STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | October 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	Monthly Trend
Goa	1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone	e													
Obje	ctive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users														
	SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.39	3.77	7.56	11.21	7.24	9.44	10.68	9.24	11.37	11.01	11.18	10.28	11.35	~~
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											
1.1.3	SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes		3	3.9	3	2	1	6	3	7	2	5	2	2	
1.1.4	Security complaints to 311 (Muni)		42	36.3	35	44	29	35	40	34	38	39	27	39	\ \
Obje	ctive 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		
1.2.2	Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)		11	11.7	15	21	12	19	11	13	8	12	15		$\overline{\sim}$
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)	Survey resul	ts will be re	ported in N	lovember.										
Obje	ctive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system														
1.3.1	Muni collisions/100,000 miles	4.53	5.03	5.23	6.14	4.27	5.81	5.18	6.20	5.41	5.23	5.72	6.59		~~
1.3.2	Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists	Awaiting 20:	12 results.												
1.3.2	Collisions involving taxis	Awaiting 201	12 results.												
1.3.3	Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.65	4.25	4.31	4.40	3.97	2.97	4.42	3.75	4.87	4.28	4.35		<u>~</u>
1.3.4	"Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		179	157.1	188.3	158	152	156	179	164	148	176	190	199	
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 & ca	arsharing	the nre	ferred	means	of trave	<u> </u>								
	ctive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications		l circ pro	rerreu											
2.1.1	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%	98%	96%	97%	97%	92%	99%	91%	98%	87%		
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%	
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%	\sim
2.1.7	Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87%	90%	90%	82%	87%	94%	97%	96%	92%	90%	92%		
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											

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | October 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	Monthly Trend
Objec	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%	5.5%	6.0%	4.8%	5.1%	5.1%	5.4%	5.7%	5.9%	5.9%	5.8%	6.0%	
2.2.1	Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network	13.9%	18.5%	17.6%	17.3%	16.6%	17.0%	15.7%	15.2%	16.8%	16.9%	16.9%	17.2%	18.1%	\ \
2.2.2	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes	85%	61.0%	59.5%	60.6%	60.0%	59.2%	60.4%	61.9%	61.6%	61.3%	62.4%	60.3%	58.6%	\
2.2.3	Percentage of scheduled service delivered	98.5%	96.6%	96.8%	97.5%	97.8%	96.7%	98.4%	99.2%	97.9%	97.6%	98.0%	96.9%	97.9%	~~
2.2.4	Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	85%	76.9%	73.5%	75.0%	74.5%	73.6%	75.0%	76.1%	75.0%	74.4%	75.0%	75.0%	74.9%	\
2.2.5	Average Muni system speed	Results will b	e reported	in Noveml	oer.										
2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance	85%	60.1%	58.9%	59.9%	60.5%	59.8%	60.7%	61.3%	60.4%	59.6%	59.8%	60.1%	59.8%	\
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points		6.4%	7.5%	9.1%	6.6%	7.6%	7.4%	7.0%	6.7%	5.4%	6.4%	8.4%	12.5%	
2.2.7	Percentage of trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		7.1%	7.7%	9.5%	6.4%	5.9%	7.0%	7.6%	7.3%	7.1%	8.1%	8.9%	11.5%	
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	3,921	3,631	3,723	4,170	3,712	3,427	3,771	3,921	3,854	3,616	$\overline{}$
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,673		3,927	4,440	3,984	3,655	2,806					
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	3,735		2,649	2,811	4,814	5,488	4,979					$\overline{}$
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered	Please see 2.	2.3.												
2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure in d	levelopme	nt.											
2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday)		490,514	495,311	505,030	467,267	488,616	493,484	501,281	504,740	478,503	483,554	504,439	527,096	
2.2.11	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)	Measure in d	levelopme	nt.											
2.2.12	Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		93.6%	96.3%	96.5%	96.5%	95.8%	98.4%	96.7%	96.8%	93.7%	96.2%	95.3%	98.1%	~~~
2.2.13	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.1%	92.7%	85.7%	87.0%	93.0%	88.2%	88.0%	95.7%	93.6%	91.8%	92.6%	\
Objec	tive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes														
2.3.1	Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%										45% (2011	Mode Sha	re Survey)	
	tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand														
_	Parking reliability rate of SFpark spaces		70.0%	71.9%	78.7%	78.9%	74.5%	72.7%	73.3%	74.0%	76.1%	76.9%	79.6%	79.5%	
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%	$\overline{}$
2.4.3	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces		5,732	6,792	6,820	6,366	6,372	6,456	6,558	6,632	6,720	6,792	6,820	6,852	
2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)		846	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	882	
	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%	53.6%	\sim
	3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fra	ancisco	<u> </u>												_
Objec	tive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource	consumptio	n, emissi	ons, wast	e, and no	ise									
	Metric tons of CO2e for the transportation system	1,515,000													2,155,000 (2010)
3.1.2	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													14	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)
Objec	tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the eco	nomy													
3.2.1	Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (annualized)			\$50M											
	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively					_									
3 3 1	,	Results repo	rting to be	gin in FV1/											
3.3.2															
3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase Results reporting to begin in FY14.															





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	Con 2012	Monthly Trend
טו	Wettic	rarget	FT12 AVg	F113 AVg	FT14 AVg	Jan 2015	ren 2013	IVIAI 2013	Apr 2013	IVIAY 2013	Juli 2013	Jul 2013	Aug 2013	3ep 2013	Wontiny 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	
	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	ess toward	s closing of	erating ar	\$70M ac	lditional ne	eded for o	perations, \$						GR) and \$1.7B 5- nd transit (FY12)
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)	Survey resul	November												
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)	Survey resul	lts will be r	eported in	November										
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.	Survey resul	ts will be re	ported in N	lovember.										
4.1.4	Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days.	Survey result	lovember.												
4.1.5	Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved.	Survey results will be reported in November.													
4.1.6	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.	Survey result	ts will be re	ported in N	lovember.										
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)	Survey resul	ts will be r	eported in	November										
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.	Survey resul	ts will be re	ported in N	lovember.										
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.	Survey resul	ts will be re	ported in N	lovember.										
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.	Survey result	ts will be re	ported in N	lovember.										
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively	Survey resul	ts will be re	ported in N	lovember.										
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.	Survey resul	ts will be re	ported in N	lovember.										
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.	Survey results will be reported in November			lovember.										
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%										
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%											
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.2%	8.9%	10.3%	8.5%	6.9%	8.3%	9.0%	8.8%	10.0%	8.9%	^ <u></u>
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.													