STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT June 2018																						SFMTA
ID Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	FY17 Avg	FY18 Avg	May 2017	Jun 2017	Jul 2017	Aug 2017	Sep 2017	Oct 2017	Nov 2017	Dec 2017	Jan 2018	Feb 2018	Mar 2018	Apr 2018	May 2018	
Goal 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone																						
Objective 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																						
1.1.1 SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	5.3	3.8	7.6	9.4	8.2	6.4	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.6	5.3	4.6	4.5	4.7	3.8	4.1	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.2	3.3	$\sim \sim$
1.1.2 Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1				3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5		3	.5												
(low) to 5 (high) Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muniston or									_													
1.1.2 station): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)*				3.1	3.2	3.2	3.2		3	.2												
1.1.4 Security complaints to 311 (Muni)*		41.6	36	29	37	29	37	39	27	45	56	35	43	44	43	34	34	30	35	44	34	\sim
Objective 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security																						
1.2.1 Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	11.3	16.2	13.8	12.0	11.0	12.8	12.4	13.2	15.4	16.3	13.0	13.1	11.2	13.2	17.5	9.8	13.0	15.7	12.0	13.5	13.2	$\sim \sim$
1.2.2 Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only)*		11.3	12	10	8	13	11	12	13	5	12	12	10	13	17	11	15	9	15	7	5	$\sim\sim\sim$
1.2.3 Lost work days due to injury			16,445 (CY13)	15,221 (CY14)	13,625 (CY15)	15,992 (CY16)	21,745 (CY17)															
1.2.4 Employee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)			3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3															
Objective 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																						
1.3.1 Muni collisions/100,000 miles	3.5	5.0	5.1	5.9	6.4	6.6	6.8	6.0	6.2	6.1	5.4	5.9	7.6	7.1	5.6	6.3	4.7	5.9	5.7	6.4	5.5	$\sim \sim$
1.3.2 Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists		3,235 (CY12)	3,049 (CY13)	2,995 (CY14)	3,046 (CY15)																	
1.3.3 Muni falls on board / 100,000 miles*		4.6	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.2	3.3	3.9	4.1	3.0	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.1	3.8	3.6	2.7	3.3	3.6	3.5	$\sim \sim$
1.3.4 "Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311		179.1	157	174	179	183	179	172	154	207	157	194	179	215	196	168	172	145	172	144	147	$\sim \sim \sim$
1.3.5 Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9		3	.9												
Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	rsharing	g the prefe	erred mear	ns of trave																		
Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications																						
2.1.1 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5	3.4			3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2		3	2												
(high)	3.4			3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2		,	.2												
2.1.2 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)*				2.5	2.7	3.0	3.2		3	.1												
2.1.3 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.8	2.9	2.9	3.0		2	.9												
Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1				3.5	3.3	3.2	3.2		3	.3												
(low) to 5 (high)* Customer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5																						
2.1.5 (high)*				2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9		2	.9												
2.1.6 Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86.4%	93.3%	93.6%	69.9%	96.6%	95.8%	98.6%	100.0%	98.6%	100.0%	96.1%	100.0%	100.0%	98.3%	98.5%	97.7%	99.1%	97.2%	94.1%		\sim
2.1.6 Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99.0%	100.0%	99.5%	98.0%	98.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
2.1.6 Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85.0%	82.4%	75.6%	60.0%	82.5%	91.2%	87.7%	95.5%	87.4%	97.7%	92.9%	84.0%	78.9%	84.8%	84.0%	98.6%	78.8%	87.3%	89.0%	89.1%	\sim
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81.0%	79.1%	53.8%	40.4%	54.7%	82.1%	85.5%	87.			76.9%	-		90.6%	-		89.6%	-			_
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97.0%	96.9%	96.8%	96.8%	97.5%	97.9%	98.8%	98.1%	99.4%	100.0%	99.3%	98.0%	98.8%	97.7%	98.3%	98.5%	99.7%	97.5%	99.5%	99.6%	\sim
2.1.7 Percentage of actionable 311 Muni operator conduct complaints addressed within 28 business days*		94.2%	93.5%	89.8%	89.5%	57.5%	74.3%	86.8%	80.8%	87.0%	84.7%	87.8%	89.4%	60.8%	85.4%	91.2%	96.9%	97.0%	94.4%	94.1%	62.9%	$\sim \sim$
2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)				2.7	2.7	2.9	3.0		3	.0												
2.1.9 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1				2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5		2	.9												
(low) to 5 (high)				2.0	2.0	2.3	2.5															
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance		-								_				_						_		~
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network*	1.8%	3.9%	4.0%	4.0%	4.8%	5.4%	5.9%	5.8%	5.8%	5.7%	5.9%	6.8%	7.7%	5.8%	6.0%	5.6%	5.0%	5.6%	5.2%	5.4%	5.6%	<u> </u>
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network	8.8%	19.5%	17.8%	18.6%	17.2%	16.9%	18.1%	16.8%	17.6%	17.5%	17.1%	16.9% 57.1%	17.5%	19.2% 56.7%	18.0%	17.0%	16.2%	15.0%	15.2%	15.9%	17.1%	\sim
2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes	85%	61.1%	59.9%	59.6%	57.4%	60.5%	59.5%	57.5%	59.7%	59.4%	57.7%		57.8%	73.5%		56.5%	58.4%	50.570		57.2%	57.2%	\sim
2.2.4 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals							75.004	75.004	75.00/	75.00/					73.8%		77.1%	77.4%	77.2%	76.3%	76.1%	\sim
	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	72.2%	75.3%	75.0%	75.3%	75.0%	75.3%	74.3%	73.4%	74.2%				E 3 E 6/	E 3 34/	57.00/	EC 044		
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance [*]	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	57.0%	59.8%	57.3%	75.3% 56.2%	75.0% 57.3%	57.2%	55.9%	55.5%	56.3%	55.0%	55.1%	55.5%	57.5%	57.7%	57.2%	56.3%	55.9%	
								75.3% 56.2% 1.6%	75.0% 57.3% 1.3%								57.5% 1.9%	57.7% 1.9%	57.2% 1.5%	56.3% 2.0%	2.0%	
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:55a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	57.0%	59.8%	57.3%			57.2%	55.9%	55.5%	56.3%	55.0%	55.1%	55.5%						<u>}</u>
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points		60.1% 5.9%	59.0% 7.4%	58.9% 7.4%	57.0% 4.7%	59.8% 3.4%	57.3% 2.1%	1.6%	1.3%	57.2% 2.0%	55.9% 1.1%	55.5% 1.5%	56.3% 1.6%	55.0% 1.6%	55.1% 1.4%	55.5% 1.4%	1.9%	1.9%	1.5%	2.0%	2.0%	~~~ ~~~
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of our trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points		60.1% 5.9%	59.0% 7.4%	58.9% 7.4%	57.0% 4.7%	59.8% 3.4%	57.3% 2.1%	1.6%	1.3%	57.2% 2.0%	55.9% 1.1%	55.5% 1.5%	56.3% 1.6%	55.0% 1.6%	55.1% 1.4%	55.5% 1.4%	1.9%	1.9%	1.5%	2.0%	2.0%	<pre>>></pre>
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points Dbjective 2.2: Improve transit performance		60.1% 5.9% 7.1%	59.0% 7.4% 8.6%	58.9% 7.4% 8.3%	57.0% 4.7% 5.6%	59.8% 3.4% 4.1%	57.3% 2.1% 2.5%	1.6% 2.1%	1.3% 1.8%	57.2% 2.0% 1.5%	55.9% 1.1% 1.4%	55.5% 1.5% 2.0%	56.3% 1.6% 3.7%	55.0% 1.6% 3.1%	55.1% 1.4% 1.5%	55.5% 1.4% 1.6%	1.9% 2.2%	1.9% 1.0%	1.5% 2.4%	2.0% 2.3%	2.0%) } } } } } } } } } } } } } } } } } } }
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points" Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (8us)		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137 2,055	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 2,045	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 1,797	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,416 5,547 1,971	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155	1.6% 2.1% 7,163	1.3% 1.8% 6,780	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652	1.9% 2.2% 6,027	1.9% 1.0% 8,409	1.5% 2.4% 7,786	2.0% 2.3% 8,447	2.0%	
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of our trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance 2.2.8 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bis) 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bis)		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179 3,835	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 2,045 4,734	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 1,797 5,200	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,416 5,547 1,971 4,412	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155 5,218 2,865	1.6% 2.1% 7,163 5,202 2,504	1.3% 1.8% 6,780 5,776	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508 5,497 2,543	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079 5,008 2,952	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528 5,591 2,610	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982 3,895 2,577	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388 5,246 2,382	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492 5,911 2,346	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652 5,464 2,346	1.9% 2.2% 6,027 5,256	1.9% 1.0% 8,409 4,479 2,745	1.5% 2.4% 7,786 5,520 2,525	2.0% 2.3% 8,447 5,272 3,384	2.0% 2.2% 6,289 2,700	$\left.\right\}$
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bus) 2.2.8 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137 2,055 2,936 96.8%	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179 3,835 97.0%	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 2,045 4,734 96.2%	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 1,797 5,200 97.7%	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,416 5,547 1,971 4,412 99.0%	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155 5,218 2,865 98.1%	1.6% 2.1% 7,163 5,202 2,504 97.9%	1.3% 1.8% 6,780 5,776 2,909 99.0%	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508 5,497 2,543 98.7%	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079 5,008 2,952 99.0%	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528 5,591 2,610 98.0%	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982 3,895 2,577 98.6%	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388 5,246 2,382 97.5%	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492 5,911 2,346 98.9%	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652 5,464 2,346 98.6%	1.9% 2.2% 6,027 5,256 1,807 98.1%	1.9% 1.0% 8,409 4,479 2,745 97.7%	1.5% 2.4% 7,786 5,520 2,525 97.9%	2.0% 2.3% 8,447 5,272 3,384 97.0%	2.0% 2.2% 6,289	
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Mean distance between failure (Bus) 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic) 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic) 2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered 2.2.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday)		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137 2,055 96.8% 490,598	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179 3,835 97.0% 495,341	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 2,045 4,734 96.2% 504,205	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 1,797 5,200 97.7% 510,844	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,416 5,547 1,971 4,412 99.0% 519,462	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155 5,218 2,865	1.6% 2.1% 7,163 5,202 2,504	1.3% 1.8% 6,780 5,776	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508 5,497 2,543	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079 5,008 2,952	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528 5,591 2,610	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982 3,895 2,577	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388 5,246 2,382	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492 5,911 2,346	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652 5,464 2,346	1.9% 2.2% 6,027 5,256	1.9% 1.0% 8,409 4,479 2,745	1.5% 2.4% 7,786 5,520 2,525	2.0% 2.3% 8,447 5,272 3,384	2.0% 2.2% 6,289 2,700	$\left.\right\}$
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points 2.2.8 Idea flastance between failure (Bus) 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bus) 2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered 2.2.1 Mean distance between failure (Bus) 2.2.1 Buse distance between failure (Bus) 2.2.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday) 2.2.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday)		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137 2,055 2,936 96.8% 490,598 141,000	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179 3,835 97.0% 495,341 145,700	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 2,045 4,734 96.2% 504,205 155,800	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 1,797 5,200 97.7% 510,844 157,841	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,5416 5,547 1,971 4,412 99.0% 519,462 171,598	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155 5,218 2,865 98.1%	1.6% 2.1% 7,163 5,202 2,504 97.9%	1.3% 1.8% 6,780 5,776 2,909 99.0%	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508 5,497 2,543 98.7%	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079 5,008 2,952 99.0%	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528 5,591 2,610 98.0%	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982 3,895 2,577 98.6%	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388 5,246 2,382 97.5%	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492 5,911 2,346 98.9%	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652 5,464 2,346 98.6%	1.9% 2.2% 6,027 5,256 1,807 98.1%	1.9% 1.0% 8,409 4,479 2,745 97.7%	1.5% 2.4% 7,786 5,520 2,525 97.9%	2.0% 2.3% 8,447 5,272 3,384 97.0%	2.0% 2.2% 6,289 2,700	$\left.\right\}$
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points" 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bus) 2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered 2.2.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday) 2.2.11 Ridership (Kistoric, average weekday)		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137 2,055 2,936 96.8% 490,598 141,000 23,450	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179 3,835 97.0% 495,341 145,700 23,210	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 2,045 4,734 96.2% 504,205 155,800 22,521	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 1,797 5,200 97.7% 510,844 157,841 20,988	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,416 5,547 1,971 4,412 99.0% 519,462 171,598 19,750	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155 5,218 2,865 98.1%	1.6% 2.1% 7,163 5,202 2,504 97.9%	1.3% 1.8% 6,780 5,776 2,909 99.0%	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508 5,497 2,543 98.7%	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079 5,008 2,952 99.0%	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528 5,591 2,610 98.0%	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982 3,895 2,577 98.6%	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388 5,246 2,382 97.5%	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492 5,911 2,346 98.9%	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652 5,464 2,346 98.6%	1.9% 2.2% 6,027 5,256 1,807 98.1%	1.9% 1.0% 8,409 4,479 2,745 97.7%	1.5% 2.4% 7,786 5,520 2,525 97.9%	2.0% 2.3% 8,447 5,272 3,384 97.0%	2.0% 2.2% 6,289 2,700	$\left.\right\}$
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points Dijective 2.2: Improve transit performance 2.2.7 Z.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Rus) 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic) 2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered 2.2.11 Ridership (Rus, average weekday) 2.2.11 Ridership (Historic, average weekday)		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137 2,055 2,936 96.8% 490,598 141,000 23,450 20,160	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179 3,835 97.0% 495,341 145,700 23,210 18,960	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 4,734 96.2% 504,205 155,800 22,521 20,640	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 5,200 97.7% 510,844 157,841 157,841 20,988 19,070	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,416 5,547 1,971 4,412 99.0% 519,462 171,598 19,750 15,490	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155 5,218 2,865 98.1% 507,333	1.6% 2.1% 7,163 5,202 2,504 97.9% 508,023	1.3% 1.8% 6,780 5,776 2,909 99.0% 519,700	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508 5,497 2,543 98.7% 497,800	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079 5,008 2,952 99.0% 486,780	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528 5,591 2,610 98.0% 516,200	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982 3,895 2,577 98.6% 546,920	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388 5,246 2,382 97.5% 536,920	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492 5,911 2,346 98.9% 494,230	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652 5,464 2,346 98.6% 487,910	1.9% 2.2% 6,027 5,256 1,807 98.1% 475,600	1.9% 1.0% 8,409 4,479 2,745 97.7% 518,830	1.5% 2.4% 7,786 5,520 2,525 97.9% 497,170	2.0% 2.3% 8,447 5,272 3,384 97.0% 519,670	2.0% 2.2% 6,289 2,700 95.7%	
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bus) 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (LKV) 2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered 2.2.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday) 2.2.11 Ridership (Historic, average weekday) 2.2.11 Ridership (Cable, average weekday)		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137 2,055 2,936 96.8% 490,598 141,000 23,450 23,450 71,172	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179 3,835 97.0% 495,341 145,700 23,210 18,960 74,054	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 2,045 4,734 96.2% 504,205 155,800 22,521 20,640 74,137	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 5,200 97.7% 510,844 157,841 20,988 19,070 75,967	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,416 5,547 1,971 4,412 99.0% 519,462 171,598 19,750 15,490 70,307	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155 5,218 2,865 98.1% 507,333 70,236	1.6% 2.1% 7,163 5,202 2,504 97.9% 508,023 67,320	1.3% 1.8% 6,780 5,776 2,909 99.0% 519,700 59,946	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508 5,497 2,543 98.7% 497,800 69,093	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079 5,008 2,952 99.0% 486,780 65,350	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528 5,591 2,610 98.0%	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982 3,895 2,577 98.6% 546,920 67,464	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388 5,246 2,382 97.5% 536,920 65,804	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492 5,911 2,346 98.9% 494,230 63,357	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652 5,464 2,346 98.6% 487,910 62,109	1.9% 2.2% 6,027 5,256 1,807 98.1% 475,600	1.9% 1.0% 8,409 4,479 2,745 97.7% 518,830 68,056	1.5% 2.4% 7,786 5,520 2,525 97.9% 497,170 67,336	2.0% 2.3% 8,447 5,272 3,384 97.0% 519,670 68,920	2.0% 2.2% 6,289 2,700 95.7%	$\left.\right\}$
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points" 2.2.7 Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance 2.2.7 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (RM) 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic) 2.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered 2.2.11 Ridership (GK), average weekday) 2.2.11 Ridership (Historic, average weekday)		60.1% 5.9% 7.1% 3,300 3,137 2,055 2,936 96.8% 490,598 141,000 23,450 20,160	59.0% 7.4% 8.6% 3,310 3,571 2,179 3,835 97.0% 495,341 145,700 23,210 18,960	58.9% 7.4% 8.3% 4,632 3,164 4,734 96.2% 504,205 155,800 22,521 20,640	57.0% 4.7% 5.6% 5,650 4,517 5,200 97.7% 510,844 157,841 157,841 20,988 19,070	59.8% 3.4% 4.1% 5,416 5,547 1,971 4,412 99.0% 519,462 171,598 19,750 15,490	57.3% 2.1% 2.5% 5,155 5,218 2,865 98.1% 507,333	1.6% 2.1% 7,163 5,202 2,504 97.9% 508,023	1.3% 1.8% 6,780 5,776 2,909 99.0% 519,700	57.2% 2.0% 1.5% 6,508 5,497 2,543 98.7% 497,800	55.9% 1.1% 1.4% 8,079 5,008 2,952 99.0% 486,780	55.5% 1.5% 2.0% 7,528 5,591 2,610 98.0% 516,200	56.3% 1.6% 3.7% 5,982 3,895 2,577 98.6% 546,920	55.0% 1.6% 3.1% 7,388 5,246 2,382 97.5% 536,920	55.1% 1.4% 1.5% 6,492 5,911 2,346 98.9% 494,230	55.5% 1.4% 1.6% 6,652 5,464 2,346 98.6% 487,910	1.9% 2.2% 6,027 5,256 1,807 98.1% 475,600	1.9% 1.0% 8,409 4,479 2,745 97.7% 518,830	1.5% 2.4% 7,786 5,520 2,525 97.9% 497,170	2.0% 2.3% 8,447 5,272 3,384 97.0% 519,670	2.0% 2.2% 6,289 2,700 95.7%	

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | June 2018

M	
	SFMTA

| Metric | Target | FY12 Avg | FY13 Avg | FY14 Avg | FY15 Avg | FY16 Avg
 | FY17 Avg | FY18 Avg | May 2017 | Jun 2017 | Jul 2017 | Aug 2017 | Sep 2017

 | Oct 2017
 | Nov 2017 | Dec 2017
 | Jan 2018 | Feb 2018
 | Mar 2018 | Apr 2018 | May 2018
 | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---
---|--|---|---|--|---|---
--
--
--
--|---|---

---|--|---
---|---|
| ctive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes | | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Non-private auto mode share (all trips) | 50% | | 50% | 54% | 52% | 54%
 | 57% | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Average daily bikeshare trips (Weekday) | | | | 885 | 1,089 | 1,023
 | 984 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| ective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand | | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas | | 40.5% | 52.2% | 66.2% | 60.3% | 64.7%
 | 71.8% | 87.1% | | | 80.1% | |

 |
 | |
 | | 89.9%
 | | | 91.3%
 | |
| Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) | | 81.2% | 81.3% | 80.7% | 80.9% | 80.6%
 | 80.7% | 80.9% | 80.2% | 80.2% | 82.2% | 79.8% | 80.1%

 | 79.6%
 | 81.7% | 85.3%
 | 79.9% | 80.1%
 | 80.2% | 79.4% | 80.9%
 | \sim |
| Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird)* | | 85.2% | 85.3% | 84.4% | 85.9% | 84.7%
 | 84.2% | 83.6% | 81.9% | 82.3% | 82.2% | 83.9% | 81.8%

 | 82.8%
 | 84.8% | 88.2%
 | 82.6% | 82.6%
 | 83.0% | 83.0% | 84.2%
 | \sim |
| # of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces | | | | | 7,958 | 8,925
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| # of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) | | | | | 1,329 | 1,429
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| al 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fra | ncisco | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| | | , emissions, v | waste, and no | ise | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons C02e) | 17,434 | 49,811 | 46,272 | 45,244 | 43,499 | 24,146
 | 3,483 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions | | 24.1% | 28.0% | 28.1% | 28.5% | 42.2%
 | 29.8% | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions | | 94.0% | 94.0% | 98.0% | 98.0% | 94.6%
 | 94.6% | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Number of electric vehicle charging stations | | 33 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63
 | 63 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Agency electricity consumption (kWh)* | | 9,862,454 | 9,790,994 | 9,944,080 | 9,783,200 | 9,957,470
 | 9,928,945 | 9,816,319 | 10,143,276 | 10,028,603 | 9,936,073 | 10,133,623 | 9,498,167

 | 9,870,792
 | 9,715,727 | 9,743,530
 | |
 | | |
 | \sim |
| Agency gas consumption (therms) [*] | | 33,934 | 32,049 | 23,057 | 19,265 | 21,108
 | 24,260 | 12,375 | 19,588 | 25,793 | 14,501 | 11,615 | 10,956

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | \rangle |
| Agency water consumption (gallons) | | 1,444,139 | 1,476,801 | 1,903,909 | 1,735,422 | 1,503,979
 | 1,431,516 | 1,478,653 | 1,336,119 | 1,597,392 | 1,237,329 | 1,375,218 | 1,341,976

 | 1,171,439
 | 2,382,053 | 1,216,688
 | 1,940,466 | 1,392,176
 | 1,409,616 | 1,319,573 | 1,694,977
 | $\sim\sim$ |
| Agency waste diversion rate | | 36.4% | 37.9% | 37.1% | 34.5% | 35.1%
 | 33.3% | 37.3% | 32.9% | 39.7% | 31.5% | 35.7% | 36.4%

 | 44.6%
 | 41.9% | 36.0%
 | 37.6% | 37.1%
 | 36.8% | |
 | $\sim \sim$ |
| ective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the econor | my | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Muni average weekday boardings | | 675,208 | 683,211 | 703,160 | 708,733 | 726,303
 | 714,910 | | 730,910 | 707,590 | 702,280 | 725,070 | 753,320

 | 735,730
 | 698,400 | 666,400
 | 663,610 | 723,750
 | 706,460 | 728,520 |
 | \leq |
| ective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively | | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase | | | | | 65.6% | 81.3%
 | 92.3% | | 94.4% | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase | | | | | 59.2% | 97.8%
 | 84.3% | | 62.7% | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| ective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently | | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Transit passengers per Hour | | | | | |
 | | | 64.9 | 63.2 | 62.7 | 64.6 | 67.1

 | 65.5
 | 62.2 | 59.9
 | 60 | 64.4
 | 62.8 | 64.8 |
 | \sim |
| Average annual transit cost per revenue hour* | \$203 | \$224.73 | \$224.54 | \$224.73 | \$242.35 | \$240.89
 | \$236.83 | \$220.39 | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Cost per unlinked trip | | \$3.14 | \$3.22 | \$4.00 | \$3.29 | \$3.48
 | \$3.49 | \$3.54 | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Farebox recovery ratio | | 32.0% | 32.0% | 33.7% | 30.4% | 29.5%
 | 26.2% | 24.5% | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Average daily Transit Operator shortfall | | 37 | 35 | 43 | 25 | 10
 | 17 | 12 | | 17 | 13 | 27 |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | / |
| Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month* | | 205 | 158 | 147 | 594 | 295
 | 249 | 157 | | 29 | | 29 |

 | 14
 | | 30
 | 42 |
 | 42 | | 42
 | |
| ective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits | | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)* | | | | | | \$229M (As of Q4)
 | \$278M (As of Q4) | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| al 4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service | | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| ective 4.1: Improve internal communications | | | | | |
 | | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Employee rating: I have the Information and tools I need to do my job; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low) | 4.0 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.4
 | 3.5 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Employee rating: I have access to information about Agency accomplishments, current
events, issues and challenges; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)* | 2.0 | | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 |
 | 3.7 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Employee rating: I feel as though the Agency communicates current events, issues,
challenges and accomplishments clearly; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)* | 3.5 | | | | | 3.2
 | 3.1 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Percentage of employees that complete the survey | | | 32.9% | 29.6% | 27.2% | 29.7%
 | 31.5% | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Employee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals/objectives and how
they contribute to Agency success. | | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5
 | 3.5 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days. | | | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0
 | 3.0 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees
has improved. | | | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.9
 | 2.9 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile. | | | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.3
 | 3.4 | | | | | |

 |
 | |
 | |
 | | |
 | |
| | tervie 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes Non-private auto mode share (all trips) Average daily bikeshare trips (Weekday) extire 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) Hourly share of SFMTA parage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) A for secure off-street bicycle parking spaces If of secure onf-street bicycle parking Agency waste diversion rate If of secure onf-street bicycle secure on-time by phase If of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase If of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase If of secure and trips If areabox recovery rato If average annual transit cost per revenue hour* If areabox recovery rato If average daily Transit Operator shortfall If whith of a morth secure secure secure of shortfall If whith of afferts If a workplace that delivers outstanding service If of secure and challenges, scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)* If employee rating: I have aceas to information | Extre 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes Non-private auto mode share (all trips) 50% Average daily biteshare trips (Weekday) 50% Average daily biteshare trips (Weekday) 50% Derecentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpork pilot areas 01 Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/atter 9:59a) 1 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/atter 9:59a) 1 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/atter 9:59a) 1 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/atter 9:59a) 1 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/atter 9:59a) 1 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/atter 9:59a) 1 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/atter 9:59a) 1 A of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking) 1 al 3: Indroce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption (SFMTA can's fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions 1 Percentage of SFMTA tan's fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions 1 Agency water consumption (galions)' 2 2 Agency water consumption (galions)' 2 2 Agency water | Everye 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes Image: Construct a structure of the structure o | Control Control Control Non-private auto mode share (all trips) 50% 50% Non-private auto mode share (all trips) 50% 50% Average daily bikeshare trips (Weekday) 50% 50% Everentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas 40.5% 52.2% Off-peak share of SMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/fiter 9:59a) 81.2% 81.3% Houry share of SMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/fiter 9:59a) 81.2% 85.3% Houry share of SMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/fiter 9:59a) 81.2% 85.3% Houry share of SMTA parage entries (before 7:00a/fiter 9:59a) 81.2% 82.3% Houry share of SMTA parage entries (before 7:00a/fiter 9:59a) 17.44 49.811 46.272 Bal S: Improve the environment and Quality of life in San Francisco 24.118 46.272 24.118 46.272 Percentage of SMTA non-revenue Blet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions 94.0% 94.0% 94.0% 94.0% 94.0% 94.0% 94.0% 94.0% 33.34 48.20.4% 97.90.994 33.34 32.049 94.0% 94.0% 97.90.994 36 | Increase use of all non-private auto modes Increase use of all non-private auto modes Increase use of all non-private auto modes Non-private auto mode share (all tripa) 50% 50% 54% werage duily biteshare trips (Weekday) 885 885 Cotte 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand 81.2% 81.3% 80.7% Precentage of metered hours with on rate change in SFpork pilot areas* 40.5% 52.2% 66.2% Off-pack share of SMTA parage entries (before 700a/arter 959a) 81.2% 81.3% 80.7% Nourly share of SMTA parage entries (before 700a/arter 959a) 85.2% 85.3% 84.4% If of secure of-treet bicycle parking spaces (parage bicycle parking) 1 1 1 at 1 Sternore orbit (metric trons Co2) 17.434 49.811 46.272 45.244 Precentage of SMTA and nether that is altemative fuel/zero emissions 17.434 49.811 46.272 45.244 Precentage of SMTA and nether that is altemative fuel/zero emissions 19.434 30.63 63.94 63.94 63.94 63.94 63.94 63.94 63.94 63.94 64.84 37.96 | Line Construction Line Construction Line Construction Line Construction Non-private auto mode share (all trips) 50% 50% 50% 52% 52% Non-private auto mode share (all trips) 50% 50% 50% 52% 53% 52% Name dub Number of Nu | Low price auto mode share (all trug) Col Col | Inc. private auto modes Image Image <thimage< th=""> Image Image</thimage<> | Line rease use of all non-private auto modes Line Lin | Low point and non-private auto modes Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private auto modes) Low point auto modes have (all hon-private hon-pr | Level 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes Low Low <thlow< th=""> Low <thlow< th=""> L</thlow<></thlow<> | Level 2.1: increase use of all non-private auto modes Low Low <thlow< th=""> Low <thlow< th=""> L</thlow<></thlow<> | Left 23. Increase use of all non-private auto mode: 1 <th1< th=""> <th1< th=""> 1 <th< td=""><td>Left 2.1: Increase use of all non-private auto modes D <thd< th=""> <thd< th=""> D <t< td=""><td>Label 2.1. Increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all in</td><td>International operation of all concepts of all concepts</td><td>back base back base <t< td=""><td>And a stateAnd<!--</td--><td>AltA</td><td>Image and all non-points approaches approac</td><td>The series and all here produces all here produces and all here a</td><td>Image: set of a lay sympt be below in the set of a lay set o</td></td></t<></td></t<></thd<></thd<></td></th<></th1<></th1<> | Left 2.1: Increase use of all non-private auto modes D <thd< th=""> <thd< th=""> D <t< td=""><td>Label 2.1. Increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all in</td><td>International operation of all concepts of all concepts</td><td>back base back base <t< td=""><td>And a stateAnd<!--</td--><td>AltA</td><td>Image and all non-points approaches approac</td><td>The series and all here produces all here produces and all here a</td><td>Image: set of a lay sympt be below in the set of a lay set o</td></td></t<></td></t<></thd<></thd<> | Label 2.1. Increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all incregizate and on the set of all increases and all in | International operation of all concepts | back base back base <t< td=""><td>And a stateAnd<!--</td--><td>AltA</td><td>Image and all non-points approaches approac</td><td>The series and all here produces all here produces and all here a</td><td>Image: set of a lay sympt be below in the set of a lay set o</td></td></t<> | And a stateAnd </td <td>AltA</td> <td>Image and all non-points approaches approac</td> <td>The series and all here produces all here produces and all here a</td> <td>Image: set of a lay sympt be below in the set of a lay set o</td> | AltA | Image and all non-points approaches approac | The series and all here produces all here produces and all here a | Image: set of a lay sympt be below in the set of a lay set o |

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | June 2018

ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	FY17 Avg	FY18 Avg	May 2017	Jun 2017	Jul 2017	Aug 2017	Sep 2017	Oct 2017	Nov 2017	Dec 2017	Jan 2018	Feb 2018	Mar 2018	Apr 2018	May 2018	
Obje	tive 4.2: Create a collaborative and innovative work environment																						
4.2.1	Employee rating: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	3.9		3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4															
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.			3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9															
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.			3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9															
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.			3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.3															
4.2.5	Employee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems efficiently/effectively			3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7															
4.2.6	Employee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're different than others'.			3.6	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.3															
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.			3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6															
Obje	tive 4.3: Improve employee accountability																						1
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year	100%		20.3%	62.5%	31.3%	59.1%	43.8%															1
4.3.1	Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans	100%		18.8%	62.5%	54.2%	58.9%	58.7%															
4.3.2	Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported			73.0%	92.3%	93.6%	96.1%	96.1%															(
4.3.3	Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.4%	7.7%	8.6%	8.1%	8.8%	9.4%	7.9%	8.0%	8.0%	7.9%	9.4%	8.1%	8.4%	9.0%	9.2%	8.3%	9.8%	10.4%	\sim
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5															
4.3.5	Employee commendations to 311		127	112	104	104	152	181	109	191	158	131	138	126	108	102	83	93	101	95	94	122	
Obje	tive 4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with our stakeholders																						
4.4.1	Stakeholder rating: satisfaction with SFMTA management of transportation in San Francisco; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)					2.9																	

*Notes

1.1.2/1.3.5/2.1.1/2.1.2/2.1.3/2.1.4/2.1.5/2.1.8/2.1.9 Results are based on a non-probability sample from opt-in SFMTA online panel surveys and have been weighted to reflect the geographic distribution of the San Francisco population.

1.1.3 Beginning with FY2015, includes all taxi, TNC, and black car service-related incidents reported to SFPD. Reporting for prior months includes "defrauding taxi driver", "operating taxi without a permit", and "overcharging taxi fare" incidents only.

1.1.4 / 1.3.4 / 4.3.5 Due to a previous calculation error that resulted in the over-reporting of 311 cases, some monthly values between May 2012 and Dec 2014 were re-calculated and revised in this document.

1.2.2 Includes assaults and threats on operators.

1.3.1 Results for October 2015, December 2015 and February 2016 have been updated slightly from previously reported figures to reflect some minor categorical revisions to reported collisions.

1.3.2 Injury collisions reported in the calendar year.

1.3.3 Previously reported figures for falls per 100,000 miles have been updated to account for an adjustment in reported number of falls.

2.1.7 Due to a calculation error, the reported figures for FY2017 were revised.

2.2.1 <1 min for headway of 5 min or less. September 2017 and October 2017 records cannot be reported pending data quality issues.

2.2.1 / 2.2.2 / 2.2.4 / 2.2.6 Effective April 2015, the Muni Rapid Network is defined as routes/lines J, K, L, M, N, 5R, 7R, 9R, 14R, 28R, and 38R. This report reflects the updated Rapid Network.

January and February 2017 on-time performance, gaps or bunching cannot be reported due to a network issue that limited NextBus predictions and prevented systemwide on-time performance data from being collected.

2.2.1 / 2.2.2 / 2.2.6 Previously reported bunching and gap, and on-time performance results have been revised to correct for a prior data processing error.

2.2.5 / 2.2.10 Running time performance measure has not been developed.

2.2.7 Due to a previous calculation error, monthly FY14 and June FY16 results were incorrectly reported in previous Metrics reports and have been corrected in this document.

2.2.8 Reported figures for Oct 2017 to May 2018 subject to data quality issues. FY 16 and FY 17 Rubber Tire MDBF figures were updated to correct for a prior reporting error. April 2015 and May 2015 Mean Distance Between Failure (MDBF) Cable Car figures have been updated to account for an adjustment in report 2.2.9 September 2016 figures have been revised to account for a prior reporting error.

2.2.11 Reported figures for average weekday bus ridership have been modifed to correct for a prior reporting error.

2.2.12 / 2.2.13 Reported figures for Elevator / Escalator do not include the following days: 1/3/2016, 1/7/2016, 1/8/2016, 2/12/2016, 2/12/2016, 2/12/2016, 2/16/2016, 2/12/2016, 3/17/2016, 5/8/2016, and 5/9/2016. Historical figures have been adjusted as per revised data.

2.4.1 Increase in percent of metered hours with no rate change indicates achievement of price point and parking availability goals. Note: sensor based rate adjustments were limited to SF park pilot blocks with 50% or more parking sensor coverage through February 2014. Sensor Independent Rate Adjustments (SIRA) based on meter payment data started in June 2014 and include all SF park pilot area blocks including those that fell below the 50% parking sensor threshold. These blocks have not approached their price point yet,

- sensor independent kate Adjustitetta (sinka) based on the payment data started in sinka court and include and spark plot and books including trose that ten below the sove parking sensor threshold, the which howers the baseline for this metric. Moving forward, June 2014 will be considered the new baseline for SIRA.
- 2.4.2 Shift in utilization from peak to off-peak indicates successful mitigation of congestion on city streets.

2.4.2 / 2.4.3 Shift in utilization to hourly from early bird and monthly indicates garages are used more for short trips that benefit nearby businesses and less for commute trips by auto.

2.4.3 Running total of SFMTA-installed facilities.

3.1.3 Upon the adopted use of renewable diesel for the Muni fleet in January 2016, the SFMTA no longer reports metric 3.1.3 (Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA).

3.1.6 Resource consumption data for facilities leased by the SFMTA is not reflected in the current reporting.

3.2.1 Reported figures for average weekday boardings have been modifed to correct for a prior reporting error.

3.3.1 / 3.3.2 Figures reflect estimate at completion-weighted % of projects on or under budget (including contingency) for all projects delivered by the SFMTA's Capital Projects & Construction division. Reported results currently exclude projects in the Sustainable Streets Division portfolio. No data for reporting project delivery budget performance is available for July 2016. Data forthcoming after measure methodology is revised.

3.4.1 Historical figures have been slightly revised to account for a prior reporting error.

3.4.2 / 3.4.3 Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY17 dollars. FY17 reporting is based on preliminary, pre-audited figures.

3.4.6 Reporting of this metric has been discontinued as of September 2017.

3.4.7 FY Total rather than FY Average.

3.5.1 Revised structural deficit figures will be reported in November 2016.

4.1.1 Employee rating of "I have access to information about Agency accomplishments, current events, issues and challenges" has been reworded to "I feel as though the Agency communicates current events, issues, challenges and accomplishments clearly" in the 2016 employee satisfaction survey.

M SFMT