

| ID | Metric | Target | FY12 Avg | FY13 Avg | FY14 Avg | FY15 Avg | FY16 Avg | May 2015 | Jun 2015 | Jul 2015 | Aug 2015 | Sep 2015 | Oct 2015 | Nov 2015 | Dec 2015 | Jan 2016 | Feb 2016 | Mar 2016 | Apr 2016 | May 2016 | Monthly Trend |
|---|--|-------------------------|--------------|----------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|
| Goal 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 1.1: Improve security for transportation system users | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1.1 | SFPD-reported Muni-related crimes/100,000 miles | 3.1 | 3.8 | 7.6 | 9.4 | 8.2 | 6.8 | 7.3 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 7.9 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 6.2 | 7.6 | 6.3 | | | | |
| 1.1.2 | Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | | | 3.4 | | | 3.4 | | | 3.4 | | | | |
| 1.1.2 | Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or station); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | | | 3.2 | | | 3.2 | | | 3.2 | | | | |
| 1.1.3 | SFPD-reported taxi-related crimes | | 3 | 4 | 4 | 37 | 41 | 43 | 36 | 36 | 46 | 36 | 63 | 30 | 36 | 43 | | | | | |
| 1.1.4 | Security complaints to 311 (Muni) | | 41.6 | 36 | 29 | 37 | 28 | 29 | 43 | 30 | 32 | 30 | 22 | 27 | 33 | 31 | 20 | 25 | 36 | 23 | |
| Objective 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2.1 | Workplace injuries/200,000 hours | 13.1 | 16.2 | 13.8 | 12.0 | 11.0 | 13.2 | 10.1 | 12.5 | 11.2 | 13.8 | 10.9 | 14.6 | 10.1 | 15.3 | 11.5 | 15.5 | 14.7 | 13.8 | | |
| 1.2.2 | Security incidents involving SFMTA personnel (Muni only) | | 11.3 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 25 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 7 | |
| 1.2.3 | Lost work days due to injury | | | 16,445 | 15,221 (CY14) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.7 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 5.7 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 5.6 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 6.8 | | |
| 1.3.2 | Collisions involving motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists | | 3,235 (CY12) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3.2 | Collisions involving taxis | | 342 (CY11) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3.3 | Muni falls on board/100,000 miles* | | 4.7 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.2 | | |
| 1.3.4 | *Unsafe operation* Muni complaints to 311 | | 179.1 | 157 | 174 | 179 | 184 | 173 | 172 | 169 | 177 | 193 | 197 | 173 | 201 | 169 | 175 | 203 | 177 | 188 | |
| 1.3.5 | Customer rating: Safety of transit riding experience; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.7 | | | 3.8 | | | 3.9 | | | 3.8 | | | | |
| Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & carsharing the preferred means of travel | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 2.1: Improve customer service and communications | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.1 | Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with transit services; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | 3.5 | | | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | | | 3.2 | | | 3.2 | | | 3.2 | | | | |
| 2.1.2 | Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.8 | | | 2.9 | | | 3.0 | | | 3.0 | | | | |
| 2.1.3 | Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | | | 2.9 | | | 2.8 | | | 2.9 | | | | |
| 2.1.4 | Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.4 | | | 3.2 | | | 3.4 | | | 3.1 | | | | |
| 2.1.5 | Customer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 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% | 96.4% | 91.3% | 94.3% | 94.6% | 94.7% | 94.4% | 95.3% | 98.7% | 95.1% | 97.6% | 97.8% | 99.0% | | | |
| 2.1.6 | Percentage of hazardous traffic sign reports addressed within 24 hours | | 99.0% | 100.0% | 99.5% | 98.0% | 98.6% | 100.0% | 94.7% | 100.0% | 92.6% | 96.2% | 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% | 82.6% | 52.8% | 82.5% | 84.5% | 83.9% | 84.4% | 87.6% | 66.6% | 71.3% | | 82.9% | 87.9% | 91.4% | | |
| 2.1.6 | Percentage of traffic and parking control requests addressed within 90 days | | 81.0% | 79.1% | 53.8% | 40.4% | 50.9% | 56.1% | | | 49.7% | | | 56.5% | | | 47.1% | | | | |
| 2.1.6 | Percentage of traffic signal requests addressed within 2 hours | | 97.0% | 96.9% | 96.8% | 96.8% | 97.5% | 98.1% | 99.2% | 100.0% | 97.7% | 94.0% | 99.3% | 96.1% | 97.5% | 96.9% | 97.0% | 97.8% | 97.5% | 99.3% | |
| 2.1.7 | Percentage of actionable 311 Muni operator conduct complaints addressed within 28 business days | | 94.2% | 93.5% | 89.8% | 89.1% | 59.3% | 81.0% | 83.3% | 77.9% | 33.7% | 76.7% | 52.0% | 33.1% | 57.6% | 58.5% | 95.1% | 61.1% | | | |
| 2.1.8 | Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni vehicles; scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.8 | | | 2.8 | | | 2.9 | | | 2.9 | | | | |
| 2.1.9 | Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) | | | | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.5 | | | 2.5 | | | 2.6 | | | 2.5 | | | | |
| Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.1 | Percentage of transit trips with <2 min bunching on Rapid Network | 2.1% | 3.9% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.8% | 5.3% | 5.1% | 5.1% | 4.9% | 6.1% | 6.4% | 5.2% | 5.3% | 5.7% | 5.0% | 4.4% | 4.7% | 5.5% | 5.8% | |
| 2.2.1 | Percentage of transit trips with + 5 min gaps on Rapid Network | 10.7% | 19.5% | 17.8% | 18.6% | 17.2% | 16.9% | 15.6% | 15.6% | 14.9% | 15.8% | 16.1% | 16.2% | 16.8% | 19.5% | 18.6% | 18.3% | 17.4% | 17.3% | 17.2% | |
| 2.2.2 | Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes | 85% | 61.1% | 59.9% | 59.6% | 57.4% | 60.6% | 60.1% | 59.5% | 59.6% | 59.1% | 58.6% | 61.5% | 63.3% | 60.3% | 61.2% | 60.7% | 61.3% | 60.8% | 60.5% | |
| 2.2.3 | Percentage of scheduled trips delivered | 98.5% | 96.8% | 97.1% | 96.3% | 97.7% | 99.1% | 99.4% | 99.5% | 99.8% | 99.5% | 99.7% | 99.6% | 99.4% | 99.4% | 99.1% | 97.7% | 98.3% | 98.7% | 98.4% | |
| 2.2.4 | Percentage of on-time departures from terminals | 85% | 76.9% | 73.7% | 73.9% | 72.2% | 75.2% | 74.6% | 74.1% | 74.3% | 73.9% | 73.6% | 74.4% | 76.1% | 74.1% | 75.3% | 75.6% | 76.6% | 76.6% | 76.7% | |
| 2.2.5 | Running time performance | Measure in development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.6 | Percentage of on-time performance | 85% | 60.1% | 59.0% | 58.9% | 57.0% | 59.9% | 59.4% | 58.9% | 59.5% | 58.7% | 58.2% | 60.8% | 62.2% | 59.4% | 60.4% | 60.3% | 60.8% | 59.9% | 59.2% | |
| 2.2.7 | Percentage of bus trips over capacity during AM peak (8:00a-8:59a, inbound) at max load points | | 5.9% | 7.4% | 7.4% | 4.7% | 3.4% | 2.5% | 3.0% | 2.8% | 3.1% | 4.8% | 3.9% | 3.6% | 2.4% | 3.3% | 3.1% | 4.2% | 3.7% | 2.8% | |
| 2.2.7 | Percentage of bus trips over capacity during PM peak (5:00p-5:59p, outbound) at max load points | | 7.1% | 8.6% | 8.3% | 5.6% | 4.2% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 5.2% | 6.0% | 5.1% | 4.2% | 4.1% | 2.6% | 3.6% | 4.2% | 3.5% | 3.4% | 3.5% | |

Color Legend
 Outperforms Previous FY Average (Green)
 Underperforms Previous FY Average (Red)
 Equal to Previous FY Average (Yellow)

Note: Reported results are subject to change as data quality improves or new data become available.

| ID | Metric | Target | FY12 Avg | FY13 Avg | FY14 Avg | FY15 Avg | FY16 Avg | May 2015 | Jun 2015 | Jul 2015 | Aug 2015 | Sep 2015 | Oct 2015 | Nov 2015 | Dec 2015 | Jan 2016 | Feb 2016 | Mar 2016 | Apr 2016 | May 2016 | Monthly Trend | |
|---|---|--------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|---------------|--|
| Objective 2.2: Improve transit performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.8 | Mean distance between failure (Bus) | | 3,300 | 3,310 | 4,632 | 5,650 | 5,388 | 6,087 | 6,693 | 6,164 | 7,276 | 6,202 | 6,927 | 5,761 | 4,552 | 3,816 | 5,082 | 4,976 | 4,997 | | | |
| 2.2.8 | Mean distance between failure (LRV) | | 3,137 | 3,571 | 3,164 | 4,517 | 5,494 | 7,260 | 5,122 | 4,834 | 4,910 | 5,235 | 7,742 | 6,498 | 6,084 | 4,583 | 5,404 | 5,785 | 5,184 | | | |
| 2.2.8 | Mean distance between failure (Historic) | | 2,055 | 2,179 | 2,045 | 1,797 | 1,890 | 1,432 | 1,383 | 1,748 | 1,629 | 1,523 | 3,822 | 2,147 | 1,508 | 1,781 | 1,892 | 1,848 | 2,090 | | | |
| 2.2.8 | Mean distance between failure (Cable)* | | 2,936 | 3,835 | 4,734 | 5,200 | 4,412 | 4,530 | 25,684 | 7,769 | 10,658 | 22,541 | 22,432 | 6,842 | 2,721 | 2,043 | 2,498 | 2,754 | | | | |
| 2.2.9 | Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered | | 96.8% | 97.0% | 96.2% | 97.7% | 99.1% | 99.5% | 99.5% | 99.7% | 99.5% | 99.7% | 99.6% | 99.6% | 99.5% | 99.2% | 97.9% | 98.4% | 98.7% | 98.4% | | |
| 2.2.10 | Percentage of scheduled mileage delivered | | Measure in development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.11 | Ridership (rubber tire, average weekday) | | 490,514 | 495,311 | 504,162 | 486,109 | 488,844 | 484,944 | 466,267 | 466,100 | 489,500 | 508,100 | 510,400 | 481,100 | 462,400 | 485,300 | 511,100 | 485,600 | | | | |
| 2.2.11 | Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday) | | 72,107 | 74,416 | 75,322 | 74,522 | 69,482 | 73,163 | 72,733 | 70,724 | 68,303 | 67,954 | 69,078 | 65,573 | 63,005 | 68,675 | 72,969 | 71,884 | 72,110 | 74,137 | | |
| 2.2.12 | Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation | | 93.6% | 96.3% | 94.4% | 93.3% | 93.3% | 93.5% | 95.8% | 93.5% | 92.7% | 94.3% | 94.6% | 90.8% | 93.5% | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.13 | Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation | | 94.2% | 88.1% | 93.8% | 91.9% | 89.5% | 92.1% | 93.2% | 93.1% | 90.6% | 94.6% | 90.1% | 89.0% | 80.1% | | | | | | | |
| Objective 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.3.1 | Non-private auto mode share (all trips) | 50% | | 50% | 54% | 52% | 54% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.3.2 | Average daily bikeshare trips (Weekday) | | | | 885 | 1,089 | 1,000 | 1,125 | 1,183 | 1,139 | 1,207 | 1,139 | 1,177 | 932 | 696 | 786 | 969 | 960 | | | | |
| 2.3.3 | Average daily taxi trips | | Measure in development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4.1 | Percentage of metered hours with no rate change in SFpark pilot areas* | | 40.5% | 52.2% | 66.2% | 60.3% | 63.3% | | | | | | 59.8% | | 66.8% | | | | | | | |
| 2.4.2 | Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a) | | 81.2% | 81.3% | 80.7% | 80.9% | 80.7% | 81.6% | 80.2% | 80.9% | 80.8% | 79.2% | 79.7% | 81.9% | 84.1% | 81.0% | 79.6% | 79.2% | 79.8% | 80.2% | | |
| 2.4.2 | Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird) | | 85.2% | 85.3% | 84.4% | 85.9% | 84.8% | 86.0% | 84.8% | 84.6% | 84.9% | 84.0% | 84.4% | 85.9% | 87.9% | 85.1% | 83.7% | 83.5% | 83.6% | 84.2% | | |
| 2.4.3 | # of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces* | | | | | 6,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4.3 | # of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)* | | | | | 120 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.1 | SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons CO2e) | | 49,811 | 46,272 | 45,244 | 43,499 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.2 | Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions | | 94.0% | 94.0% | 98.0% | 98.0% | 98.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.3 | Percentage biodiesel to diesel used by SFMTA (blend equivalent) | | | 98.4% | 91.2% | 93.2% | 94.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.4 | Number of electric vehicle charging stations | | 33 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.6 | Agency electricity consumption (kWh)* | | 9,862,454 | 9,790,994 | 9,944,080 | 9,783,200 | 10,061,079 | 9,976,185 | 9,878,605 | 10,240,993 | 10,230,894 | 9,803,340 | 10,302,803 | 9,654,669 | 10,133,775 | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.6 | Agency gas consumption (therms)* | | 33,934 | 32,049 | 23,057 | 19,265 | 10,432 | 26,940 | 25,478 | 8,221 | 4,554 | 3,918 | 3,454 | 9,268 | 33,177 | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.6 | Agency water consumption (gallons)* | | 1,447,255 | 1,476,801 | 1,903,909 | 1,735,422 | 1,525,322 | 1,655,324 | 1,491,512 | 1,691,228 | 1,671,032 | 1,660,560 | 1,605,956 | 1,825,868 | 1,306,008 | 1,231,208 | 1,323,960 | 1,479,544 | 1,457,852 | | | |
| 3.1.7 | Agency waste diversion rate | | 36.4% | 37.9% | 37.1% | 34.5% | 35.1% | 36.3% | 33.8% | 36.6% | 34.8% | 34.0% | 35.2% | 35.2% | 35.7% | 35.2% | 33.3% | 35.5% | 34.9% | | | |
| Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the economy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2.1 | Estimated economic impact of Muni service delays (Monthly \$M) | | | \$3.7 | \$2.8 | \$1.9 | \$1.7 | \$1.9 | \$1.4 | \$1.5 | \$1.8 | \$2.0 | \$2.0 | \$1.4 | \$1.9 | \$2.1 | \$1.4 | \$1.7 | \$1.3 | \$1.1 | | |
| Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3.1 | Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase* | | | | | 65.6% | 81.5% | 68.8% | 71.9% | 78.7% | 77.9% | 75.6% | 77.9% | 74.7% | 83.0% | 98.1% | 93.6% | 95.0% | 80.9% | 80.3% | | |
| 3.3.2 | Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase* | | | | | 59.2% | 60.7% | 51.2% | 54.3% | 57.4% | 57.4% | 57.4% | 55.3% | 55.4% | 51.9% | | | | | | | |
| Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4.1 | Average annual transit cost per revenue hour* | \$192 | \$212.94 | \$213.12 | \$230.97 | \$227.91 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4.2 | Passengers per revenue hour for buses | | 70 | 70 | 74 | 69 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4.3 | Cost per unlinked trip* | | \$3.05 | \$3.06 | \$3.13 | \$3.29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4.5 | Farebox recovery ratio | | 32.0% | 33.7% | 30.4% | 29.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4.6 | Average daily Transit Operator shortfall | | 37.3 | 35 | 43 | 25 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 16 | 17 | 12 | 20 | | |
| 3.4.7 | Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month* | | 205 | 158 | 147 | 594 | 295 | 37 | 55 | 46 | 27 | 27 | 30 | | 33 | 24 | 55 | | | | | |
| Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5.1 | Structural operating budget deficit | \$35M | \$70M | \$70M | \$35M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5.1 | Structural capital budget deficit (S0GR)* | \$130M | \$260M | \$260M | \$260M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Color Legend
 Outperforms Previous FY Average (Green)
 Underperforms Previous FY Average (Red)
 Equal to Previous FY Average (Yellow)

Note: Reported results are subject to change as data quality improves or new data become available.

| ID | Metric | Target | FY12 Avg | FY13 Avg | FY14 Avg | FY15 Avg | FY16 Avg | May 2015 | Jun 2015 | Jul 2015 | Aug 2015 | Sep 2015 | Oct 2015 | Nov 2015 | Dec 2015 | Jan 2016 | Feb 2016 | Mar 2016 | Apr 2016 | May 2016 | Monthly Trend |
|--|---|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|
| Goal 4: Create a workplace that delivers outstanding service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 4.1: Improve internal communications | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.1 | Employee rating: I have the information and tools I need to do my job; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low) | 4.0 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.1 | Employee rating: I have access to information about Agency accomplishments, current events, issues and challenges; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low) | | | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.2 | Percentage of employees that complete the survey | | | 32.9% | 29.6% | 27.2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.3 | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.4 | Employee rating: I have received feedback on my work in the last 30 days. | | | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.5 | Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved. | | | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.6 | Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile. | | | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.2 | Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately. | | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.3 | Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others. | | | 3.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.4 | Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals. | | | 3.4 | 3.4 | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.7 | Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment. | | | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective 4.3: Improve employee accountability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.1 | Percentage of employees with performance plans prepared by start of fiscal year | 100% | | 20.3% | 62.5% | 31.3% | 59.1% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.1 | Percentage of employees with annual appraisals based on their performance plans | 100% | | 18.8% | 62.5% | 54.2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.2 | Percentage of strategic plan metrics reported | | | 73.0% | 92.3% | 93.6% | 96.1% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.3 | Unscheduled absence rate by employee group (Transit operators) | 12.2% | | 8.6% | 9.4% | 7.7% | 8.7% | 6.5% | 7.0% | 7.6% | 8.8% | 7.2% | 7.2% | 8.0% | 9.0% | 8.7% | 10.2% | 11.0% | 9.9% | 7.7% | |
| 4.3.4 | Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives. | | | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3.5 | Employee commendations to 311* | 127 | | 112 | 104 | 104 | 140 | 120 | 146 | 133 | 126 | 123 | 132 | 99 | 159 | 143 | 141 | 177 | 156 | 149 | |
| Objective 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.
- 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 new automated reporting process that accurately reflects the current Transit Operator MOU-based performance standard for timeliness of complaint resolution, the reported percentage of Muni related 311 complaints resolved within 28 business days slightly differs from previously published figures.
- 2.2.1 <1 min for headway of 5 min or less.
- 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.
Note: due to a NextBus data syncing issue, data for J and N lines are not included in reporting for Saturday service from 7/11/15 through 7/25/15 and data for all LRV lines are not included in reporting for 7/31/15 and 8/11/15.
- 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.
- 2.2.7 Due to a previous calculation error, monthly FY14 results were incorrectly reported in previous Metrics reports and have been corrected in this document.
- 2.2.8 April 2015 and May 2015 Mean Distance Between Failure (MDBF) Cable Car figures have been updated to account for an adjustment in reported mileage.
- 2.2.11 Reported figures for average weekday station faregate entries have been updated for all dates to correct for a prior reporting error.
- 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 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.
- 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.
- 3.1.6 Resource consumption data for facilities leased by the SFMTA is not reflected in the current reporting.
- 3.2.1 Calculations are based on a model provided by the San Francisco Chief Economist's office and use the 2014 annual average hourly wage for San Francisco.
- 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. Data forthcoming after measure methodology is revised.
- 3.4.1 / 3.4.3 Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY15 dollars.
- 3.4.7 FY Total rather than FY Average.
- 3.5.1 Operating and capital structural deficit figures are being recalculated and will be available by the end of the FY16.

Color Legend

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Outperforms Previous FY Average | Underperforms Previous FY Average | Equal to Previous FY Average |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|

Note: Reported results are subject to change as data quality improves or new data become available.