STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | November 2015



	letric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Jul 2015	Aug 2015	Sep 2015	Oct 2015	Monthly Trend
Goal 3	1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyon	e																				
Objecti	ve 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																					
	FPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.1	3.8	7.6	9.4	8.2	7.1	9.9	8.2	6.8	8.0	8.5	9.2	9.2	7.3	7.3	7.5	6.9	6.4	7.9		}
1112	ustomer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1				3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3		3.2			3.3			3.4			3.3			
(lc	ow) to 5 (high) ¹ ustomer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or																					
	ation): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹				3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0			3.2			3.2			3.1				
1.1.3 SF	PD-reported taxi-related crimes ²		3	4	4	37	39	39	32	42	41	36	33	35	26	43	36	36	46	36		\
1.1.4 Se	ecurity complaints to 311 (Muni) ³		41.6	36	29	37	29	51	32	25	31	40	38	45	41	29	43	30	33	30	21	\
Objecti	ve 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security																					
	/orkplace injuries/200,000 hours	13.1	16.2	13.8	12.0	11.0	12.0	12.5	13.0	10.9	12.2	12.6	10.7	9.5	10.5	10.1	12.5	11.2	13.8	10.9		\}
	ecurity incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) ⁴		11.3	12	10	8	12	11	9	7	9	5	6	8	8	9	11	11	8	16	11	~
1.2.3 Lo	ost work days due to injury			16,445	15,221 (CY14))																
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																	
	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	6.6	7.5	6.5	5.8	7.1	6.3	6.6	7.2	6.4	6.7	5.9	6.4	5.7	6.9	7.7	>
	ollisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists ⁵		3,235 (CY12)																	ļ		
	ollisions involving taxis		342 (CY11) 4.7	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.0	F 2	4.7	3.8	4.4	4.3	4.9	3.9	4.3	3.5	3.9	4.2	4.2	F 7	~~~
	luni falls on board/100,000 miles Jnsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311 ³		4.7 179.1	157	174	179	184	214	5.2 206	210	142	161	173	207	164	171	172	170	177	192	5.7 196	\sim
			1/9.1	157					200		142	101		207	104		1/2	1/0		192	190	
1.3.5 Cu	ustomer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹				3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8		3.7			3.8			3.7			3.7			
Goal 2	2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	arsharin	g the pref	erred me	ans of tra	vel																
Objecti	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	3.5			3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1		3.0			3.0			3.1			3.1			
	ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.5	2.7	2.8	2.6		2.6		2.7			2.8			2.8				
2.1.3 Cu	ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.8	2.9	2.8	3.0		2.9		3.0			2.9			2.8				
	ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1				3.5	3.3	3.1	3.3		3.3			3.1			3.4			3.1			
	war to 3 might ustomer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8		2.9			2.8			2.8			2.8			
2.1.6 Pe	ercentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86.4%	93.3%	93.6%	69.9%	94.6%	41.9%	26.0%	34.5%	70.8%	89.0%	93.5%	84.7%	89.7%	91.3%	94.3%	94.6%	94.7%	94.4%		
	ercentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99.0%	100.0%	99.5%	98.0%	97.2%	96.2%	96.4%	95.7%	97.6%	100.0%	94.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	94.7%	100.0%	92.6%	96.2%	100.0%	~
	ercentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85.0%	82.4%	75.6%	60.0%	85.2%	71.0%	71.0%	62.9%	62.5%	39.2%	67.4%	48.8%	55.4%	52.8% 56.1%	82.5%	84.5%	83.9% 49.7%	84.4%	87.6%	~~~
	ercentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days ercentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		81.0% 97.0%	79.1% 96.9%	53.8% 96.8%	40.4% 96.8%	49.7% 97.7%	29.1% 100.0%	94.4%	33.7% 95.9%	95.5%	96.7%	52.2% 96.4%	96.8%	98.1%	98.1%	99,2%	100.0%	97.7%	94.0%	99.3%	
	ercentage of actionable 311 Muni operator conduct complaints addressed within 28 days		87.0%	90.0%	78.6%	82.6%	37.776	80.6%	73.9%	74.4%	84.4%	86.1%	78.9%	85.6%	30.176	38.176	33.270	100.076	37.770	34.078	33.376	
\vdash	ustomer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹				2.7	2.7	2.7	2.8		2.7			2.7			2.8			2.7	<u> </u>		ر
2 1 9 Cı	ustomer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1				2.6	2.6	2.4	2.6		2.6			2.5			2.5			2.4			
I(lc	ow) to 5 (high) ¹				2.0	2.0				-						-						
	ve 2.2: Improve transit performance	2.40/		4.0%	4.0%	4.8%	5.5%	5.00/	E 40/	E 00/	5.7%	4.5%	4.1%	4.6%	4.6%	5.1%	E 40/	4.9%	6.1%	5.40/	E 40/	
	ercentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network ^{6,7}	2.1%	3.9%	17.8%	18.6%		15.6%	5.0%	5.4%	5.0% 17.3%	18.8%	16.4%	15.9%	16.1%	15.6%	15.6%	5.1%	14.9%	15.8%	6.4%	5.1% 16.2%	× ·
	ercentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network ^{6,7}	85%	19.5%	59.9%		17.2% 57.4%	59.6%	19.1%	19.3%	55.8%	18.8% 53.4%	58.2%	58.5%		59.4%	60.1%	15.6%	59.6%	59.1%	16.1% 58.6%	61.5%	
	ercentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes ⁷ ercentage of scheduled trips delivered	98.5%	61.1% 96.8%	97.1%	59.6% 96.3%	97.7%	99.6%	55.8% 96.2%	53.5% 96.7%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.3%	59.2% 99.1%	99.3%	99.4%	59.5% 99.5%	99.8%	99.5%	99.7%	99.6%	~
	ercentage of scrieduled trips delivered	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	72.2%	74.2%	70.1%	67.7%	71.3%	69.5%	73.2%	74.1%	74.0%	74.4%	74.6%	74.1%	74.3%	73.9%	73.6%	74.9%	~
	unning time performance		development.	73.770	73.370	12.270	74.270	70.170	07.778	71.570	03.370	73.270	77.170	74.070	74.470	74.070	74.170	74.570	73.370	75.078	74.570	
	ercentage of on-time performance ⁷	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	57.0%	59.2%	55.4%	53.1%	55.6%	53.3%	57.8%	58.4%	58.7%	58.9%	59.4%	58.9%	59.5%	58.7%	58.2%	60.9%	~~~
	ercentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load		5.9%	7.4%	7.4%	4.7%	3.7%	7.2%	9.3%	5.4%	3.9%	4.9%	3.4%	3.6%	4.6%	2.5%	3.0%	2.8%	3.1%	4.8%	4.4%	کسم
2.2.7	Diffix recentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load		7.1%	8.6%	8.3%	5.6%	5.2%	8.0%	7.8%	6.9%	4.8%	5.7%	4.0%	5.8%	5.1%	4.0%	4.0%	5.2%	6.0%	5.1%	4.4%	W

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | November 2015



ID Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	EV1E Ava	EV16 Ava	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Doc 2014	lan 2015	Eob 201E	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	lun 2015	Jul 2015	Δυσ 2015	Son 201E	Oct 2015	Monthly Trend
ib went	Target	FIIZAVg	F113 AVg	FI14 AVg	FII3 AVg	FIIO AVg	3ep 2014	OCT 2014	NOV 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2013	FED 2013	IVIAI 2013	Apr 2013	IVIAY 2013	Juli 2013	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	3ep 2013	OCT 2013	Wiontiny Trend
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																					
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	4,632	5,650	6,508	6,517	5,223	5,216	3,463	5,670	5,847	6,318	5,701	6,087	6,693	6,164	7,276	6,202		~~~
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,164	4,517	4,870	4,233	3,954	4,921	4,687	4,683	3,896	4,281	4,248	7,260	5,122	4,834	4,910			
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	1,797	1,631	1,515	2,425	2,405	1,476	1,740	2,090	2,331	1,788	1,432	1,383	1,748	1,629	1,523		\sim
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,835	4,734	5,135	7,769	3,538	23,706	3,044	2,998	3,317	4,182	4,173	5,771	4,200	25,684	7,769				\sim
2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.8%	97.0%	96.2%	97.7%	99.7%	96.1%	96.5%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.4%	99.1%	99.3%	99.5%	99.5%	99.7%	99.5%	99.7%	99.6%	
2.2.10 Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure II	n development	405.044	504.450	405 400		E 40 0E0	540.470	404.000	444.945	455.075	476 405	404 000	404.050	404.044	466.067					
2.2.11 Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday) ⁹		490,514	495,311	504,162 73,522	486,109 73.932	69,351	549,058 73.517	519,179 75.908	481,093 74.132	71.318	466,975 73.145	476,425 74.485	481,938 66.395	481,362 73.230	484,944 73.163	466,267 72,733	71.959	68.303	67,954	69.078	\leq
Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday) Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		70,423 93.6%	72,948 96.3%	94.4%	93,3%	93.8%	97.2%	75,908 96.4%	91.7%	91.7%	92.2%	97.0%	92.5%	73,230 89.4%	93.5%	95.8%	93.5%	92.7%	94.3%	94.6%	\sim
2.2.13 Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation 2.2.13 Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		93.6%	88.1%	93.8%	91.9%	93.8%	96.3%	96.4%	90.8%	86.5%	85.4%	88.5%	90.8%	90.6%	92.1%	93.2%	93.1%	90.6%	94.5%	90.1%	
		94.2%	88.176	33.670	31.370	32.076	30.376	30.376	30.876	80.376	83.478	00.370	30.676	30.076	32.170	33.270	33.170	30.076	34.076	30.176	
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)	30%		30%	54% 885	1,089		1,158	1,213	1.008	685	1,039	1,082	1,164	1,191	1,125	1,183					\
2.3.3 Average daily taxi trips	Measure i	n development		003	1,009		1,136	1,213	1,000	003	1,033	1,002	1,104	1,151	1,123	1,103					_
Objective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand	ivicasare ii	Lacvelopinent																			
		40.5%	52.2%	66.2%	60.3%	59.8%								60.3%					59.8%		
2.4.1 Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas ¹⁰							70.20/	70.00/	00.00/	04.40/	00.00/	00.00/	70.00/		04.50/	00.00/	00.00/	00.00/		70.00/	
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%	80.2%	79.3%	78.9%	82.9%	84.1%	80.9%	80.0%	79.8%	80.0%	81.6%	80.2%	80.9%	80.8%	79.2%	79.8%	\sim
2.4.2 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird) ¹²		85.2%	85.3%	84.4%	85.9%	84.5%	84.9%	85.1%	87.6%	89.0%	86.0%	85.7%	84.9%	84.9%	86.0%	84.8%	84.6%	84.9%	84.0%	84.3%	
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 F	rancisco)																			
Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource	consumpt	ion. emissior	is, waste, an	d noise																	
3.1.1 SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons CO2e)		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%																	i l
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																	i I
3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh)		124,120,362	122,809,359																		1
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 eco	nomy																				
3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M)			\$3.7	\$2.8	\$1.8	\$1.6	\$2.3	\$2.0	\$1.8	\$2.5	\$1.5	\$1.6	\$2.2	\$1.3	\$1.7	\$1.2	\$1.4	\$1.6	\$1.8	\$1.8	~~~
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																					
3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase 14					73.9%	86.6%		64.9%	65.4%		66.9%	67.1%	82.0%	81.1%	77.7%	79.1%	83.9%	85.0%	84.1%	93.2%	_ ~
3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase 14					44.6%	40.0%		20.0%	22.9%		16.7%	21.6%	38.5%	40.4%	36.5%	40.0%	39.3%	36.7%	35.7%	37.5%	- /
Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently																					
3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour 15	\$187	\$207.33	\$207.50	\$224.88 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	t -	32.2%	33.7%	29.8% ¹⁶							l										$\overline{}$
3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator shortfall	1	37.3	35.1%	42.6	24.9	3.2	40.2	38.5	22.7	31.5	19.1	16.8	9.3	6.8	5.2	3.8	2.0	3.8	2.4	4.7	~
3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷	t -	205	158	147	594	130	39	56	56	56	56	57	80	37	37	55	46	27	2.4	30	
Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits		203	130	147	334	130	33	30	30	30	30	31	80	31	31	رر	40	21	21	30	
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 | November 2015



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Jul 2015	Aug 2015	Sep 2015	Oct 2015	Monthly Trend
Goa	4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service																					
	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)	4.0		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																	
Object	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)	3.9		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	tive 4.3: Improve employee accountability																					
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year	100%		20.3%	62.5%	31.3%																
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans	100%		18.8%	62.5%	54.2%															,	
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%	7.7%	8.6%	8.4%	7.1%	7.5%	7.5%	7.4%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	7.0%	7.6%	8.8%	7.2%	7.2%	<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 ³		127	112	104	104	127	107	110	81	79	98	100	118	105	120	146	133	126	122	126	$\left. \left\langle \right. \right. \right.$
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) Results are hased on a non-probability sample from ont-in SFMTA online panel surve	•		lected. Results	•																	

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 Effective April 2015, the Muni Rapid Network is defined as routes/lines J, K, L, M, N, 5R, 7R, 9R, 14R, 28R, and 38R. This report reflects the updated Rapid Network. Note: due to a NextBus data syncing issue, data for J and N lines are not included in reporting for 7/31/15 and 8/11/15.

September 2015 OTP figures have been revised to correct for a data processing error.

⁸ Due to a previous 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. June 2015 figure has been revised to correct for a previous calculation error.

¹⁵ Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY14 dollars.

 $^{\rm 16}\,$ Based on preliminary unaudited figures.

 $^{\rm 17}\,$ FY Total rather than FY Average.