STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | December 2015



ID Metric Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Jul 2015	Aug 2015	Sep 2015	Oct 2015	Nov 2015	Monthly Trend
Goal 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone																			
Objective 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																			
1.1.1 SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100.000 miles 3.1	3.8	7.6	9.4	8.2	6.9	6.8	8.0	8.5	9.2	9.2	7.3	7.3	7.5	6.9	6.4	7.9	6.4	6.8	$\sim \sim$
Line Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹			3.2	3.3	3.4		.2		3.3			3.4			3.4				
Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or 1.1.2			3.1	3.2	3.2	3	.0		3.2			3.2			3.2				
station): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)*			-		-		-		-			-			-				
1.1.3 SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes ²	3	4	4	37	42	42	41	36	33	35	26	43	36	36	46	36	63	30	\sim
1.1.4 Security complaints to 311 (Muni) ³	41.6	36	29	37	28	25	31	40	38	45	41	29	43	30	32	30	22	26	/~ v~~
Objective 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security																			
1.2.1 Workplace injuries/200,000 hours 13.1	16.2 11.3	13.8 12	12.0 10	11.0	12.2 12	10.9	12.2	12.6	10.7	9.5	10.5	10.1 9	12.5 11	11.2	13.8	10.9 16	14.6 13	10.1	~~~~
1.2.2 Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) ⁴	11.3	12	10 15,221 (CY14)	8	12	/	9	5	b	8	8	9	11	11	8	16	13	15	~~~
1.2.3 Lost work days due to injury		., .	,																-
1.2.4 Employee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)		3.2	3.3																
Objective 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																			
1.3.1 Muni collisions/100,000 miles 4.1	5.0	5.2	5.9	6.5	6.5	5.8	7.1	6.3	6.6	7.2	6.4	6.7	5.9	6.5	5.7	6.9	6.3	7.0	~~~~~
1.3.2 Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists ⁵	3,235 (CY12)																		
1.3.2 Collisions involving taxis	342 (CY11)				1.0														
1.3.3 Muni falls on board/100,000 miles	4.7	4.2	4.5 174	4.3 179	4.3	4.7 210	3.8 142	4.4	4.3	4.9 207	4.0	4.4	3.6 172	3.9 169	4.3	4.2 193	4.6 196	4.6	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
1.3.4 "Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311 ³	179.1	157						161		207	164		1/2	169		193	196	1/2	
1.3.5 Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹			3.7	3.7	3.8	3	.7		3.8			3.8			3.8				
Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & carsharin	ig the pref	erred mea	ns of trav	el															
Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications																			
2.1.1 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high line) 3.5			3.0	3.1	3.2	3	.0		3.0			3.2			3.2				
Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (hiph) ¹			2.5	2.7	2.9	2	6		2.7			2.9			2.9				
Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5			2.8	2.9	2.9	2	.9		3.0			2.9			2.9				
(high) ¹ 2.1.4 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 2.1.4			3.5	3.3	3.2		.3		3.1			3.2			3.2				
(low) to 5 (high)* Customer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers: scale of 1 (low) to 5									2.8			2.9			2.9				
2.1.5 (high) ¹		00.00/	2.8	2.8	2.9						00 70/			0.0.00/				0.0.00/	
2.1.6 Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days	86.4%	93.3% 100.0%	93.6% 99.5%	69.9% 98.0%	95.5% 97.2%	34.5% 95.7%	70.8% 97.6%	89.0% 100.0%	93.5% 94.3%	84.7% 100.0%	89.7% 100.0%	91.3% 100.0%	94.3% 94.7%	94.6% 100.0%	94.7% 92.6%	94.4% 96.2%	100.0%	97.5%	~~~
2.1.6 Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours 2.1.6 Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours	99.0% 85.0%	82.4%	99.5% 75.6%	98.0%	97.2%	95.7%	97.6% 62.5%	39.2%	94.3%	48.8%	55.4%	52.8%	94.7%	84.5%	92.6% 83.9%	96.2%	87.6%		~~~~
2.1.6 Percentage of parking meter manufactions addressed within 48 hours 2.1.6 Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days	81.0%	79.1%	53.8%	40.4%	49.7%	33		35.270	52.2%	40.070	33.470	56.1%	02.370	04.370	49.7%	04.470	87.076		~
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours	97.0%	96.9%	96.8%	96.8%	97.7%	95.9%	95.5%	96.7%	96.4%	96.8%	98.1%	98.1%	99.2%	100.0%	97.7%	94.0%	99.3%		
2.1.7 Percentage of actionable 311 Muni operator conduct complaints addressed within 28 days	87.0%	90.0%	78.6%	82.6%		74.4%	84.4%	86.1%	78.9%	85.6%									γ
2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles: scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹			2.7	2.7	2.8	2	.7		2.7			2.8			2.8		İ		
Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1			2.6	2.6	2.5	2	.6		2.5			2.5			2.5				
(low) to 5 (high) ⁴			2.0	2.0	2.5	2			2.5			2.5			2.5			-	
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																			
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network ^{6,7} 2.1%	3.9%	4.0%	4.0%	4.8%	5.5%	5.0%	5.7%	4.5%	4.1%	4.6%	4.6%	5.1%	5.1%	4.9%	6.1%	6.4%	5.2%	5.3%	$\sim \sim$
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network ^{6,7} 10.7%	19.5%	17.8%	18.6%	17.2%	15.8%	17.3%	18.8%	16.4%	15.9%	16.1%	15.6%	15.6%	15.6%	14.9%	15.8%	16.1%	16.2%	16.8%	\sim
2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes ⁷ 85%	61.1%	59.9%	59.6%	57.4%	60.3%	55.8%	53.4%	58.2%	58.5%	59.2%	59.4%	60.1%	59.5%	59.6%	59.1%	58.6%	61.5%	63.3%	~
2.2.3 Percentage of scheduled trips delivered 98.5%	96.8%	97.1%	96.3%	97.7%	99.6%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.3%	99.1%	99.3%	99.4%	99.5%	99.8%	99.5%	99.7%	99.6%	99.4%	~
2.2.4 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals ⁷ 85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	72.2%	74.4%	71.3%	69.5%	73.2%	74.1%	74.0%	74.4%	74.6%	74.1%	74.3%	73.9%	73.6%	74.4%	76.1%	$\overline{}$
	n development				50.00/				80.444				50 00V				60 01/	co. oo:	
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance ⁷ 85% Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	57.0%	59.8%	55.6%	53.3%	57.8%	58.4%	58.7%	58.9%	59.4%	58.9%	59.5%	58.7%	58.2%	60.8%	62.3%	
2.2.7 points ⁸ Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load	5.9%	7.4%	7.4%	4.7%	3.8%	5.4%	3.9%	4.9%	3.4%	3.6%	4.6%	2.5%	3.0%	2.8%	3.1%	4.8%	4.5%	4.0%	~~~`
2.2.7 points ⁸	7.1%	8.6%	8.3%	5.6%	5.1%	6.9%	4.8%	5.7%	4.0%	5.8%	5.1%	4.0%	4.0%	5.2%	6.0%	5.1%	4.7%	4.4%	$\sim \sim$

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | December 2015



Description Description Low Low <thlow< th=""> Low Low</thlow<>	ID	Metric	Target F	Y12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Jul 2015	Aug 2015	Sep 2015	Oct 2015	Nov 2015	Monthly Trend
12 Match match mark mark mark mark mark mark mark mark	Obie	tive 2.2: Improve transit performance																				
1 interpretation interpretat				3,300	3,310	4,632	5,650	6,427	5,216	3,463	5,670	5,847	6,318	5,701	6,087	6,693	6,164	7,276	6,202	6,927	5,761	\sim
2.12 Bearson structure large (log) 3.75 4.700 4.700 4.700 4.700 4.700 4.700 5.700 5.700 7.700 4.000 <th< td=""><td>2.2.8</td><td>Mean distance between failure (LRV)</td><td></td><td>3,137</td><td>3,571</td><td>3,164</td><td>4,517</td><td>5,621</td><td>4,921</td><td>4,687</td><td>4,683</td><td>3,896</td><td>4,281</td><td>4,248</td><td>7,260</td><td>5,122</td><td>4,834</td><td>4,910</td><td>5,235</td><td>7,742</td><td>6,498</td><td>\sim</td></th<>	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,164	4,517	5,621	4,921	4,687	4,683	3,896	4,281	4,248	7,260	5,122	4,834	4,910	5,235	7,742	6,498	\sim
12.1 Description of control shape shap	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	1,797	1,974	2,405	1,476	1,740	2,090	2,331	1,788	1,432	1,383	1,748	1,629	1,523	3,822	2,147	$\sim \sim$
Diss Diss <thdiss< th=""> Diss Diss <thd< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>^</td></thd<></thdiss<>																						^
111 Descriptione in same sensity 1111 Descriptione in same sensity 1111 Descriptione in same sensity 1111 Descriptione in same sensity Descriptione in same sensity Description in	2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.8%	97.0%	96.2%	97.7%	99.6%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.4%	99.1%	99.3%	99.5%	99.5%	99.7%	99.5%	99.7%	99.6%	99.6%	~~~~
121 Description process serveds 77.16 77.00																						
121 Provinged days but exclutes and update 91.06 92.85 91.08 92.05 91.08 92.05 91.08 92.05 91.08 92.05 91.08 92.05 91.08 92.05 91.08 92.05 91.08 92.05				/ -																		\sim
1 1.1 Processes and Part Synchronize also mode and regarding 94.76 82.86 95.86							- /			1	- 1 -	,	/			,						\sim
Display Space <																						-~~~~
Lix Decomposition and marked project on the properties of the properis of the proproperties of the proproperties of the properties of				94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	91.9%	91.4%	90.8%	86.5%	85.4%	88.5%	90.8%	90.6%	92.1%	93.2%	93.1%	90.6%	94.6%	90.1%	89.0%	$\sim \sim \sim$
L3: Description function of members/ Market and market method present development. Best Data Lab Lab <																						
Image any set of the two participant of the t			50%		50%																	
Object 24: In prove parting utilization and manage parking demand Image of the state of the sta						885	1,089	1,161	1,008	685	1,039	1,082	1,164	1,191	1,125	1,183	1,139	1,207	1,139			\sim
21.1 Procentage of metered hours who mus due name who mus due namus due namus due namus due name who mus due name who mus due name		• • •	leasure in dev	velopment.																		
2-1.2 Dispace scales definit grange nome banders 20xx44m = 28x1/m B1.2% B1.3% B2.7% B2.9% B2.9% B2.0% B2.9% B2.9% <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>40 50/</td> <td>52.20/</td> <td>66.20</td> <td>60.00/</td> <td>50.00/</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>60.20</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>50.00/</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4</td>				40 50/	52.20/	66.20	60.00/	50.00/						60.20					50.00/			4
1.2.1 Singlight and at 2000 and product and bady (m)" 85.76 84.87 84.97 84.06 84.97 <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>00.00/</td><td></td><td>00.00/</td><td>00.00/</td><td>BO 00/</td><td></td><td>04.04/</td><td>00.00/</td><td>00.00/</td><td>00.00/</td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td>2</td></th<>									00.00/		00.00/	00.00/	BO 00 /		04.04/	00.00/	00.00/	00.00/		-		2
21.3 25.1 25.1 25.0 100 <																						\sim
21.3 21 drawn of street bicle parking layers (game				85.2%	85.3%	84.4%		84.8%	87.6%	89.0%	86.0%	85.7%	84.9%	84.9%	86.0%	84.8%	84.6%	84.9%	84.0%	84.4%	85.9%	\sim
Constrained way more thanks and models and analysis of life in San Francisco V																						
Objective 3.1: Beding the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and notes objective 3.1: Match and the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions display di							120															
3.1.1 3.1.4 3.1.4 3.1.4 4.3.270 4.3.2.6 1.1.0																						1
1.1 Prendage of SMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fue//rev emissions 94.0%																						1
1.1 Procentage of SMAT has fleet that is alternative fuel/see emissions 94.0% 94.0% 92.0% 92.2% 94.3% Procentage is blockers	3.1.1	SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons C02e)		49,811	46,377	45,244	43,226															
1.13 Procenting backetsel to dised used by SMAX (bind equivalent) P 91.2% 91.2% 91.2% 91.2% 91.2% 91.2% P	3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions																				
1.1.4 humber of electric vehicle charging stations 3.3 6.3 7.13 20,842 29,7159 9,86,326 9,26,283 26,640 25,718 6,22,083 1,26,20,834 1,805,708 1,805,708 1,805,708 1,805,708 1,805,708 1,805,708 1,82,7159 1,805,726 1,805,708 1,82,7159 1,805,728 1,32,830 1,665,788 1,605,786 1,805,708 1,805,728 1,82,804 1,665,788 1,605,786 1,805,786 1,805,786 1,805,786 1,805,786	3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94.0%	94.0%	98.0%																
1.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kVM) ⁴ 9.962,454 9.902,400 9.783,200 10.91,724 9.954,529 9.27,139 9.886,373 9.976,136 9.878,050 10.20,093																						
3.16 Agency acconsumption (herms) ¹⁴ 33,934 32,049 23,057 19,265 5,564 7,713 20,489 35,596 28,485 37,906 15,280 26,940 25,478 8,221 4,554 3,918 Image: Constraint on therms) ¹⁴ 3.16 Agency acconsumption (galons) ¹⁴ 1,316,54 1,360,799 1,706,811 1,671,331 1,798,152 1,423,444 1,353,76 1,390,522 1,350,140 1,531,56 1,537,86 1,667,88 1,607,96 1,605,956		Number of electric vehicle charging stations																				
11.1 Agency water consumption (stations) ¹⁴ 1 1.316,522 1.360,799 1.706,811 1.617,799 1.671,331 1.798,192 1.423,444 1.355,376 1.300,532 1.351,156 1.537,888 1.682,788 1.670,284 1.585,760 1.605,956 1.825,888 3.3.8% 36.3% 32.3% 36.3% 36.3% 36.3% 36.3% <	3.1.6							.,,	- / /			-1- 1 -		- 1 1 -		- , ,		-, -,	-,,			•
3.1.7 Agency waste diversion rate 1 3 3 6 4 % 37.9 % 37.1 % 34.5 % 34.8 % 33.8 % 31.8 % 32.3 % 33.8 %				/	- 1	- /				- ,		-,										$\sim\sim$
Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy S3.7 S2.8 S1.8 S1.6 S2.7 S1.8 S1.6 S2.7 S1.8 S1.6 S1.7 S1.7 S1.7 S1.7 S1.8 S1.6 S1.7 S1.7 S1.8 S1.6 S1.7 S1.7 S1.7 S1.7 S1.8 S1.6 S1.7 S1.7 S1.7 S1.8 S1.8 S1.6 S1.7				11-					, , .	, .,					1	1 1						$\sim \sim$
3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM) i i S1.8 \$1.6 \$1.8 \$1.6 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.3 \$1.7 \$1.2 \$1.4 \$1.6 \$1.8 \$1.6 \$1.6 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.3 \$1.7 \$1.2 \$1.4 \$1.6 \$1.8 \$1.6 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.1 \$1.6 \$2.8 \$1.6 \$2.8 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.1 \$1.6 \$2.8 \$1.6 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.1 \$1.6 \$2.1 \$1.6 \$2.1 \$1.6 \$2.1 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$1.6 \$2.6 \$1.8 \$2.6 \$1.8 \$2.6 \$1.8 \$2.6 \$1.8 \$2.6 \$1.8 \$2.6 \$1.8 \$2.6 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.6 \$2.	3.1.7	Agency waste diversion rate		36.4%	37.9%	37.1%	34.5%	34.8%	33.8%	31.8%	32.5%	33.8%	36.3%	32.3%	36.3%	33.8%	36.6%	34.8%	33.3%	34.6%	34.6%	$\sim\sim\sim$
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively in i			omy																			
3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase ¹³ c c					\$3.7	\$2.8	\$1.8	\$1.6	\$1.8	\$2.5	\$1.5	\$1.6	\$2.2	\$1.3	\$1.7	\$1.2	\$1.4	\$1.6	\$1.8	\$1.8	\$1.6	\sim
3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹³ Image: constraint of all capital projecap delivered on-time by p	Obje	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																				
Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently Image: model of the services efficient								86.2%	65.4%		66.9%				-		83.9%		84.1%	93.2%		<u>~~~</u>
3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour ¹⁶ \$187 \$207.33 \$207.50 \$224.88 Image of the second	3.3.2	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹⁵					44.6%	52.9%	22.9%		16.7%	21.6%	38.5%	40.4%	36.5%	40.0%	39.3%	36.7%	35.7%	37.5%	51.5%	~~~~
3.42 Passengers per revenue hour for buses i 68 67 68	Obje	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently																				
3.3 Cost per unliked trip ¹⁶ <td>3.4.1</td> <td>Average annual transit cost per revenue hour¹⁶</td> <td>\$187 \$</td> <td>\$207.33</td> <td>\$207.50</td> <td>\$224.88</td> <td></td>	3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour ¹⁶	\$187 \$	\$207.33	\$207.50	\$224.88																
3.4.5 farebox recovery ratio 3.2.% 3.3.% 3.0.% very	3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses		68	67	68																
3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator shortfall 3.7 3.7 3.5 4.3 2.5 3 2.3 3.2 1.9 1.7 9 7 5 4 2 4 2 5 4 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ⁷⁷ 205 158 147 594 130 56 56 57 80 37 37 55 46 27 27 30 100 Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 7 6.7 8.0 37 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.0 7.7 5.5 4.6 2.7 2.7 3.0 100 Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 7 6.7 8.0 3.7 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.0 7.7 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.7 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.7 7.7 8.7 8.6 7.7 8.7 8.7 <td>3.4.3</td> <td>Cost per unlinked trip¹⁶</td> <td></td> <td>\$2.97</td> <td>\$2.98</td> <td>\$3.05</td> <td></td>	3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip ¹⁶		\$2.97	\$2.98	\$3.05																
3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ C 205 158 147 594 130 56 56 57 80 37 37 55 46 27 27 30 30 Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits Image: Control operating budget deficit S35M 570M 55M 61 56 57 80 37 37 55 46 27 27 30 Image: Control operating budget deficit 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit S35M S70M S35M C <thc< th=""> C C C <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>32.0%</td><td>33.7%</td><td>30.4%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<></thc<>				32.0%	33.7%	30.4%																
Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits Image: Constraint operating structural deficit				-		-	-		-						-						4	~
3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$35M \$35	3.4.7	Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷		205	158	147	594	130	56	56	56	57	80	37	37	55	46	27	27	30		$\sim\sim$
	Obje	tive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits																				
3.5.1 Structural capital budget deficit (SGGR) \$130M \$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 | December 2015



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Jul 2015	Aug 2015	Sep 2015	Oct 2015	Nov 2015	Monthly Trend
Goa	al 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)	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				3.1	3.1																
4.1.5	Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved.			2.9	3.0																
	Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.			3.4	3.5																
	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)	3.9		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																
Obje	ctive 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%	59.1%														
4.3.1		100%		18.8%	62.5%	54.2%															
4.3.2				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%	7.8%	7.1%	7.5%	7.5%	7.4%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	7.0%	7.6%	8.8%	7.2%	7.2%	8.0%	$\sim\sim$
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	122	81	79	98	100	118	105	120	146	133	126	122	132	99	
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)			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 Saturday service from 7/11/15 through 7/25/15 and data for all LRV lines are not included in reporting for 7/31/15.

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 Figures reflect monthly average consumption and do not include resource consumption at facilities leased by the SFMTA.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY14 dollars.

¹⁷ FY Total rather than FY Average.