STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2015



ID Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Jul 2015	Aug 2015	Monthly Trend
Goal 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyon	e																			
Objective 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users																				
1.1.1 SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles	3.1	3.8	7.6	9.5	8.2	6.9	8.0	9.9	8.2	6.8	8.0	8.5	9.2	9.2	7.3	7.3	7.5	6.9		\sim
Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle): scale of 1	5.12	3.0	7.0			0.5	3.		U.L	3.2	0.0	0.5	3.3	3.2	7.5	3.4	7.5	0.5		· -
1.1.2 (low) to 5 (high) ¹				3.2	3.3		3.	.3		3.2			3.3			3.4				
Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or				3.1	3.2		3.	.2		3.0			3.2			3.2				
station): scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹ 1.1.3 SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes ²		3	3.9	4.3	36.6	36.0	39	39	32	42	41	36	33	35	26	43	36	36		~~~
		41.6	36.4	28.7	37.1	33	39	51	32	25	31	40	38	45	41	29	43	30	36	, - - - , - - , - - - , - - - - - - - - - -
		41.0	30.4	20.7	57.1	33	39	31	32	25	31	40	30	43	41	29	43	30	30	~ ~~
Objective 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security				10.0					40.0	400								44.0		000
1.2.1 Workplace injuries/200,000 hours	13.1	16.2	13.8	12.0	11.0	11.2	9.4	12.5	13.0	10.9	12.2	12.6 5	10.7	9.5	10.5	10.1	12.5	11.2		/
1.2.2 Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) ⁴		11.3	12.1	9.9	8.3	11.0	/	11	9	/	9	5	6	8	8	9	11	11		/ ~~
1.2.3 Lost work days due to injury Employee rating: I feel safe and secure in my work environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5		16,445																		
1.2.4 (high)			3.2	3.3																
Objective 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system																				
1.3.1 Muni collisions/100.000 miles	4.1	5.0	5.2	5.9	6.5	6.4	6.3	7.5	6.5	5.8	7.1	6.2	6.6	7.2	6.4	6.7	5.8	6.4		^~~~
1.3.2 Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists ⁵		3,235 (CY12)																		,
1.3.2 Collisions involving taxis		342 (CY11)																		
1.3.3 Muni falls on board/100,000 miles		4.7	4.2	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.9	4.0	5.2	4.7	3.8	4.4	4.3	4.9	3.9	4.3	3.5	3.9		~~~~
1.3.4 "Unsafe operation" Muni complaints to 311 ³		179.1	157.3	174.2	178.5	172.0	179	214	206	209	142	161	173	205	164	171	170	170	174	
1.3.5 Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹				3.7	3.74		3.	.7		3.6			3.8			3.7				
Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & ca	arsharin	g the prefe	erred mea	ns of tra	avel															
, 3, , 6, ,	I	I III	inca mee	1113 01 01	1VC1															
Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications [Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5																				
2.1.1 (high) ¹	3.5			3.0	3.1		3.	.0		2.9			3.0			3.1				
Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.5	2.7		2.	6	2.5		2.7			2.8						
I (high)				2.5	2.,		-	.0				2,								
2.1.3 Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.8	2.9		3.	.0	2.8			3.0			2.9					
Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with nedestrian environment: scale of 1							3.	2			2.1			3.4						
2.1.4 (low) to 5 (high) ¹				3.5	3.3		3.	.3	3.2			3.1			3.4					
2.1.5 Customer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.8	2.8		2.	×		2.7		2.8			2.8					
2.1.5 (high) ¹																				
2.1.6 Percentage of color curb requests addressed within 30 days		86.4%	93.3%	93.7%	67.8%	94.6%	50.8%	41.9%	26.0%	34.5%	70.8%	89.0%	93.5%	84.7%	89.7%	91.3%	94.3%	94.6%		<u></u>
2.1.6 Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours		99.0%	100.0%	99.4%	98.0%	100.0%	100.0%	96.2%	96.4%	95.7%	97.6%	100.0%	94.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	94.7%	100.0%		$\sim\sim$
2.1.6 Percentage of parking meter malfunctions addressed within 48 hours		85.0%	82.4%	75.6%	60.0%	84.3%	63.0%	71.0%	71.0%	62.9%	62.5%	39.2%	67.4%	48.8%	55.4%	52.8%	82.5%	84.5%	83.9%	~~~
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days		81.0%	79.1%	53.8%	40.4%		29.	-		33.7%			52.2%			56.1%				
2.1.6 Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours		97.0%	96.9%	96.8%	96.8%	99.0%	94.0%	100.0%	94.4%	95.9%	95.5%	96.7%	96.4%	96.8%	98.1%	98.1%	99.2%	100.0%	97.7%	\\
2.1.7 Percentage of actionable 311 Muni-related complaints addressed within 28 days		87.0%	90.0%	78.6%	82.6%		90.1%	80.6%	73.9%	74.4% 2.6	84.4%	86.1%	78.9% 2.7	85.6%		2.8				\sim
2.1.8 Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) ¹ Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1				2.7	2.7															
2.1.9 (low) to 5 (high) ¹				2.6	2.6		2.	.6		2.5			2.5			2.5				
Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance																				
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network 6,7	2.1%	3.9%	4.0%	4.0%	4.8%	4.8%	4.5%	5.0%	5.4%	5.0%	5.7%	4.5%	4.1%	4.6%	4.6%	5.1%	5.1%	4.8%		~~~
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with +5 min gaps on Rapid Network	10.7%	19.5%	17.8%	18.6%	17.2%	15.3%	19.0%	19.1%	19.3%	17.3%	18.8%	16.4%	15.9%	16.1%	15.6%	15.6%	15.6%	15.3%		~~~
2.2.2 Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network 2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes 7	85%	61.0%	59.6%	59.0%	56.8%	59.8%	56.5%	55.3%	53.4%	55.4%	53.7%	56.9%	57.4%	58.0%	57.8%	59.0%	59.4%	59.8%		
2.2.2 Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes 2.2.3 Percentage of scheduled trips delivered	98.5%	96.7%	97.0%	96.3%	97.6%	99.7%	95.2%	96.2%	96.7%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.3%	99.3%	99.4%	99.4%	99.5%	99.8%	99.5%	~~
2.2.4 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	85%	76.9%	73.7%	73.9%	72.2%	33.176	71.0%	70.1%	67.7%	71.3%	69.5%	73.2%	74.1%	73.9%	74.5%	75.5%	74.1%	74.3%	33.370	-
2.2.5 Running time performance		development.	73.770	13.370	12.2/0		71.078	70.170	07.770	71.370	03.370	73.270	74.170	73.370	74.370	73.370	74.1/0	74.570		~~
2.2.6 Percentage of on-time performance	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	57.0%		56.3%	55.4%	53.1%	55.6%	53.3%	57.8%	58.4%	58.7%	58.9%	59.4%	58.9%	59.5%		>^/
Percentage of hus trins over canacity during AM neak (8:00a-8:59a, inhound) at may load	0370					2.00/													2.20/	Ň
2.2.7 points ⁸ Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max		5.9%	7.4%	7.4%	4.7%	3.0%	6.3%	7.2%	9.3%	5.4%	3.9%	4.9%	3.4%	3.6%	4.5%	2.5%	3.0%	2.8%	3.3%	_~~_
2.2.7 load points ⁸		7.1%	8.6%	8.3%	5.8%	6.0%	7.4%	8.0%	7.8%	6.9%	4.8%	5.7%	4.0%	5.8%	5.2%	4.4%	5.2%	5.5%	6.6%	\\\\

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2015



Description: Target Fill 2 Age Fill				1	1																	
1.2.1 Monta Stance Notices Table 18(1) 1.3.10 1.3	ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Jul 2015	Aug 2015	Monthly Trend
1.5 Manufactor States Tables (1976)	Objec	tive 2.2: Improve transit performance																				
1.24 Man distance Interview Tables (Fisher) 1.25 1	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Bus)		3,300	3,310	4,632	5,650		5,941	6,260	4,947	5,216	3,463	5,670	5,847	6,318	5,701	6,087	6,693			~~~
2.2.2 Processing of children ferroman flatent plant of the company of the children of the	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (LRV)		3,137	3,571	3,164	4,517	4,834	4,146	4,233	3,954	4,921	4,687	4,683	3,896	4,281	4,248	7,260	5,122	4,834		\ \
1.2 Processing of stabolish control barry deterors 1.5 Pro	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Historic)		2,055	2,179	2,045	1,797	1,748	1,924	1,515	2,425	2,405	1,476	1,740	2,090	2,331	1,788	1,432	1,383	1,748		<
23.10	2.2.8	Mean distance between failure (Cable)		2,936		4,734	5,135	7,769	12,839	3,538	23,706	3,044	2,998	3,317	4,182	4,173	5,771	4,200	25,684	7,769		<<
Section Continue from Processes Continue from Pr	2.2.9	Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered		96.7%	97.0%	96.2%	97.6%	99.6%	95.3%	96.1%	96.5%	97.8%	97.3%	98.3%	98.4%	99.3%	99.4%	99.5%	99.5%	99.7%	99.5%	
\$2.12 Securing formula controls in registerated 7,0/31 7,2/34 7,2	2.2.10	Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered	Measure in	n development																		
2.11	2.2.11	Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday) ⁹		490,514	495,311	504,162	- ,		495,899	549,058	519,179	481,093	444,945	466,975	476,425	481,938	481,362	484,944	466,267			<u> </u>
Section Sect	2.2.11	Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday)					73,932		69,591	- , -	- /	74,132	,	-, -	,				,		,	~~~
Description 2.3 Increase use of all non-private auto modes																						~~~
2.1.1 Non-private such mode de tanty (all trips) 50% 50% 54% 52% 1.009 1.151 1.150 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.185 1.213 1.000 685 1.009 0.002 1.164 1.191 1.175 1.185 1.1	2.2.13	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation		94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	91.9%	91.8%	94.9%	96.3%	96.3%	90.8%	86.5%	85.4%	88.5%	90.8%	90.6%	92.1%	93.2%	93.1%	90.6%	\sim
23.2 Average daily blockwhare into (Weedoday)	Objec	tive 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes																				
Measure in development Measure in developm			50%		50%	54%	52%															
Descriptive 2.4 improve parking utilization and manage parking demand	2.3.2	Average daily bikeshare trips (Weekday)				885	1,089		1,151	1,158	1,213	1,008	685	1,039	1,082	1,164	1,191	1,125	1,183			~
24.1 Percentage of meterned hours with no rate change in Sport, pilote reast** 40.5% 52.2% 66.2% 62.3% 9.7% 80.0% 9.0% 80.0% 80.0% 80.9% 80.0% 80.9% 80.0% 80.9% 80.0% 80.	2.3.3	Average daily taxi trips	Measure in	n development																		
1.2.2 1.2.	Objec	tive 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand																				
12.25 Dispask that of STMTA garge entries (before 750/Mrb e 553)1 1.12	2.4.1	Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas ¹⁰		40.5%	52.2%	66.2%	60.3%										60.3%					
1.4.3 of secure on-server tologic parking spaces	2.4.2	Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) 11		81.2%	81.3%	80.7%	80.9%	80.9%	81.5%	79.3%	78.9%	82.9%	84.1%	80.9%	80.0%	79.8%	80.0%	81.6%	80.2%	80.9%	81.0%	\sim
2.4.3 of secure on street biotycle parking spaces	2.4.2	Hourly share of SEMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird) ¹²		85.2%	85.3%	84.4%	85.9%	84.8%	85.8%	84.9%	85.1%	87.6%	89.0%	86.0%	85.7%	84.9%	84.9%	86.0%	84.8%	84.6%	85.0%	
2.4.3 of secure off-store boycle parking spaces (gange bloycle parking)		, , , , ,																				
Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Francisco Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource consumption, emissions, waste, and noise 1.1.2 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 48,555 45,455 1.1.2 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.2 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.3 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.3 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.3 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.3 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.4 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.5 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.5 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.5 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.5 Percentage of SIMTA non-tensine fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.5 Percentage of side due due fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.5 Percentage of side due fluet fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.5 Percentage of side due fluet fluet/zero emissions 94,0% 98,0% 1.1.5 Percentage of side due fluet/zero emissions 1.1.5 Percentage of side of side due fluet/zero emissions 1.1.5 Percentage of all captal projects delivered on-budget by phase 1.1.5 Percentage of all captal projects delivered on-budget by phase 1.1.5 Percentage of all captal projects delivered on-budget physics 1.1.5 Percentage of all captal projects delivered on-budget by phase 1.1.5 Percentage of all captal projects delivered on-																						
Designation Section		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ancisco				120															
State Stat	_		<u> </u>																			
1.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fixer that is alternative fuel/zero emissions 1.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA tasi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions 1.1.3 Percentage indicates to discless used by SFMTA (blend equivalent) 1.1.4 (blend equivalent) 1.1.5 Percentage indicates to discless used by SFMTA (blend equivalent) 1.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (Wh) 1.1.1 (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)			consumpt			nd noise																
1.12 Percentage of SFMTA tax fleet that is alternative fue/zero emissions				48,556																		
1.1.3 Percentage hodiese for dised used by SMTA (blend equivalent) 1.4.0% 19.3% 3.6	3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions			37.0%																	
13.14 Number of electric vehicle charging stations 33 63 63	3.1.2	Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94.0%	94.0%	98.0%																
1.16 Agency electricity consumption (RWh) 124,120,362 122,809,359				14.0%	19.3%																	
13.16 Agency gas consumption (therms) 4.96,707 415,308						63																
3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons) 20,201,299 20,116,592 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 36.4% 38.1% 37.1% 36.4% 36.5% 36.4% 36.5% 36.4% 36.5% 36.4% 36.5%																						
3.1.7 Agency waste diversion rate 36.4% 38.1% 37.1%																						
Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy				.,.,																		
3.2.1 Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly SM) \$ 53.7 \$2.8 \$2.0 \$1.9 \$2.3 \$2.0 \$1.8 \$2.5 \$1.5 \$1.6 \$2.2 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$				36.4%	38.1%	37.1%																
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively S.3: Allocate capital projects delivered on-budget by phase ** 78.2% 64.9% 65.4% 66.9% 67.1% 82.0% 81.1% 77.7% 90.0% 83.9% 85.0%			nomy																			
3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase ¹⁴ 3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹⁴ 3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹⁴ 3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹⁴ 3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹⁴ 3.3.2 Description and transit cost per revenue hour services efficiently 3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour for buses 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses 3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip ¹⁵ 3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio 3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit 3.5.2 Massing and a service of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase ¹⁴ 3.6.4 New and a services efficiently 3.7.7 Massing and a services efficiently 3.8.5 No.4 No.4 No.4 No.4 No.4 No.4 No.4 No.4		1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1			\$3.7	\$2.8	\$2.0		\$1.9	\$2.3	\$2.0	\$1.8	\$2.5	\$1.5	\$1.6	\$2.2						$\sim\sim$
3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹⁴ Dipective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently 3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour ¹⁵ 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses 68 67 67 ¹⁶ 3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip ¹⁵ \$2.90 \$2.91 \$3.13 ¹⁶ 3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio 3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall Measure in development. 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ 205 158 147 594 34 39 56 56 56 57 80 37 37 55 48 Dipective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit 3.7.2 Structural operating budget deficit	Objec	tive 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																				
Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently 3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour 15 \$187 \$207.33 \$207.50 \$222.6816 \$207.50 \$222.6816	3.3.1	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase 14					78.2%				64.9%	65.4%		66.9%	67.1%	82.0%	81.1%	77.7%	90.0%	83.9%	85.0%	_
3.4.1 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour ¹⁵ 3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses 68 67 67 ¹⁶ 3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip ¹⁵ 52.90 52.91 53.13 ¹⁶ 3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio 3.2.78 33.7% 29.88 ¹⁶ 3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ 70bjective 3.5: Reduce Capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit 535M \$70M \$70M \$35M	3.3.2	Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase ¹⁴									20.0%	22.9%		16.7%	21.6%	38.5%	40.4%	36.5%	39.3%	39.3%	36.7%	- /
3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses 68 67 67 ¹⁶ 3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip ¹⁵ 52.90 \$2.91 \$3.13 ¹⁶ 3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio 3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M	Objec	tive 3.4: Deliver services efficiently																				
3.4.2 Passengers per revenue hour for buses 68 67 67 ¹⁶ 3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip ¹⁵ 52.90 \$2.91 \$3.13 ¹⁶ 3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio 3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ 205 158 147 594 34 39 56 56 56 57 80 37 37 55 48 Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M	3.4.1	Average annual transit cost per revenue hour ¹⁵	\$187	\$207.33	\$207.50	\$222.68 ¹⁶																
3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip ¹⁵ \$2.90 \$2.91 \$3.13 ¹⁶ \$32.2% 33.7% 29.8% ¹⁶ \$33.2% 33.7% 29.8% ¹⁶ \$34.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall Measure in development. 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ 205 158 147 594 34 39 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37 55 48 \$			¥																			
3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio 3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ 205 158 147 594 34 39 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37 55 48 Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M		• .																				
3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator surplus or shortfall Measure in development. 3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ 205 158 147 594 34 39 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37 55 48 Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M				-																		
3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month ¹⁷ 205 158 147 594 34 39 56 56 56 56 57 80 37 37 55 48 Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit 935M \$70M \$70M \$35M		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Measure in		33.170	23.070																
Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits 3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$70M \$35M			···cusure II		158	1/17	59/		3/1	30	56	56	56	56	57	gn	37	37	55	48		~^^~
3.5.1 Structural operating budget deficit \$35M \$70M \$35M				203	130	14/	JJ4		54	33	50	50	50	50	31	50	51	51	- 55	70		
3.5.1 Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR) \$130M \$260M \$260M \$260M	3.5.1	Structural operating budget deficit	\$35M	\$70M	\$70M	\$35M																
	3.5.1	Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)	\$130M	\$260M	\$260M	\$260M																

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | September 2015



Objective 4.1.1 Employ to 5 (I Employ event 4.1.2 Percer 4.1.3 Employ they c 4.1.4 Employ exployed to 5 (I Employ exployed to 5 (I Employed to	Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service 4.1: Improve internal communications loyee rating: I have the Information and tools I need to do my job; scale of 1 (high) (low) loyee rating: I have access to information about Agency accomplishments, current tts, issues and challenges; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low) entage of employees that complete the survey loyee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals/objectives and how	4.0		3.5																	
4.1.1 Emplo to 5 (I Emplo event 4.1.2 Percei 4.1.3 Emplo they c 4.1.4 Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo to 5 (I Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo to 5 (I Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo	loyee rating: I have the Information and tools I need to do my job; scale of 1 (high) (low) loyee rating: I have access to information about Agency accomplishments, current ts, issues and challenges; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low) entage of employees that complete the survey	4.0		3.5																	
4.1.1 Emplo to 5 (I Emplo event 4.1.2 Percei 4.1.3 Emplo they c 4.1.4 Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo to 5 (I Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo to 5 (I Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo	loyee rating: I have the Information and tools I need to do my job; scale of 1 (high) (low) loyee rating: I have access to information about Agency accomplishments, current ts, issues and challenges; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low) entage of employees that complete the survey	4.0		3.5																	
4.1.2 Percei 4.1.3 Emplo they c 4.1.4 Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo	its, issues and challenges; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low) entage of employees that complete the survey] 3.3	3.5																1
4.1.3 Employed they of 4.1.4 Employed has in 4.1.6 Employed they of 4.1.5 Employed the first they of 4.1.6 Employed they of 4.1.6 Employe				3.4	3.5																
4.1.4 Emplo 4.1.5 Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo	lovee rating: I have a clear understanding of my division's goals (phiostives and how			34.6%	28.3%	<u> </u>											<u> </u>			1	
4.1.5 Emplo has in 4.1.6 Emplo	contribute to Agency success.			3.4	3.5																<u> </u>
4.1.5 has in 4.1.6 Emplo	oyee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days.			3.1	3.1	<u> </u>											<u> </u>			1	
	loyee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees mproved.			2.9	3.0																<u> </u>
Ohiostivo	loyee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.			3.4	3.5																<u> </u>
objective i	4.2: Create a collaborative and innovative work environment																				
4.2.1 Emplo	loyee rating: Overall employee satisfaction; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)	3.9		3.4	3.4																
	oyee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon kly and appropriately.			2.9	3.0																<u> </u>
4.2.3 Emplo	loyee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.			3.9	3.9																<u> </u>
4.2.4 Emplo	oyee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.			3.3	3.4															1	
4.2.5 efficie	loyee rating: Employees in my work unit share job knowledge to solve problems ently/effectively			3.7	3.8																<u> </u>
	loyee rating: I feel comfortable sharing my thoughts and opinions, even if they're rent than others'.			3.6	3.7																
4.2.7 Emplo	oyee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.			3.7	3.8	<u> </u>											<u> </u>				1
Objective -	4.3: Improve employee accountability																			ı	
	entage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year	100.0%		20.3%	62.5%	31.3%											<u> </u>				
	entage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans			18.8%	62.5%	54.2%											<u> </u>	igwdow	igwdow	<u> </u>	.
	entage of strategic plan metrics reported			73.0%	93.2%	92.3%															
4.3.3 Unsch	heduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators)		12.2%	8.6%	9.4%	7.7%	8.2%	9.0%	8.6%	8.4%	7.1%	7.5%	7.5%	7.4%	7.7%	7.0%	6.5%	7.0%	7.6%	8.8%	\sim
4.3.4 Emplo	oyee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.6	3.6															1	<u> </u>
4.3.5 Emplo	loyee commendations to 311 ³		127.1	112.2	104.0	103.8	122.5	83	107	110	81	79	98	100	118	104	120	146	133	112	~~~
Objective ·	The state of the s																				
4.4.1 Stake scale	4.4: Improve relationships and partnerships with our stakeholders					1												1)	!	!	

¹ Results are based on a non-probability sample from opt-in SFMTA online panel surveys and have been weighted to reflect the geographic distribution of the San Francisco population.

² Beginning with FY2015, includes all taxi, TNC, and black car service-related incidents reported to SFPD. Reporting for prior months includes "defrauding taxi driver", "operating taxi without a permit", and "overcharging taxi fare" incidents only.

³ Due to a previous calculation error that resulted in the over-reporting of 311 cases, some monthly values between May 2012 and Dec 2014 were re-calculated and revised in this document.

⁴ Includes assaults and threats on operators.

⁵ Injury collisions.

 $^{^{6}\,}$ <1 min for headway of 5 min or less.

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

⁸ Due to a prevous calculation error, monthly FY14 results were incorrectly reported in previous Metrics reports and have been corrected in this document.

⁹ Due to a reporting error, previous Metrics reports stated average Saturday ridership for December 2014 instead of weekday. This document reports the correct weekday figure.

¹⁰ Increase in percent of metered hours with no rate change indicates achievement of price point and parking availability goals. Note: sensor based rate adjustments were limited to SFpark pilot blocks with 50% or more parking sensor coverage through February 2014. Sensor Independent Rate
Adjustments (SIRA) based on meter payment data started in June 2014 and include all SFpark pilot area blocks including those that fell below the 50% parking sensor threshold. These blocks have not approached their price point yet, which lowers the baseline for this metric. Moving forward,
June 2014 will be considered the new baseline for SIRA.

¹¹ Shift in utilization from peak to off-peak indicates successful mitigation of congestion on city streets.

¹² Shift in utilization to hourly from early bird and monthly indicates garages are used more for short trips that benefit nearby businesses and less for commute trips by auto.

 $^{^{\}rm 13}\,$ Running total of SFMTA-installed facilities.

¹⁴ Data collection began in October 2014. No data were collected in December 2014.

 $^{^{\}rm 15}\,$ Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY14 dollars.

¹⁶ Based on preliminary undaudited figures.

¹⁷ FY Total rather than FY Average.