STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2014



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Monthly Trend
Goa	1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone	5																		
Objec	tive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																			
	SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.39	3.77	7.55	9.45	7.67	10.24	11.34	12.15	7.74	8.19	7.53	9.97	8.82	8.50	8.22	9.26	8.52	6.83	$\sim \sim$
1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1				3.25					3.25			3.19			3.30				
	(low) to 5 (high) Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or				5.25										l/					
1.1.2	station): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				3.13					3.16			3.08			3.16				
	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes ¹		3	3.9	6.8	38.0	2	5	2	1	2	3	10	8	2	3	8	37	39	
	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		42	37.8	28.6	34.0	27	39	29	28	22	30	20	23	27	23	37	31	37	$\sim \sim \sim$
	tive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security																			
	Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	14.6	16.2	13.8	12.1	8.6	17.6	12.1	12.2	13.6	9.0	9.3	10.3	11.1	14.7	10.5	12.3	8.6		$\sim \sim$
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) ²		11.3	12.1	9.8	9.0	16	15	9	12	6	10	6	5	12	8	11	9		$\sim\sim\sim\sim$
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																
Objec	tive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																			
1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.53	5.03	5.85	5.88	5.32	6.64	5.56	7.06	6.75	4.67	5.74	4.94	4.78	6.16	6.68	6.02	5.32		$\sim \sim$
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists ³		3,235 (CY12)														1			
1.3.2	Collisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)														1			
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.65	4.23	4.48	3.73	4.35	4.68	4.49	4.50	3.96	4.13	5.33	4.61	4.45	4.81	4.51	3.73		$\sim \sim$
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		179	159.3	179.6	176.0	197	222	210	185	161	174	157	204	179	158	144	157	195	$\sim \sim$
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	2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	rsharing	g the pref	erred me	ans of tra	vel														
Obied	tive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications																			
	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5																			
2.1.1	(high) ⁴				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 (high) ⁴				2.49					2.54			2.47			2.46	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			2.80				
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													1			
2.1.5	Customer rating: Communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ⁴			5.20	2.76											2.76				
2.1.5	Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86%	93.3%	93.7%	62.1%	87%	90%	88%	89%	92%	100%	99%	98%	94%	99%	93%	62%		
2.1.6	Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 30 days		99%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%	100%	100%	`
2.1.6	Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85%	82.4%	75.6%	65.8%	56%	87%	86%	84%	84%	76%	73%	75%	85%	73%	45%	72%	63%	$\sim \sim$
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81%	79.1%	53.8%		79.	0%		68%			26%			32%				
2.1.6	Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97%	96.9%	96.8%	96.2%	98%	97%	98%	95%	98%	97%	94%	98%	96%	98%	95%	98%	94%	$\sim\sim\sim\sim$
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87%	90.0%	78.6%	89.0%	92%	85%	71%	56%	57%	59%	76%	90%	84%	95%	87%	89%		\sim
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				2.64					2.75			2.61			2.57				
Ohior	(low) to 5 (high) tive 2.2: Improve transit performance																			
-		4.0%	F 20/	5.6%	5.6%	6.1%	5.8%	6.5%	6.2%	6.0%	5.4%	4.9%	5.5%	F 20/	5.3%	5.6%	5.5%	6.1%	6.2%	\sim
	Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network ^{5,6}	4.0% 13.9%	5.3%	5.6%	5.6% 18.2%		5.8%			6.0% 17.5%	5.4%	4.9%	5.5%	5.2% 17.1%	5.3%	5.6% 20.7%				
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network ⁶		18.5%			19.2%		19.1%	18.8%								21.1%	19.2%	19.3%	\sim
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes ⁶	85%	61.0%	59.6%	59.0%	57.3%	60.2%	58.6%	57.5%	57.9%	58.3%	59.6%	60.1%	60.1%	59.1%	57.0%	57.8%	58.4%	56.5%	\sim
2.2.3	Percentage of scheduled trips delivered	98.5%	96.7%	97.0%	96.3%	95.2%	96.4%	97.3%	98.2%	98.6%	96.7%	96.3%	97.5%	96.9%	95.6%	94.6%	91.0%	95.1%	95.2%	\sim
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals ⁶	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	71.5%	74.3%	73.4%	72.7%	73.5%	73.5%	74.7%	75.4%	75.3%	74.0%	72.1%	72.3%	72.1%	71.0%	\sim
	Average Muni system speed		development.	50.00/	50.00/	50.001	50.20	50.000	57.40/	57.00/	50.000	60.200	CO 40(CO 50(50.50(57.00	57.001	57.50	50.001	
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance ⁶ Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	56.8%	59.2%	58.0%	57.4%	57.8%	58.6%	60.2%	60.4%	60.5%	59.5%	57.6%	57.2%	57.5%	56.3%	\sim
2.2.7	points		5.9%	7.4%	6.9%	4.9%	7.3%	9.7%	9.0%	6.1%	4.9%	7.8%	6.0%	7.2%	6.3%	5.8%	6.9%	4.7%	5.1%	$\sim \sim \sim$
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		7.1%	8.6%	6.9%	6.7%	7.4%	8.7%	8.0%	7.2%	4.7%	6.6%	6.4%	5.7%	7.2%	7.0%	7.3%	6.4%	7.0%	` \~~~

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2014



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Monthly Trend
Obje	tive 2.2: Improve transit performance																			
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	4,632	6,067	3,876	3,735	4,040	4,021	4,661	5,209	4,747	5,675	5,920	5,881	5,707	6,202	5,941	
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,164	3,988	2,434	2,453	2,710	3,222	3,101	3,562	3,083	4,045	3,182	5,450	4,061	3,988		
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	1,888	1,417	2,917	1,787	2,653	2,215	1,923	1,682	3,235	2,132	1,795	1,758	1,888		$\sim\sim$
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,835	4,734	8,080	5,600	4,797	5,540	4,315	6,850	4,307	3,196	3,465	4,026	9,076	5,770	8,080		\sim
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.7%	96.8%	96.2%	95.1%	96.8%	97.5%	98.2%	98.4%	96.6%	96.0%	97.3%	96.6%	95.1%	93.9%	90.7%	94.9%	95.3%	\sim
2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure in	development.																	
2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		490,514	495,311	502,965	484,245	504,439	527,096	517,076	497,653	482,111	495,529	502,172	512,759	513,835	515,109	498,616	484,245		\sim
2.2.11	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)		70,423	71,949	72,595	71,835	68,075	70,375	67,433	57,690	66,251	69,960	75,039	70,031	67,990	75,357	68,066	70,982	72,688	$\sim \sim \sim$
2.2.12	Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		93.6%	96.3%	94.4%	91.5%	95.3%	98.1%	93.9%	89.1%	94.6%	97.3%	95.5%	96.0%	94.7%	90.3%	91.4%	97.0%	86.0%	$\sim \sim$
2.2.13	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	96.5%	91.8%	92.6%	90.0%	90.5%	95.3%	96.1%	95.4%	93.5%	97.5%	95.4%	93.0%	96.5%	94.9%	$\sim \sim \sim$
Obje	tive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes																			
2.3.1	Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%	45% (2011 M	ode Share Sur	vey)															1
Obje	tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand																			í l
2.4.1	Parking reliability rate of SF <i>park</i> spaces ⁷		70.0%	71.9%	75.2%		79.4%	79.6%	73.0%	72.1%	70.0%									\sim
2.4.2	Parking reliability of SFMTA garage spaces		97.8%	97.7%	97.8%	98.4%	99.0%	98.9%	98.5%	97.3%	93.7%	97.7%	97.7%	97.7%	98.2%	98.4%	98.4%	99.0%	97.8%	$\overline{}$
2.4.3	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces ⁸		5,095	6,208	6,730	6,794	6,288	6,404	6,426	6,522	6,614	6,618	6,618	6,618	6,672	6,730	6,730	6,742	6,794	
2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) ⁸		32	32	120		32	32	56	56	56	56	56	120	120	120	120	120	120	
2.4.4	On-street payment compliance (SFpark pilot areas only) ⁷			53.3%	53.5%		53.5%	53.8%	54.1%	52.8%	52.9%									2
	13: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fr	ancisco																		
					al a sta s		-								-					
	tive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource				na noise															
	Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system	#########	2,266,322 (20	-																·
3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94%	94%	98%															
3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions			37%																L
3.1.3	Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent)		14.0%	19.3%																L
3.1.4	Number of electric vehicle charging stations		33	63	63															L
3.1.5	Citywide gasoline consumption rate		149,156,104 (
3.1.6	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)		124,120,362	,,																
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 compost production (tons)		14 (CY09)																	ļ
3.1.7	Agency recycling production (tons)		535 (CY09)																	ļ
3.1.7	Agency waste production (tons)		593 (CY09)																	
	tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the eco	nomy																		
	Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M)			\$3.7	\$3.0		\$2.2	\$3.1	\$4.7	\$3.3	\$2.2	\$2.5	\$2.6	\$2.6						\sim
	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																			
	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase		orting to begi																	
	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase	Results repo	orting to begin	in FY15.																
Obje	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		68	67																1
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	1.12	1.11	<u></u>
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio		32%	34% ⁹																
Obje	tive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits																			
3.5.1	Structural operating budget deficit		ress towards erating and	\$70M	\$35M															
3.5.1	Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)		itical capital ral deficit	\$260M	\$260M															

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2014



ID Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Aug 2013	Sep 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	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)			3.45																
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																
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)			3.36																
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																
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%															
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%	93.2%															
4.3.3 Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.4%	8.9%	10.0%	8.9%	8.8%	9.1%	10.3%	10.5%	7.4%	8.1%	9.3%	9.6%	11.8%	8.8%	9.0%	$\sim \sim$
4.3.4 Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.55																
Objective 4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with our stakeholders	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)	be conducted	-																	

¹ Beginning with FY2015, includes all taxi, TNC, and black car service-related incidents reported to SFPD. Data for prior years includes "defrauding taxi driver", "operating taxi without a permit", and "overcharging taxi fare" incidents only.

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.

 $^{\rm 5}$ <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.

* Data forthcoming.