## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | June 2015



ID N	letric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Monthly Trend
Goal	ا Create a safer transportation experience for everyon،	۵																		
	ve 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																			
	FPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.1	2.0	7.0	9.5	8.3	8.2	9.3	8.5	8.0	0.0	0.2	C 0	0.0	8.5	9.2	9.2	7.2		$\sim$
C	ustomer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1	3.1	3.8	7.6					8.5		9.9	8.2	6.8	8.0	8.5		9.2	7.3		~~ \
1.1.2	ow) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				3.2	3.3	3	.3		3.3			3.2			3.3				
	ustomer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or				3.1	3.2	3	.2		3.2			3.0			3.2				
st	ation): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>		3	3.9	4.3	36.0	3	8	37	39	39	32	42	41	36	33	35	26		~~~
	PD-reported taxi-related crimes <sup>2</sup>		-		28.7	36.4	23	37				32	25		40	38	45	41	27	
	ecurity complaints to 311 (Muni) <sup>3</sup>		41.6	36.4	28.7	36.4	23	3/	31	39	51	32	25	31	40	38	45	41	27	~ _
	ve 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security			10.0	10.0	44.0	40.5	40.0			40.5	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.7		40.5		
	/orkplace injuries/200,000 hours	13.1	16.2	13.8	12.0	11.0	10.5	12.3	8.6	9.4	12.5	13.0	10.9	12.2	12.6	10.7	9.5	10.5		$\sim$
	ecurity incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) <sup>4</sup>		11.3	12.1	9.9	7.9	8	11	9	7	11	9	/	9	5	6	8	8		/ <b>V</b> VV
	ost work days due to injury		16,445 (CY 20:																	
1.2.4 Er	mployee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.2	3.3															
Objecti	ve 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																			
	luni collisions/100,000 miles	4.1	5.0	5.2	5.9	6.5	6.7	6.0	5.4	6.3	7.5	6.5	5.8	7.1	6.2	6.6	7.2	6.4		<b>&gt;</b>
1.3.2 C	ollisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists <sup>5</sup>		3,235 (CY12)																	
	ollisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)																	
	luni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.7	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.8	4.5	3.8	4.9	4.0	5.2	4.7	3.8	4.4	4.3	4.9	3.8		<b>~~~</b>
	Jnsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311 <sup>3</sup>		179.1	157.3	174.2	179.0	160	145	148	179	214	206	209	142	161	173	205	164	168	$\sim$
1.3.5 C	ustomer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				3.7	3.7	3	.7		3.7			3.6			3.8				
Goal 2	2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	ırsharin	g the pref	erred mea	ans of tra	ivel														
Obiecti	ve 2.1: Improve customer service and communications																			
12 1 1	ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5				3.0	3.0	2	.9		3.0			2.9			3.0				
0	night ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5											2.5			2.7					
	igh) <sup>1</sup>				2.5	2.7	2	.5		2.6		2.5			2.7					
213	ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.8	2.9	2	.8	3.0			2.8			3.0					
2 1 A	ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1				3.5	3.2	3	.3	3.3			3.2			3.1					
(10	ow) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>											+			1					
2 1 5	ustomer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 $\operatorname{light}^1$				2.8	2.8	2	.8		2.8		2.7				2.8				
2.1.6 Pe	ercentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86%	93.3%	93.7%	62.0%	99.0%	92.7%	62.1%	50.8%	41.9%	26.0%	34.5%	70.8%	89.0%	93.5%	84.7%			$\langle$
2.1.6 Pe	ercentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99%	100%	99%	98.2%	100.0%	94.1%	100.0%	100.0%	96.2%	96.4%	95.7%	97.6%	100.0%	94.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	$\sim$
2.1.6 Pe	ercentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85%	82.4%	75.6%	59.0%	73.2%	45.0%	71.9%	63.0%	71.0%	71.0%	62.9%	62.5%	39.2%	67.4%	48.8%	55.4%	52.8%	<b>&gt;</b>
	ercentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81%	79.1%	53.8%	36.7%	31.			29.1%			33.7%			52.2%				
	ercentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97%	96.9%	96.8%	96.7%	97.5%	94.7%	97.7%	94.0%	100.0%	94.4%	95.9%	95.5%	96.7%	96.4%	96.8%	98.1%	98.1%	<u>~~~</u>
-	ercentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87%	90.0%	78.6%	82.6%	94.9%	86.9%	88.7%	90.1%	80.6%	73.9%	74.4%	84.4%	86.1%	78.9%	85.6%			$\langle$
	ustomer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup> ustomer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1				2.7	2.7		.7		2.8			2.6			2.7				
2.1.9	pw) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				2.6	2.5	2	.6		2.6			2.5			2.5				
Objecti	ve 2.2: Improve transit performance																			
2.2.1 P	ercentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network <sup>6,7</sup>	2.9%	5.3%	5.6%	5.8%	6.4%	5.6%	5.5%	6.1%	6.2%	6.6%	7.4%	6.6%	7.6%	5.9%	5.9%	6.2%	6.3%	6.4%	
	ercentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network <sup>6,7</sup>	10.2%	18.5%	18.0%	18.2%	17.8%	20.7%	21.1%	19.2%	19.3%	19.0%	19.8%	18.2%	19.4%	16.6%	16.0%	15.9%	15.7%	15.1%	<u> </u>
2.2.2 Pe	ercentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes <sup>7</sup>	85%	61.0%	59.6%	59.0%	56.3%	57.0%	57.8%	58.4%	56.5%	55.3%	53.4%	55.4%	53.7%	56.9%	57.4%	58.0%	57.8%	59.0%	$\left. \left\langle \right. \right. \right.$
2.2.3 Pe	ercentage of scheduled trips delivered	98.5%	96.7%	97.0%	96.3%	97.4%	94.6%	91.0%	95.1%	95.2%	96.2%	96.7%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.3%	99.3%	99.4%	99.4%	<u></u>
	ercentage of on-time departures from terminals <sup>7</sup>	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	71.8%	72.1%	72.3%	72.1%	71.0%	70.1%	67.7%	71.3%	69.5%	73.2%	74.1%	73.9%	74.5%	75.5%	
	unning time performance		development.																	
	ercentage of on-time performance <sup>7</sup>	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	56.5%	57.6%	57.2%	57.5%	56.3%	55.4%	53.1%	55.6%	53.3%	57.8%	58.4%	58.7%	58.9%	60.4%	~~~
	ercentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load		5.9%	7.4%	7.4%	5.0%	6.3%	6.4%	5.2%	6.3%	7.2%	9.3%	5.4%	3.9%	4.9%	3.4%	3.6%	4.6%	3.0%	~ \ _
2 2 7 Pe	ercentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load		7.1%	8.6%	8.3%	5.9%	9.4%	9.0%	6.4%	7.4%	8.0%	7.8%	6.9%	4.8%	5.7%	4.0%	5.8%	5.1%	4.5%	\\\
D	pints <sup>8</sup>																			~~

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | June 2015



Dependence   1.5   Manufacture March Bay   1.5	ID Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Monthly Trend
2.5   Mon-informer between fallow (Phi)	Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																			
1.21   Marce distance feature (100%)   1.21   2.37   2.37   2.31   2.37   2.3			3.300	3.310	4.632	5.523	5.881	5.707	6,202	5.941	6.260	4.947	5.216	3.463	5.670	5.847	6.318	5.701		~~~
\$2.50   Processing of minimal statement was a final experiment of the control o					_				_		_									<u> </u>
12.20   Processing of standard manage inflamed   Measure in development   Measure in developme	2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	1,913	1,795	1,758	1,888	1,924	1,515	2,425	2,405	1,476	1,740	2,090	2,331	1,788		~~
\$2.20   Tenerage of the following schemes   Associar in development   49,5514   495,511   504,112   475,619   511,00   98,816   485,275   696,800   519,70   481,001   511,00   486,075   476,475   481,781   481,182   22.21   481,001	2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,835	4,734	4,817	9,076	5,770	8,080	12,839	3,538	23,706	3,044	2,998	3,317	4,182	4,173	5,771		~
\$1.11   Starting (Control (Proceed First, Average concident)	2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.7%	97.0%	96.2%	97.4%	93.9%	90.7%	94.9%	95.3%	96.1%	96.5%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.4%	99.3%	99.4%	99.5%	<u> </u>
1.211   Internating foregree entrols, merrage ententry   1.73   1.74   1.75	2.2.10 Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure ii	n development																	
12.11   Processing of the section are in full operation   9.8.6 kg   90.00			490,514	495,311			515,109							319,036						<u></u>
\$1.21   Increasing of days had excelsion are in if agonation   \$4.21   \$8.15   \$9.28   \$9.58   \$9.50   \$8.50   \$8.50   \$8.50   \$8.50   \$9.50   \$9.21   \$\$\$   \$2.11   Improved the continuous support of a month of the continuous support of the co	2.2.11 Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)		70,423	72,948	73,522	75,222	77,236	68,066	69,362	69,591	73,517	75,908	74,132	71,318	73,145	74,485	66,395	73,167	73,163	$\overline{}$
Digitable 2.3: Increase use of all non-private automodes	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,																			~~~
23.1   Non-private auto mode harse (at trige)	,		94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	91.8%	95.4%	93.0%	96.5%	94.9%	96.3%	96.3%	90.8%	86.5%	85.4%	88.5%	90.8%	90.6%	92.1%	~~
2.12   Average daily blackharter retrievalethy    885   1,000   980   1,009   1,076   1,151   1,158   1,233   1,008   653   1,099   1,064   1,591	- 7																			
Measure in free-decignment   Measure in fore-decignment   Measure in for		50%		50%																
Designation   Company					885	1,050	989	1,099	1,076	1,151	1,158	1,213	1,008	685	1,039	1,082	1,164	1,191		~~
24.1   Preventage of metered hours with no rate Change in Stipped pilot arras*   40.5%   52.2%   66.3%   60.3%   55.5%   80.9%   80.9%   80.5%   80.9%   80.		Measure ii	n development																	
12.2   16   16   16   16   16   16   16   1	Objective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand																			
24.2   Lower years of SMTR garge entered for, mornify & and years   8.5.7%   8.5.7	2.4.1 Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas <sup>9</sup>		40.5%	52.2%	66.2%	60.3%		56.5%										60.3%		
24.3   of seurce on-street blodge parting spaces (garage blocyte parting)	2.4.2 Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) <sup>10</sup>		81.2%	81.3%	80.7%	80.9%	80.4%	80.0%	80.8%	81.5%	79.3%	78.9%	82.9%	84.1%	80.9%	80.0%	79.8%	80.0%	81.6%	$\langle$
24.3   Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco	2.4.2 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird) <sup>11</sup>		85.2%	85.3%	84.4%	86.0%	84.7%	84.3%	85.0%	85.8%	84.9%	85.1%	87.6%	89.0%	86.0%	85.7%	84.9%	84.9%	86.0%	
Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco	2.4.3 # of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces <sup>12</sup>					6,500														
Dispective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise	, , , , , ,					120														
3.1.1   SMMA carbon footprint (metric tons C02e)	Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco																			
3.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions  9.4 0% 98.0	Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's reso	ource consumpt	tion, emissio	ns, waste, an	d noise															
3.1.2   Percentage of SFMTA tas fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions	3.1.1 SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons CO2e)		48,556	45,455																
1.1.2   Percentage hodiesel to diseal used by SFMTA (blend equivalent)   14 (blend equivalent)   15 (blend equivalent)   15 (blend equivalent)   16	3.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions			37.0%																
1.14   Number of electric vehicle charging stations   33   63   63   63	3.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94.0%	94.0%	98.0%															
3.1.6   Agency executive whick charging stations   33   63   63   63	3.1.3 Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent)		14.0%	19.3%																
3.1.6   Agency pas consumption (therms)   436,707   415,308   20,201,299   20,115,592   3.1.6   Agency water consumption (gallons)   20,201,299   20,115,592   3.1.7   Agency water diversion rate   36,444   38,134   37,134   37,134   3.1.7   Agency water diversion rate   36,444   38,134   37,134   3.1.7   Agency water deconomic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM)   53,7   52,8   52,0   52,1   52,8   51,8   51,9   52,3   52,0   51,8   52,5   5.1.8   52,5			33	63	63															
3.1.6   Agency waste diversion rate   20,201,299   20,116,592   36.4%   38.1%   37.1%   38.1%   37.1%   38.1%   37.1%   38.1%   37.1%   38.1%   37.1%   38.1%   37.1%   38.1	3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh)		124,120,362	122,809,359																
3.17   Agency waste diversion rate   36.4%   38.1%   37.1%	3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms)		436,707	415,308																
Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy  3.2.1 [Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM)  5.3.7 5.2.8 \$2.0 \$2.1 \$2.8 \$1.8 \$1.9 \$2.3 \$2.0 \$1.8 \$2.5 \$2.0 \$2.1 \$2.8 \$3.3 \$3.3 \$3.3 \$3.3 \$3.3 \$3.3 \$3.3 \$3	3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons)		20,201,299	20,116,592																
3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM)  \$3.7 \$2.8 \$2.0 \$2.1 \$2.8 \$1.8 \$1.9 \$2.3 \$2.0 \$1.8 \$2.5 \$  Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively  3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  Results reporting to begin July 2015.  3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  Results reporting to begin July 2015.  Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently  3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour for buses  68 67 67 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses  68 67 67 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.3 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase  7.5 Passengers per revenue hour for buses  8.6 67 67 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses  8.6 67 67 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.3 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase  8.6 67 67 <sup>14</sup> 8.7 S2.8 \$2.0 \$2.1 \$2.8 \$1.8 \$1.9 \$2.3 \$2.0 \$1.8 \$2.5 \$  Deliver services efficiently  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase  8.6 Captural funding a part of the percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase  8.7 Captural funding a part of the percentage of a	3.1.7 Agency waste diversion rate		36.4%	38.1%	37.1%															
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively 3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase Results reporting to begin July 2015. 3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase Results reporting to begin July 2015.  Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently  3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour 3 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses  68 67 67 <sup>1.4</sup> 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses  68 67 67 <sup>1.4</sup> 3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip <sup>33</sup> 3.4.5 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall 3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month <sup>15</sup> 205 158 147 539 23 24 31 34 39 56 56 56 57 80 37 37  Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits  3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit  \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M	Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the	ne economy																		
3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase  Results reporting to begin July 2015.  3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase  Results reporting to begin July 2015.  Cobjective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently  3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour <sup>33</sup> 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour <sup>34</sup> 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses  68 67 67 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip <sup>13</sup> 52.90 \$2.91 \$3.13 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio  3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall  3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month <sup>15</sup> 205 158 147 539 23 24 31 34 39 56 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37  Cobjective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating budget deficit  \$3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit	3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M)			\$3.7	\$2.8	\$2.0	\$2.1	\$2.8	\$1.8	\$1.9	\$2.3	\$2.0	\$1.8	\$2.5						<b>~~</b>
3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase Results reporting to begin July 2015.  Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently  3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour for buses  5187 \$207.33 \$207.50 \$222.68 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses  68 67 67 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip <sup>13</sup> 5.2.90 \$2.91 \$3.13 <sup>14</sup> 3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio  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 <sup>15</sup> 205 158 147 539 23 24 31 34 39 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37  Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits  3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit	Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																			
Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently   Start	3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase	Results re	porting to begi	n July 2015.																
3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour 13 \$187 \$207.33 \$207.50 \$222.68 14 \$ \$3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses 68 67 67 14 \$ \$3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip 13 \$2.90 \$2.91 \$3.13 14 \$ \$3.2.2 \$3.7.8 \$2.9.8 1 \$3.13 14 \$ \$3.4.5 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall \$3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator training per month 15 \$2.90 \$1.58 \$1.47 \$3.9 \$2.3 \$2.4 \$3.1 \$3.4 \$3.9 \$5.6 \$5.6 \$5.6 \$5.6 \$5.7 \$8.0 \$3.7 \$3.7 \$3.7 \$3.7 \$3.7 \$3.7 \$3.7 \$3.7	3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase	Results rep	porting to begin	n July 2015.																
3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses 68 67 67 <sup>14</sup>	Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently		_																	
3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses 68 67 67 <sup>14</sup>	-	\$187	\$207.33	\$207.50	\$222.6814															
3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip <sup>13</sup> \$2.90 \$2.91 \$3.13 <sup>14</sup> \$3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio 32.2% 33.7% 29.8% <sup>14</sup> \$3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall Measure in development. 34.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month <sup>15</sup> \$2.95 \$1.58 \$1.47 \$5.99 \$2.30 \$2.40 \$3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$3.5.1 Structural operat	1 . 0	7-31			_														1	
3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio 3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month <sup>15</sup> 2.05 158 147 539 23 24 31 34 39 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37  Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M	• •									<b>†</b>										
3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall  3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month <sup>15</sup> 205 158 147 539 23 24 31 34 39 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37  Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits  3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit  \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M																			1	
3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month <sup>15</sup> 205 158 147 539 23 24 31 34 39 56 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37  Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits  3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit  \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Measure ii			23.8%															
Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits  3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M		ivicusul e II			1/17	520	22	24	21	2/	30	56	56	56	56	57	80	37	37	$\overline{}$
3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M	Transcer of marvadus effecting transic operator training per month		203	130	147	333	43	24	31	34	33	30	30	30	30	31	ου	3/	3/	
			4	4	4															
3.5.1   Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)   \$130M   \$260M   \$260M   \$260M	3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit	\$35M	\$70M	\$70M	\$35M															
	3.5.1 Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)	\$130M	\$260M	\$260M	\$260M															

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | June 2015



טו	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	May 2014	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Monthly Trend
Goa	14: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service																			
Objec	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)			3.5	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															
Objec	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)			3.4	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															
Objec	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%	31.3%														
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans			18.8%	62.5%															
	Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported			73.0%	93.2%	94.6%														
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.4%	7.8%	9.6%	11.8%	8.8%	9.0%	8.6%	8.4%	7.1%	7.5%	7.5%	7.4%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	<u></u>
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 <sup>3</sup>		127.1	112.2	104.0	99.3	94	95	99	83	107	110	81	79	98	100	118	103	114	\ \
Objec	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)																			

- 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.
- <sup>2</sup> 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.
- <sup>3</sup> 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.
- $^{\rm 4}$  Includes assaults and threats on operators.
- <sup>5</sup> Injury collisions.
- $^{6}$  <1 min for headway of 5 min or less.
- <sup>7</sup> 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 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.
- <sup>10</sup> Shift in utilization from peak to off-peak indicates successful mitigation of congestion on city streets.
- 11 Shift 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.
- 12 Running total of SFMTA-installed facilities.
- $^{\rm 13}$  Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY14 dollars.
- $^{14}\,$  Based on preliminary undaudited figures.
- $^{\rm 15}\,$  FY Total rather than FY Average.