The SFPUC is a department of the City and County of San Francisco that provides retail drinking water and wastewater services to San Francisco, wholesale water to three Bay Area counties, and emissions-free hydroelectric and solar power to San Francisco’s municipal departments. With over 2,300 employees, SFPUC is overseen by five Commissioners and the City’s Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

Our mission envisages that we provide our customers with these services in a manner that values environmental and community interests and sustains the resources entrusted to our care. By integrating sustainability as the core of our strategic planning, we can consider our challenges more holistically and bring these considerations to bear in our decisionmaking.

Thus, we welcome you to our fourth annual Strategic Sustainability report in which we present how we performed during FY2012-13 on the sustainability issues most material to our mission and of interest to you, our stakeholders. We’ve structured this year’s report to reflect the feedback we’ve received over time on how you prefer to access these results. To that end we provide a brief overview of our FY2012-13 performance, followed by a section featuring one or more results and performance trends from each of our six sustainability categories:

Customers:
Issues relating to affordability, rates, and service standards

Community:
Issues relating to the SFPUC’s engagement with and investment in its communities

Environment & Natural Resources:
Issues relating to environmental impacts and the use, protection, and health of natural resources

Governance & Management:
Issues relating to organizational planning, management, effectiveness, accountability, and financial health

Infrastructure & Assets:
Issues relating to the management, reliability and performance of assets, and infrastructure

Workplace:
Issues relating to human resource management, labor relations, health, and safety

Following the examples, we offer a look into our SFPUC-wide approach to sustainability: its structural framework, our evaluation and scoring methodology, and a one-page FY2012-13 performance profile.

The detailed data and benchmarks that underlie our FY2012-13 results are in the first appendix, followed by a glossary and list of acronyms in appendix 2. For those who would like to delve deeper into the data, two additional appendices are available by linking to our website. These include a 3rd appendix with the standards and best practice criteria for each KPI, and the 4th appendix that indexes our FY2012-13 results to the Global Reporting Initiative (G4) sustainability reporting standard.
Overview of SFPUC’s FY2012-13 Sustainability Performance

In Fiscal Year 2012-13, we met a majority of our annual performance targets and industry requirements, standards and best practices. As always with sustainability, there remains much room for improvement. We're glad to report, however, that overall, SFPUC is trending towards continuous improvement and a leadership role in framing, tracking and reporting performance on an organization-wide scale. With this fourth annual performance report, SFPUC advances our capacity to integrate and benchmark our performance so that we and you, our customers, can trend it more transparently over time.

Simply put, performance benchmarking is good business practice. It challenges SFPUC to improve our risk evaluation and foresight planning to continuously advance San Francisco’s longterm water, sewer and power resilience and sustainability. In broad form, the following flow chart represents the annual process for reporting on our strategic sustainability performance. It includes the benefit of streamlining: the use of subsets of our measures (or key performance indicators) by the City Controller for reporting our performance in other contexts or for other City purposes.

Featured Examples of SFPUC FY2012-13 Results and Performance Trends

This section features examples of our FY2012-13 results and performance trends. The examples are ordered by Sustainability Category as shown on the previous page. Each example focuses on the average performance score for that category’s Objective(s) and associated Key Performance Indicators, many with associated trends.

Note the guide to our performance scale of 1 to 5 below and that our performance goal always is a score of 5. For FY2012-13, SFPUC had no individual KPI scores of 1 and only five individual KPI scores of 2. Thus, the majority of individual KPI and average sustainability category scores ranged from 3 (meeting requirements and best practice) to 5 (significantly exceeding requirements and leading best practice). Go to pages 23-26 for a full explanation of our scoring methodology. And for those who would like to explore the detailed data that anchors the featured examples and all our FY2012-2013 results, please see appendices 1 through 4 to this report.
Customers:
Issues relating to affordability, rates, and service standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Foster customer satisfaction (CR1.1-CR1.2)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Advance collaboration to support potential SFPUC customers due to City development (CR1.4)</td>
<td>No Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Enhance meter reading technology and billing accuracy (CR3.1-CR3.5)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Align rate structure to reflect conservation, full costs of providing service and affordability (CR5.1-CR6.4)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SFPUC’s overall FY2012-13 performance in meeting the needs of our customers improved over last year, specifically those relating to affordability, rates, and service standards, and in most instances, exceeding best practice. We intend that continuous improvements, such as those this year, will help in time to improve our performance in other areas.

CR3.3: Percent of customers that are metered for Wholesale water, Retail water, and Power.

SFPUC now services 100% of our wholesale and retail waste customers with automated meters. Ninety-one percent of our power customers are metered. Automated meters save water and electricity, improve customer service and conservation, and reduce operating costs. By eliminating field visits and manual meter reading, the automated water meter system collects hourly water consumption data and transmits them from San Francisco’s residential and commercial customers to the SFPUC billing system. The automated water meters also provide accurate and frequent consumption data that allows the SFPUC and individual customers to monitor water use and detect leaks faster than manually-read water meters. The SFPUC was the first major California water utility to install the technology, also known as Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI), for each of its 170,000 plus retail customer accounts.

CR5.1: Average residential Water, Wastewater and Power bill as a percent of median income in San Francisco.

Customers of SFPUC have historically experienced a combined Water, Wastewater and Power bill that is less than 2.5% of the median household income in San Francisco. For Water and Power, SFPUC performed better than peers and reached its FY2012-13 targets. Even though SFPUC did not reach its FY2012-13 target for Water and Wastewater combined, the SFPUC performed better than our SSIP Level of Service (LOS) Goal of less than 2.5% of median household income, exceeded the AWWA industry standard, and met EPA’s definition of affordability for these services. In addition, though Wastewater’s rate increased and did not reach its FY2012-13 target, SFPUC continues to meet or lead best practice. Finally, SFPUC continues to significantly exceed best practice overall by performing above and beyond our SSIP LOS goal with all three enterprise bills combined under 2.5% median income for San Francisco.
CR6.3: Percent of rate and fee structure that reflects cost of service (including funding, capital investment, O&M, and contribution to reserve) for Water, Wastewater, and Power.

SFPUC reached its FY2012-13 targets of 100% for water and wastewater fee structure that reflects cost of service, and continues to meet recommended industry best practice. SFPUC Power surpassed its FY2012-13 target. A portion of power service customers (general fund and streetlights) receive subsidized rates, not based on cost of service. This cost of service at 78% is below recommended industry best practice.

Community: Issues relating to the SFPUC’s engagement with and investment in its communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Promote Environmental Justice (CY1.1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Advance Community Benefits (CY2.1-CY3.2)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Foster engagement with current and developing stakeholder groups (CY4.1)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFPUC continues to exceed requirements and best practice in the area of early stakeholder engagement for both capital and non-capital projects, and with our unique Community Benefits Program (CBP). Though in early development, the CBP has set goals and targets and begun implementation of a number of pilots in such areas as Environmental Justice, workforce development and coordination, and realignment of public arts investment.

CY1.1: Efforts to prevent, address, and lessen disproportionate environmental impacts attributable to the SFPUC.

The SFPUC was the first public utility in the nation to adopt an Environmental Justice Policy (2009). In FY2010-11, the Commission adopted SFPUC’s Community Benefits (CB) Policy which explicitly requires implementation of our Environmental Justice (EJ) Policy. Both policies were highlighted in the SSIP Program Management contract to begin revitalization of the Southeast Community Facility, and to initiate planning for development of an interpretive center for the town of Sunol. In FY2011-12, the SFPUC stepped up its activities, including recruiting candidates for the Environmental Justice and Land Use Analyst position and piloting several initiatives.

In FY2012-13, we met our targets and continue to make progress on initiatives, projects, and deliverables to promote and institutionalize environmental justice. An Environmental Justice and Land Use Analyst were hired in FY2012-13 and we defined the Environmental Justice and Land Use priorities as: integration of EJ principles into business decisions that affect SFPUC’s core operations, programs, and policies, education of all PUC on Environmental Justice, and meaningful and authentic stakeholder engagement.

Furthermore, we partnered with the SF Foundation for additional funding for a matching grant program called the Convergence Partnership, which allowed us to start piloting two urban agriculture programs in the Excelsior and Bayview Hunters Point neighborhoods, where we identified an opportunity for secondary land use, and initiation of urban agriculture projects.
The SFPUC was also the first public utility in the nation to adopt a Community Benefits Policy (2011). This policy guides the Agency’s efforts to be a “good neighbor” to all whose lives or neighborhoods are directly affected by the operation of its Water, Wastewater, and Power Enterprises. We define community benefits as those “positive effects on a community that result from the operation and improvement of our water, wastewater, and power services.” As we make critical investments in our infrastructure, we focus our community benefits on a sustainable future for the people and places that make our region special.

SFPUC met its FY2012-13 targets to improve on the specificity and design of its initiatives, projects, and deliverables in order to enhance benefits and institutionalize the CBP, thereby exceeding industry best practice. In FY2012-13, we defined the CB priority areas for the next three years as: education, art and culture, land use, workforce development, economic development, and neighborhood revitalization. We also piloted the Summer Youth Workforce Summer Initiative and the Bayview Arts Strategy this year.

**CY3.2: Percent of labor hours worked by local residents on SFPUC construction projects covered by the City’s Local Hiring Ordinance:**

- **a. Labor hours worked by local residents as percent of all hours worked.**
- **b. Labor hours worked by local resident apprentices as a percent of all apprentice hours worked.**

In 2010, the City and County of San Francisco passed a Local Hire Ordinance requiring public work or improvement contracts over $400k to hire employees that are local to the project. The requirement begins with a 20% requirement and increases by 5% each year until it reaches the maximum threshold of 50%. The ordinance took effect in 2011 (Year 1). Per the ordinance, Year 1 or FY2011-12 projects must meet the 20% requirement. Year 2 or FY2012-13 projects must meet the 25% requirement and so on, up to 50%. For FY2012-13, SFPUC exceeded its annual targets, as well as, exceeded the requirements of the Local Hire Ordinance for both labor hours worked by local residents and by local resident apprentices.

**CY3.2: Percent of labor hours worked by local residents on SFPUC construction projects covered by the City’s Local Hiring Ordinance**

- **% of Labor Hours Worked by Local Resident Apprentices:**
- **% of Labor Hours Worked by Local Residents:**
- **% Required by 2010 Local Hire Ordinance**

![Graph showing percentages of labor hours worked by local residents and apprentices compared to the required target.](chart.png)
CY4.1: Stakeholder Access/Exchange:

a. Percent of traffic increase in SFPUC social media platforms.

SFPUC surpassed its FY2012-13 targets and continues to improve the architecture and utility of its social media platforms, while continuing to meet reporting standards and guidelines. The SFPUC’s website had a total of 483,462 visits, with 19% new visits and average time on site of 2:22. Total digital Currents subscriptions increased by 38% this year for a total of 52,289, our Facebook page had 3,824 likes, and we had 6,538 Twitter followers.

b. Percent of projects for which engagement is timely, effective and for which stakeholder feedback is included in early input.

For this year and in our previous three annual reports, early stakeholder feedback was sought for 100% of projects with resulting stakeholder input included in design and initial planning stages. Specifically, for FY2012-13, SFPUC met its target with early stakeholder input for all of its 24 projects and continuing to lead best practice.

c. Key stakeholder groups that engage on a regular basis to advance communication, education and community interaction.

SFPUC increased the number of events held and the number of attendees, surpassing its FY2012-13 target. Though SFPUC did not reach all its FY2012-13 quantitative targets, we continued to engage with stakeholders on a regular basis and to re-design and improve our stakeholder communications and outreach in response to operational dynamics and in anticipation of future events, programs and projects. In FY2012-13, we held eight CAC meetings with 81 people in attendance, 190 public events with 12,926 people attending, and system awareness or education activities with 1,861 in attendance.

Environment & Natural Resources:

Issues relating to environmental impacts and the use, protection, and health of natural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Become a leader in environmental stewardship (e.g. habitat, biodiversity, land management (EN2.2-EN2.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Diversify high quality water sources and advance water efficiency, conservation and reuse (EN6.1-EN8.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Reduce inflows to the sewer system and ensure quality effluent (EN9.4-EN11.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Increase energy efficiency and conservation (EN12.1-EN12.2)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Advance high quality and emissions-free power supply sources (EN13.2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Address SFPUC in-house emissions contributing to climate change (EN16.1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Reduce SFPUC in-house environmental impacts (EN16.3-EN19.2)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFPUC’s performance in the Environment and Natural Resources category either meets or exceeds sector requirements and standards, often leading best practice. Examples include our 100% sewage sludge going to beneficial reuse, excellent water quality, relatively stable and conservative customer per capita water use, and our low GHG emissions and energy consumption (called Energy Intensity) in the management and delivery of our utility services. In addition, we continue to foster improvements and advances in the stewardship of associated lands, natural resources, watersheds and habitats. Though we have not done as well in lessening peak storm flows to our combined sewer system, we are now engaged in the development of a hydraulic model that will reflect progress along with our Wastewater and Sewer System Improvement Programs.
EN6.1: Total amount of water delivered/sold to customers:
SFPUC manages a complex water supply system stretching from the Sierra to the City that features a complex series of reservoirs, tunnels, pipelines, and treatment systems. The primary source for this system is the Hetch Hetchy watershed, an area located in Yosemite National Park that provides approximately 85% of San Francisco’s total water needs. The Alameda and Peninsula watersheds together produce about 15% of the remaining total water supply. Two unique features of the Hetch Hetchy system stand out: the drinking water provided is among the purest in the world; and the system for delivering that water is almost entirely gravity fed, requiring almost no fossil fuel consumption to move water from mountains to tap.

We are the third largest municipal utility in California, serving 2.6 million residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the Bay Area. Approximately one-third of our delivered water goes to retail customers in San Francisco, while wholesale deliveries to 28 suburban agencies in Alameda, Santa Clara, and San Mateo counties comprise the other two-thirds.

a. Total amount of water delivered per capita to retail customers in gallons per capita per day (gpcd).
With a slight improvement over last year and continuing to lead best practice, SFPUC met its FY2012-13 target of less than 100 gpcd sold to retail customers. The total amount of water delivered per capita to retail customers includes all uses in the City & County (e.g. municipal, residential, commercial, water loss, main flushing—note this does not include suburban retail due to problematic population calculation issues).

b. Total amount of water sold to San Francisco residential customers in gpcd.
Total water sold to San Francisco residential customers decreased slightly from last year and continues to lead best practice with steady sales around 50 gpcd and significantly below the state average of 100 gpcd.

c. Total amount of water delivered to wholesale customers in million gallons per day (mgd).
The total amount of water delivered to wholesale customers this year was slightly higher than last year. Performance continues to meet standards and best practices and is well below our target of 184 mgd which is set per the Interim Water Supply Allocation established via the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP).

d. Total City and suburban water demand in mgd.
Total retail water demand of customers which does include suburban retail, has stayed within a 10 mgd range over the past reporting periods. This year we delivered a total of 77.2 mgd. As with the wholesale supply above, our target here of less than 81 mgd is set per the Interim Water Supply Allocation established via WSIP. Maintaining and/or decreasing water deliveries are evidence of improving water efficiencies and conservation.
EN8.2: Percent of total water supplied by alternative sources to retail customers.
San Franciscans enjoy great drinking water from the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System. To protect our water from disruption of supply due to climate change, drought and natural disaster, we must develop new high-quality local water sources and diversify our water supplies. That’s why we’re taking steps to supplement our supplies through groundwater wells, recycled water for irrigation and an aggressive water conservation program. Using local water sources reduces the vulnerability that comes from being heavily dependent on distant reservoirs, while at the same time limiting the amount of water we need from the Tuolumne River and keeping our commitment to protect and preserve our watersheds. Since FY2005-06, SFPUC has consistently increased its alternative water sources, meeting our FY2012-13 target and the Level of Service we intend to maintain through 2018, while concurrently developing additional alternatives sources.

EN9.4: Percent sewage sludge going to beneficial reuse.
After primary and secondary treatment of wastewater, the extracted solid material is called sludge. Once treated, sludge is transformed into biosolids; San Francisco produces 80,000 wet tons of biosolids every year. Since FY2005-06 through FY2012-13, SFPUC has succeeded in delivering 100% of its sewage sludge to either composting or land application as a beneficial reuse in three receiving counties: Solano, Sonoma, and Merced. Though SFPUC estimates this measure at 100% into the future, it will continue to track it, as it is material to our core business and of interest to our stakeholders.

EN12.1a: Total Calendar year Energy Use Intensity (EUI) for municipal buildings (kBTU/sq.ft).
SFPUC’s FY2012-13 EUI of 74.74 kBTU/sq.ft. reflects a substantial decrease in energy use for municipal buildings. The 2011 San Francisco Existing Commercial Buildings Energy Performance Ordinance requires owners of non-residential buildings over 10,000 square feet to annually benchmark and disclose the energy performance of their buildings, using the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Portfolio Manager tool to obtain ENERGY STAR ratings when possible. As the owner and occupant of hundreds of buildings, the City and County of San Francisco has chosen to lead by example and provide transparency about its own operations.

The SFPUC’s Energy Benchmarking Report for calendar year 2012 provides a fresh perspective on our public facilities, highlighting energy performance successes and focusing attention and resources on buildings that may benefit from energy improvements. The findings suggest that San Francisco’s municipal buildings performed well in 2012. However, the wide variation in energy performance within most facility types suggests there are many opportunities for improvement.
EN12.2: Quantify reductions in customer electricity and gas consumption:
As the City’s provider of clean, Hetch Hetchy power, one of our most important jobs is to help customers use their energy as efficiently as possible. Since 2002, our energy efficiency programs have reduced San Francisco’s current electricity use by over 40,000 megawatt hours each year and natural gas consumption by over 800,000 therms each year. That’s enough electricity to power over 8,000 homes and enough natural gas for 1,600 homes per year.

a. Annual peak load reduction (kW).
SFPUC did not reach its FY2012-13 target, nor was its performance comparable to previous years, instead showing a significant decrease in peak load reductions to 282 kW. However, we have a target of 1,000 kW peak load reduction for FY2013-14.

b. Total electricity reduction achieved by customers (MWh).
SFPUC exceeded its FY2012-13 target with performance comparable to previous years and has set its highest electricity reduction target for next year.

c. Total gas reduction achieved by customers (therms).
While demonstrating significant improvement in reducing therms used over previous years, SFPUC also significantly exceeded its FY2012-13 target. We hope to continue on this path with a target of 1,600,000 therms reductions for FY2013-14, which is more than twice as much as this year.
EN13.2a: Percent of electricity supplied to retail and municipal customers that is GHG-free and/or renewable as shown on the SFPUC’s power content label.

The Hetch Hetchy Power System is the clean energy backbone of the City and County of San Francisco. Hetch Hetchy energy is 100% greenhouse gas free and doesn’t produce any harmful emissions/byproducts. In fact, our diverse energy portfolio is among the cleanest in the nation and primarily features hydroelectric, solar, and biogas-generated power. We provide this power to all of San Francisco’s municipal facilities and customers. SFPUC met the benchmark or Renewable Portfolio Standard of 100% for retail and municipal deliveries in 2011, and this year’s performance demonstrates consistency and reliability in SFPUC’s target of 100%.

2012 Greenhouse Gas-Free, Renewable Power Supply

EN16.1: Annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emission due to:
a. SFPUC’s electricity and/or natural gas consumption for provision of all SFPUC services (metric tons).
b. SFPUC’s fleet and fuel consumption (metric tons).

[Note that this data and data for EN16.3 are sourced from the Department Climate Action Plan (DepCap) that is published in the spring of each fiscal year for the previous fiscal year. Thus, this FY2012-13 report data is taken from the spring 2013 DepCap report on our FY2011-12 performance.] SFPUC made stand-out progress in FY2011-12 in bringing its electricity emissions to zero and in lessening its emissions from fleet fuel consumption. The SFPUC’s annual carbon footprint is driven by two factors: (1) the annual consumption of fuels and (2) the carbon content of the fuels consumed. Carbon footprint reductions can be achieved by either reducing consumption levels or the carbon content of the fuels consumed, or both.

Compared to the previous year (FY2010-11), the SFPUC’s FY2011-12 carbon footprint dropped by 1,169 metric tons (13%), broken down as follows:

-320 metric tons for Fleet Fuels, due primarily to a significant (53%) reduction in the consumption of diesel, coupled with a 21% and 8% increase in the consumption of cleaner burning biodiesel fuels B20 and B5, respectively;
+235 metric tons for Natural Gas, due to a 10% increase in natural gas consumption;
-1,084 metric tons for Electricity, due to the reduction in the carbon content of SFPUC-supplied electricity from the already low level of 32.4 lb. CO2/MWh in calendar year 2010 to 0.0 lb. CO2/MWh for calendar years 2011 and 2012, despite a 1.6% increase in electricity consumption at SFPUC facilities.
EN16.3: NOx, SOx air emissions by weight (applies across all SFPUC operations including fleet).

Though NOx and SOx emissions associated with SFPUC’s electricity purchases dropped to zero in FY2011-12, our natural gas purchases increased 26% for a total increase in emissions of 38%. However, this increased natural gas use is due entirely to two factors: (1) gas use at 525 Golden Gate, while under construction and before occupancy in July FY2011-12, accounted for 80% of the 26% FY2011-12 gas use increase (natural gas at the rented SFPUC Headquarters at 1155 Market was provided by the landlord and use data was not included in previous reports); (2) increased operation of the biogas cogeneration facility at the Southeast Plant (which requires a small percentage of added natural gas in its operation). Note that data continues to exclude emissions data from SFPUC’s vehicle fleet.

EN17.1: Direct energy consumption broken down by source = Energy Intensity (EI metric):
Energy Intensity is measured by the quantity of energy required per unit output or activity, so that using less energy to produce a product or service reduces the intensity. Each of the following is measured by megawatt hours, which is equivalent to the amount of electricity used by 300 homes during one hour.

a. MWh energy used per million gallons of water delivered (In-City Retail Water).
Though MWh increased in FY2012-13, SFPUC’s energy intensity measure for in-City retail water delivered remains comparable to the AwwaRF 2010 median.

b. MWh energy used per million gallons of water delivered (Regional Water System).
SFPUC continues to exceed the 2010 AwwaRF median, surpassing its FY 2012-13 energy intensity target for regional water system deliveries and remaining comparable to the last years of performance.

c. MWh energy used per million gallons of wastewater treated.
SFPUC met its FY2012-13 target, but remains at less than other utility best practice. Note that rainfall continues to be less than normal.
Governance & Management:
Issues relating to organizational planning, management, effectiveness, accountability, and financial health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O. Provide high quality service to all customers (GM1.1)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ensure compliance with regulatory requirements (GM1.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Enhance partnerships with City Departments, Agencies and Raker Act entities (GM1.3)</td>
<td>No Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Drive accountability and transparency (GM1.4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Strengthen financial performance (GM2.1-GM2.3)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Implement and improve supply chain and contracting procedures (GM3.1-GM3.3)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Optimize relevant technological innovations (GM4.1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Optimize planning to meet Water, Wastewater and Power demand (GM4.2-GM4.4)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Advance strategic sustainability planning, management and decisionmaking (GM6.1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Advance relevant public policy and legislation (GM6.2)</td>
<td>No Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Develop and implement SFPUC-wide risk assessment and management (GM5.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Advance security, emergency planning and response (GM6.1-GM6.3)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because SFPUC is a City and County Department and because it provides all three Water, Wastewater and Power services, our overall business strategies, risks, challenges, and opportunities invite the integration of the triple bottom with performance also reflected in those issues relating to organization-wide planning, management, effectiveness and financial health.

**GM1.1: Percent of current services meeting level of service goals for: Water, Wastewater, and Power.**
For GM1.1a, SFPUC met all water deliveries in FY2012-13 and continues to make progress through our ongoing infrastructure improvements and adherence to schedule to meet our LOS goals and targets. We met 100% of water deliveries in drought years. Note that though we are not currently able to meet our LOS goal of 265 mgd with no more than 20% rationing during dry years, given depressed demand, we are able to meet dry year needs with no more than 20% rationing and are working to secure additional dry year sources. In addition, we met 17% of deliveries after seismic events – note that WSIP was re-baselined in FY2012-13 with data and targets that reflect the re-baselined schedule.

Because SFPUC is a City and County Department and because it provides all three Water, Wastewater and Power services, our overall business strategies, risks, challenges, and opportunities invite the integration of the triple bottom with performance also reflected in those issues relating to organization-wide planning, management, effectiveness and financial health.

**GM1.1a: Percent of Current Services meeting Level of Service Goals for Water**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>FY12-13</th>
<th>FY13-14 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For GM1.1b, SFPUC did not meet its FY2012-13 sewer targets; the number of odor complaints increased by 11 violations and the number of miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned was 20 miles less than targeted (note that the under-target was due to unexpected resource demands of SFDPW Paving Program). FY2012-13 performance is considered comparable in light of overall increases and capital improvements coming in the SSIP.

**GM1.1b: Miles of Sewer Lines Inspected and Cleaned**

- FY13-14 Target: 150
- FY12-13: 130
- FY11-12: 125
- FY10-11: 112
For GM1.1c, there is no FY2012-13 data for Power’s Level of Service Goals or for establishing those goals and no fiscal year targets for the future. Referencing the FY2010-11 performance report, Power highlighted the outage reporting tool as a key component in establishing Power’s LOS goals for Hunters Point and Treasure Island, thus naming it a requirement toward establishing Power’s LOS goals. Performance, therefore, is below previous targets and industry standards and best practices.

**GM 1.4: Management is held accountable for project and division performance through audits and performance reports.**

The number of audits completed has increased over the past year, with an increase in findings not implemented. However, the time taken for findings to be implemented has decreased, with the majority being done in the first six months. SFPUC’s Annual Audit Program continues to lead best practice in the City and County.

**GM2.1: Credit rating for Water and Wastewater Enterprises.**

The SFPUC’s credit rating remains solid as determined by credit rating agencies, primarily Standard & Poor’s (S&P) and Moody’s. For Water and Wastewater Enterprises we met our FY2012-13 target and we continue to be comparable to peers. The credit ratings maintaining a low risk indicates a strong capacity to meet financial commitments.

**GM2.2: Operating cost coverage (total operational revenues/total operating costs) for Water, Wastewater, and Power.**

Though we met standard and best practice in that our revenues covered operating costs with ratios comparable to previous years, we did not meet our FY 2012-13 targets for each of our three enterprises.

**Number of findings/recommendations implemented from all prior audits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>FY12-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 6 months:</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 12 months:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 18 months:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Implemented:</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings or recommendations identified and which were treated by management as either not feasible or not cost effective to implement, have not been included in the metric for implemented findings. Also, partially implemented findings have been treated for this SSP/KPI purpose as not implemented. Only findings fully implemented are included as implemented.**

**Cost coverage ratio is a measure of an organization’s ability to cover its expenses. A ratio of 1 indicates that it is breaking even with no profit. An increasing ratio above 1 is optimal.**
GM2.3: Enterprise Operating Fund Balance is sufficient to comply with Fund Balance Reserve Policy: Debt service coverage is greater than or equal to 1.25 times.

The SFPUC evaluates its financial performance by its compliance with the Fund Balance Reserve Policy, especially in accordance with the requirement of the debt service coverage ratio being equal to or greater than 1.25 times. The debt service coverage ratio is represented by total revenues divided by total debt service expenditures. For FY2012-13, in addition to meeting the majority of its annual targets, SFPUC’s Total Enterprise Operating Fund Balance exceeded the Fund Balance Reserve Policy. It met all of three criteria, and exceeded performance in two of the three (greater than or equal to: 15% annual revenues, 15% annual expenditures or 1.25 times debt service coverage).

GM4.1: Number of innovative and/or pilot projects using new technology that target the Objective and improve quality of services.

SFPUC is making continuous progress in initiating innovative and pilot projects using new technologies. Examples for FY2012-13 include the following: We piloted ten new technologies while also meeting our FY2012-13 installation goal for water meters and for progress in our non-potable program. Pilots to improve field productivity included for instance: (1) Interloc Maximo mobile software running on iPads, (2) Mtelligence connector between Maximo and eDNA for Reliability Centered Maintenance, (3) Cloud based ESRI GIS software for Lake Merced, and (4) Sharefile corporate grade cloud data storage.

In addition, SFPUC met its FY2012-13 target for water meter installations in August 2013, and developed the Non-Potable Water program, which creates a streamlined process for new large developments to collect, treat, and reuse water for toilet flushing, irrigation, and other non-potable uses. SFPUC also began a pilot non-potable grant program, which will provide up to $250,000 for projects over 100,000 sq.ft. that implement on-site reuse to replace either all toilet-flushing demands or 40% of overall water demands. Both the City ordinance creating guidelines for non-potable systems and the grant program have attracted significant interest from other CA cities and water utilities looking to model their own programs off of the SFPUC’s program.

Finally, SFPUC’s Renewable Generation group piloted a new solar technology at the Moscone Convention Center. This technology focused on mounting the solar panels on the roof and reducing the weight of the project. New light-weight solar technologies will allow solar to be installed more easily on buildings in San Francisco.
GM4.2: Show progress on long term integrated resource planning to meet future water, wastewater, and power demand in a reliable and sustainable manner.

SFPU C’s Water Enterprise utilizes the Level of Service Goals established through the Water System Improvement Program to benchmark our long term water supply needs. First and foremost in FY2012-13, we remained fully engaged in increasing conservation. We also continued to explore additional water supplies, (e.g. recycled water, groundwater, transfers, and desalination,) in order to meet the 265 mgd guaranteed by the WSIP LOS Goals. To that end, Water Enterprise managers provided the Commission with a number of water supply options to meet 265 mgd in a reliable and sustainable manner. Complementing current WSIP projects, SFPU C is also considering additional recycled water projects through partnerships with South San Francisco, Daly City, and Menlo Country Club, as well as a potential Regional Desalination Plant, and additional water transfers. We will continue to develop new supplies and to diversify our water supply portfolio in order to best meet long term demand for our customers.

SFPU C’s Wastewater Enterprise continued planning in FY2012-13 for our long-term Sewer System Improvement Project (SSIP), including for instance the laundry to landscape program and TBL program and project plans. SFPU C’s Power Enterprise provided a status memo to the Commission in 2012-13 highlighting the recommendations in SFPU C’s implementation of the Electricity Resource Plan (ERP). We will continue to implement the 14 recommendations in the ERP and will provide another update to the Commission on the status of each of the recommendations.

GM4.3: Identify potential climate change risks to the organization and analyze and develop adaptation measures that may be needed in the future for Water, Wastewater, and Power.

SFPU C further developed the scope of work for comprehensive assessment of the potential effects of climate change on water supply. This process has been delayed while additional data gathering, advancing scientific capabilities, and new knowledge are incorporated into the scope of work. In addition, conversations with a potential consulting team have advanced the project’s ability to incorporate decision support planning methods into the scope. The project will be initiated in FY2013-14 and completed late in FY2013-14 or in FY2014-15. We also continue to integrate adaptive strategies into SSIP project designs.

SFPU C continues its leadership working toward more effective adaptations related to Climate Change, including: setting strategic and programmatic targets for improvements, inventorying and assessing climate change related risks, and initiating adaptation and mitigation measures.
GM5.2: Support and initiate local, regional, state and federal policy actions that support SFPUC’s mission.

SFPUC continues to build its capacity and relationships to support, initiate, and report on local, state, and federal policy and actions that support its mission.

- In FY2012-13, there were a total of 103 pieces of legislation of interest to the SFPUC at the Board of Supervisors.
- 46 pieces of local legislation were submitted to the Board of Supervisors by or on behalf of the SFPUC and all were passed.
- An additional 57 pieces of legislation were tracked due to potential impacts on the SFPUC.

GM5.3: Percent of organization integrating Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) into sustainability and operational planning, management, and decision-making. Types of risk can include: strategic, operational, financial, reputational, environmental, political, regulatory, and license to operate.

Since FY2010-11, the SFPUC has had 100% of Business and Financial Services and Contracts Administration that have integrated pilot ERM into operational planning, which represents 18.5% of the entire SFPUC organization. While SFPUC did not meet its FY2012-13 target to integrate ERM into strategic and operational planning, it continues to advance implementation comparable to previous years.

GM6.2: Emergency drinking water plan in place and reviewed, updated, and tested annually.

On an average day, the City of San Francisco — its residents, businesses, and visitors — consumes about 70 million gallons of water. This water is supplied solely by the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System. Recent earthquake activity in Japan and the Bay Area are a clear reminder to prepare ourselves with an emergency plan and provisions. Developing local groundwater can help diversify our supply portfolio and ensure we have a local source for water should a drought, earthquake or other disaster interrupt our Hetch Hetchy supply. We have established an emergency water plan and a fleet of trucks is already in place to deliver drinking water to centrally located distribution sites throughout San Francisco as quickly as possible. Transportation routes will be established and debris cleared from them first for access.

SFPUC has completed its portion of the City's Emergency Drinking Water Plan i.e. defining its role. We will continue to work with other City agencies and the SFDEM to complete the entire plan in FY2013-14.
Infrastructure & Assets:
Issues relating to the management, reliability and performance of assets, and infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA. Improve capital facilities through construction (IA2.1-IA2.5)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB. Optimize maintenance for Water, Wastewater and Power assets (IA4.1-IA6.2)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFPUC’s overall performance during FY2012-13 met regulatory requirements and best practices, as well as, earned recognition and awards for several specific projects. In optimizing maintenance for our utility assets, however, we scored poorly in the development of our SFPUC-wide asset management plan. While some progress was made on improving asset inventories and identifying the value of certain assets, there was less progress, with the exception of Wastewater, on condition assessments.

IA2.2: Deviation in actual vs. planned facilities and project expenditures (in Millions).
Deviations in actual versus planned facilities and project expenditures greatly increased in FY2012-13. However, actual expenditures in all four categories were less than respective planned expenditures for the year. The deviation reflects that the SFPUC under-spent in FY2012-13. This should not be considered as bad news; costs and schedules need to be analyzed together. SFPUC is only slightly behind schedule and under spending, which means the forecasted cost at completion is less than the approved budget. Planned value is based on early schedule; there is usually float in schedules. So, the planned value based on early schedule is expected to be higher than expenditure. Finally, the planned value includes a construction contingency (10%). If change orders are not issued, the contingency budget will not be spent, which is a good project outcome.

IA2.3: Percent of projects completed within the program budget.
For FY2012-13, SFPUC did not meet its target of 22 completed WSIP projects, but 100% of all WSIP (13 projects) and WWECIP (11 projects) projects completed were completed within program budget. Performance, therefore, shows continuous improvement over the last three reporting periods with significant positive impact. For FY2013-14, we have 12 projects planned for WSIP (Regional and Local) and 22 projects planned for WWECIP.
IA2.4: Percent deviation in actual vs. planned capital facilities and project schedules.
SFPUC demonstrated improvement in FY2012-13, exceeding its targeted completion rate for WSIP local including ground water or recycled water projects (LWS) and falling only slightly below the targeted completion rate for WSIP Regional and WWECIP. In FY2012-13, WSIP Local (including LWS) had a deviation of 1.2%, WSIP Regional had a deviation of 6.3%, and WWECIP had a deviation of 12.7%. Though scheduling deviations occur for legitimate reasons (e.g. historical or archeological discoveries in construction), we continue to improve our planning for all major capital projects and increase savings.

IA2.4a&b: Percent Deviation in Actual vs. Planned Capital Facilities and Project Schedules

IA2.5: Awards or commendations received for best practice demonstrated in capital construction.
The following are examples of awards for and/or recognition of SFPUC leading best practices in FY2012-13:

- Western Council of Construction Consumers (Tesla Water Treatment Facility)
  1. Exceptional Project Award
  2. Innovative Solution Award
- International Partnering Institute – John L. Martin Partnered Project of the Year Award (University Mound North Basin Seismic Upgrades)
- American Public Works Association Exemplary Performance Award – WSIP Safety Program
- Global Institute “The Strategic 100 – the Top Global Infrastructure Projects for 2013”
- American Public Works Association Project of the Year $5-25M (Lower Crystal Springs Dam Improvements Project)
- American Society of Civil Engineers Government Civil Engineer of the Year (Julie Labonte)
- 2013 Employer Champion Award at JobTrain’s 29th Annual Breakfast of Champions

WSIP Regional Safety Managers Rick Wakefield, Peninsula & Bay Division; Steve Nash, Sunol; Alan Ordaz, San Joaquin and Todd Bjornsen join Julie Labonte, Carolyn Jones and Alan Johanson to celebrate the safety award.
IA4.1: Develop and implement SFPUC-wide Asset Management planning:
  a. Percent of assets by value covered by asset management plan.
  b. Percent of assets with a risk ranking.
  c. Percent of assets with risk ranking of 4 or 5 covered by an asset management plan.
Several SFPUC entities continue to work on improving individual Enterprise asset management inventories for identifying assets by value and for risk ranking and planning. The sources of this data however are multiple and not necessarily consistent in use of methodologies and valuing results. Progress on the development and implementation of an SFPUC-wide asset management plan that is used for SFPUC-wide strategic sustainability planning purposes, therefore, remains unclear.

IA5.1: Preventive maintenance ratio for Water & Wastewater (in Percent).
In FY 2012-13, SFPUC continued to exceed the western U.S. median for water, and to exceed the AWWA top quartile for preventive maintenance for combined utilities. Even with performance that leads best practice, our preventive maintenance ratio for both Water and Wastewater did not meet respective targets, and while Water’s ratio fell slightly, Wastewater’s improved over last year.

IA5.3: System renewal and replacement rates for Water distribution mains and Wastewater pipelines.
SFPUC did not meet its FY2012-13 Water target of nine miles of replacement pipeline due to unavoidable schedule changes in funding that resulted in a replacement rate below peer practice (4.8 miles). However, this past year, redundant seismically-engineered conduits were installed where the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System crosses three of the nation’s most active earthquake faults to help create a lifeline around the San Francisco Bay. Renewing and replacing water distribution mains will reduce vulnerability of the water system to damage from earthquakes, increase system reliability to deliver water, provide improvements related to water supply/drought protection, and enhance sustainability through improvements that optimize protection of the natural and human environment.
SFPUC’s surpassed its FY2012-13 Wastewater target by 1.7 miles. Sewer Repair Work involves replacement or repair of defective or broken sections of the main sewer and sewer laterals (sections that stretch from the face of the curb to the main sewer pipeline). These sewer repairs are crucial in providing uninterrupted sewer service and protecting public health and environment.
**Workplace:**

Issues relating to human resource management, labor relations, health, and safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC. Advance positive employee relations through fair labor practices (WP1.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD. Ensure employee health and safety and promote employee morale (WP3.2-WP4.2)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE. Expand and improve internal communication (WP5.2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF. Provide effective recruitment, orientation and mentoring support (WP6.1-WP6.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG. Promote the professional development and retention of staff and ensure employees have clear expectations for performance (WP7.2-WP9.1)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFPUC’s FY2012-13 performance on Workplace objectives ranged across the scale. We continued to lead best practice with no work related fatalities and in the low number of complaints regarding equal opportunity violations/discrimination. However, we under-performed in recordable injury and lost time rates, and in two related areas: the number of annual performance reviews completed and the mapping of at-risk job categories and formal succession planning for the 44% of staff expected to retire within five years.

**WP1.2: Number of complaints filed regarding equal opportunity violations/discrimination.**

SFPUC met its FY2012-13 target with performance comparable to previous reporting periods. This year we had 12 complaints, representing 0.52% of staff, which is two more complaints than last year. The upward trend of complaints is consistent with state and national increases in EEO complaints.

**WP 4.2a-c: Recordable injury rate and its subset or associated lost time rate, and number of work related fatalities.**

For FY 2012-13, the SFPUC met its annual targets for both its recordable injury and resulting lost time rates, however, performance for each remains below the industry standard for over four consecutive reporting periods. SFPUC continued to have zero work-related fatalities, even during major capital improvement projects, including long-term and complex construction activities.
WP 9.1: Percent of staff expected to retire within five years, identification of at-risk classifications, and percent for which succession plan has been developed.

For FY2012-13, 44% of SFPUC staff was eligible to retire within five years. Though at-risk classifications have been identified and Competency Model consultants have been selected, performance remains comparable to previous years, with mapping of at-risk job categories and formal succession planning still incomplete.

The SFPUC identifies at-risk classifications across the organization and the percent for which a succession plan has been developed. Included for eligibility are any non-temporary, exempt employees who have equal to or greater than a combination of 45 years of age and 15 years of service or 55 years of age and five years of service.

SFPUC’S Approach to Organization-wide Sustainability

How did SFPUC get to the results featured in the foregoing examples of our FY2012-13 performance?

While the triple bottom line is the dominant model for framing and evaluating organizational sustainability, SFPUC has innovated on this model by integrating the triple bottom line through six categories of strategic issues that are most readily understood and applied by a utility fully engaging with its longterm future.

The practicable result of this systemic approach is that we can use our 2008 Plan and annual performance as a system for planning, managing and evaluating SFPUC-wide performance. The added value is that we can take into account the long term economic, environmental and social impacts of our business activities, including integrating longer term considerations for policy and budget decisions.

Our Strategic Sustainability framework, located on the next page, represents the systemic, triple bottom line integration of sustainability into strategy. It is organized as follows: SFPUC’s five overarching strategic goals are to provide high quality services, engage our public and invest in our communities, promote a green and sustainable city, invest in our people and plan for the future.

To address progress on these goals are a variety of strategic objectives, each associated with one of our six sustainability categories. Though intended to be relatively durable over time, we expect that objectives will evolve and change as we take lessons learned from our performance.

Our measures or key performance indicators (KPIs) and their associated standards and best practices are not shown on the framework graphic but are critical to organizing, tracking and benchmarking performance on our objectives and goals.

These KPIs are sourced from international, national and local reporting and utility performance standards and best practices. They are, for instance, consistent with the guidelines of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) that is the internationally recognized standard for sustainability reporting, with indicators advocated by the American Water Works Association (AWWA) and with other water and power utilities.

In addition, we associate each KPI with the most current industry metrics (Appendix 3) to allow for benchmarking performance, and regularly re-examine these to stay aligned with ongoing developments and internal applicability. To the extent possible, KPIs are material, contextual, quantitative, measurable and impact-based. In cases where no rigorous quantitative measure is available, we use a qualitative KPI.
Our Strategic Sustainability Plan is a system for planning, managing, and evaluating SFPUC-wide performance that takes into account the long term economic, environmental and social impacts of our business activities. Our framework integrates these principles through long term sustainability categories, goals and objectives most material to the SFPUC.

**Customers**
- A. Foster customer satisfaction
- B. Advance collaboration to support potential SFPUC customers due to City developments
- C. Enhance meter reading technology & billing accuracy
- D. Align rate structure to reflect conservation, full costs of providing service & affordability

**Environment & Natural Resources**
- H. Become a leader in environmental stewardship e.g. habitat, biodiversity & land management
- I. Diversify high quality water sources & advance water efficiency, conservation & reuse
- J. Reduce inflows to the sewer system & ensure quality effluent
- K. Increase energy efficiency and conservation
- L. Advance high quality & emissions-free power supply sources
- M. Address SFPUC in-house emissions contributing to climate change.
- N. Reduce SFPUC in-house environmental impacts

**Infrastructure**
- AA. Improve capital facilities through construction
- BB. Optimize maintenance for water, wastewater & power assets

**Community**
- E. Promote environmental justice
- F. Advance Community Benefits
- G. Foster engagement with current & developing stakeholder groups

**Governance & Management**
- O. Provide high quality service to all customers
- P. Ensure compliance with regulatory requirements
- Q. Enhance partnerships with City Departments, Agencies, & Raker Act entities
- R. Drive accountability & transparency
- S. Strengthen financial performance
- T. Implement and improve supply chain and contracting procedures
- U. Optimize relevant technological innovations
- V. Optimize planning to meet water, wastewater & power demand
- W. Advance strategic sustainability planning, management & decision making
- X. Advance relevant public policy & legislation
- Y. Develop and implement SFPUC-wide risk assessment and management
- Z. Advance security, emergency planning & response

**Workplace**
- CC. Advance positive employee relations through fair labor practices
- DD. Ensure employee health & safety & promote employee morale
- EE. Expand & improve internal communication
- FF. Provide effective recruitment, orientation and mentoring support
- GG. Promote the professional development & retention of staff & ensure employees have clear expectations for performance

**Goals**
Provide high quality services / Engage our public & invest in our communities / Promote a green and sustainable city / Invest in our people / Plan for the future
SFPUC FY2012-13 Strategic Sustainability Performance

In this section, we explain the methodology we use to evaluate and “score” our annual performance. We provide a visual summary of those results in our Performance Profile on the next page. Note that Appendix 1 presents the actual FY2012-13 results and benchmarks for each KPI. Appendix 3 provides the FY2012-13 standards and best practices that underlie the evaluation for each KPI.

Performance Evaluation and Scoring Methodology

Normalizing Performance Data

Normalizing data is the process of representing data against a driver or strong determinant or correlator of performance. For instance, the amount of water distributed by the SFPUC is a driver that has a direct impact on energy use. Thus when looking at efficiency measures, for instance, data can be presented as energy use per million gallons of water delivered. Normalization also facilitates trend analysis as it helps hold the variable operating factors constant. SFPUC normalizes all data where appropriate in order to facilitate evaluation and to benchmark and trend performance results over time.

Performance Trends

With four years of sustainability data “banked”, we have begun trending our performance results for the value it can add to benchmarking, risk analysis and long term strategic planning. Note that to keep the results realistic for actual budgeting and planning purposes, SFPUC trends its actual data results; we do not trend our scores.

Performance Scoring and Profile

We do, however, score our performance data results to provide stakeholders a snapshot of our annual average performance. We acknowledge that there is a degree of subjectivity in the scoring for our performance profile; we intend this to diminish as we monitor data trends over time and secure third party accounting of our annual sustainability performance data, evaluations, results and reporting.

To enable a consistent, methodical assignment of scores, we continue to score our annual data results for each KPI using a generic ordinal scale from 1 to 5. This allows us to benchmark performance against our prior performance and future targets, against industry peers in both private and government sectors while taking into account standards and best practices. It surfaces specific KPI progress, reversals and continuity in performance. It also enables KPIs and associated SFPUC objectives to be averaged together to establish an overall score for each of our six sustainability categories. In the case of KPIs with multiple scores, we average those scores first and round up or down from .5 to provide the average score for that objective. See our FY 2012-13 Performance Profile on the next page.

Please note as you review these results that we define the term “average” and the score of “3” as what's required of ourselves and all industry peers, including meeting all specific federal, state and local rules, regulations and industry best practice. To express it another way, achieving a score of 4 or 5 means that SFPUC must exceed requirements and/or excel in and/or lead best practice for that KPI. Thus, the dark green bulls-eye target for every KPI is a score of “5”.

An additional note is that we include qualitative KPIs in our scoring that are supported with enough information to provide a basis for assessment. An example is GM1.4, “Management is held accountable for project and division performance through audits and performance reports.” Here, we compare and benchmark against the previous years’ performance to determine whether there has been improvement toward annual targets and the objective of driving accountability and transparency. Note, however, that we do not include in our scoring the few KPIs that are primarily process or input oriented, or include elements so variable that scoring is not yet useful. An example is GM5.2, “Support and initiate local, state and federal policy actions that support SFPUC’s mission.”

Finally, in cases where SFPUC is assessing data for the first time, we consider this data a baseline and will assign a score of “3” with the following exception: we’ll assign a higher or lower score if a new KPI shows performance that can be benchmarked against evidence that we are performing above or below applicable standards and/or relative to peer and industry practice.
Our Strategic Sustainability Profile visually summarizes our performance results for FY2012-13. The goal always is the “bulls-eye”, or dark green “5”. Thus, the scores along the slices move from 1 to 5 as performance improves. There are six slices, one for each Sustainability category. In each category are more narrow slices for its associated objectives. In each of these are the performance scores for its KPIs, represented in the distribution of the bullets/dots. The color represents the average performance score for that Objective (see the key below).
For those of you who would like to review the details of our performance and supporting data, please see the following appendices:

1. Appendix 1: FY2012-13 data, calculations, results and benchmarks (FY2005-06 to FY2012-13)
2. Appendix 2: Glossary and abbreviations

For additional/deeper detail, please link to FY2012-13 Supporting Data on our webpage:
3. Appendix 3: FY2012-13 standards and best practices for each KPI,
4. Appendix 4: SFPUC’s FY 2012-13 Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Index,
APPENDIX 1: FY2012-13 Performance Data, Results, and Benchmarks

Appendix 1 provides detailed FY2012-13 data and results for each KPI and benchmarks years from our baseline FY2005-06. If a year is marked N/A, no data was submitted for that year, or the KPI was introduced subsequent to the FY2005-06 baseline.
A. Foster customer satisfaction 

**Objective**

B. Advance collaboration to support potential SFPUC customers due to City development

---

### CR3.1

**Percent of retail customers surveyed that rate SFPUC as good or better**

**Technical Description**

Data source: NICE Feedback System

How: Report Generated from an automated survey that customers respond to after speaking with a Customer Services Representative. Identify number of retail customers who rank SFPUC services as "good" or "excellent", divide by total number of SFPUC retail customers and multiply by 100. Data should be obtained from customer satisfaction survey.

Calculation: Total number of survey respondents - Number reporting "good" or "excellent" / Total number of survey respondents * 100

**Current Report Year:**

FY2013-14 Target: 90% or higher

**Data:**

90% (FY2007-08 survey)

**ANALYSIS:**

Though comparable to the previous reporting period, SFPUC did not reach its FY2011-12 target and performed below peers in the industry.

**Score:** 3

---

### CR3.2

**Average Wholesale Customer Satisfaction (1 to 5 Scale)**

**Technical Description**

Data source: FY2007-08 Wholesale Customer Survey (see note)

How: Email Survey

- Identify number of wholesale customers who rank SFPUC services as "4" or "5", divide by total number of SFPUC wholesale customers and multiply by 100. Use results of Water Supply and Treatment Division periodic customer service surveys for the regional water system.

Calculation: Average of scores

**Current Report Year:**

FY2013-14 Target: 4.5 or higher

**Data:**

4.5 (per FY2007-08 survey)

**ANALYSIS:**

SFPC targets reached its FY2011-12 target. However, the target was based on the survey results of FY2007-08 and that survey remains the most current. Until there is an updated survey, we will consider performance as neutral.

**Score:** 3

---

### CR3.3

**Advance collaboration to support potential SFPUC customers**

**Technical Description**

Data source: Deputy GM

How: Describe this Fiscal Year’s collaborations to support potential City customers

Calculation: Qualitative review

**Current Report Year:**

FY2013-14 Target: 4.5 or higher

**Data:**

*Note: No data available for FY2010-11*

**ANALYSIS:**

SFPC continues progress and reporting on collaborations with various parties to support potential customers

**Score:** 3

---

### CR3.4

**Billing Accuracy**

**Technical Description**

Data source: SFPUC Customer Care and Billing System

How: SQL Query of cancelled and rebilled bills

Calculation: Water & Wastewater combined use the billing error rate or Number of error-driven billing adjustments per 10,000 bills generated. Power billing error rate uses adjustment for which 100% of 2400 accounts (primarily municipal) are reviewed prior to billing.

**Current Report Year:**

FY2013-14 Target: 1/1000 = .001 billing error rate = 10 errors per 10,000 bills.

**Data:**

6 errors per 10,000 bills

**ANALYSIS:**

SFPC has made progress in reporting the data. However, its error rate exceeds the industry median and did not meet the FY2011-12 target.

**Score:** 3

---

### CR3.5

**Bill Payment Options**

**Technical Description**

Data source: SFPUC customer service improvement Measures

How: SQL Query of cancelled and rebilled bills

Calculation: Power for which 100% of customer accounts are reviewed prior to billing.

**Current Report Year:**

FY2013-14 Target: 1/1000 = .001 billing error rate = 10 errors per 10,000 bills.

**Data:**

12 billing errors per 10,000 completed for Water and Wastewater combined, and 0 billing errors for Power for which 100% of (primarily municipal) accounts are reviewed prior to billing.

**ANALYSIS:**

SFPC has made progress in lowering its billing errors. Its error rate, however, exceeds the industry median and it did not meet its FY2011-12 target.

**Score:** 3
### C3A3 Percent of customers that are metered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3A3</td>
<td>a. Wholesale water</td>
<td>4. Data Source: Wholesale water meters</td>
<td>How: Meter reading and billing; identify number of wholesale water customers who are metered. Divide each by total number of respective wholesale customers. Multiply results by 100 to get percent. Calculation: Sum (130 total billed service connections)</td>
<td>1. Whole Water: 100%</td>
<td>1. Whole Water: 100%</td>
<td>1. Whole Water: 100%</td>
<td>1. Whole Water: 100%</td>
<td>4. 100%</td>
<td>5. 100%</td>
<td>5. 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Retail water</td>
<td>5. Data Source: Retail water meters</td>
<td>How: Meter reading and billing; identify number of retail water customers who are metered. Divide each by total number of respective retail customers. Multiply results by 100 to get percent. Calculation: Sum</td>
<td>1. Ret Water: 100%</td>
<td>1. Ret Water: 100%</td>
<td>1. Ret Water: 100%</td>
<td>1. Ret Water: 100%</td>
<td>5. 100%</td>
<td>5. 100%</td>
<td>5. 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Power</td>
<td>6. Data Source: Power Enterprise Meter Data Management System (WEMS) and calculated in spreadsheet</td>
<td>How: Sum of monthly metered accounts divided by sum of monthly all accounts Calculation: Metered 2313 Unmetered 210 Total 2313 metered/total = 2103/2313 = 91%</td>
<td>1. Power: 91.2%</td>
<td>1. Power: 91.2%</td>
<td>1. Power: 92.8%</td>
<td>1. Power: 91%</td>
<td>5. 91%</td>
<td>5. 91%</td>
<td>5. 91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C3A4 Water Meter Reading Accuracy (number of errors per 1,000 reads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3A4</td>
<td>a. Wholesale water</td>
<td>Data Source: SFPUC Customer Care and Billing System</td>
<td>How: SQL query for meter reads not used on bill Calculation: Number of errors divided by total number of meter reads multiplied by 1000 = Water meter reading errors per 1,000 water meter reads</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.07/1,000 or .0002 number of water meter read error over 1,000 meter reads completed, equaling 0.2% We do not track power meters as 89% of manually read electric meters are owned &amp; read by PG&amp;E</td>
<td>DATA: 1.31 errors per 1,000 meter reads or .13% error rate Note: That while we do not report an error rate for power meter reads for which we bill service (89% are owned and read by PG&amp;E), we continue to meet ISO standards for producing settlement quality meter data. ANALYSIS: SFPUC did not meet its error rate target for Water but continues to lead best practice.</td>
<td>4/1,000 = .0001 meter reading error rate</td>
<td>4/1,000 = .0001 meter reading error rate</td>
<td>4/1,000 = .0001 meter reading error rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SFPUC Performance: Strategic Sustainability Annual Report FY2012-13

### Appendix 1: Performance Indicators

#### Key Performance Indicator (KPI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>How/Calculation</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Current Report Year</th>
<th>FY2013 Target</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Average household income for water, wastewater, and power sectors</td>
<td>FY2012-13 total</td>
<td>FY2005-06: Data</td>
<td>How/Calculation: Determine combined monthly SFR bill using SFHUC adopted rates and average monthly consumption (ccf). Determine median household income and project annually using 3% CPI Divide by 12 for median monthly income. Total combined monthly SFR bill divided by projected median household income in SF for FY2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicators

**Water**

- Percentage of customers billed at full cost: **99%**
- Value of benefits per customer: **$150**

**Wastewater**

- Percentage of customers billed at full cost: **100%**
- Value of benefits per customer: **$150**

**Power**

- Percentage of customers billed at full cost: **100%**
- Value of benefits per customer: **$150**

### Compliance

- **Score:** 5 (Continuous improvement in surpassing its FY2012-13 target, its performance did not meet recommended practice.)

### Analysis

- Even though SFHUC did not reach its FY2012-13 target, the SFHUC exceeds the industry standard determined by AWWA for combined water and wastewater and meets EPA's definition of affordability for these services. Furthermore, SFHUC is in compliance with the SFHUC Commission Policy endorsing its SSIP LOS Goal of less than 2.5% of median HH income.

---

Scores and indicators are based on historical data and trends, and the performance of water, wastewater, and power service customers as of FY2012-13. Further analysis and improvements are recommended for future fiscal years.

---
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### Objective E: Promote environmental justice attributable to the SFPUC

#### a. Water

**Data Source:** Rate studies; Rate Book: YTD Water sales

**How/Calculation:** Periodic independent rate studies determine rate structure (multi-tiered) that encourages conservation and is designed to reduce peak demands. Water Sales determine water supplied to retail customers using conservation-based rates. Total water supplied to retail customers has been charged using conservation-based rate schedule divided by total water supplied to retail customers.

**Power:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Data</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>58%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:** Power's 2-tiered rates continue to incent conservation but its non-residential single tiered pricing does not.

**SCORE:** 3

#### b. Wastewater

**Data Source:** Rate studies

**How/Calculation:** Periodic independent rate studies determine rate structure (multi-tiered) that encourages conservation and is designed to reduce peak demands. Total wastewater collected from retail customers that has been charged using conservation-based rate schedule divided by total wastewater collected from retail customers.

**Power:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wastewater Data</th>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:** Though wastewater's rates are two rather than three-tiered, the structure and non-residential strength changes continue to incent conservation.

**SCORE:** 4

### Objective F: Increase water efficiency and promote energy conservation.

**Data Source:** Refer to CB files.

**How:** Refer to CB files. Describe efforts to prevent, address, and lessen disproportionate environmental impacts attributable to the SFPUC, e.g.: (1) Context in which environmental justice impacts are taken into account in initial program and project planning

**Power:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Data</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:** Power rates did not directly reflect any conservation incentives - usage is charged at a uniform rate of $1.87 per 100 cu ft.

**TOTAL = 1,293,813,608 kWh**

**SCORE:** 4

### Objective G: Efficient resource use and efficient operation.

**Data Source:** Refer to CB files.

**How:** Refer to CB files. Describe efforts to prevent, address, and lessen disproportionate environmental impacts attributable to the SFPUC, e.g.: (1) Context in which environmental justice impacts are taken into account in initial program and project planning

**Power:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Data</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:** Water's 2-tiered rates continue to incent conservation but its non-residential single tiered pricing does not.

**SCORE:** 3

### Objective H: Market-based success.

**Data Source:** Refer to CB files.

**How:** Refer to CB files. Describe efforts to prevent, address, and lessen disproportionate environmental impacts attributable to the SFPUC, e.g.: (1) Context in which environmental justice impacts are taken into account in initial program and project planning

**Power:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Data</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:** Power rates improved slightly but remain significantly below cost of service and do not encourage conservation.

**SCORE:** 3

### Objective I: Enhanced engagement and outreach.

**Data Source:** Refer to CB files.

**How:** Refer to CB files. Describe efforts to prevent, address, and lessen disproportionate environmental impacts attributable to the SFPUC, e.g.: (1) Context in which environmental justice impacts are taken into account in initial program and project planning

**Power:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Data</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:** Power rates improved slightly but remain significantly below cost of service and do not encourage conservation.

**SCORE:** 3

### Objective J: Integrated decision making.

**Data Source:** Refer to CB files.

**How:** Refer to CB files. Describe efforts to prevent, address, and lessen disproportionate environmental impacts attributable to the SFPUC, e.g.: (1) Context in which environmental justice impacts are taken into account in initial program and project planning

**Power:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Data</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:** Power rates improved slightly but remain significantly below cost of service and do not encourage conservation.

**SCORE:** 3

### Objective K: Cost Allocation and recovery.

**Data Source:** Refer to CB files.

**How:** Refer to CB files. Describe efforts to prevent, address, and lessen disproportionate environmental impacts attributable to the SFPUC, e.g.: (1) Context in which environmental justice impacts are taken into account in initial program and project planning

**Power:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Data</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:** Power rates improved slightly but remain significantly below cost of service and do not encourage conservation.

**SCORE:** 3
### Community
#### CY2.1 Percent of Progress on Community Benefits Program Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Commission adopted CB Policy/Resolution and approved CB Director position.</td>
<td>2) New initiatives began: partner with School District as part of School Project to implement an integrated arts enrichment program to support arts in education;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Community Benefits Program Initiatives completed MDU with Arts Commission; hired Contractor Assistance Center director to build small contractor capacity and increase small contractor participation in PUC work; provided ongoing support to Garden Project linked to EarthStewards Program; facilitated stakeholder roundtable on community land use opportunities.</td>
<td>DATA:</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Contractor signed contract to pilot apprenticeship program with San Francisco Arts Commission.</td>
<td>DATA:</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Community Benefits Program Initiatives and projects aligned with the SFPPC's community benefits policy and values.</td>
<td>DATA:</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) 78% PLA Residents labor hours:</td>
<td>DATA:</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) PLA Residents labor hours:</td>
<td>DATA:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C4.1.1 Stakeholder Access/Exchange

a. Percent of traffic increase in SFPUC social media platforms:
   - a. Total website visits: 390,289
   - b. 28.82% increase (May/June 2010 vs. May/June 2011: 529,791 visits; 1,988,249 sfwater.org from June 2010-June 2011)

b. Percent of projects for which engagement is timely, effective, and for which stakeholder feedback is included in early perspectives (e.g. design or early planning stages):
   - a. 100% of CAC meetings attended
   - b. 80% of meetings had at least 10 attendees

C4.1.2 Community Input

a. Community input sought early on for 100% of major capital projects
   - a. 100% have early stakeholder input (137 sum of prior CEQA/WSP responses)
   - b. 15% increase in 1)

b. Percent of projects with early stakeholder input divided by total number of FY projects:
   - a. 100%
   - b. 100%

C4.1.3 Education/Training

a. Labor hours worked by local residents as percent of all hours worked:
   - a. Labor hours worked by local residents: 25%
   - b. Requirement: 30%

b. Labor hours worked by local resident apprentices as percent of all apprentice hours worked:
   - a. 50%
   - b. Requirement: 50%

C4.1.4 Strategic Partnerships

a. Percent of traffic increase in SFPUC social media platforms:
   - a. Total Website Visits: 390,289
   - b. 28.82% increase (May/June 2010 vs. May/June 2011: 529,791 visits; 1,988,249 sfwater.org from June 2010-June 2011)

b. Percent of projects for which engagement is timely, effective, and for which stakeholder feedback is included in early perspectives (e.g. design or early planning stages):
   - a. 100% of CAC meetings attended
   - b. 80% of meetings had at least 10 attendees

C4.1.5 Media Approach and Use

a. Percent of traffic increase in SFPUC social media platforms:
   - a. Total Website Visits: 390,289
   - b. 28.82% increase (May/June 2010 vs. May/June 2011: 529,791 visits; 1,988,249 sfwater.org from June 2010-June 2011)

b. Percent of projects for which engagement is timely, effective, and for which stakeholder feedback is included in early perspectives (e.g. design or early planning stages):
   - a. 100% of CAC meetings attended
   - b. 80% of meetings had at least 10 attendees

C4.1.6 Social Media

a. Percent of traffic increase in SFPUC social media platforms:
   - a. Total Website Visits: 390,289
   - b. 28.82% increase (May/June 2010 vs. May/June 2011: 529,791 visits; 1,988,249 sfwater.org from June 2010-June 2011)

b. Percent of projects for which engagement is timely, effective, and for which stakeholder feedback is included in early perspectives (e.g. design or early planning stages):
   - a. 100% of CAC meetings attended
   - b. 80% of meetings had at least 10 attendees

C4.1.7 Business Outreach

a. Percent of traffic increase in SFPUC social media platforms:
   - a. Total Website Visits: 390,289
   - b. 28.82% increase (May/June 2010 vs. May/June 2011: 529,791 visits; 1,988,249 sfwater.org from June 2010-June 2011)

b. Percent of projects for which engagement is timely, effective, and for which stakeholder feedback is included in early perspectives (e.g. design or early planning stages):
   - a. 100% of CAC meetings attended
   - b. 80% of meetings had at least 10 attendees
## Environmental Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1a.1</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>a. Data Source: Water Natural Resources</td>
<td>The Natural Resources Division provides feedback to the Environmental Regulatory and Compliance Division (ERCD) on specific SFPUC projects and related environmental impact assessments required by CEQA/NCEA and associated permitting.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Develop plan by end of FY2012-13 to train all Water employees in environmental stewardship, and to track that training.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1a.2</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>b. Wastewater &amp; Technical Description*</td>
<td>The Natural Resources Division provides feedback to the Environmental Regulatory and Compliance Division (ERCD) on specific SFPUC projects and related environmental impact assessments required by CEQA/NCEA and associated permitting.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Develop plan by end of FY2012-13 to train all Water employees in environmental stewardship, and to track that training.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1b</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>a. Data Source: Water Natural Resources</td>
<td>The Natural Resources Division provides feedback to the Environmental Regulatory and Compliance Division (ERCD) on specific SFPUC projects and related environmental impact assessments required by CEQA/NCEA and associated permitting.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Develop plan by end of FY2012-13 to train all Water employees in environmental stewardship, and to track that training.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1c</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>b. Wastewater</td>
<td>The Natural Resources Division provides feedback to the Environmental Regulatory and Compliance Division (ERCD) on specific SFPUC projects and related environmental impact assessments required by CEQA/NCEA and associated permitting.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Develop plan by end of FY2012-13 to train all Water employees in environmental stewardship, and to track that training.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water

**Objective:** Provide data on the percentage of total SFPUC land ecologically monitored.

**Data Source:** Water Natural Resources

**How:** Files and programs. Report the following:

1. Percent of total SFPUC land ecologically monitored
2. Percent of primary watershed land protected and levels of protection (by acre)
3. Improvement in indices of key species and habitat
4. Amount of money (US dollars) invested in above existing obligations. Include description of outcome of investment

**Calculation:** Descriptive & quantitative

**FY2012-13 total:** N/A

**Score:** 3

### Wastewater

**Objective:** Protect habitats and monitor progress on stewardship.

**Data Source:** Water Natural Resources

**How:** Files and programs. Report the following:

1. Percent of total SFPUC land ecologically monitored
2. Percent of primary watershed land protected and levels of protection (by acre)
3. Improvement in indices of key species and habitat
4. Amount of money (US dollars) invested in above existing obligations. Include description of outcome of investment

**Calculation:** Descriptive & quantitative

**FY2012-13 total:** N/A

**Score:** 3

### Natural Resources

**Objective:** Protect habitats and monitor progress on stewardship.

**Data Source:** Water Natural Resources

**How:** Files and programs. Report the following:

1. Percent of total SFPUC land ecologically monitored
2. Percent of primary watershed land protected and levels of protection (by acre)
3. Improvement in indices of key species and habitat
4. Amount of money (US dollars) invested in above existing obligations. Include description of outcome of investment

**Calculation:** Descriptive & quantitative

**FY2012-13 total:** N/A

**Score:** 3
### Key Performance Indicator (KPI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source, how calculated, and calculation for the FY2010-11 total</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Target</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Target</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN3.1</td>
<td>Total amount of water delivered to customers</td>
<td>A. Data Source: J-Table and UNWNP How: County line meters and GWK estimate from 2010 UNWNP - includes all uses in the City &amp; County (e.g., municipal, residential, commercial, water loss, main flushing), exclusive suburban</td>
<td>&lt;55 gpcd</td>
<td>&lt;81 mgd</td>
<td>&lt;100 gpcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation: 70.9 mgd (j-table line I) + 1.5 mgd groundwater = 72.4 mgd (J-table line 6) + 0.4 mgd</td>
<td>42 gpcd</td>
<td>75.5 mgd</td>
<td>77.2 mgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(groundwater + 0.8 mgd suburban + 0.6 mgd) L&amp;L = 73.1 mgd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. DATA: A. 50.29 gpcd</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>NO SCORE</td>
<td>NO SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANA: Total water delivered to wholesale customers decreased and remained comparable over the past reporting periods</td>
<td>SCORE: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO SCORE: This is an indicator for which performance is primarily descriptive and variable. Though it is not scored, national guidelines recommend reporting the data as material to SFPUC performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Wholesale in mgd:</td>
<td>184 mgd</td>
<td>184 mgd</td>
<td>184 mgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DATA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN3.2</td>
<td>Residential water supplied by alternative sources to retail customers</td>
<td>A. Data Source: County line and Retail meters. How: Divide the amount of water supplied by new or alternative sources by the total water supplied. Multiply by 100 to get percent. Calculation: SF Groundwater currently 2.2 mgd, Sharp Park and Harding Park Recycled Water plants came online in FY2011-12, adding 0.31 mgd, for a total of 2.53 mgd of alternative water sources. Gross in-City water use estimated at 73.1 mgd</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DATA: A. 2.40% total water is supplied by alternative sources (2.53 mgd groundwater)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANA: SFPUC reached its FY2011-12 target which is comparable to the previous reporting periods</td>
<td>SCORE: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO SCORE: This is an indicator for which performance is primarily descriptive and variable. Though it is not scored, national guidelines recommend reporting the data as material to SFPUC performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Data Source:** How: county line meters, GWK estimate from 2010 UNWNP - includes all uses in the City & County (e.g., municipal, residential, commercial, water loss, main flushing), exclusive suburban. How: J-Table line I, groundwater + suburban groundwater + suburban + L&L. How: J-Table line 6, groundwater + suburban groundwater + suburban + L&L. How: County line meters, groundwater. How: Simplified J-Table line 6. How: Data from billing system and population data drawn from CA Department of Finance population estimates. How: Simplified J-Table line 6. How: Data from billing system and population data drawn from CA Department of Finance population estimates. How: Simplified J-Table line 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN10.3</td>
<td>Percent sewage sludge (the residual, semi-solid material left from the sewage treatment process) going to beneficial reuse</td>
<td>Data Source: Data from Contracts with receiving counties (Soleo, Sansum, Kedrod) for beneficial land applications, beneficial use of RCV (alternative daily cover) or composting. Calculation: Percentage of material disposed of to receiving county that meets beneficial use requirements for land, divided by total material disposed of to receiving county, multiplied by 100.</td>
<td>Data: 100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Data: 100%</td>
<td>ANALYSIS: SFPUC has succeeded in continuously delivering 100% of its sewage sludge to beneficial reuse. Since FY2005-06, SFPUC has succeeded in continuously delivering 100% of its sewage sludge to beneficial reuse. Though SFPUC estimates this measure at 100% into the future, it will continue to track it as material to its core business and of interest to stakeholders. SFPUC sewage sludge goes either to composting or to land application as a beneficial reuse.</td>
<td>Data: 100%</td>
<td>Score: 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN10.1</td>
<td>Number of unauthorized discharges from the combined sewer system</td>
<td>Data Source/How/Calculation: Data from continuous monitoring system. Calculation: Divide unauthorized discharges reported to the EPA: Permit No. 13391678 by the total amount of wet and dry weather flows received at each facility.</td>
<td>Data: 330</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>67 days</td>
<td>Data: 2</td>
<td>ANALYSIS: SFPUC continues to perform above average with two consecutive years of no violations.</td>
<td>Data: 0 unauthorized discharges</td>
<td>Score: 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN10.2</td>
<td>Percent annual wet and dry weather flow treated before discharged per year (by level of quality)</td>
<td>Data Source/How/Calculation: Data from continuous monitoring system. Calculation: Divide quantity of wet and dry weather flows discharged from the collection system that have resulted from low impact development initiatives or surface drainage management plans, by total quantity of wet and dry weather flows discharged from the collection system.</td>
<td>Data: 87%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Data: 100%</td>
<td>ANALYSIS: SFPUC continues to lead standards and best practice with three consecutive years of no violations in combined sewer system discharges.</td>
<td>Data: 100%</td>
<td>Score: 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EN10.4   | Reduction in peak storm flows to the combined system due to low impact development initiatives and/or surface drainage management plans | Data Source: N/A | How: Enter estimated reductions in peak storm flows to combined system that have resulted from low impact development initiatives or surface drainage management plans. Calculation: Will Develop | Data: N/A | Data: N/A | Target is to have model developed by January 2014 | Data: SFPUC continues, through its GSP capital improvement program, to develop a hydraulics model to capture reduction of storm water reaching the collection system. | Data: Target is to have model developed by January 2014 | Score: 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | Appendix 1: Page 9 | Complete Urban Watershed Assessments by June 1, 2015.
|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
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### Objective 1
#### Exceeded energy efficiency and conservation

- **Energy use for municipal buildings**
  - FY2011-12 performance exceeded target.
  - Performance comparable to previous years.
  - The energy use for municipal buildings has decreased for the third year in a row and performance has improved both in terms of energy savings and collecting and reporting the data for the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Energy Benchmarking Report for San Francisco Municipal Buildings, published by SFPUC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>The energy use for municipal buildings has decreased for the third year in a row and performance has improved both in terms of energy savings and collecting and reporting the data for the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>FY2005-06 Baseline Data for calendar year (ending in December of associated Fiscal Year) or as reported in annual Energy Benchmarking Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: kBtu includes electricity, natural gas and steam in a single factor to express total energy use in standard units. While kWh and MWh are units only of electricity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
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### Objective 2
#### Increased energy efficiency and conservation

- **Energy use for SFPUC streetlight (in kWh)**
  - FY2012-13 total 346,540 therms
  - FY2011-12 total 346,540 therms
  - FY2010-11 total 346,540 therms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Energy Benchmarking Report for San Francisco Municipal Buildings, published by SFPUC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>The energy use for municipal buildings has decreased for the third year in a row and performance has improved both in terms of energy savings and collecting and reporting the data for the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>FY2005-06 Baseline Data for calendar year (ending in December of associated Fiscal Year) or as reported in annual Energy Benchmarking Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: kBtu includes electricity, natural gas and steam in a single factor to express total energy use in standard units. While kWh and MWh are units only of electricity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
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### Objective 3
#### Increased energy efficiency and conservation

- **Energy use for SFPUC streetlight (in kWh)**
  - FY2012-13 total 346,540 therms
  - FY2011-12 total 346,540 therms
  - FY2010-11 total 346,540 therms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Energy Benchmarking Report for San Francisco Municipal Buildings, published by SFPUC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>The energy use for municipal buildings has decreased for the third year in a row and performance has improved both in terms of energy savings and collecting and reporting the data for the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>FY2005-06 Baseline Data for calendar year (ending in December of associated Fiscal Year) or as reported in annual Energy Benchmarking Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: kBtu includes electricity, natural gas and steam in a single factor to express total energy use in standard units. While kWh and MWh are units only of electricity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
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### Objective 4
#### Increased energy efficiency and conservation

- **Energy use for SFPUC streetlight (in kWh)**
  - FY2012-13 total 346,540 therms
  - FY2011-12 total 346,540 therms
  - FY2010-11 total 346,540 therms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Energy Benchmarking Report for San Francisco Municipal Buildings, published by SFPUC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>The energy use for municipal buildings has decreased for the third year in a row and performance has improved both in terms of energy savings and collecting and reporting the data for the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>FY2005-06 Baseline Data for calendar year (ending in December of associated Fiscal Year) or as reported in annual Energy Benchmarking Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: kBtu includes electricity, natural gas and steam in a single factor to express total energy use in standard units. While kWh and MWh are units only of electricity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
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### Objective 5
#### Increased energy efficiency and conservation

- **Energy use for SFPUC streetlight (in kWh)**
  - FY2012-13 total 346,540 therms
  - FY2011-12 total 346,540 therms
  - FY2010-11 total 346,540 therms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Energy Benchmarking Report for San Francisco Municipal Buildings, published by SFPUC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>The energy use for municipal buildings has decreased for the third year in a row and performance has improved both in terms of energy savings and collecting and reporting the data for the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>FY2005-06 Baseline Data for calendar year (ending in December of associated Fiscal Year) or as reported in annual Energy Benchmarking Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: kBtu includes electricity, natural gas and steam in a single factor to express total energy use in standard units. While kWh and MWh are units only of electricity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
**Percent of electricity supplied from GHG-free emissions or renewable sources**

**a. Percent of electricity supplied to retail and municipal customers that is GHG-free or renewable as shown on the SFPUC’s power content label**

- **Note:** We report both CEC Power Content Label figures (which total supplies and total sales) and SFPUC’s internal report used to prepare the SFPUC DepCAP report as submitted to the California Energy Commission (or its equivalent). We continue to report it according to Industry Standards and National Guidelines as material to SFPUC sustainability performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders.

- **ANALYSIS for both a. and b.:**
  - Identify opportunities for direct and indirect GHG reductions; implement where cost effective and feasible.
  - Identify opportunities for GHG reductions; implement where most cost effective and feasible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</th>
<th>Technical Description</th>
<th>Data Source, how calculated, and calculation for the FY2012-13 total</th>
<th>FY2008-09 Data (No Score)</th>
<th>FY2010-11 Data, Analyze and Score</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Data, Analyze and Score</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Target</th>
<th>CURRENT REPORT YEAR</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Target</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><strong>GHG emissions for electricity and natural gas consumption</strong></td>
<td>GHG emissions for electricity and natural gas consumption: 13,775 tons (A)</td>
<td>GHG emissions for electricity and natural gas consumption: 19,975 tons (B)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Corrected as follows in 12/2012: 15,132 metric tons (A2) = electricity and natural gas consumption (as published 12/2011) and includes Treasure Island natural gas consumption.</td>
<td>Corrected as follows in 12/2012: 20,191 metric tons (B2) = electricity and natural gas consumption (as published 12/2011) and includes Treasure Island natural gas consumption.</td>
<td>15,132 metric tons (A2)</td>
<td><strong>Total greenhouse gas emissions for all the significant sources:</strong></td>
<td>20,191 metric tons (B2)</td>
<td><strong>Total greenhouse gas emissions for all the significant sources:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><strong>GHG emissions for fleet fuel consumption</strong></td>
<td>GHG emissions for fleet fuel consumption: 1,126 metric tons (A)</td>
<td>GHG emissions for fleet fuel consumption: 2,070 metric tons (B)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Corrected as follows in 12/2012: 1,126 metric tons (A2) = electricity and natural gas consumption (as published 12/2011) and includes Treasure Island natural gas consumption.</td>
<td>Corrected as follows in 12/2012: 2,070 metric tons (B2) = electricity and natural gas consumption (as published 12/2011) and includes Treasure Island natural gas consumption.</td>
<td>1,126 metric tons (A2)</td>
<td>2,070 metric tons (B2)</td>
<td>1,989 metric tons (A2)</td>
<td>2,079 metric tons (B2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent of electricity supplied to retail and municipal customers that is GHG-free and/or renewable**

- **Note:** The SFPUC Power Content Label includes SFPUC’s GHG reductions and the SFPUC Power Content Label now includes retail supplies and retail sales. While the SFPUC continues to make progress in bringing its electricity emissions to zero and in lessening its emissions from its fleet fuel consumption, we continue to report it according to Industry Standards and National Guidelines as material to SFPUC sustainability performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders.

- **ANALYSIS:**
  - Identify opportunities for direct and indirect GHG reductions; implement where cost effective and feasible.
  - Identify opportunities for GHG reductions; implement where cost effective and feasible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</th>
<th>Technical Description</th>
<th>Data Source, how calculated, and calculation for the FY2012-13 total</th>
<th>FY2008-09 Data (No Score)</th>
<th>FY2010-11 Data, Analyze and Score</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Data, Analyze and Score</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Target</th>
<th>CURRENT REPORT YEAR</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Target</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Percent of electricity supplied to retail and municipal customers that is GHG-free and/or renewable as shown on the SFPUC’s power content label</td>
<td>SFPUC will undertake analyses to set annual targets when and if it is able to provide 1990 baseline levels (specific to the SFPUC)</td>
<td>SFPUC will undertake analyses to set annual targets when and if it is able to provide 1990 baseline levels (specific to the SFPUC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,079 metric tons (B2)</td>
<td>2,079 metric tons (B2)</td>
<td>2,079 metric tons (B2)</td>
<td><strong>Total greenhouse gas emissions for all the significant sources:</strong></td>
<td>2,079 metric tons (B2)</td>
<td>2,079 metric tons (B2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electricity market purchases vary according to wet or dry years and are contingent on operations. As a result, the major market purchases and their environmental attributes are offset by market sales over the course of a year.**

**NO SCORE:**

**ANALYSIS:**

- Though SFPUC continues to make progress in bringing its electricity emissions to zero and in lessening its emissions from its fleet fuel consumption, we continue to report it according to Industry Standards and National Guidelines as material to SFPUC sustainability performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders.

- **Identify opportunities for direct and indirect GHG reductions; implement where cost effective and feasible.**
- **Identify opportunities for GHG reductions; implement where cost effective and feasible.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</th>
<th>Technical Description</th>
<th>Data Source, how calculated, and calculation for the FY2012-13 total</th>
<th>FY2008-09 Data (No Score)</th>
<th>FY2010-11 Data, Analyze and Score</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Data, Analyze and Score</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Target</th>
<th>CURRENT REPORT YEAR</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Target</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><strong>32% power supplied from renewable/emissions-free sources</strong></td>
<td>Total supply (renewable) = 1,074,623 MWh; solar = 7,412 MWh</td>
<td>Total supply (renewable) = 1,074,623 MWh; solar = 7,412 MWh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) footprint as a City Agency/Department.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) footprint as a City Agency/Department.</strong></td>
<td>1,074,623 MWh</td>
<td>1,074,623 MWh</td>
<td>1,074,623 MWh</td>
<td>1,074,623 MWh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><strong>99.73% power supplied from renewable/emissions-free sources</strong></td>
<td>Total supply (renewable) = 1,074,623 MWh; solar = 7,412 MWh</td>
<td>Total supply (renewable) = 1,074,623 MWh; solar = 7,412 MWh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>NO SCORE:</strong> This indicator is no longer scored and analyzed.</td>
<td><strong>NO SCORE:</strong> This indicator is no longer scored and analyzed.</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
<td><strong>Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) footprint as a City Agency/Department.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) footprint as a City Agency/Department.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) footprint as a City Agency/Department.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electricity market purchases vary according to wet or dry years and are contingent on operations.**

**NO SCORE:**

**ANALYSIS:**

- Though SFPUC continues to make progress in bringing its electricity emissions to zero and in lessening its emissions from its fleet fuel consumption, we continue to report it according to Industry Standards and National Guidelines as material to SFPUC sustainability performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders.

- **Identify opportunities for direct and indirect GHG reductions; implement where cost effective and feasible.**
- **Identify opportunities for GHG reductions; implement where cost effective and feasible.**
### Nox, Sox air emissions by source:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Waste</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2010-11</td>
<td>0.14 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.14 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.14 MWh/MG treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011-12</td>
<td>0.16 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.16 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.16 MWh/MG treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012-13</td>
<td>0.17 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.17 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.17 MWh/MG treated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Waste</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2010-11</td>
<td>0.14 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.14 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.14 MWh/MG treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011-12</td>
<td>0.16 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.16 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.16 MWh/MG treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012-13</td>
<td>0.17 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.17 MWh/MG treated</td>
<td>0.17 MWh/MG treated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Energy intensity (EI) total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN17.1</td>
<td>MWh used divided by MG treated = EI</td>
<td>See attached spreadsheet for source data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Energy intensity (EI) by source:

- **Regional Water System (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 2.16 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 2.14 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 2.1 MWh/MG treated

- **In-City Retail (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 0.34 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 0.35 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 0.39 MWh/MG treated

- **Wastewater (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 0.51 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 0.45 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 0.49 MWh/MG treated

### Energy intensity (EI) by source (continued):

- **Regional Water System (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 2.16 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 2.14 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 2.1 MWh/MG treated

- **In-City Retail (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 0.34 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 0.35 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 0.39 MWh/MG treated

- **Wastewater (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 0.51 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 0.45 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 0.49 MWh/MG treated

### Energy intensity (EI) by source (continued):

- **Regional Water System (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 2.16 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 2.14 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 2.1 MWh/MG treated

- **In-City Retail (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 0.34 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 0.35 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 0.39 MWh/MG treated

- **Wastewater (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 0.51 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 0.45 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 0.49 MWh/MG treated

### Energy intensity (EI) by source (continued):

- **Regional Water System (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 2.16 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 2.14 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 2.1 MWh/MG treated

- **In-City Retail (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 0.34 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 0.35 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 0.39 MWh/MG treated

- **Wastewater (water):**
  - FY2010-11: 0.51 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2011-12: 0.45 MWh/MG treated
  - FY2012-13: 0.49 MWh/MG treated
### EN19.2: Reduce SFPUC in-house environmental impacts

#### a. Bio solids from landfill excluding in San Francisco

- **Objective:** Divert 78% of SFPUC's waste in San Francisco, including compost, from landfill (excluding bio-solids).
- **FY2011-12 Total Recyling and Compost Collected:** 1,353,651 lbs. Total Waste Diverted: 1,353,651 lbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bio solids from landfill excluding in San Francisco</td>
<td>1,353,651 lbs.</td>
<td>1,353,651 lbs.</td>
<td>1,353,651 lbs.</td>
<td>1,353,651 lbs.</td>
<td>Diverted from landfill (excluding bio-solids)</td>
<td>SCORE: 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:**
- **FY2011-12:** SFPUC exceeded its FY2011-12 target and is comparable to the City total in progress toward zero waste by 2020. This trend continues to be admirable.

**Future/Score:**
- **FY2012:** The SFPUC is working to improve and make its performance metrics for this measure more accurate, consistent and reliable.

**No Score** for FY2012-13:

**Reason:**
- **Probable Reason:** No data available for FY2012-13.

**Future Score:**
- **FY2013-14:** Improved metrics and reliable calculation for this measure as new baseline for "0" target by 2020.

---

**Note:** Calculation is best accomplished in collaboration with SFES and waste hauler and/or through waste audit. Calculation should try to get data for 2-3 largest offices occupied by SFPUC staff.

---

**Excel Tool:** Used to calculate the amount of recycling, compost, and waste collected by weight based on the size of containers/dumpsters. Calculation assumes containers/dumpsters are full when emptied. This is the process recommended by SFES.

**Calculation:** FY2011-12 Total Recycling and Compost Collected - 1,353,651 lbs. Total Waste Diverted - 1,353,651 lbs. 

**Data Source:** Recycling Billings. Division for all-in-City Recycling accounts includes non-office waste but does not include bio-solids volume.

**How:** Excel Tool is used to calculate the amount of recycling, compost, and waste collected by weight based on the size of containers/dumpsters. Calculation assumes containers/dumpsters are full when emptied. This is the process recommended by SFES.

**Reason:** For FY2011-12, an average of 76% of SFPUC's waste in San Francisco was being diverted from landfill (excluding bio-solids). These results appeared to make SFPUC comparable to the City as a whole in our progress toward zero waste by 2020. This trend continues to be admirable.

**ANALYSIS:** The SFPUC continues its leadership in advancing IT energy reductions while meeting all federal, state and local requirements, standards and best practice for desk and laptop computers.

**Score:** 5

**Future Score:**
- **FY2013-14:** Improved metrics and reliable calculation for this measure as new baseline for "0" target by 2020.
### Objective

**a. Water**
- **Percent of current service level of service (LOS) goal, if available**
  - No data available for FY2010-11.
  - SPFUC Power Utility services currently have staff on call and ready to respond to electric outages and emergencies on a 7 days per week basis.
- **Performance on items 1 and 2**
  - SPFUC did not meet its FY2012-13 LOS sewer targets, i.e. the number of odor complaints increased by 11 violations and the number of miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned was 20 miles less than targeted. Performance is considered comparable to light of overall increases and capital improvements being initiated through the SSIP.
- **SCORE:** 3

**b. Wastewater**
- **Level of Service Goals for Wastewater**
  - 1) Verified number of odor complaints from neighbors adjacent to operating facilities (SEP, Oceanside, Channel Pump Station)
  - 2) Miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned
  - 3) Verified number of odor complaints from neighbors adjacent to operating facilities (SEP, Oceanside, Channel Pump Station)
  - 4) Miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned
  - 5) 12 odor complaints
  - 6) 122 miles
  - **Target not yet defined**

**c. Power**
- **Level of Service Goals for Power**
  - 1) Verified number of odor complaints from neighbors adjacent to operating facilities (SEP, Oceanside, Channel Pump Station)
  - 2) The number of sewer lines cleaned and inspected
  - 3) Verified number of odor complaints from neighbors adjacent to operating facilities (SEP, Oceanside, Channel Pump Station)
  - 4) Miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned
  - 5) 1 odor complaint
  - 6) 112 miles
  - **Target not yet defined**

### Calculation

**a. Water**
- **Total number of sewer lines inspected and cleaned**
- **Data Source:** WSP Projects, "Appendix K: Impacts on Level of Service (LOS) Goal" from June 2012 Revised WSP
- **How:** Estimated % completion as ability to meet LOS goals
- **Report an ability to meet the following:**
  - 1) Percent of deliveries met in drought years (water supply)
  - 2) Percent of deliveries met after seismic events after 24 hrs.
  - 3) Percent of deliveries met after planned and unplanned outages (reliability/maintenance)
  - 4) Provide percent of FY services meeting long term LOS goal and multiply by 100
- **Data Source:** FY2012-13 Data, Analysis and Score
- **Analysis:**
  - SPFUC did not meet its FY2012-13 LOS sewer targets, i.e. the number of odor complaints increased by 11 violations and the number of miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned was 20 miles less than targeted. Performance is considered comparable to light of overall increases and capital improvements being initiated through the SSIP.

**b. Wastewater**
- **Total number of odor complaints verified**
- **Data Source:** TBD
- **How:** TBD
- **Calculation:** TBD

**c. Power**
- No data available for FY2010-11.
- **Will serve as baseline.**

### Objective

**a. Water**
- **Percent of deliveries met in drought years (water supply)**
  - SFPUC is not currently able to meet our LOS goal of 265 mgd with no more than 20% rationing during dry years; however given depressed demand we are able to meet dry year needs with no more than 20% rationing, and we are working to secure additional water sources.
- **Score:** 3

**b. Wastewater**
- **Percent of deliveries met after seismic events after 24 hrs. and 30 days (seismic)**
  - SPFUC is 50% closer to the LOS goal in FY2011-12, due to ongoing infrastructure improvements (WSIP)
  - SPFUC is 60% closer to the LOS goals in FY2011-12, due to ongoing infrastructure improvements (WSIP)
  - **WSP capital improvements are underway to meet 100% in all cases by 2016.**
  - **Score:** 3

**c. Power**
- **Total number of miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned**
  - **Target not yet defined**
  - SPFUC Power Utility services have staff on call and ready to respond to electric outages and emergencies on a 7 days per week basis.

### Objective

**a. Water**
- **Percent of deliveries met after seismic events after 24 hrs. and 30 days (seismic)**
  - 1) SFPUC is not currently able to meet our LOS goal of 265 mgd with no more than 20% rationing during dry years; however given depressed demand we are able to meet dry year needs with no more than 20% rationing, and we are working to secure additional water sources.
  - 2) SPFUC did not meet its FY2012-13 LOS sewer targets, i.e. the number of odor complaints increased by 11 violations and the number of miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned was 20 miles less than targeted. Performance is considered comparable to light of overall increases and capital improvements being initiated through the SSIP.

### Analysis

**Overall:** SPFUC did not meet its FY2012-13 LOS sewer targets, i.e. the number of odor complaints increased by 11 violations and the number of miles of sewer lines inspected and cleaned was 20 miles less than targeted. Performance is considered comparable to light of overall increases and capital improvements being initiated through the SSIP.
|----------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------
| *GM1.2*  | Quantify compliance with regulatory requirements  
| a. Incidents of, and fines or non-monetary sanctions for non-compliance with applicable laws and regulations  
| b. Drinking water quality compliance rate (percent days in full compliance with drinking water standards)  
| c. Incidents of, and fines or non-monetary sanctions for non-compliance with applicable laws and regulations  
| d. Only regulatory permits considered:  
| 1) Water: 2 NPDES violations  
| 2) Wastewater: 0 violations  
| 3) Power: 0 violations  
| 4) Only regulatory permits considered:  
| a. SFPUC incidents or fines:  
| b. Data:  
| c. FY2012-13 Data, Analysis, and Score:  
| d. FY2013-14 Target:  
| e. FY2014-15 Target:  
| **Governance & Management** | **Key Performance Indicator (KPI)** | **Technical Description:** Data source, how calculated, and calculation for the FY2012-13 total | **FY2012-13 Data, Analysis and Score** | **FY2012-13 Target** | **CURRENT REPORT YEAR:** | **FY2013-14 Target** | **FY2014-15 Target** |
### MOU for Auxiliary Water Supply

1) **18 completed audits.**
- **N/A**
- **N/A**

2) **100% of audits completed audits.**
- **6 months: 44**
- **12 months: 11**
- **18 months: 13**

3) **No significant findings for implementation within 12 months.**
- **None not implemented**

4) **No target**
- **None not implemented**

#### Performance Objectives

1) **Draft agreement is in review to complete MOU with SF Fire Dept. for AWSS operations and maintenance.**
2) **Port reconceptualizing options given new development plans for port property.**
3) **Draft agreement for revised MOU with SF Rec and Park Dept. for management of Lake Merced and surrounding lands is in review by respective Department for review; Project Manager handled through AWSS general fund bond for system expansion and renewal.**
4) **Completed review of design specifications and provision of information for City Build new headquarters.**
5) **Negotiations to develop MOU regarding water transfers with the District have broken off due to lack of agreement.**

**Analysis:**
- Of the five target partnerships, three are ongoing, one completed its work and one has broken off.
- SFPUC continues to foster new partnerships and make continuous improvement in this regard.

**No Score:**
This is an indicator for which performance is primarily descriptive and variable. Though it is not scored, national guidelines recommend reporting the data as material to SFPUC performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders.

---

### SFPUC Credit Rating for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GM1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Management is held accountable for project and plan execution performance through audits and performance reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source:</strong> Quarterly Audit &amp; Performance Review, used as a source for the file in #2 below.</td>
<td><strong>Calculation:</strong> No specific calculations involved. File is a running tally of the audits &amp; individual audit recommendations. #s reported for this KPI are tally totals.</td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Recommendations identified and which were treated by management are either not feasible or not cost effective to implement, have not been included in this metric for implemented findings. Also, partially implemented findings have been treated as non-scored. Though it is not scored, national guidelines recommend reporting the data as material to SFPUC performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders.

**Score:**
4

**ANALYSIS:**
- The number of audits completed has increased over the past year but with an increase in findings not implemented. However the time taken for findings implemented has decreased, with the majority being done in the first 6 months. SFPUC’s Annual Audit Program continues to lead best practice in the City & County.

**Notes:**
- Findings/recommendations identified and which were treated by management are either not feasible or not cost effective to implement, have not been included in this metric for implemented findings. Also, partially implemented findings have been treated as non-scored.

**Score:**
4

**ANALYSIS:**
- SFPUC meets its FY2012-13 credit rating target with performance comparable to last year.

**Notes:**
- Findings/recommendations identified and which were treated by management are either not feasible or not cost effective to implement, have not been included in this metric for implemented findings. Also, partially implemented findings have been treated as non-scored.

**Score:**
4

**ANALYSIS:**
- SFPUC Water met its FY2012-13 credit rating target with performance comparable to last year.

---

### SFPUC Index of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GM2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credit rating for: GM1.4 - Audit &amp; Recommendation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source:</strong> SFPUC Official Statement</td>
<td><strong>Calculation:</strong> By Standard &amp; Poor's (S&amp;P) and Moody's. Though this year's Moody's rating dropped slightly and did not meet its target, it held its S&amp;P rating and remains strong in investment grade. Water can continue to be comparable to peers, varying a notch higher or lower over time.</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> S&amp;P: AA; Moody's: Aa3</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> S&amp;P: AA; Moody's: Aa3</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> S&amp;P: AA; Moody's: Aa3</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> S&amp;P: AA; Moody's: Aa3</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> S&amp;P: AA; Moody's: Aa3</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> S&amp;P: AA; Moody's: Aa3</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> S&amp;P: AA; Moody's: Aa3</td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> S&amp;P: AA; Moody's: Aa3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:**
Through this year’s Moody’s rating dropped slightly and did not meet its target, it held its S&P rating and remains strong in investment grade. Water can continue to be comparable to peers, varying a notch higher or lower over time.

**Score:**
4

**ANALYSIS:**
- SFPUC Water met its FY2012-13 credit rating target with performance comparable to last year.

**Notes:**
- Findings/recommendations identified and which were treated by management are either not feasible or not cost effective to implement, have not been included in this metric for implemented findings. Also, partially implemented findings have been treated as non-scored. Only findings fully implemented are included as implemented.

**Score:**
4

**ANALYSIS:**
- SFPUC Water met its FY2012-13 credit rating target with performance comparable to last year.

**Notes:**
- Findings/recommendations identified and which were treated by management are either not feasible or not cost effective to implement, have not been included in this metric for implemented findings. Also, partially implemented findings have been treated as non-scored. Only findings fully implemented are included as implemented.

**Score:**
4

**ANALYSIS:**
- SFPUC Water met its FY2012-13 credit rating target with performance comparable to last year.

**Notes:**
- Findings/recommendations identified and which were treated by management are either not feasible or not cost effective to implement, have not been included in this metric for implemented findings. Also, partially implemented findings have been treated as non-scored. Only findings fully implemented are included as implemented.

**Score:**
4

**ANALYSIS:**
- SFPUC Water met its FY2012-13 credit rating target with performance comparable to last year.

**Notes:**
- Findings/recommendations identified and which were treated by management are either not feasible or not cost effective to implement, have not been included in this metric for implemented findings. Also, partially implemented findings have been treated as non-scored. Only findings fully implemented are included as implemented.

**Score:**
4

**ANALYSIS:**
- SFPUC Water met its FY2012-13 credit rating target with performance comparable to last year.

---
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### Appendix 1: Objectives

#### GiM3-2 Operating cost coverage ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFPUC Performance: Strategic Sustainability Annual Report FY2012-13</td>
<td>Strengthen financial performance</td>
<td>Operating cost coverage ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source:** 10-Yr Financial Plan

**How:** Total Operating Revenue and Total Operating Expenses are both documented in the Water Enterprise’s 10-Yr Financial Plan

**Calculation:** Total annual operating revenues divided by total annual operating costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Water:</th>
<th>Wastewater:</th>
<th>Power:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2012-13</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013-14</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014-15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** N/A

### GiM3-3 Enterprise Operating Fund Balance is sufficient to comply with fund balance reserve policy

**Data Source:** 10-Yr Financial Plan

**How:** Calculation: Ending Fund Balance (Operating Fund Balance for the following year) divided by the Total Gross Revenues; Ending Fund Balance divided by the Total Expenditures

**Calculation:** Total annual operating revenues divided by total annual operating costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Water:</th>
<th>Wastewater:</th>
<th>Power:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2012-13</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013-14</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014-15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** N/A
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#### 1. Professional Services within 45 days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Professional Services within 45 days</td>
<td>Analysis: For professional service contracts, SFPUC met its FY2012-13 target for percent of completion from Commission award to certification of components within 45 days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Construction Contracts within 60 days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Construction Contracts within 60 days</td>
<td>Calculation: Number of construction contracts processed within 60 days from contract award to contract certification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Professional Services within 45 days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Professional Services within 45 days</td>
<td>Calculation: Total number of professional services contracts processed within 45 days from contract award to contract certification = 26 &amp; Total number of professional services contracts processed = 46; Therefore, (26/46)*100 = 56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Percent of completion within 60 days from Commission Award to Certification of components of construction contracts that are within SFPUC control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Percent of professional service firms active each year for which post-project quality and satisfaction reviews have been performed</td>
<td>Calculation: Total number of professional services contracts processed within 45 days from contract award to contract certification = 26 &amp; Total number of professional services contracts processed = 46; Therefore, (26/46)*100 = 56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Percent of professional service firms for which post-project quality and satisfaction reviews have been performed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Percent of professional service firms for which post-project quality and satisfaction reviews have been performed</td>
<td>Calculation: Total number of professional services contracts processed within 45 days from contract award to contract certification = 26 &amp; Total number of professional services contracts processed = 46; Therefore, (26/46)*100 = 56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Percent improvement in contracting procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>Percent improvement in contracting procedures</td>
<td>Analysis: Though a target of 70% (overall and at the finish of the WSIP) was set in FY 2010-11, there has been no improvement this year because none of the WSIP contracts come to an end of term, and none have been performed for other Programs. SFPUC has set a target of 75% for FY 2012-13 and 100% for FY 2013-14, and is preparing to show continuous improvement on this indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Optimize relevant technological innovations</td>
<td>GM4.1</td>
<td>Number of innovative and/or pilot projects using new technology that target the Objective and improve quality of services</td>
<td>At the direction of the OAA, staff are studying the feasibility of using tidal power, thin-film solar cells and defined to expand our energy efficiency. Development project and water conservation group looking at new technologies. The new SFPUC building at 25 Golden Gate is being designed to incorporate cutting-edge green technologies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### V. Optimize planning to meet water, wastewater, and power demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Indicator (KPI)</th>
<th>Key Performance Score</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Data, Analysis and Score</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Target</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Water</td>
<td>1. Water: Adoption of the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan</td>
<td>Data Source: Conversation</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Data Source: FY2005-06 Baseline Data</td>
<td>Score: 3</td>
<td>FY2012-13 Target</td>
<td>FY2013-14 Target</td>
<td>FY2014-15 Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

**Recommendation 4 (community-scale energy initiatives):**
- Water helps implement power's Energy Efficiency Plan (EEP).
- Power continues to plan for the long term, with example actions comparable to prior years.

**Wastewater:***
- Water continues to plan for long term with example actions.

**Power:**
- Power has begun outlining next steps for various recommendations within the ERP including a comprehensive outline and schedule for Recommendation 3 that has been sent to the Commission. Power is moving forward with identifying pilot project and site locations, and is working with other sister agencies to implement Recommendation 4 (community-scale energy systems).

**ANALYSIS:**
- Water continues to make progress in planning for the long term and in projects and actions to reach its WSIP LOS goals.
- Wastewater continues to plan for the long term, comparable to prior years.

**SCORE:**
- Water: 3
- Wastewater: 3
- Power: 3

**ANALYSIS:**
- Water: SSIP long term and TBL planning in progress.
- Wastewater: Implementation of Water System Improvement Program to benchmark our long term water supply needs.
- Power: The Water Enterprise utilizes the Level of Service Goals established through the Water System Improvement Program to benchmark our long term water supply needs.

**WORKING ON REGULATIONS WITH DPH AND DPW**
- Water: Watershed managers began working with other sister agencies to implement power's recommendations, including developing new state regulations with DPH and DPW.

**Recommendation 5 (community-scale energy initiatives):**
- Power continues to implement the 14 recommendations, and will provide another update to the Commission on the status of each of the recommendations.

**ANALYSIS:**
- Water: Water Enterprise will continue to implement the 14 recommendations, and will provide another update to the Commission on the status of each of the recommendations.
- Wastewater: Implement the 14 recommendations, and will provide another update to the Commission on the status of each of the recommendations.
- Power: Implement the 14 recommendations, and will provide another update to the Commission on the status of each of the recommendations.

**SCORE:**
- Water: 4
- Wastewater: 4
- Power: 4
V. Optimize planning to meet water, wastewater, and power demand

a. Water

Data Source: Descriptive
How: Discussion
Calculation: N/A

Study on climate change impacts to water supply identified impacts within the range of current variability through the year 2050. SFPUC continues to integrate adaptive strategies into SSIP project designs.

DATA: Completed calibration of hydrologic model HFAW that can calculate the effect of climate change on the Hetch Hetchy reservoir and stream flow. Studies have revealed leadership with the Water Utility Climate Alliance (CUWA), www.wss caucus.org, learning from climate scientists, agency leaders, and water management colleagues with expertise on climate assessment and adaptation. As part of WUCA work helped enable a climate change assessment national pilot project (Piloting Utility Modeling Applications for Climate Change, or PUMA), developed scope of work as part of PUMA to use climate model output, observational data, and paleoclimate records (along with the HFAW tool) to evaluate potential changes in water supply. Goal is to launch the project in FY2011-12.

SCORE: 4

b. Wastewater

Data Source: WWF: Planning & Regulatory Compliance Division Manager
How/Calculation: Describe efforts to identify climate change risks and to develop adaptation measures

Redevelopment project plans incorporate agreed on long term strategies such as future pumping, outfall check valves, levees or other measures to address at least 10" of sea level rise or greater by 2050. Long term targets:
1) Ensure SSD and larger redevelopment projects integrate sea level rise adaptive strategies to address at least 16" of sea level rise or greater by 2050. 2) Address adaptive strategies to address sea level rise projections over the next 100 years.

DATA: Completed calibration of hydrologic model HFAW, conducted sensitivity analysis of the effect of various climate change scenarios on stream flow above Hetch Hetchy, and issued subsequent report. The report, entitled "Sensitivity of Upper Tuolumne River Flow to Climate Change Scenarios" was finalized and released in January 2012. At the January 26, 2012 Commission meeting, the Commission received a written and oral summary of report of findings as well. Substantially developed scope of work for a comprehensive assessment of the potential effects of climate change on water supply, and are targeting the scope to be completed and work initiated in FY2012-13. Continue our collaboration and leadership with the Water Utility Climate Alliance (CUWA) for long term sector cooperation on needed research and adaptive strategies.

ANALYSIS (for all of GM 4.3c)
SFPUC continues its leadership working toward more effective adaptations related to Climate Change, including setting strategic and programmatic targets for improvements, assessing climate change related risks, and initiating adaptation and mitigation measures to protect current and future generations.

SCORE: 4

C. Power

Data Source/How/Calculation: Qualitative

No specific risks identified nor targets set but covered through SFPUC-wide assessments.

Building off SFPUC-wide assessments, identify climate change risks and analyze and develop adaptation measures specific to Power.

DATA: The comprehensive assessment identified in line a) above is ongoing.

ANALYSIS (for all of GM 4.3b-e)
SFPUC continues its leadership working toward more effective adaptations related to Climate Change, including setting strategic and programmatic targets for improvements, assessing and addressing climate change related risks, initiating adaptation and mitigation measures.

SCORE: 4
Objectives

1. Continue program and budget support/efforts for independent 3rd party assurance of SFPUC-wide SSPTBL data/ performance reporting

2. Sustainability Reporting Assurance:
   - DATA: Though the Controller audited its subset of the SSP KPIs for SFPUC FY2012-13 performance reporting, there was no audit for an overall third party assurance of our performance report (SSP since 2011).
   - ANALYSIS: Though the Controller has audited a subset of SSP KPIs for data accuracy/reliability, sustainability performance evaluation, reporting standards and best practice emphasize the need for periodic expert 3rd party assurance against certain sustainability reporting criteria. Thus, scoring remains comparable to previous years.

3. Advance SFPUC-wide Strategic Sustainability Performance (SSPTBL) and annual performance reporting
   - a. Report annually on triple bottom line performance, strategic performance trends for strategic planning, management, and budgeting
   - b. Conduct periodic report that party assurance of SSPTBL annual performance and report to ensure accuracy and adherence to GRI, Accountability, AWWA, and relevant sustainability reporting standards

4. Advance SFPUC-wide Strategic Sustainability Performance (SSPTBL) and annual performance reporting
   - a. Report annually on triple bottom line performance, strategic performance trends for strategic planning, management, and budgeting
   - b. Conduct periodic report that party assurance of SSPTBL annual performance and report to ensure accuracy and adherence to GRI, Accountability, AWWA, and relevant sustainability reporting standards

5. Sustainability Reporting Assurance:
   - DATA: Though the Controller audited its subset of the SSP KPIs for SFPUC FY2012-13 performance reporting, there was no audit for an overall third party assurance of our performance report (SSP since 2011).
   - ANALYSIS: Though the Controller has audited a subset of SSP KPIs for data accuracy/reliability, sustainability performance evaluation, reporting standards and best practice emphasize the need for periodic expert 3rd party assurance against certain sustainability reporting criteria. Thus, scoring remains comparable to previous years.

6. First year reporting of annual performance data and sustainability metrics in accordance with GRI
   - a. Calculations: Plunge into evaluating and scoring SSP FY2010-11 performance reports. However, because it continues without an electronic database embedding its framework and metrics into other internal and City Controller program and data control, use and reporting
   - b. Sustainability Reporting Assurance:

7. Complete integrated implementation w SSPTBL 2013
   - a. Calculations: As part of 2005 Efficiency Plan, SFPUC established a range of performance measures, goals, targets and standards against which it tracks its performance. Some measures useful for organization-wide performance management, but others too focused on inputs, rather than outcomes. New measures are department-wide.

8. Complete integrated implementation w SSPTBL 2013
   - a. Calculations: As part of 2005 Efficiency Plan, SFPUC established a range of performance measures, goals, targets and standards against which it tracks its performance. Some measures useful for organization-wide performance management, but others too focused on inputs, rather than outcomes. New measures are department-wide.

9. Complete integrated implementation w SSPTBL 2013
   - a. Calculations: As part of 2005 Efficiency Plan, SFPUC established a range of performance measures, goals, targets and standards against which it tracks its performance. Some measures useful for organization-wide performance management, but others too focused on inputs, rather than outcomes. New measures are department-wide.

10. Complete integrated implementation w SSPTBL 2013
   - a. Calculations: As part of 2005 Efficiency Plan, SFPUC established a range of performance measures, goals, targets and standards against which it tracks its performance. Some measures useful for organization-wide performance management, but others too focused on inputs, rather than outcomes. New measures are department-wide.

11. Complete integrated implementation w SSPTBL 2013
   - a. Calculations: As part of 2005 Efficiency Plan, SFPUC established a range of performance measures, goals, targets and standards against which it tracks its performance. Some measures useful for organization-wide performance management, but others too focused on inputs, rather than outcomes. New measures are department-wide.

12. Continue efforts for future independent 3rd party assurance of SFPUC-wide SSPTBL performance reporting
   - a. Calculations: Since the expert 3rd party consultant on SFPUC’s 2009 and 2011 plans, the SSP performance reporting had no independent review or assurance due to budget limitations and executive leadership concerns regarding assurance utility.
   - ANALYSIS: SSP FY2010-11 Performance Report is not verified by a third party and due to continuing budget constraints, there is no capacity/ budget in place for a future performance report audit/assurance. However, staff continues to engage in the ongoing research and practice necessary to maintain, update and apply the rigor of its KPIs, standards and framework foundation for best practice SSP performance reporting.

13. Continue efforts for future independent 3rd party assurance of SFPUC-wide SSPTBL performance reporting
   - a. Calculations: Since the expert 3rd party consultant on SFPUC’s 2009 and 2011 plans, the SSP performance reporting had no independent review or assurance due to budget limitations and executive leadership concerns regarding assurance utility.
   - ANALYSIS: SSP FY2010-11 Performance Report is not verified by a third party and due to continuing budget constraints, there is no capacity/ budget in place for a future performance report audit/assurance. However, staff continues to engage in the ongoing research and practice necessary to maintain, update and apply the rigor of its KPIs, standards and framework foundation for best practice SSP performance reporting.

14. Continue efforts for future independent 3rd party assurance of SFPUC-wide SSPTBL performance reporting
   - a. Calculations: Since the expert 3rd party consultant on SFPUC’s 2009 and 2011 plans, the SSP performance reporting had no independent review or assurance due to budget limitations and executive leadership concerns regarding assurance utility.
   - ANALYSIS: SSP FY2010-11 Performance Report is not verified by a third party and due to continuing budget constraints, there is no capacity/ budget in place for a future performance report audit/assurance. However, staff continues to engage in the ongoing research and practice necessary to maintain, update and apply the rigor of its KPIs, standards and framework foundation for best practice SSP performance reporting.

15. Continue efforts for future independent 3rd party assurance of SFPUC-wide SSPTBL performance reporting
   - a. Calculations: Since the expert 3rd party consultant on SFPUC’s 2009 and 2011 plans, the SSP performance reporting had no independent review or assurance due to budget limitations and executive leadership concerns regarding assurance utility.
   - ANALYSIS: SSP FY2010-11 Performance Report is not verified by a third party and due to continuing budget constraints, there is no capacity/ budget in place for a future performance report audit/assurance. However, staff continues to engage in the ongoing research and practice necessary to maintain, update and apply the rigor of its KPIs, standards and framework foundation for best practice SSP performance reporting.

16. Continue efforts for future independent 3rd party assurance of SFPUC-wide SSPTBL performance reporting
   - a. Calculations: Since the expert 3rd party consultant on SFPUC’s 2009 and 2011 plans, the SSP performance reporting had no independent review or assurance due to budget limitations and executive leadership concerns regarding assurance utility.
   - ANALYSIS: SSP FY2010-11 Performance Report is not verified by a third party and due to continuing budget constraints, there is no capacity/ budget in place for a future performance report audit/assurance. However, staff continues to engage in the ongoing research and practice necessary to maintain, update and apply the rigor of its KPIs, standards and framework foundation for best practice SSP performance reporting.

17. Continue efforts for future independent 3rd party assurance of SFPUC-wide SSPTBL performance reporting
   - a. Calculations: Since the expert 3rd party consultant on SFPUC’s 2009 and 2011 plans, the SSP performance reporting had no independent review or assurance due to budget limitations and executive leadership concerns regarding assurance utility.
   - ANALYSIS: SSP FY2010-11 Performance Report is not verified by a third party and due to continuing budget constraints, there is no capacity/ budget in place for a future performance report audit/assurance. However, staff continues to engage in the ongoing research and practice necessary to maintain, update and apply the rigor of its KPIs, standards and framework foundation for best practice SSP performance reporting.
### GM5.2 Support and initiate local, regional, state and federal policy actions that support SFPUC mission.

#### Data Source: Weekly Board Update Files, State Bill Tracking Matrix, Email Review of Votes

**Calculation:** Descriptive. Briefly describe and/or report the number of local, regional, state and federal policy actions SFPUC supported or initiated and resulted in benefits or positive action. Briefly describe examples and/or report the number of positive/beneficial engagements with elected or appointed officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM5.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NO SCORE: This is an indicator for which performance is primarily descriptive and variable. Though it is not scored, national guidelines recommend reporting the data as material to SFPUC performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Note:
- **Targets are set in season and are a response to changes in agency needs.**
- **N/A** indicates no score.

**GM5.3 Percentage of organization integrating Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) into sustainability and operational planning, management, and decision-making.**

#### Data Source: Enterprise Risk Management Quarterly Report

**Calculation:** Percentage of organization integrating ERM into operational planning, management, and decision-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM5.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NO SCORE: This is an indicator for which performance is primarily descriptive and variable. Though it is not scored, national guidelines recommend reporting the data as material to SFPUC performance and of continuing interest to stakeholders.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Note:
- **Targets are set in season and are a response to changes in agency needs.**
- **N/A** indicates no score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</th>
<th>Technical Description*</th>
<th>FY2008-09 Baseline Data and Score</th>
<th>FY2010-11 Data, and Score (Score)</th>
<th>FY2011-12 Data, Analysis and Score (Score)</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Target</th>
<th>CURRENT REPORT YEAR: FY2012-13 Data, Analysis, and Score (Score)</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Target</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance &amp; Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM5.1</td>
<td>SFPUC-wide strategic security plan in place, including annual implementation targets</td>
<td>Data Source: Director of Emergency Management. How: Outline and project plan developed; past strategy and plans reviewed. Calculation: 20%</td>
<td>GM5.1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Plan &amp; set annual implementation targets</td>
<td>DATA: Plan is 20% complete</td>
<td>ANA: SFPUC did not meet its target for FY2012-13, but continues to make progress on completing the SFPUC-wide strategic security plan.</td>
<td>Score: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM5.2</td>
<td>Emergency drinking water plans in place, and updated and tested annually</td>
<td>Data Source: Director of Emergency Management. How: SFPUC emergency drinking water resources identified; workshops held with City departments to clarify roles for emergency drinking water activities, including procurement and distribution; identified that the plan needs to be shared by several departments and jointly completed with SFDEM. Calculation: 75%</td>
<td>GM5.2</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Plan</td>
<td>DATA: 110% completed of SFPUC portion of the City's Emergency Drinking Water Plan. 75% of the total City Plan is complete</td>
<td>Score: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM5.3</td>
<td>Identify progress institutionalizing Emergency Operations Plans (EOP)</td>
<td>Data Source: Director of Emergency Management. How: Table Top Exercises completed; and DEOPs finalized for the Water Enterprise - including EOD; WSC; WW, WW; initial plans identified for the Power Enterprise, plans to be developed for WWE, both slated for completion in 2013-14. Calculation: We - 100%; Power - 2%; WWE - 0%</td>
<td>GM5.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Plan</td>
<td>DATA: SFPUC met its annual target, i.e. the EOP is complete. It will continue to work with other City agencies and the SFDEM to complete the entire plan in FY2013-14.</td>
<td>Score: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure &amp; Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA1.1</td>
<td>Lost time incident rate for procured construction projects</td>
<td>Data Source: WESP Program Construction Management Monthly Progress Report. How: [Number of Incidents x 200,000]/Total Exposure Hours to date + 17. Incidence Rate = 200,000 hours of 100 workers x 40 hrs. x 50 weeks/yr. - This the OSHA or BLS standard incident rate calculation for Heavy Construction. Calculation: The plugged in Numbers are: 57 Total Recordable Injuries to Date; 15 Lost Time Injuries to Date; 5,404,829 hours Worked to Date. (5 x 200,000) / 5,404,829 = .703</td>
<td>IA1.1</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>1.2 Lost time incident rate</td>
<td>Analysis: Performance exceeds industry standard.</td>
<td>DATA: Lost time incident rate is 0.7</td>
<td>ANALYSIS: SFPUC exceeded its FY2011-12 target and continues to perform well below the industry average of 1.6.</td>
<td>Score: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</td>
<td>Technical Description*</td>
<td>FY2010-11 Data</td>
<td>FY2011-12 Data, Analyze and Score</td>
<td>FY2012-13 Target</td>
<td>CURRENT REPORT YEAR: FY2012-13 Data, Analyze, and Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA2.2</td>
<td>a. Data Source: The WSP and Other program related projects that were completed during the fiscal year, and the total completed capital facilities expenditures (in millions). How: The reports are generated based on a Work Breakdown Structure that is followed for each project in a program. Primavera P6 is used to generate reports. Calculation: Total planned expenditures - Actual expenditures.</td>
<td>a. WSP Local:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. WSP Local including LWS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. WSIP Regional:</td>
<td>b. WSIP Regional:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. WSIP Regional:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. SSIP:</td>
<td>c. SSIP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. SSIP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. WWEC:</td>
<td>d. WWEC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. WWEC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA2.3</td>
<td>a. Data Source: June 2012 Quarterly Reports How: The reports are generated based on a Work Breakdown Structure that is followed for each project in a program. Primavera P6 is used to generate reports. Calculation: Total planned expenditures - Actual expenditures.</td>
<td>a. Number of projects completed within the program budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Number of projects completed within the program budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. WSP (Regional and Local) planned 12 projects</td>
<td>b. WSECP planned: 11 out of 12 projects = 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. WSECP planned: 11 out of 12 projects = 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. WSECP planned: 4 projects</td>
<td>c. WSECP planned: 4 projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. WSECP planned: 4 projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The deviation reflects that the SFPUC under-spent in FY2012-13. This should not be considered as bad news; costs and schedules need to be analyzed together. SFPUC is only slightly behind schedule and under spending, which means the forecasted cost at completion is less than the approved budget. Planned value is based on early schedule; the planned value based on early schedule is expected to be higher than expenditure. Finally, the planned value includes construction contingency (20%). If change orders are not issued, the contingency/budget will not be spent, which is a good project outcome.
### Infrastructure & Assets

#### Key Performance Indicator (KPI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</th>
<th>Technical Description*</th>
<th>FY2009-10 Baseline Data and Score</th>
<th>FY2010-11 Data, Analysis and Score</th>
<th>FY2011-12 Data, Analysis and Score</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Data, Analysis and Score</th>
<th>FY2013 Target</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### a. WSIP Local

- **Data Source:** The WSIP and Other capital program related Quarterly reports periodically presented to the Commission
- **How:** The reports are generated based on a Work Break-Down structure that is followed for each project in a program, and applied Earn Value Management (EVM) method.
- **Break Down structure that is followed for each project:**
  - a. WSIP Local progress: P 65% v. A 42%
  - b. WSIP Regional progress: P 65% v. A 38%
  - c. WWECIP: N/A

- **Analysis:** Nature of awards show leadership in peer practice
- **Analysis:** Nature of awards demonstrate leadership in peer practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Plan % Complete</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. WSIP Local progress</td>
<td>P 65% v. A 42%</td>
<td>Delta: 23%</td>
<td>73% or 73 miles achieved against 83% planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. WSIP Regional progress</td>
<td>P 65% v. A 38%</td>
<td>Delta: 27%</td>
<td>79% or 79 miles achieved against 79% planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. WWECIP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b. WSIP Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Plan % Complete</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. WSIP Regional progress</td>
<td>P 65% v. A 38%</td>
<td>Delta: 27%</td>
<td>90% or 90 miles achieved against 90% planned</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### c. WWECIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Plan % Complete</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. WWECIP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Score FY2012-13 Data, Analysis, and Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. WSIP Local including ground water or recycled water projects (LWK)</th>
<th>DATA:</th>
<th>Actual: 30.5%</th>
<th>Planned: 30%</th>
<th>Percent deviation: 1.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. WSIP Regional</td>
<td>DATA:</td>
<td>Actual: 79%</td>
<td>Planned: 79%</td>
<td>Percent deviation: 0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. WWECIP</td>
<td>DATA:</td>
<td>Actual: 70%</td>
<td>Planned: 67.7%</td>
<td>Percent deviation: 12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ongoing work towards excellence

- **DATA:** No Score
- **Ongoing work towards excellence:** No Score
- **Ongoing work towards excellence:** No Score

---

*Note:* The technical description provides a detailed breakdown of the performance indicators, including the data sources, how the data is calculated, and the analysis of the performance. The table structure helps in organizing the data clearly, making it easier to understand and compare the performance across different fiscal years and targets.
### Objective

**a. Data Source:** Maximo (Materials Planner at the site provides data)

**How/Calculation:** Run a report that shows the number of operating assets and the number of assets with an asset ranking of "poor" or "failed". Divide the assets with an asset ranking of "poor" or "failed" by the total number of operating assets at the percentage of assets with a "poor" or "failed" asset ranking. List percent of assets with a risk ranking of 4 or 5 covered by an asset management plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB. Optimize maintenance for Water, Wastewater, and Power assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>BB. Optimize maintenance for Water, Wastewater, and Power assets</th>
<th>b. Wastewater pipelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA5.1</td>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>- System renewal and replacement ratios for Water for Water &amp; Wastewater</td>
<td>- System renewal and replacement ratios for Water &amp; Wastewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IA5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>IA5.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KPI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source: WWF PM vs. CM Work Order Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SFPUC Performance: Strategic Sustainability Annual Report FY2012-13

**Appendix 1: Page 28**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1.2</td>
<td># of formal complaints filed</td>
<td>12 formal complaints</td>
<td>12 formal complaints</td>
<td>12 formal complaints</td>
<td>12 complaints</td>
<td>12 complaints</td>
<td>12 complaints</td>
<td>12 complaints</td>
<td>12 complaints</td>
<td>12 complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1.2</td>
<td>% of staff receiving equal</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1.2</td>
<td>communication effort</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1.2</td>
<td>Total number of formal</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1.2</td>
<td>formal complaints filed</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1.2</td>
<td>% of staff receiving equal</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1.2</td>
<td>communication effort</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All data and score are based on the reconciliation of the internal or staff survey and the external survey (HRS Survey Monkey). **Note: The cost of the survey is implemented annually and comparable to previous reporting periods. Four consecutive reporting periods.

**Note: The data is calculated biennially and comparable to previous reporting periods. Four consecutive reporting periods.

**Note: The data is calculated biennially and comparable to previous reporting periods. Four consecutive reporting periods.

**Note: The data is calculated biennially and comparable to previous reporting periods. Four consecutive reporting periods.

**Note: The data is calculated biennially and comparable to previous reporting periods. Four consecutive reporting periods.

**Note: The data is calculated biennially and comparable to previous reporting periods. Four consecutive reporting periods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR.6.1</td>
<td>Average number of days to fill vacant position from the date the requisition is issued</td>
<td>Data Source: How Calculation: The number of calendar days between the requisition issue date and employee effective date was calculated and converted to an approximate number of business days (where 7 calendar days = 1 business day).</td>
<td>20 Business Days</td>
<td>19.6 Business Days</td>
<td>Numbers reflect business days from the date HRS submits the requisition into PeopleSoft to employee hire date. However, delays are being experienced in requisitions are under review longer by the Mayor's Office and the Department of Human Resources. This is expected to continue into FY2011-12. Therefore the target for FY2011-12 is up rather than down.</td>
<td>Data: 178 Bus. Days</td>
<td>Analysis: Due primarily to new City business processes that prolong the time to fill positions, SFPUC did not reach the FY2011-12 target, and days to fill vacant positions has increased over its baseline performance. In order to align this measure with actual SFPUC performance going forward, SFPUC is beginning to track the time to fill a position from the point SFPUC gains control of the hiring process.</td>
<td>Score: 2</td>
<td>Data: 231 business days</td>
<td>Analysis: As was the case last fiscal year, SFPUC did not reach the FY2012-13 target due primarily to the new City business processes that prolong the time to fill positions. Though the City's streamlining will continue over the next few fiscal years, SFPUC will continue to target continuous improvement in number of days to fill vacant positions. In the meantime, our score reflects performance comparable to last year's data.</td>
<td>Score: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP.3.2</td>
<td>Average percent of SFPUC workforce turnover</td>
<td>Data Source: SFPUC HRS Position Control System. How: For purposes of this measure, SFPUC employees are defined as those employees who don't have limited term appointments. Turnover is defined as an employee leaving the SFPUC. The metric is calculated by totaling the % of employees who have left the SFPUC within the FY and dividing it by the average # of employees during the FY. Average # of employees is calculated by obtaining an employee count as of the end of each month, adding up each count for the FY and dividing by 12.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Data: 5.38%</td>
<td>Analysis: This baseline score for SFPUC's workforce turnover rate reflects a rate well below the AWWA industry standard and leading best practice.</td>
<td>Score: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP.7.2</td>
<td>Percent of work force receiving performance review on an annual basis</td>
<td>Data Source: Excel spreadsheet located on an internal HRS Employee Relations drive. How: Calculation: Total the number of completed performance evaluations submitted to HRS as a percentage of the total SFPUC employee population.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Data: 101.5% of required performance appraisals received over the baseline</td>
<td>Analysis: Performance improved over the baseline</td>
<td>Score: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP.8.5</td>
<td>Average hours of training per employee</td>
<td>Data Source: SFPUC HRS Learning Management System. How: Calculation: Calculated by dividing total hours of training in FY2012-13 by total employee. Data reported reflects hours of training recorded in the HRS Learning Management System.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Data: 16.38 Hours per Employee eLearning Pilot completed.</td>
<td>Analysis: Though SFPUC did not meet its FY2011-12 target, performance has improved and SFPUC is making progress to its requirements.</td>
<td>Score: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9.1</td>
<td>a. Percent of staff eligible to retire within 5 years &amp; the percent for which a succession preparedness planning, including knowledge sharing and transfer, work process and job duties documentation has been developed.</td>
<td>43.35% expected to retire within 5 years.</td>
<td>SFPUC HRS Position Control System</td>
<td>Any non Temporary Exempt employees who had equal to or greater than a combination of 45 years of age and 15 years of service OR 55 years of age and 5 years of service were counted as eligible to retire. The number of staff eligible to retire was divided by the total number of SFPUC staff (excluding temporary exempt staff) to arrive at % of staff eligible to retire within 5 years. At risk classifications were identified based on proportionally high ratios of current incumbents eligible to retire within the next five years.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>46% of staff expected to retire within 5 years</td>
<td>4% of positions currently have succession plans</td>
<td>87 Classes across the organization have been identified as at-risk for the potential of heightened staff turnover.</td>
<td>A. Model for identifying At-Risk classes defined and approved by AGMs</td>
<td>A. DATA: 53% expected to retire within 5 years.</td>
<td>Mapping of at-risk job categories and formal succession planning not completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9.1</td>
<td>b. Identify the number of high-turnover, at-risk classifications &amp; the percent for which succession preparedness planning, including knowledge sharing and transfer, work process and job duties documentation has been developed.</td>
<td>44% of Employees Eligible to Retire within 5 Years.</td>
<td>SFPUC HRS Position Control System</td>
<td>Any non Temporary Exempt employees who had equal to or greater than a combination of 45 years of age and 15 years of service OR 55 years of age and 5 years of service were counted as eligible to retire. The number of staff eligible to retire was divided by the total number of SFPUC staff (excluding temporary exempt staff) to arrive at % of staff eligible to retire within 5 years. At risk classifications were identified based on proportionally high ratios of current incumbents eligible to retire within the next five years.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>46% of staff expected to retire within 5 years</td>
<td>4% of positions currently have succession plans</td>
<td>87 Classes across the organization have been identified as at-risk for the potential of heightened staff turnover.</td>
<td>A. Model for identifying At-Risk classes defined and approved by AGMs</td>
<td>A. DATA: 53% expected to retire within 5 years.</td>
<td>Mapping of at-risk job categories and formal succession planning not completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9.1</td>
<td>c. Identify the number of high-turnover, at-risk classifications &amp; the percent for which succession preparedness planning, including knowledge sharing and transfer, work process and job duties documentation has been developed.</td>
<td>46% of staff expected to retire within 5 years</td>
<td>SFPUC HRS Position Control System</td>
<td>Any non Temporary Exempt employees who had equal to or greater than a combination of 45 years of age and 15 years of service OR 55 years of age and 5 years of service were counted as eligible to retire. The number of staff eligible to retire was divided by the total number of SFPUC staff (excluding temporary exempt staff) to arrive at % of staff eligible to retire within 5 years. At risk classifications were identified based on proportionally high ratios of current incumbents eligible to retire within the next five years.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>46% of staff expected to retire within 5 years</td>
<td>4% of positions currently have succession plans</td>
<td>87 Classes across the organization have been identified as at-risk for the potential of heightened staff turnover.</td>
<td>A. Model for identifying At-Risk classes defined and approved by AGMs</td>
<td>A. DATA: 53% expected to retire within 5 years.</td>
<td>Mapping of at-risk job categories and formal succession planning not completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Description:**
- **Data Source:** SFPUC HRS Position Control System
- **How/Calculation:** Any non Temporary Exempt employees who had equal to or greater than a combination of 45 years of age and 15 years of service OR 55 years of age and 5 years of service were counted as eligible to retire. The number of staff eligible to retire was divided by the total number of SFPUC staff (excluding temporary exempt staff) to arrive at % of staff eligible to retire within 5 years. At risk classifications were identified based on proportionally high ratios of current incumbents eligible to retire within the next five years.

**Data:**
- 46% of staff expected to retire within 5 years
- 4% of positions currently have succession plans
- 87 Classes across the organization have been identified as at-risk for the potential of heightened staff turnover.

**Analysis (for all of WP9.1):**
- SFPUC's performance remains comparable to previous years and did not reach its FY2011-12 target.

**Score:** 2

**Analysis (for all of WP9.1a and b):**
- Though SFPUC continues to report % of employees eligible to retire within 5 years, it has not reported the total % for which a succession plan is in place. In addition, though the competency model pilot phase 1 was completed, the model for identifying at-risk classes was not defined and approved by the AGMs, and the FY2012-13 target was not met. SFPUC's performance remains comparable to previous years.

**Score:** 2
APPENDIX 2: Glossary and Abbreviations
APPENDIX 2 - GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

The following is a glossary of terms and abbreviations we use in daily considerations of SFPUC’s strategic and sustainability issues, our annual performance reports and in other Strategic Sustainability Planning reports available at sfwater.org/sustainability.

Glossary

Accounting for Sustainability Impacts: As complement to financial accounting, the measurement, verification and reporting of the environmental, social and governance performance of an organization in order to assess all forms of material capital risks and opportunities and better inform development of integrated, long-term business strategy.

Asset Management: Defined by the EPA as “managing infrastructure capital assets to minimize the total cost of owning and operating them, while delivering the service levels that customers desire.”

Average Performance: An SFPUC annual strategic sustainability performance score of 3 refers to an average performance level based on SFPUC’s relative scale from 1 to 5. It does not refer to an industry average. Rather, a score of 3 means SFPUC meets all required laws, rules, regulations and best practice. To score above a 3, therefore, SFPUC must perform above and beyond industry requirements and/or lead best practice.

Baseline Assessment: Evaluation of performance in a baseline year that serves as a starting point for long-term performance evaluation, trend analyses and strategic planning/ decision-making.

Benchmarking: The process by which organizations evaluate performance in relation to best practice within their own sector, or against their own past performance

Best Practice: An activity or procedure that produced outstanding results in another situation (or organization) and could be adapted to improve effectiveness, efficiency, ecology, innovation, etc. in another situation (or organization).

Biodiversity: The variability among living organisms within species, between species, and between ecosystems. (Source: World Resources Institute)

California Independent System Operator (CAISO): The California ISO is a not-for-profit public-benefit corporation charged with operating the majority of California’s high-voltage wholesale power grid. Balancing the demand for electricity with an equal supply of megawatts, the ISO is the impartial link between power plants and the utilities that serve more than 30 million consumers. The ISO provides equal access to the grid for all qualified users and strategically plans for the transmission needs of this vital infrastructure.

Ecosystem: A dynamic complex of plant, animal, and micro-organism communities and their nonliving environment interacting as a functional unit.


Flat Rate: $/month regardless of consumption.

Greenhouse Gases (GHG): The six gases covered by the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC): carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF).

GHG Emissions: Direct - Scope 1: Emissions from the operations that are owned or controlled by the organization (SFPUC); include but are not limited to, the CO2 emissions from electricity, natural gas and fuels consumption.

Indirect – Scope 2: Emissions from the generation of purchased or acquired electricity, heating, cooling, and steam consumed by the organization (SFPUC) or are a consequence of the activities of the reporting organization, but occur at sources owned or controlled by another entity.
Other Indirect - Scope 3: Emissions not included in Scope 2 that occur outside of the organization (SFPUC), including both upstream and downstream emissions; e.g. from the extraction and production of purchased materials and fuels, transport-related activities in vehicles not owned or controlled by the organization, electricity-related activities (e.g. T&D losses), and outsourced activities.

Foresight Planning: Active monitoring of key uncertainties, technologies, trends, megatrends and events that could create opportunities and risks.

HFAM: Hfam is based on the Stanford, HSP, HSPF, SRFM and SeaFM family of models. It is a continuous simulation model that does historical or forecast analysis and it includes probabilistic or ensemble forecasts of stream flows, reservoir levels and releases or power production.

Indicator: One of a type of measure used to determine, over time, performance of a defined process, or function, or achievement of a defined outcome.

International Organization for Standardization (ISO): The world’s largest developer and publisher of International Standards. ISO is a network of the national standards institutes of 157 countries, one member per country, with a Central Secretariat in Switzerland that coordinates the system. Standards ensure desirable characteristics of products and services such as quality, environmental friendliness, safety, reliability, efficiency and interchangeability—and at an economical cost.

Material Information (for publicly listed companies): Defined by the U.S. Supreme Court as presenting a substantial likelihood that the disclosure of the omitted fact would have been viewed by the “reasonable investor” as having significantly altered the “total mix” of information made available (TSC Indus., Inc. v. Northway, Inc. 426 US 438 (1976) as cited by SASB Conceptual Framework Exposure Draft, 2013.

Materiality: Refers to the degree to which an issue could make a major difference to an organization’s performance. Material information provides the basis for stakeholders and management to make sound judgments about the things that matter to them, and take actions that influence the organization’s performance. http://www.accountability.org/standards/qualifications/index.html

Nonrenewable Resources: Resources that cannot be replaced as, or once, they are used, or for which present use does diminish future supply. Examples include coal, oil, gas, metal ores, and certain aquifers.

Normalization: A means of standardizing data to a particular measure of activity (e.g. mgd water delivered), such that true performance can be seen over time independent of variance in activity levels. As a general rule, normalization should be based on levels of production at a facility, e.g. manufactured product, services rendered or delivered, or some other productive output from the facility. (Source: USEPA)

Renewable Portfolio Standard: The California RPS includes alternative compliance language for the SFPUC as the result of its Hetch Hetchy power generation such that the SFPUC must meet 100% of its retail needs with either Hetch Hetchy generation or RPS-eligible supplies.

Renewable Resources: Resources that can be replaced as, or once, they are used, or for which present use does not diminish future supply. Examples include soil, air, water, and sunlight.


Risk Management: Coordinated activities used to identify, direct and control risk in an organization.

Stakeholders: Those individuals and groups that affect and/or are affected by the organization and its activities. (Source: AccountAbility Assurance Standard 2003)
Standards: Policies, regulations, measures or practices that establish an industry norm; standards are established typically by authority, custom, or general consent.

Strategic Business Plan: A tool for making resource allocation decisions among core business functions, and investments in expanding and/or diversifying business functions, in a way that positions the utility to increase value to customers/shareholders. (Source: AwwaRF 2003)

Strategic Governance: Methodology enabling principles, principles enabling purpose, a principle-based, systematic approach to business. (Source: Governance & Accounting Institute, H. Boerner & M. Sickles in “Strategic Governance”, 2013)

Strategic Sustainability Plan: For the SFPUC, a system and tool for planning, managing and evaluating SFPUC-wide performance that takes into account the long term economic, environmental and social impacts of our business activities. [2002 Prop E/CCSF Charter Article VIII Sec.8B. 123(A)(3) requires SFPUC to develop an agency-wide strategic plan and report annually.]

Strategic Sustainability Planning: The process of identifying an organization’s long-term goals, determining the best triple bottom line approach for achieving those goals to and allocating adequate resources for implementation.

Strategy: The science or art of planning and directing large-scale movements and operations; plan or method for achieving longterm goals.

Supply Chain: Sequence of activities or parties (e.g. manufacturers, wholesalers, distributors, retailers) that provides products or services to the organization.

Sustainability: For the SFPUC, the framework through which it will responsibly manage the resources under its care, protect public health and balance its social and environmental responsibilities to the citizens and community, while providing cost effective services to its ratepayers.

Sustainability Performance: An organization’s total performance, which include its policies, decisions, and actions that create social, environmental and/or economic (including financial) outcomes. (Source: AccountAbility Assurance Standard 2003)

Sustainability Plan: For the SFPUC, see San Francisco Public Utilities Commission : Sustainability

Sustainability Planning: The process of identifying key priorities, actions, targets, responsibilities, resources and timetable for a business or organization to implement its environmental, economic and social strategies for improving overall performance.

Sustainability Reporting: The act of publicly reporting on environmental, social, and economic management and performance toward a goal of sustainable development. Internationally recognized standards are the Global Reporting Initiative’s Sustainability Reporting Guidelines and AccountAbility’s AA1000 Assurance Standard.

Sustainable Development: Defined in the 1987 Brundtland Report (“Our Common Future”) as development that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

Tiered Rate or Multi-Tiered Rate: $/unit @tier 1, $+/unit @ Tier 2, etc. The more you use into the next allocated tier, the more you pay.

Triple Bottom Line: Refers to broadening the traditional bottom line perspective for evaluating business performance that is focused solely on financial performance to take into account the environmental and social impacts associated with business activities. The term “triple bottom line” is attributed to John Elkington, co-founder of the UK based consultancy SustainAbility.

Triple Bottom Line Reporting: Systematic management, performance, improvement and public disclosure in environmental, economic, and social dimensions at local, regional, and global scales. (Source: AwwaRF 2007)
Visioning: Stepping through what is required of an organization in terms of re-aligning goals and strategies, objectives and targets for a number of alternative futures and/or for a preferred future state; can include risk convergence.

Volumetric Rate: $/unit. The more you use the more you pay.

Waste: An output of a process that has no market value.

Waste Disposal: Method by which waste is treated or disposed of, including composting, reuse, recycling, recovery, incineration, landfill, deep well injection, and on-site storage.

Water Recycling and Reuse: The act of processing used water and wastewater through another cycle before discharge to final treatment and discharge to the environment. In general, there are three types of water recycling and reuse: 1) Wastewater recycled back in the same process or higher use of recycled water in the process cycle; 2) Wastewater recycled and reused in a different process, but within the same facility; 3) Wastewater reused at another of the organization’s facilities.

Abbreviations/Acronyms
ABCWUA: Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority
ACSI: American Customers Satisfaction Index
ADC: Alternative Daily Cover
AFWA: African Water Association
AGM: Assistant General Manager
AIDIS: Inter-American Association of Sanitary and Environmental Engineering
AMI: Advanced Metering Infrastructure
AMWA: Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies
APWA: American Public Works Association
AWSS: Auxiliary Water Supply System
AWWA: American Water Works Association
AWWARF: American Water Works Association Research Foundation
BAAQMD: Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BAWSCA: Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency
BLM: Bureau of Land Management (US)
BLS: Bureau of Labor Statistics
CAC: Citizens’ Advisory Committee
CAFR: Comprehensive Annual Financial Report
CAISO: California Independent System Operator
CAP: Climate Action Plan
CB: Community Benefits
CBA: Collective Bargaining Agreement
CBP: Community Benefits Program
CCA: Community Choice Aggregation
Ccf: Hundred Cubic Feet
CCSF: City and County of San Francisco
CDBS: Climate Disclosure Standards Board
CDD: City Distribution Division
CDP: Carbon Disclosure Project
CDPH: California Department of Public Health
CEC: California Energy Commission
CEQ: Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act
CIP: Capital Improvement Program
CIP: Community Investment Program
CM: Corrective Maintenance
CO2: Carbon Dioxide
CPI: Consumer Price Index
CPUC: California Public Utilities Commission
CRAM: California Rapid Assessment Method
CSIRO: Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization
CSLC: California State Lands Commission
CSO: Combined Sewage Overflows
CSWRCB: California State Water Resources Control Board
CT: Combustion Turbine
Cu. ft.: Cubic feet
CWA: Clean Water Act (US)
CWA: Community Workforce Agreements
DDA: Deferred & Deviation Accounts
DEOP: Department Emergency Operations Plans
DepCAP: Department Climate Action Plan
DGS: Department of General Services (CA State)
DHR: Department of Human Resources (CCSF)
DH: Department of Human Services
DJSI: Dow Jones Sustainability Index
DOI: Department of the Interior (US)
DOL: Department of Labor (US)
DPH: Department of Public Health
DRP: Disaster Recovery Plan
DPW: Department of Public Works (CCSF)
DWSD: Detroit Water and Sewerage Department
EBMUD: East Bay Municipal Utility District
EBRPD: East Bay Regional Parks District
EE: Energy Efficiency
EEO: Equal Employment Opportunity
EES: Energy Efficiency Savings
EI: Energy Intensity
EIA: Energy Information Administration (US)
EIR: Environmental Incident Reporting
EJ: Environmental Justice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EJ IWG</td>
<td>Environmental Justice Interagency Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Environmental Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPEAT</td>
<td>Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>Environmentally Preferable Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM</td>
<td>Enterprise Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Electricity Resource Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESER</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Emergency Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRI</td>
<td>Economic and Social Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUI</td>
<td>Energy Use Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUM</td>
<td>Effective Utility Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUREAU</td>
<td>European Federation of National Associations Water and Wastewater Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVM</td>
<td>Earned Value Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWP</td>
<td>European Water Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Federal Acquisition Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMP</td>
<td>Federal Energy Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOG</td>
<td>Fats Oils and Grease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCD</td>
<td>Gallons per Capita per Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI</td>
<td>Global Reporting Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Ground Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>California Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources (SFPUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRS</td>
<td>Human Resources Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASB</td>
<td>International Accounting Standards Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB-NET</td>
<td>International Benchmarking Network for Water and Sanitation Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHA</td>
<td>International Hydropower Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>International Organization for Standardization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>Independent System Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td>International Water Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kBTU</td>
<td>Kilo-British Thermal Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>Kilowatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KWh</td>
<td>Kilowatt hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADWP</td>
<td>Los Angeles Department Water &amp; Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Light-Emitting Diode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LID</td>
<td>Low Impact Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>Learning Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Lost Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWS</td>
<td>Local Water System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDMS</td>
<td>Meter Data Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Million Gallons per Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHI</td>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Million Liters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPUC</td>
<td>Maine Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Megawatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh</td>
<td>Megawatt hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACWA</td>
<td>The National Association of Clean Water Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS</td>
<td>North American Industry Classification System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>National Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAWC</td>
<td>National Association of Water Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act (administered by the EPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERC</td>
<td>North American Electric Reliability Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFS</td>
<td>National Forest Service (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHDOT</td>
<td>New Hampshire Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMAPME</td>
<td>European Office of Crafts, Trades and Small and Medium sized Enterprises for Standardization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>Mono-Nitrogen Oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (administered by the EPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Park Service (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRRI</td>
<td>National Regulatory Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWC</td>
<td>National Water Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCDEP</td>
<td>New York City’s Water Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
<td>New York State Energy Research and Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCSD</td>
<td>Orange County Sanitation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEWD</td>
<td>Office of Economic and Workforce Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFBR</td>
<td>Operating Fund Balance Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMBI</td>
<td>Ontario Municipal Benchmarking Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety &amp; Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCL</td>
<td>Power Content Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER</td>
<td>Public Entity EMS Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIR</td>
<td>Program Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>Project Labor Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Planned Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNWGW</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest Watershed Managers Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POU: Publicly-Owned Utilities
PUB: Public Utilities Bureau
PV: Photovoltaic
PWB: Portland Water Bureau
PWD: Philadelphia Water Department
RFP: Request for Proposals
RFQ: Request for Qualifications
ROA: Return on Assets
ROW: Right of Way
RPS: Renewable Portfolio Standard
R&R: Repair & Replacement
RWQCB: Regional Water Quality Control Board
RWS: Regional Water System
SCVWD: Santa Clara Valley Water District
SDG: Storm water Design Guidelines
SEC: Securities and Exchange Commission
SEW: South East Water
SFE: San Francisco Environment (Dept. of)
SFPUC: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (CCSF)
SFRC: San Francisco Residential
SHRM: Society for Human Resource Management
SLR: Sea Level Rise
SMUD: Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
SOx: Sulfur Oxide
S&P: Standard & Poor’s
SPU: Seattle Public Utilities
SSIP: Sewer System Improvement Program
SSMP: Sewer System Master Plan
SSP: SFPUC’s 2008 Strategic Sustainability Plan & subsequent Strategic Sustainability Performance (annual reports)
SVP: Silicon Valley Power
SVWTP: Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant
SWRCB: State Water Resources Control Board (CA)
TBD: To Be Determined
TBL: Triple Bottom Line
TI: Treasure Island
UK: United Kingdom
UN: United Nations
UN-DESA: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
USEPA: United States Environmental Protection Agency
UWMP: Urban Water Management Plans
Water EUM: Effective Utility Management Collaborative Effort
WB: Within Budget
WBCSD: World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WECC: Western Electricity Coordinating Council
WEF: Water Environment Federation
WHO: World Health Organization
WQ: Water Quality
WRI: World Resources Institute
WSIP: Water System Improvement Program
WSPP: Western Systems Power Pool
WSTD: Water Supply and Treatment Division
WUCA: Water Utility Climate Alliance
WWE: Wastewater Enterprise
WWECIP: Wastewater Enterprise Capital Improvement Project
YNP: Yosemite National Park
YTD: Year to Date
YVV: Yarra Valley Water
FY2012-13 Strategic Sustainability Performance Supporting Data:
The following appendices are available on our website. To access them use the links below:

APPENDIX 3: Standards and Best Practices for KPI Data Evaluations
Appendix 3 supplements the results and benchmarking in Appendix 1 by providing the standards and best practices for each KPI result.

APPENDIX 4: Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Index
Based in Amsterdam, GRI is an international non-profit organization that promotes economic, environmental and social sustainability. It works toward the goal of a sustainable global economy by providing organizational reporting guidance to all companies and organizations. This guidance is offered primarily through a comprehensive sustainability reporting framework that is considered the lead standard for reporting on triple bottom line sustainability and is widely used around the world.

GRI is committed to a sustainable global economy that combines long term profitability with social justice and environmental care. This means that, for organizations, sustainability performance reporting covers the key areas of economic, environmental, and social performance, commonly called the triple bottom line (TBL).

SFPUC’s foundational Sustainability Plan of 2008 and integration with strategic planning in 2011 are anchored in the GRI framework. From our extensive stakeholder engagement early on, however, we expanded the GRI model by integrating the triple bottom line into the six categories of issues most material to our organization. We continue to report against the GRI Index in commitment to this standard.