STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2017



Description Control	ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	FY17 Avg	Jun 2016	Jul 2016	Aug 2016	Sep 2016	Oct 2016	Nov 2016	Dec 2016	Jan 2017	Feb 2017	Mar 2017	Apr 2017	May 2017	Jun 2017	
Second Column Col	Goa	1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyon	IP.																				
12		, , ,																					
142 Section of the process of the content of th			5.3	3.8	7.6	9.4	8.2	6.4	4.6	4.9	4.9	5.5	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.0	3.8	5.0	4.6	4.5		~~~
1-		Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while on a Muni vehicle); scale of 1																					
1	1.1.2	Customer rating: Security of transit riding experience (while waiting at a Muni stop or				3.1	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2		3.1			3.2			3.2			3.2		
13. Market reconstruction 13	1.1.4			41.6	36	29	37	29	36	35	21	44	48	38	33	33	32	26	24	37	27		<
122	Objec	tive 1.2: Improve workplace safety and security																					
March Section March Sectio			11.3		13.8		11.0	12.8					11.7	11.7		10.4	9.0		12.9				~
Company Comp				11.3			Ü		11	12	12	10	9	16	13	6	4	12	16	11	13		~~~
Description of the safety of the recognition spaces 2	1.2.3	Lost work days due to injury			16,445 (CY13)	15,221 (CY14)	13,625 (CY15)	15,992 (CY16)															
1.51 Methodophism when 1.52 1.52 1.52 1.53 1.54 1.55 1.56 1					3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3															
13																							
13.20 Section of the control of			3.5					6.6	7.0	7.6	6.2	7.1	7.4	6.2	6.8	6.3	6.5	7.4	7.9	6.8	6.4	6.4	$\sim\sim$
1.33 March					3,049 (CY13)	2,995 (CY14)	3,046 (CY15)																
1.50					2.0	4.0	4.2	4.0	2.0	2.5	2.0		2.6	2.0	0.7	4.5		2.0	2.4		2.5	2.5	
20.20 22. Alse Communication 20.20 Communi																						3.5	~~~~
Goal 24 Make transit, walking, buyeling, tax, incleasing & carbanney the preferred means of travel Complete 24 in Property of Commission with position of the property of t				175.1	137						133		134	1/3		103	137		110	103	134		
Decimage Company Com			arsharin	g the nrefe	rred mean		3.,	5.0	3.3														
24.	_		arsmaring	g the prefe	.iica iiicaii	3 OI tIAVCI																	
24.24 Contemporaries (performance) content content infection with believe in the performance of the content in the performance of the cont		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		3.2			3.2			3.2					
1.0	2.1.2	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with taxi availability; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.5	2.7	3.0	3.2	3.0		3.0			3.1			3.2					
1.5 1.5	2.1.3	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with bicycle network; scale of 1 (low) to 5					2.9			3.1		2.9			3.0			3.0					
1.1. Content rating Sinification with Communication to possenger, sear of 2 loop 10 5 94.0 1.0	2.1.4	Customer rating: Overall customer satisfaction with pedestrian environment; scale of 1				3.5	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3		3.1			3.3			3.1					
2.1.2. Procenting of claser carbon processes addressed with the Toky process Section Sec	2.1.5	Customer rating: Satisfaction with communications to passengers; scale of 1 (low) to 5				2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9		2.9			3.0			2.9					
2.1.2. Increasing or inflamental for the Police 99.0% 100.	216			96.4%	03 3%	02 6%	60.0%	96.6%	05.5%	07 1%	97.6%	02 0%	05.2%	06 5%	08.6%	08.6%	90.6%	08 8%	0.4 9%	95 2%	100.0%		~~/
2.1.5 Processing of authors whether with the Bours								30.070	00.010								30.070	30.070			100.070	100.0%	
2.1.5 Processing of training control requests addressed within 26as 8.1.0% 79.1.5% 53.8% 60.6% 54.7% 82.1% 63.5% 77.5% 7								82.5%									95.0%						\sim
1.1. Increasing of actionals #21 More operator conduct complaints addressed within 28 bookers 600° . 1.2. Increasing elements of Man whiches scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) . 2.7 2.7 2.9 3.0 2.9 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0				81.0%	79.1%	53.8%	40.4%	54.7%	82.1%	63.5%		75.3%			84.0%			82.2%			87.1%		
1.11 billions days 92.76 93.76 93.76 93.76 93.77 9	2.1.6			97.0%	96.9%	96.8%	96.8%	97.5%	97.9%	97.9%	98.5%	100.0%	97.1%	96.7%	99.1%	96.0%	95.1%	99.4%	98.8%	98.8%	98.1%	99.4%	~
2.1.1 Boctomer rating cleanlesses of Nami vehicles, scale of 1 [owl to 5 (high)] 2.7 2.7 2.9 3.0 2.9 3.0 2.9 3.0 3.0 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.6 2.5 2	2.1.7			94.2%	93.5%	89.8%	89.5%	57.5%	75.8%	49.3%	55.0%	49.2%	61.4%	75.1%	68.9%	70.4%	94.9%	99.1%	95.5%	87.7%			~
1.1	2.1.8					2.7	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.9		3.0			3.0			3.0				-	~
Composition		Customer rating: cleanliness of Muni facilities (stations, elevators, escalators); scale of 1				2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5		2.5			2.6			2.5					
Precentage of transit trips with -2 min bunching on Rapid Network 1.8 m						2.0	2.0	2.3	2.3						2.0			2.5					
2.2.1 Percentage of transit trips with s a min gaps on Rajed Network routes 2.2.2 Percentage of con-time performance for non-Rajed Network routes 2.2.3 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 2.2.4 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 2.2.5 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 2.2.6 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 2.2.7 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 2.2.8 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 2.2.8 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 2.2.9 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals 2.2.0 Percentage of bus trids verification to the departure from terminals 2.2.0 P		the state of the s	1.00/	2.00/	4 00/	4.00/	4.007	E 40/	E 00/	E C0/	E 20/	6.00/	6.00/	E 60/	E 00/	6 00/			7.00/	7 70/	E 70/	E 70/	~
Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rupid Network routes 85% 61.1% 59.9% 59.6% 57.4% 60.5% 59.5% 59.8% 59.7% 59.2% 59.1% 59.2% 59.1% 59.2%			,.										0.011		0.0								≈ ∴
22.27 Percentage of on-time departures from terminals	2.2.7	Percentage of on-time performance for non-Rapid Network routes																					_
Percentage of on-time departures from terminals* SS% 76.9% 73.7% 73.9% 73.9% 73.2% 75.3% 75.0% 75.5% 76.7% 75.5% 74.7% 74.4% 75.0% 73.6% 74.6% 74.0% 71.8% 72.0% 72.										97.7%							98.9%	99.2%		22.070	55.770	22.470	
2.22 Percentage of on-time performance* 2.27 Percentage of but trips over capacity during AM peak (8.00a-8.59a, inbound) at max load joints* 2.27 percentage of but trips over capacity during AM peak (8.00a-8.59a, inbound) at max load joints* 2.28 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.27 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.28 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p, outbound) at max load joints* 2.29 percentage of but trips over capacity during PM peak (5.00p-5.39p										76.5%			74.7%							74.0%	71.8%	72.0%	~~ ~
Symbol S	2.2.6	Percentage of on-time performance	85%	60.1%	59.0%	58.9%	57.0%	59.8%	57.3%	59.1%	59.2%	57.7%	56.7%	57.0%	57.4%	56.2%			56.8%	57.3%	57.3%	57.2%	~ ~
Dijective 2.28 Mean distance between failure (Bus) 3,300 3,310 4,632 5,650 5,416 5,063 5,942 5,491 6,148 5,681 4,440 4,579 4,705 4,213 4,386 5,095 4,937 6,780 5,476 4,213 4,386 5,095 4,937 6,780 5,476 4,517 5,547 5,144 5,143 4,755 5,474 5,084 5,320 5,629 5,056 4,559 5,216 5,366 4,979 5,776 5,476 5,476 5,476 5,476 5,476 5,476 5,477 5,4	2.2.7	points*		5.9%	7.4%	7.4%	4.7%	3.4%	2.1%	2.7%	2.2%	1.8%	2.4%	2.1%	2.3%	1.6%	3.7%	3.3%	1.6%	2.5%	1.3%	2.0%	$\sim\sim$
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Bus) 3,300 3,310 4,632 5,550 5,416 5,063 5,942 5,491 6,148 5,681 4,400 4,579 4,705 4,213 4,386 5,095 4,937 6,780	2.2.7			7.1%	8.6%	8.3%	5.6%	4.1%	2.5%	3.6%	3.3%	3.7%	2.9%	2.3%	3.4%	2.4%	3.0%	2.8%	1.9%	1.2%	1.8%	1.1%	~~~
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (LRV) 3,137 3,571 3,164 4,517 5,547 5,194 5,143 4,755 5,474 5,084 5,320 5,629 5,056 4,559 5,216 5,368 4,979 5,776																							
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic) 2,055 2,179 2,045 1,797 1,971 2,983 2,450 2,049 2,050 2,362 2,809 3,131 2,868 3,207 3,128 3,651 3,827 2,909 2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Historic) 2,936 3,835 4,734 5,200 4,412 4.2.9 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered 9,6.8% 97.0% 96.2% 97.7% 99.0% 98.8% 97.6% 98.5% 98.5% 98.7% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.2% 99.4% 99.2% 99.2% 99.2% 99.2% 99.2% 99.2% 99.2% 99.2% 99.2% 99.2% 9	_																						~
2.2.8 Mean distance between failure (Cable) 2,936 3,835 4,734 5,200 4,412 3,835 4,734 5,200 4,412 49,593 49,0% 98,5% 98,																							~~~
22.19 Percentage of scheduled service hours delivered 96.8% 97.0% 96.2% 97.7% 99.0% 98.8% 97.6% 98.5% 98.5% 98.7% 99.2% 98.5% 98.9% 99.2% 99.4% 22.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday) 141,000 145,700 155,800 175,920 171,630 12.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday) 23,450 23,210 22,610 21,070 19,830 12.11 Ridership (Cable, average weekday) 20,160 18,960 20,640 19,070 15,490 12.11 Ridership (Cable, average weekday) 20,160 18,960 20,640 19,070 15,490 15.00 1									2,983	2,450	2,049	2,050	2,362	2,809	3,131	2,868	3,207	3,128	3,651	3,827	2,909		`
2.2.11 Ridership (Bus, average weekday) 490,598 495,341 504,205 512,817 519,462 511,094 502,640 497,600 526,640 497,600 526,640 535,260 529,110 516,220 484,360 483,420 511,370 503,550 514,800 519,700 141,000 145,700 145,700 145,700 155,800 171,630 171,6			l						98.8%	97.6%	98.5%	98.5%	98.7%	98.7%	99.2%	98.5%	98.9%	99.2%	99.4%				
2.2.11 Ridership (IRV, average weekday) 141,000 145,700 155,800 157,920 171,630	_									0.1.0,0	0.01071	0.01071	0.011.71		0.01.01.0	00.070	0.01011	00.00.0		514.800	519.700	1	~~~
2.2.11 Ridership (Historic, average weekday) 2.3,450 2.3,210 2.2,610 2.1,070 19,830 2.0,160 18,960 2.0,640 19,070 15,490 2.2.11 Ridership (Cable, average weekday) 2.0,160 18,960 2.0,640 19,070 15,490 172,107 174,167 175,322 174,522 174,167 175,322 174,167 175,490 175,49											,	223,2.0	,,	,	,,	,	,	,	,	,	,		
22.11 Ridership (faregate entries, average weekday) 72,107 74,416 75,322 74,522 69,646 68,660 71,370 69,694 66,929 71,449 69,963 70,097 62,702 70,177 72,014 70,990 70,860 59,946 92.12 Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation 93.6% 94.4% 93.3% 94.4% 97.0% 95.3% 96.2% 96.2% 96.7% 100.0% 99.4% 98.1% 96.0% 97.6% 98.6% 93.5% 92.5%																							
22.12 Percentage of days that elevators are in full operation 93.6% 96.3% 94.4% 93.3% 94.4% 97.0% 95.3% 96.5% 96.2% 96.7% 100.0% 99.4% 98.1% 96.0% 97.6% 98.6% 93.5% 92.5%							19,070																
						- 7 -														-,			~~~
2.2.13 Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation 94.2% 88.1% 93.8% 91.9% 86.5% 91.4% 84.4% 88.4% 88.6% 83.3% 85.7% 85.6% 80.5% 85.8% 89.2% 92.5% 93.0% 88.5%						0.11.170		34.470												30.070		02.077	~~
	2.2.13	Percentage of days that escalators are in full operation	L	94.2%	88.1%	93.8%	91.9%	86.5%	91.4%	84.4%	84.4%	88.4%	85.6%	83.3%	85.7%	85.6%	80.5%	85.8%	89.2%	92.5%	93.0%	88.5%	~~~

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2017



																			,		
ID Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	FY17 Avg	Jun 2016	Jul 2016	Aug 2016	Sep 2016	Oct 2016	Nov 2016	Dec 2016	Jan 2017	Feb 2017	Mar 2017	Apr 2017	May 2017	Jun 2017	
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	1,023	984	1,127	986	1,085	1,067	1,082	981	704							\sim
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%	64.7%	71.8%	67.6%				69.2%			74.4%						
2.4.2 Off-peak share of SFMTA garage entries (before 7:00a/after 9:59a)*		81.2%	81.3%	80.7%	80.9%	80.6%	80.7%	79.4%	81.8%	80.1%	79.3%	79.9%	81.4%	84.2%	80.0%	80.1%	79.7%	80.5%	80.2%	80.2%	\sim
2.4.2 Hourly share of SFMTA garage entries (vs. monthly & early bird)		85.2%	85.3%	84.4%	85.9%	84.7%	84.2%	83.7%	84.2%	81.5%	82.1%	82.0%	83.3%	86.4%	82.1%	82.7%	82.0%	82.5%	81.9%	82.3%	~~
2.4.3 # of secure on-street bicycle parking spaces					7,958	8,925															
2.4.3 # of secure off-street bicycle parking spaces (garage bicycle parking)					1,329	1,429															
Goal 3: Improve the environment and quality of life in San Fra	ancisco																				
Objective 3.1: Reduce the Agency's and the transportation system's resource of	onsumptio	on, emissions,	waste, and n	oise																	
3.1.1 SFMTA carbon footprint (metric tons CO2e)	17,434	49,811	46,272	45,244	43,499	24,146															
3.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA non-revenue fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		24.1%	28.0%	28.1%	28.5%	42.2%	29.8%														
3.1.2 Percentage of SFMTA taxi fleet that is alternative fuel/zero emissions		94.0%	94.0%	98.0%	98.0%	94.6%	94.6%														
3.1.4 Number of electric vehicle charging stations		33	63	63	63	63	63														
3.1.6 Agency electricity consumption (kWh)		9,862,454	9,790,994	9,944,080	9,783,200	9,957,470	9,916,414	9,770,339	9,934,018	10,156,517	9,912,487	10,032,098	9,823,160	10,156,078	9,920,424	9,124,890	10,188,051				/~~/
3.1.6 Agency gas consumption (therms)		33,934	32,049	23,057	19,265	21,108	24,292	2,166	7,994	27,178	5,097	7,949	8,719	17,533	51,417	59,391	33,353				\sim
3.1.6 Agency water consumption (gallons)*		1,447,255	1,476,801	1,903,909	1,735,422	1,503,979	1,424,415	1,412,972	1,531,156	1,501,236	1,794,452	1,261,128	1,753,312	1,289,552	1,402,235	1,160,828	1,179,604	1,370,642			~~~
3.1.7 Agency waste diversion rate		36.4%	37.9%	37.1%	34.5%	35.1%	32.7%	36.1%	34.0%	34.1%	33.0%	31.0%	32.5%	35.9%	32.7%	31.7%	30.2%	31.3%	32.9%		\sim
Objective 3.2: Increase the transportation system's positive impact to the econ	nomy																				
3.2.1 Muni average weekday boardings		675,208	683,211	703,255	710,877	726,412	717,275	709,290	704,550	733,590	742,210	736,060	723,170	691,310	690,370	718,320	710,950	722,220			\sim
Objective 3.3: Allocate capital resources effectively																					
3.3.1 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-budget by phase					65.6%	81.3%	92.1%	79.0%		76.5%	92.0%	93.7%	94.1%	95.3%	95.1%		95.1%	94.3%			
3.3.2 Percentage of all capital projects delivered on-time by phase*					59.2%	97.8%	96.0%	91.9%		84.5%	90.3%	91.7%	89.8%	79.2%	77.7%		69.7%	61.5%			$\overline{}$
Objective 3.4: Deliver services efficiently																					
3.4.1 Transit passengers per Hour									60.8	63.5	64.3	63.8	62.7	60.1	60.1	62.4	61.1	62.1	65.1		\sim
3.4.2 Average annual transit cost per revenue hour*	\$198	\$218.84	\$219.02	\$237.37	\$233.99	\$229.37															
3.4.3 Cost per unlinked trip		\$3.14	\$3.15	\$3.22	\$3.38	\$3.38															
3.4.5 Farebox recovery ratio		32.0%	33.7%	30.4%	29.5%	26.2%															
3.4.6 Average daily Transit Operator shortfall		37.3	35	43	25	10	17	29	17	16	14	14	11	19	13	10	8				
3.4.7 Number of individuals entering Transit Operator training per month		205	158	147	594	295	278		33		42		39	21	28	29	29	28		29	\sim
Objective 3.5: Reduce capital and operating structural deficits																					
3.5.1 Structural capital budget deficit (SOGR)						\$229M (As of Q4)	\$350M (As of Q4)														
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	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																
4.1.1 Employee rating: I feel as though the Agency communicates current events, issues, challenges and accomplishments clearly; scale of 1 (high) to 5 (low)*	3.9					3.3															
4.1.2 Percentage of employees that complete the survey			32.9%	29.6%	27.2%	29.7%															
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	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	3.1															
4.1.5 Employee rating: I have noticed that communication between leadership and employees has improved.			2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9															
4.1.6 Employee rating: Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.		_	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4															

STRATEGIC PLAN METRICS REPORT | July 2017



ID	Metric	Target	FY12 Avg	FY13 Avg	FY14 Avg	FY15 Avg	FY16 Avg	FY17 Avg	Jun 2016	Jul 2016	Aug 2016	Sep 2016	Oct 2016	Nov 2016	Dec 2016	Jan 2017	Feb 2017	Mar 2017	Apr 2017	May 2017	Jun 2017	
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	3.4															
4.2.2	Employee rating: My concerns, questions, and suggestions are welcomed and acted upon quickly and appropriately.			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0															
4.2.3	Employee rating: I find ways to resolve conflicts by working collaboratively with others.			3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0															
4.2.4	Employee rating: I am encouraged to use innovative approaches to achieve goals.			3.4	3.4	3.3	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	3.9															
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	3.5															
4.2.7	Employee rating: My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.			3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8															
Obje	ctive 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%	58.9%															
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%	8.6%	8.1%	7.3%	7.4%	6.6%	7.4%	8.3%	8.2%	9.7%	9.0%	8.1%	7.0%	8.5%	9.4%	7.9%	~~~
4.3.4	Employee rating: My manager holds me accountable to achieve my written objectives.			3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6															
4.3.5	Employee commendations to 311*		127	112	104	104	152	183	245	331	234	173	177	151	173	134	126	79	154	181		~~~
Obje	ctive 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 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. November and December 2016 figures are adjusted to account for a moratorium on all hearings and disciplinary grievance timelines between 12/12/16 and 1/2/17.
 - .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.

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.
 - $2.2.5\,\mbox{/}\, 2.2.10\,$ 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 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 reported mileage.
 - $2.2.9\,$ 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, 2/8/2016, 2/12/2016, 2/12/2016, 2/12/2016, 3/17/2016, 3/17/2016, 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 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.
 - 3.1.3 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.
 - 3.4.3 Figures are adjusted for inflation to reflect FY16 dollars.
 - 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.