## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2015



	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Monthly Trend
Goal	1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone	2																		
	ive 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users	-																		
	FPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	2.4	2.0	7.6	9.5	8.2	9.3	8.5	8.0	9.9	8.2	6.8	0.0	8.5	9.2	9.2	7.3	7.0		~~
	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		8.0	8.5		9.2	7.3	7.3		~~~
1.1.2	ow) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				3.2	3.3	3.3		3.3			3.2		3.3				3.4		
	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		3.2			
S	tation): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>		3	3.9	4.3	36.6	8	37	39	39	32	42	41	36	33	35	26	43	1	~~~
	FPD-reported taxi-related crimes <sup>2</sup>		-		28.7	36.8	37		39		32	25		40	38	45	41	28	44	/
	ecurity complaints to 311 (Muni) <sup>3</sup>		41.6	36.4	28.7	36.8	3/	31	39	51	32	25	31	40	38	45	41	28	41	~ ~ ~
	ive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security			40.0	10.0	40.0	40.0			40.5	40.0	100	40.0	40.0	40.0	0.5	40.5	40.4		
	Vorkplace injuries/200,000 hours	13.1	16.2	13.8	12.0	10.9	12.3	8.6	9.4	12.5	13.0	10.9	12.2	12.6	10.7	9.5	10.5	10.1		$\sim$
	ecurity incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) <sup>4</sup>		11.3	12.1	9.9	8.0	11	9	7	11	9	/	9	5	6	8	8	9		~~~
	ost work days due to injury		16,445																	
1.2.4 E	mployee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.2	3.3															
Object	ive 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																			
	Nuni collisions/100,000 miles	4.1	5.0	5.2	5.9	6.5	6.0	5.4	6.3	7.5	6.5	5.8	7.1	6.2	6.6	7.2	6.4	6.6		<b>~~~~</b>
1.3.2 C	ollisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists <sup>5</sup>		3,235 (CY12)																	
	ollisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)																	
	1uni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.7	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.5	3.8	4.9	4.0	5.2	4.7	3.8	4.4	4.3	4.9	3.8	4.2		~~~
	Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311 <sup>3</sup>		179.1	157.3	174.2	178.5	145	148	179	214	206	209	142	161	173	205	164	170	170	
1.3.5 C	ustomer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				3.7	3.74	3.7		3.7			3.6			3.8			3.7		
Goal	2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	ırsharin	g the pref	erred mea	ans of tra	ivel														
Object	ive 2.1: Improve customer service and communications																			
2.1.1	ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5				3.0	3.1	2.9		3.0			2.9			3.0			3.1		
1 1/1	high) <sup>1</sup> ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5				3.0	3.1									3.0					
2 1 2	ustomer rating. Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability, scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.5	2.7	2.5		2.6		2.5			2.7			2.8			
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			2.9		
C	nigh) <sup>1</sup> ustomer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1													2.1						
2 1 1/1	ow) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				3.5	3.3	3.3		3.3		3.2			3.1			3.4			
2 1 5	ustomer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 high) <sup>1</sup>				2.8	2.8	2.8		2.8		2.7 2.8					2.8				
2.1.6 P	ercentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86.4%	93.3%	93.7%	67.8%	92.7%	62.1%	50.8%	41.9%	26.0%	34.5%	70.8%	89.0%	93.5%	84.7%	89.7%	91.3%		<b>\</b>
	ercentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99.0%	100.0%	99.4%	98.2%	94.1%	100.0%	100.0%	96.2%	96.4%	95.7%	97.6%	100.0%	94.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		$\langle$
	ercentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85.0%	82.4%	75.6%	59.0%	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>\</b>
	ercentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81.0%	79.1%	53.8%	40.4%	31.8%		29.1%			33.7%			52.2%			56.1%		
	ercentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97.0%	96.9%	96.8%	96.8%	94.7%	97.7%	94.0%	100.0%	94.4%	95.9%	95.5%	96.7%	96.4%	96.8%	98.1%	98.1%	99.2%	
	ercentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87.0%	90.0%	78.6%	82.6%	86.9%	88.7%	90.1%	80.6%	73.9%	74.4%	84.4%	86.1%	78.9%	85.6%		2.0	l .	
	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	2.7		2.8			2.6			2.7			2.8		
(1	ow) to 5 (high) <sup>1</sup>				2.0	2.0	2.0		2.0			2.5			2.5			2.5		
	ive 2.2: Improve transit performance																			
	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%	5.5%	6.1%	6.2%	6.6%	7.4%	6.6%	7.6%	5.9%	5.9%	6.2%	6.3%	6.4%	6.6%	
-	ercentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network <sup>6,7</sup>	10.2%	18.5%	18.0%	18.2%	17.4%	21.1%	19.2%	19.3%	19.0%	19.8%	18.2%	19.4%	16.6%	16.0%	15.9%	15.7%	15.1%	15.7%	~~~
	ercentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes <sup>7</sup>	85%	61.0%	59.6%	59.0%	56.8%	57.8%	58.4%	56.5%	55.3%	53.4%	55.4%	53.7%	56.9%	57.4%	58.0%	57.8%	59.0%	59.4%	~~~
-	ercentage of scheduled trips delivered	98.5%	96.7%	97.0%	96.3%	97.6%	91.0%	95.1%	95.2%	96.2%	96.7%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.3%	99.3%	99.4%	99.4%	99.5%	
	ercentage of on-time departures from terminals <sup>7</sup>	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	72.3%	72.3%	72.1%	71.0%	70.1%	67.7%	71.3%	69.5%	73.2%	74.1%	73.9%	74.5%	75.5%	74.1%	~~
-	unning time performance		development.																	
	ercentage of on-time performance 2	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	57.1%	57.2%	57.5%	56.3%	55.4%	53.1%	55.6%	53.3%	57.8%	58.4%	58.7%	58.9%	60.4%	59.0%	
1 IP	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%	6.4%	5.2%	6.3%	7.2%	9.3%	5.4%	3.9%	4.9%	3.4%	3.6%	4.6%	3.1%		<u> </u>
	oints <sup>8</sup>																			

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2015



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	EV15 Ava	lun 2014	Jul 2014	Λυσ 2014	Son 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Doc 2014	Ian 2015	Eab 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	lun 2015	Monthly Trend
	Wethic	ranget	TTIZ AVg	F113 AVg	FI14 AVg	riis Avg	Juli 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	3ep 2014	OCI 2014	NOV 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2013	TED 2013	IVIAI 2013	Apr 2013	IVIAY 2013	Juli 2013	Wontiny Trend
Obje	ctive 2.2: Improve transit performance																			
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	4,632	5,523	5,707	6,202	5,941	6,260	4,947	5,216	3,463	5,670	5,847	6,318	5,701	6,087		~~
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,164	4,278	4,061	3,988	4,146	4,233	3,954	4,921	4,687	4,683	3,896	4,281	4,248			~~
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	1,913	1,758	1,888	1,924	1,515	2,425	2,405	1,476	1,740	2,090	2,331	1,788		<u> </u>	~~~
2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936	3,835	4,734	4,817	5,770	8,080	12,839	3,538	23,706	3,044	2,998	3,317	4,182	4,173	5,771		'	~~_
2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.7%	97.0%	96.2%	97.6%	90.7%	94.9%	95.3%	96.1%	96.5%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.4%	99.3%	99.4%	99.5%	99.5%	
	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure in	development.																	<b>!</b>
2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday) <sup>9</sup>		490,514	495,311	504,162	487,913	498,616	485,225	495,899	549,058	519,179	481,093	444,945	466,975	476,425	481,938	481,362	484,944	L	
2.2.11	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)		70,423	72,948	73,522	73,932	68,066	69,362	69,591	73,517	75,908	74,132	71,318	73,145	74,485	66,395	73,167	73,163	72,733	~~~
2.2.12	Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation		93.6%	96.3%	94.4%	93.0%	91.4%	97.0%	86.0%	97.2%	96.4%	91.7%	91.7%	92.2%	97.0%	92.5%	89.4%	93.5%	<b></b>	$\sim$
	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	91.8%	93.0%	96.5%	94.9%	96.3%	96.3%	90.8%	86.5%	85.4%	88.5%	90.8%	90.6%	92.1%		
	tive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes																			
	Non-private auto mode share (all trips)	50%		50%	54%	52%													<b></b>	L
	Average daily bikeshare trips (Weekday)				885	1,050	1,099	1,076	1,151	1,158	1,213	1,008	685	1,039	1,082	1,164	1,191			
		Measure in	development.																	
-	tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand																			
2.4.1	Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas <sup>10</sup>		40.5%	52.2%	66.2%	60.3%	56.5%										60.3%			i
2.4.2	Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) <sup>11</sup>		81.2%	81.3%	80.7%	80.9%	80.0%	80.8%	81.5%	79.3%	78.9%	82.9%	84.1%	80.9%	80.0%	79.8%	80.0%	81.6%	80.2%	$\sim\sim$
2.4.2	Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird) <sup>12</sup>		85.2%	85.3%	84.4%	86.0%	84.3%	85.0%	85.8%	84.9%	85.1%	87.6%	89.0%	86.0%	85.7%	84.9%	84.9%	86.0%	84.9%	~~
2.4.3	# of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces <sup>13</sup>					6,500														
2.4.3	# of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) <sup>13</sup>					120														
Goa	13: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fr																			
	1 7																			-
_	ctive 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource	consumpt			a noise															1
3.1.1	SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons CO2e)		48,556	45,455															<b></b>	<del>                                     </del>
3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions			37.0%															<u> </u>	<b> </b>
3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94.0%	94.0%	98.0%														<b></b>	<b>.</b>
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														<u> </u>	<b>!</b>
3.1.6	Agency electricity consumption (kWh)		124,120,362	122,809,359																+
3.1.6	Agency gas consumption (therms)		436,707	415,308																+
3.1.6	Agency water consumption (gallons)		20,201,299	20,116,592	27.40/														<b></b>	<del>                                     </del>
3.1.7	Agency waste diversion rate		36.4%	38.1%	37.1%															
_	tive 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the eco	nomy			4		4	4	4		4	4	4		4					
	Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M)			\$3.7	\$2.8	\$2.0	\$2.8	\$1.8	\$1.9	\$2.3	\$2.0	\$1.8	\$2.5	\$1.5	\$1.6	\$2.2				$\sim\sim$
_	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																			
3.3.1	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase 14					77.3%					64.9%	65.4%		66.9%	67.1%	82.0%	81.1%	77.7%	90.0%	~
3.3.2	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase <sup>14</sup>					43.9%					20.0%	22.9%		16.7%	21.6%	38.5%	40.4%	36.5%	39.3%	- /
Obje	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently																			
3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour <sup>15</sup>	\$187	\$207.33	\$207.50	\$222.68 <sup>16</sup>															<u>                                      </u>
3.4.2	Passengers per revenue hour for buses		68	67	67 <sup>16</sup>														i	
3.4.3	Cost per unlinked trip <sup>15</sup>		\$2.90	\$2.91	\$3.13 <sup>16</sup>														i	
3.4.5	Farebox recovery ratio		32.2%	33.7%	29.8% <sup>16</sup>															
3.4.6	•	Measure in	development.	33.770	23.070															
3.4.7	Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month <sup>17</sup>		205	158	147	539	24	31	34	39	56	56	56	56	57	80	37	37	55	$\sim$
_	ctive 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits		203	155		333		3.	3.	33	30	30	30		ς,		3.	5,	33	
Obje	Aire 5.5. Neduce capital and operating structural denoits																			
3.5.1	Structural operating budget deficit	\$35M	\$70M	\$70M	\$35M														<u> </u>	
3.5.1	Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)	\$130M	\$260M	\$260M	\$260M															

## STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2015



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	Jun 2014	Jul 2014	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Monthly Trend
Goa	14: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service																			
Obje	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)			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															
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)			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	tive 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%														
	Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans			18.8%	62.5%															
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%	11.8%	8.8%	9.0%	8.6%	8.4%	7.1%	7.5%	7.5%	7.4%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	7.0%	<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	103.0	95	99	83	107	110	81	79	98	100	118	104	120	137	~~~
Obje	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)															_				

- 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.
- <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.
- <sup>8</sup> Due to a prevous 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.
- <sup>13</sup> Running total of SFMTA-installed facilities.
- $^{14}\,$  Data collection began in October 2014. No data were collected in December 2014.
- $^{\rm 15}$  Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY14 dollars.
- <sup>16</sup> Based on preliminary undaudited figures.
- 17 FY Total rather than FY Average.