |
| 2.2.2 | Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes | 85% | 61.0% | 59.6% | 59.7% | 60.1% | 59.4% | 60.5% | 62.1% | 61.7% | 61.5% | 62.5% | 60.2% | 58.7% | 57.5% | \ |
| 2.2.3 | | 98.5% | 96.6% | 96.8% | 97.7% | 97.8% | 96.7% | 98.4% | 99.2% | 97.9% | 97.6% | 98.0% | 96.9% | 97.5% | 98.2% | \ |
| 2.2.4 | Percentage of on-time departures from terminals | 85% | 76.9% | 73.7% | 74.6% | 74.6% | 73.8% | 75.2% | 76.2% | 75.2% | 74.5% | 75.3% | 75.0% | 74.9% | 73.2% | \ |
| 2.2.5 | Average Muni system speed Re | esults will be | e reported | in Decemb | ber. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.6 | Percentage of on-time performance | 85% | 60.1% | 59.0% | 59.5% | 60.5% | 59.9% | 60.9% | 61.4% | 60.5% | 59.7% | 60.0% | 60.1% | 59.9% | 58.0% | \ |
| 2.2.7 | Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points | | 6.4% | 7.5% | 9.8% | 6.6% | 7.6% | 7.4% | 7.0% | 6.7% | 5.4% | 6.4% | 8.4% | 12.5% | 12.8% | $\overline{}$ |
| 2.2.7 | Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points | | 7.1% | 7.7% | 10.1% | 6.4% | 5.9% | 7.0% | 7.6% | 7.3% | 7.1% | 8.1% | 8.9% | 11.5% | 12.3% | |
| 2.2.8 | Mean distance between failure (Bus) | | 3,300 | 3,310 | 3,759 | 3,631 | 3,723 | 4,170 | 3,712 | 3,427 | 3,771 | 3,914 | 3,801 | 3,486 | 3,851 | \ |
| 2.2.8 | Mean distance between failure (LRV) | | 3,137 | 3,571 | 2,714 | 3,927 | 4,440 | 3,984 | 3,655 | 2,806 | 2,682 | 2,714 | , | , | , | |
| 2.2.8 | Mean distance between failure (Historic) | | 2,055 | 2,224 | , | 1,958 | 2,316 | 1,620 | 2,530 | 2,025 | , | | | | | ^ |
| 2.2.8 | Mean distance between failure (Cable) | | 2,936 | 3,835 | 4,689 | 2,649 | 2,811 | 4,814 | 5,488 | 4,979 | 5,336 | 3,992 | 5,600 | 4,797 | | |
| 2.2.9 | Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered Ple | ease see 2.2 | | <u>, </u> | , | , | , | , | , | , | , | , | , | , | | |
| 2.2.10 | | easure in de | | t. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday) | | | 495,311 | 505,030 | 467,267 | 488,616 | 493,484 | 501,281 | 504,740 | 478,503 | 483,554 | 504,439 | 527,096 | | / |
| | | easure in de | | | , | , | , | , | , | , | , | , | , | , | | |
| | Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation | | 93.6% | 96.3% | 95.9% | 96.5% | 95.8% | 98.4% | 96.7% | 96.8% | 93.7% | 96.2% | 95.3% | 98.1% | 93.9% | ~~~ |
| - | Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation | | 94.2% | 88.1% | 92.1% | 85.7% | 87.0% | 93.0% | 88.2% | 88.0% | 95.7% | 93.6% | 91.8% | 92.6% | 90.0% | ~~ |
| | tive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Non-private auto mode share (all trips) | 50% | | | | | | | | | | | | 45% | /2011 Mor | de Share Survey) |
| | tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand | 3070 | | | | | | | | | | | | 73/0 | (2011 1110) | ac share sarvey, |
| | | | 70.00/ | 74.00/ | 77.20/ | 70.70/ | 74.20/ | 72 (0/ | 72.20/ | 72.00/ | 75.00/ | 76.00/ | 70.40/ | 70.60/ | 72.00/ | |
| _ | Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces | | 70.0% | 71.9% | 77.2% | 78.7% | 74.3% | 72.6% | 73.2% | 73.8% | 75.9% | 76.8% | 79.4% | 79.6% | 73.0% | |
| 2.4.2 | Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces | | 97.8% | 97.7% | 98.6% | 97.7% | 98.2% | 98.4% | 96.8% | 96.8% | 98.6% | 98.0% | 99.0% | 98.9% | 98.5% | |
| 2.4.3 | # of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces | | 5,732 | 6,792 | 6,820 | 6,366 | 6,372 | 6,456 | 6,558 882 | 6,632 | 6,720 | 6,792 882 | 6,820 | 6,852 882 | | |
| 2.4.3 | # of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) | | 846 | 882 | 882 | 882 | 882 | 882 | ł | 882 | 882 | | 882 | | E 4 20/ | |
| | On-street payment compliance (SFpark pilot areas only) | | | 53.3% | 53.6% | 53.2% | 54.4% | 54.7% | 53.3% | 52.9% | 53.4% | 53.6% | 53.5% | 53.8% | 54.2% | |
| | 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fran | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | tive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource con | - | n, emissio | ons, wast | te, and no | oise | | | | | | | | | | 2.455.000 (2040) |
| 3.1.1 | Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system 1 | 1,515,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | • | 2,155,000 (2010) |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2% (FY11) |
| 3.1.4 | Number of electric vehicle charging stations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 33 |
| 3.1.5 | Citywide gasoline consumption rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 9,156,104 (2009) |
| 3.1.6 | Agency electricity consumption (kWh) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 12 | 3,746,104 (FY11) |
| 3.1.6 | Agency gas consumption (therms) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 579,043 (FY11) |
| 3.1.6 | Agency water consumption (gallons) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 1,301,010 (FY11) |
| 3.1.7 | Agency compost production (tons) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 14 (CY09) |
| 3.1.7 | Agency recycling production (tons) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 535 (CY09) |
| 3.1.7 | Agency waste production (tons) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 593 (CY09) |
| | tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the econo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2.1 | Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M) | | | \$3.9 | \$2.5 | | | | \$4.6 | \$4.6 | \$2.4 | \$3.1 | \$1.9 | | | ~ |
| Obje | tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3.1 | Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Re | esults report | ting to beg | gin in FY14 | l. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3.2 | | esults report | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Color Legend

Outperforms Previous FY Average FY Average FY Average FY Average FY Average

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | November 2013



| ID | Metric | Target | FY12 Avg | FY13 Avg | FY14 Avg | Jan 2013 | Feb 2013 | Mar 2013 | Apr 2013 | May 2013 | Jun 2013 | Jul 2013 | Aug 2013 | Sep 2013 | Oct 2013 | Monthly Trend |
|-------|---|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|
| Obje | ctive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4.1 | Average annual transit cost per revenue hour | \$187 | \$195 | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$195 (FY12) |
| 3.4.2 | Passengers per revenue hour for buses | | 70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 70 (FY12) |
| 3.4.3 | Cost per unlinked trip | | \$2.77 | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$2.77 (FY12) |
| 3.4.4 | Pay hours: platform hours ratio | | 1.12 | 1.12 | 1.11 | 1.12 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.10 | 1.11 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.12 | \ |
| 3.4.5 | Farebox recovery ratio | | 30.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 30.8% (FY12) |
| Obje | ctive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5.1 | Operating and capital structural deficit | Make progre mission cirit | | | | nd | | \$70M a | dditional n | | = | | | | | nd Repair (SOGR) |
| Goa | I 4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Obje | ctive 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Obje | ctive 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.5 | Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively | | | 3.67 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.6 | Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'. | | | 3.58 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.7 | Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment. | | | 3.68 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Obje | ctive 4.3: Improve employee accountability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.1 | Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year | | | 20.3% | 62.5% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.1 | Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans | | | 18.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.2 | Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported | | | 73.0% | 90.5% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.3 | Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators) | | 12.2% | 8.6% | 9.1% | 8.9% | 10.3% | 8.5% | 6.9% | 8.3% | 9.0% | 8.8% | 10.0% | 8.9% | 8.8% | ∼ |
| 4.3.4 | Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives. | | | 3.55 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Obje | ctive 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) | Survey will be conducted in FY14. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |