



**Minutes of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition Board of Directors meeting.
April 25, 2017
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition offices, 1720 Market Street, San Francisco, CA**

Directors in attendance	Adam Keats
	Amandeep Jawa (by phone)
	Andy Thornley (president)
	Chema Hernandez Gil
	Jenn Fox
	Jeremy Pollock
	Jiro Yamamoto
	Lawrence Li (treasurer)
	Lindy Kae Patterson (by phone)
	Lisa Fisher
	Mary Kay Chin (secretary)
	Nic Jay Aulston
	Leah Shahum
	Shirley Johnson
Directors absent	Rocky Beach
Staff	Brian Wiedenmeier (Executive Director)
Guests in attendance	Katherine Roberts (SFBC member)

Start	The meeting was convened with quorum at 6:32pm.
--------------	---

Agenda Item	Purpose	Presenter
1 Consent Calendar	Action	Andy Thornley
<p>Consent Calendar: March 2017 Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Approval: Motion to approve consent calendar. Jeremy moved. Adam seconded. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Jenn and Jiro arrived at 6:33pm.</p>		
2 Public & General Member Comment	Information	Andy Thornley
No comments.		
3 President's Report	Information	Andy Thornley

**Board@ emails:**

Email from former member Kirk Boydston, voicing support of SFBC's opposition to the watered down Turk Street bike lane design.

Email from Edward Hasbrouck with proposed suggestions for the strategic planning process. Brian responded to the email and had a positive exchange of ideas and information. Brian also encouraged Ed to attend the Strategic Planning Open House, which he did.

Updates:

The BART Bike Advisory Task Force is still looking for new members. Interested parties are encouraged to reach out directly to Shirley as a local representative. They are looking closely at bike theft data.

Lindy Kae joined the meeting at 6:34pm.

4 Finance**Information****Lawrence Lee**

The new fiscal year started and the committee is focusing on the deep dive of the last quarter. Lawrence and Brian will review and report back. To date and pre audit, the budget presents a good picture with the last fiscal year closing with approximately \$500 in the black and with 4.8 months of operational reserve in the bank.

Lisa arrived at 6:37pm.

Discussion:

- Leah congratulated the staff on the hard work required to get the budget in the positive at close.
- Andy asked if the current budget is for full staff. Brian clarified it is but the current budget will be impacted by a staff resignation in May.
- Brian reported the fundraising & sponsorship goals for Bike to Work Day have been met this year, although the board would not see those sponsorships applied to the budget until the June meeting.
- Brian congratulated the hard work of the development team to have ended last fiscal year in the black. Part of the success was also Frank and operations having tight control on expenses.
- Jiro asked if the money that was not spent last year would be expected to be spent this year. Brian explained that those expenses were budgeted for this year to help the staff do their work (e.g. trainings & conferences).

5 Fundraising**Information****Leah Shahum**

- 1) Staff is currently working towards the final push of Bike to Work Day sponsorship, having already raised approximately \$130,000, which was \$1000 over their goal.
- 2) Golden Wheel fundraising is underway with \$80,000 goal for sponsorship and \$11,000 goal for ticket sales. Reminder to board members to do their follow up requests and encourage ticket purchases.
- 3) All board members are encouraged to review their individual fundraising commitments and goals. Review specially the goals for Golden Wheel and sponsorship.
- 4) Work on scheduling 2017 house parties. Most board members had agreed to host house parties. Leah asked board members who had already hosted their house parties to give a recap and



lessons learned on how their events went:

- i) Lindy Kae – Lindy is still closing the loop on donations that were promised during the event, but it looks like over \$3000 was raised. Great idea to have a co-host, with whom the work can be shared. Recruit friends to help volunteer before, during and after the event. A key to throwing a successful event is to know your audience, offer them an event they're excited to attend.
- ii) Mary Kay and Jenn – The event raised around \$6000 and while the raffle prize and silent auction were a lot of work, they were worth the time. There were a lot of staff that attended, which is great but we don't want to rely on them to support our house parties. Team up with other board member(s) to help share the work, expand your audience and make it worth the time spent.

Discussion:

- Leah reminded every board member to complete their emails and follow up calls with businesses and individuals they've been assigned. Lisa encouraged these touches to happen quickly because donations and sponsorships often require time for approval.
- Brian shared that he was interviewed for the May 5th cover of the Business Times for an article titled "Business of Biking", which focused on the benefit of biking to businesses and the business community. This might be helpful to mention for certain businesses.
- Jeremy asked about missing contact information. For missing data, please follow up with Tracy directly. Also update the spreadsheet with any bounce back email addresses.
- Leah reminded that May 5th is the print deadline for Golden Wheel.
- Leah encouraged board members to extend invitations to Golden Wheel to beyond the bicycle community, as the goal is high ticket sales.

6	Audit	Information	Amandeep Jawa
----------	--------------	--------------------	----------------------

Deep confirmed with staff that the auditors have all the data they need and will continue to review. The committee is still searching for the RFP from 2012 for the audit company and will be connecting with the current audit company to see if they have a copy.

7	Personnel	Information	Jenn Fox
----------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------

Nothing to report to the board.

8	Strategic Planning	Information	Shirley Johnson
----------	---------------------------	--------------------	------------------------

Shirley reviewed the Strategic Planning Committee report (Appendix A) posted in Dropbox. She reminded all board members to be scheduling interviews & group sessions, as scheduling these takes time. Board members are encouraged to complete at least 2/3 of their individual interviews by the May board meeting. To ensure data integrity, Matt Bigger & John Beckman suggested taking turns between facilitators for note taking and read back the notes to the other to ensure each "heard the same thing".

Over 70 people showed up for the Member Open House on April 19. John will help with data analysis for a blog post about feedback & an update on the process. The blog post will also include input from emails the strategic planning committee has received. There was also feedback on the open house event itself, which will be incorporated into a lessons learned.



Discussion:

- Leah requested a deadline be assigned for scheduling sessions. Shirley agreed to set May 10th as the deadline for contacting groups and individuals.
- Brian prompted board members with questions to contact him and Shirley directly.

Action Items:

- Board members may add more names to the optional interview list by April 28. Shirley will confirm with Brian that the new additions are acceptable.
- Board members are to make contact with groups and individuals by May 10 at the latest.

9	Membership	Information	Mary Kay Chin
----------	-------------------	--------------------	----------------------

Committee members aided with the Strategic Planning Member Open House. A committee meeting will be planned shortly.

10	Board Development	Information	Rocky Beach
-----------	--------------------------	--------------------	--------------------

The chairperson is out of town.

11	Governance	Information	Adam Keats
-----------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------

The committee met and spent the majority of the meeting reviewing ranked choice voting (RCV). Adam presented a draft proposal (Appendix B), available in Dropbox for board review. The committee's goal was to discuss the proposal at this board meeting and vote on an updated proposal at the May board meeting.

The committee developed a proposal for a bylaws amendment to adopt RCV. The committee plans to write a series of policy proposals that will address logistical challenges (e.g. what to do with written ballots, electronic voting by members without email, how to authenticate voters) while balancing cost, fairness and transparency. The expected cost burden of implementation is approximately \$6000 in staff time. Adam clarified the following:

1. \$6000 is not an unreasonable cost for election administration.
2. Approximately \$3000 is spent on administration of the current election process.
3. Approximately \$1500 is a one-time cost to implement RCV.
4. Administration cost of the election will decrease as it is repeated.
5. The committee has already identified a third party vendor that could handle much of the work, relieving the staff burden.

The committee proposes a blog post before the next meeting to share what the board is considering. This would ensure full disclosure and an opportunity for the membership to provide input.

Discussion

- Lisa stated support to run a pilot of RCV but was concerned about the impact of changing the bylaws for a system currently untested in our organization. Andy clarified the proposal was for discussion with no action to amend the bylaws this meeting.



- Leah voiced concerns about cementing the change in the bylaws and would like to see some flexibility in the proposal. She was concerned about how RCV impacts diversity. Jiro stated RCV has the possibility of creating more diversity than other voting methods.
- Jenn said when voters have three or more alternatives, no voting system works well. Jenn did not inherently disagree with RCV's merits, but requested the committee do more research to include morale cost on staff and to not micro manage staff.
- Adam clarified the committee did not believe this proposal significantly or adversely affects member voting rights, so a member vote on the bylaw change would not be required. But it would be prudent and respectful to inform the membership that the conversation is underway.
- Lisa reminded that this would be the first time the board used the term "bylaws" in its communications since 2015 and that it might be volatile. Andy agreed, clarifying that need for the board's communication to be clear, transparent and far ahead of any actual decision made by the board. Adam supported and pointed out the community outreach plan for an audience test where any red flags could be raised. Leah voiced support for the board to review the language regarding member outreach and feedback.
- Andy supported amending the bylaws to make RCV possible, acknowledging there can always be a later action taken by the board to adjust.
- Lisa thanked the committee for the heavy work on this project but was concerned about the weight of the request on the membership given that the organization is in a strategic planning year. Lisa would like the minimal amount of bylaws changes to enable the pilot but was overall nervous about any bylaws change. Jiro presumed these particular bylaws changes may not loom as negatively as the bylaws changes proposed in 2015.
- Jeremy supported a clear message to the membership rather than options in the bylaws. He reminded of the potential of inviting ambiguity or confusion, if the goal and process are not stated clearly. Jeremy asked to clarify the election timing, because there was discussion of moving the election to early 2018. He asked whether we would need a member vote to amend the bylaws to move the next election to early 2018.
- Adam said his legal opinion is that the proposed bylaws amendments including changing the voting date to early 2018 would not materially and adversely affect member voting rights. Therefore no member vote on the proposed bylaws amendments would be required. Adam clarified that election timing would be a decision made by the Board Development Committee, not the Governance Committee.
- Jeremy mentioned Board Development had a general consensus that early in the calendar year would be better for the election, as there would be fewer burdens on the staff. Brian supported late January to be an ideal time to hold the election. This would eliminate overlap with the year-end appeal and sending mixed messages at the member party.
- Shirley recommended a single positive communication be sent to the membership on May 12th that included both RCV and a change in election timing. Leah asked to clarify that this communication was solely to inform the membership that the board was considering these things, not actually making any changes. Lisa was concerned about pushing the communication too soon. Andy supported early communication to the membership with plenty of warning.
- Adam asked if the full board would support a communication to the membership before the May meeting about the board's consideration of these changes. Andy clarified a communication in the middle of May stating the intention of the board to discuss at the May board meeting would give members a chance to participate with plenty of advance notice and transparency.
- Jenn voiced concern and suggested we proceed with continued discussion. Adam clarified there was still room for a discussion about election timing and if in May the board is not ready to send



the communication out, there was still time to do so after the May meeting.

- Lisa was concerned about the timing of things and the need for a proper feedback loop, especially with the membership. Leah commented that the process felt rushed and the deadline self-imposed rather than necessary. She also supported hearing from Board Development once they had a chance to meet and discuss this topic.
- Jeremy apologized on behalf of Board Development regarding follow up. He proposed an initial communication to the membership be limited:
 - The board is considering some changes, including possibly RCV
 - No action will be taken in the May board meeting, but please attend to participate in the conversation
- Deep agreed the need for clear communication given the possibility of a negative backlash. Deep also reminded that the 2016 board did mandate this current board look into RCV.
- Adam said that a communication to the membership should be sent in an effort of transparency. Shirley supported putting the communication out to the membership as soon as possible to allow for any questions or concerns.
- Chema encouraged board members interested in these conversations to attend the Governance Committee meetings, as there was extensive work done at a committee level regarding these concerns.
- Adam made a motion (detailed below) to publish a blog post and Jiro seconded.
- Jenn noted the agenda had not identified this as an action item and if it had been, she would have approached the conversation differently.
- Jenn and Leah both voiced concern and emphasized caution regarding such a heavy topic. Leah asked that the committee also consider the organization's health in the conversation.
- Lawrence noted this conversation had not included staff and he would like to hear the opinion from management. Brian noted a concern about any bylaws amendment, but staff will remain focused on the process and implementation, as directed by the board. Brian had looked into outsourcing all of the election process but with costs exceeding \$22,000 it was not an option.
- Andy said he would be tabling the item and voiced interest in having board consensus regarding communication to the membership. Adam asked if consensus was a policy for the board, as it was not an official policy in the bylaws. He also reminded the board that with a motion and a second on the table, the board is obligated to take a vote.
- Lisa said that while the committee may have done a lot of work on the proposal, there needed to be more respect regarding questions and feedback given by the full board. Deep reminded that the board is a deliberative body and urged the committee to recognize the number of board members who had voiced concern or discomfort with the proposal. The last time the board discussed bylaws, it felt rushed and mistakes were made. Deep stated that while he was fundamentally supportive of the proposal, the board should not make past mistakes and rush a decision especially when board members are voicing concern.
- Jiro said there is a need for a blog post soon to be transparent on the potential change of voting process and a potential change of election timing. Adam stated if there is a delay on the blog post, the board is essentially delaying engaging members in the conversation. The proposal put forward to the board tonight was to engage the membership, not to move the proposed bylaws amendment forward. Jeremy added the sooner the board includes the membership in the conversation, the more time the board will have to address any red flags and that between Bike to Work Day and Golden Wheel there is a narrow window to release a blog post.
- Leah stated the blog post proposal was not clearly stated and that there was a feeling of unnecessary pressure to push forward with it.



- Shirley suggested a redline version of the bylaws be added to the blog post. Andy proposed the blog post language be more informative and less legal by not including redlined bylaws and no linked proposals. Adam said the redline version of the bylaws is necessary to satisfy the purpose of member engagement.

Lindy Kae's phone call dropped and she left the meeting before the board vote.

Motion:

The board would post a blog post on May 12th informing the membership the board would be discussing at its May meeting the possibility of adopting ranked choice voting for board elections along with changing the election timing to January 2018. Membership input is welcomed via email or by attending the May board meeting.

Adam moved. Jiro seconded.

Approve:: Jiro, Shirley, Jeremy, Chema, Adam

Oppose:: Deep, Leah, Lisa, Andy, Lawrence, Jenn

Abstain: Nic Jay & Mary Kay

The motion failed.

Action Items:

1. Jenn will give Adam feedback about voting methods in an email. Any board member is invited to do the same.
2. Adam will work with Rocky to synchronize Governance and Board Development Committees on changing the election timing.

Member Comment:

Katherine Roberts requested to address the board and the president granted her permission. Katherine voiced concern that if ranked choice voting (RCV) is set as an option in the bylaws, then there is the possibility it will not be used. She suggested making RCV required in the bylaws.

12	Executive Director's Report	Information	Brian Wiedenmeier
-----------	------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------

See Appendix C for the dashboard showing progress towards our 2012-17 Strategic Plan.

Highlights:

- The bill for automated speed enforcement was pulled from the Transportation Committee by its sponsor, David Chu, due to lack of votes to carry it forward. There is a chance it might be brought back in a year, but it is not likely.
- SFMTA will be holding open houses for Folsom & Howard streets. The SOMA member committee is working hard to develop comprehensive feedback that would best inform SFMTA on those two street designs.
- May 2nd will be the Treasure Island Vista Point opening ceremony. This is the touchdown of the Bay Bridge bike lane onto the San Francisco side. Bike Easy Bay is committing a large presence.
- May 2nd will be the SFMTA Board meeting at 1pm. Upper Market Street will be voted upon and Turk Street will be brought up during public comment. Members are encouraged to attend.



Talking points will be available from the advocacy team.

- Regional Measure 3 is a regional measure that will raise money through a Bay Bridge toll raise. There is some push back from representatives who have more constituents who are more heavily car-dependent.
- The SFMTA board recently approved the eastern section of 13th & Division parking protected bike lanes. This was the site where Mr. Cheng Jin Lai was struck and killed in 2013 and these treatments could have saved his life.
- Vicente Street currently only has sharrows but the SFMTA is planning on repainting and striping the street with a bike lane. The same group who opposed the Ocean Avenue safety treatments voiced opposition. SFMTA will address this in its upcoming May 2nd board meeting.
- The SFBC is currently opposing the proposed chop shop legislation as it is currently written. Brian and Janice will be working on talking points to share. The Land Use committee will meet on May 8th to review the proposal.
- Bike to Work Day is May 11th and is the organization's biggest membership day. All board members are encouraged to participate, sign up for a shift and invite a person new to biking to join.
- Spur will be hosting a "State of Biking in San Francisco" talk 4/26 at 12:30pm. The panel will include Brian, staff from Liveable Streets and a representative from Her Bike Lane.
- Brian will be out of town the first week of May to attend the Vision Zero Cities conference in New York.

13	Reflection
-----------	-------------------

Information

Andy Thornley

Andy thanked all the board members for their civility during the meeting.

12	Adjourn
-----------	----------------

Action

Andy Thornley

Motion to adjourn the April 25, 2017 SF Bicycle Coalition Board meeting. Leah moved. Chema seconded. Meeting adjourned at 9:18pm.

List of Appendices

Identifier	Title
-------------------	--------------

- | | |
|---|---|
| A | Strategic Planning Committee Report |
| B | Ranked Choice Voting for Board Elections DRAFT proposal |
| C | Dashboard for Progress Toward the Strategic Plan |

Signature

Mary Kay Chin, Secretary


--



Appendix A: Strategic Planning Committee Report for April 25, 2017 SFBC Board Meeting



Strategic Planning Committee Report for April 25, 2017 SFBC Board Meeting

Summary

- The committee finalized plans for community listening sessions and interviews. Two people from the committee and board have been paired as co-facilitators for listening sessions. Interviews are being conducted solo by board members only.
- A member open house was held on April 19 to solicit member input on broad scope topics, over 70 people attended.
- The committee will hold an all-day retreat for committee members and interested board members on June 24 to develop draft goals, objectives, and strategies based on the accumulated data.

Requests to the board

- At the board meeting on April 25, any board member who has not yet signed up for listening sessions and interviews will be asked to do so.
- Please complete listening sessions and interviews (including data entry into the appropriate google form) by June 10. Detailed [instructions can be found here](#).

Strategic Planning Process Overview

(gray has been completed)

Phase	What	When
I. Needs Assessment	Review of existing data Input from board and staff	January-February
II. Shaping Direction for Strategic Plan	Determine plan scope and duration Development of core values Design and prepare Phase III	February-April
III. Broad Stakeholder Input	Input from membership and external stakeholders Data analysis	April - May June
IV. Development of Strategic Plan	Development of goals, objectives and strategies	May - June
V. Plan Writing	Drafting, revising, finalizing and presenting plan	July - August September

Opportunities for general member input (gray has been completed)

1. Webpage scheduled to go public February 28 with a form seeking input on groups and individuals to contact for strategic planning
2. Open house – held Wednesday, April 19
3. Member survey – to be opened this summer
4. Member meetings to review draft plan – to be scheduled in July or August



For more information:

See [minutes from the Strategic Planning Committee meeting held April 6, 2017](#) in the board's DropBox.

Committee Members

Abigail Tinker, Amandeep Jawa, Ana Vasudeo, Anna Gore, Brian Wiedenmeier, Catherine Orland, Chema Hernández Gil, Frank Chan, Janice Li, Jiro Yamamoto, John Beckman, Libby Nachman, Lindy Kae Patterson, Mary Kay Chin, Rocky Beach, Tracy Chinn, Sacha Ielmorini, Shirley Johnson (chair)

Working Groups

- Member open house: Ana, Brian (chair), Chema, Deep, Shirley
- Member survey: Anna (chair), Chema, Frank, Libby, Lindy



Appendix B: Ranked Choice Voting for Board Elections DRAFT Proposal

Ranked Choice Voting for Board Elections

A Proposed Bylaws Amendment

DRAFT - FOR DISCUSSION AT APRIL BOARD MEETING

I. Introduction

At the Board of Directors meeting in August, 2016, the Board passed a resolution calling for the Board to move towards implementation of ranked choice voting for Board elections in 2017:

The Board Development Committee will take input received from this year's board election process, input from Strategic Planning process, and a review of staff, budget and bylaw implications, as they move towards refining the voting process with an eye towards implementing Rank Choice Voting for Board Elections in 2017.

(Resolution of the Board of Directors, August 30, 2016)

After being formed in January, 2017, the Governance Committee elected to work on this project, setting a goal of presenting a ranked choice voting proposal to the Board early enough in 2017 to allow successful implementation of the system for 2017's Board election. After discussing the issue at three committee meetings, soliciting the input of interested members and outside experts in ranked choice voting systems, and considering staff, bylaws, and budget implications, the Governance Committee has prepared the proposal below for consideration by the Board.

II. Reasons for Adopting Ranked Choice Voting for Board Elections

In addition to the goal of implementing the previous Board resolution by moving towards ranked choice voting, the Governance Committee has identified several compelling reasons for the Board to adopt a ranked choice voting system:

First, ranked choice voting is regarded as a fairer electoral system compared to our current "winner-take-all" election system, where the candidates with the most votes win. Using a ranked choice voting system in a multi-winner election (like our Board elections) can promote diversity on the board - whether a diversity of political perspectives, backgrounds, or demographics. This is because ranked choice voting enables representation for political minorities by ensuring that their votes are not wasted.



Of course, just because ranked choice voting is fairer than winner-take-all systems and results in more diverse boards does not mean that adopting ranked choice voting will radically change the make-up of our Board. It is entirely possible that there will be no discernible difference in the diversity of our board if we implement ranked choice voting (again, in a broad sense of diversity, including politics, demographics, interests, etc). But that should not be a reason to not adopt the system, if only because it is impossible for us to know the answer to that question without trying it.

But there are other reasons to implement rank choice voting outside of its possible effect on the makeup of our Board, including the fact that our acting to ensure the fairest elections possible and working to have the most diverse board possible is a significant political statement of who we are as the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition and what our values are.

Finally, we are an advocacy organization based in San Francisco, a city that uses ranked choice voting in our local elections. By using ranked choice voting for our Board elections, we will be supporting and reinforcing our community's efforts to ensure fairer and more representative elections. By having our members participate in a ranked choice election, even on the small scale of our Board election, we will be directly and indirectly educating our members about both how to vote in a ranked choice election and the importance of such a system.

III. Explanation of the Proposal

Amending our Bylaws to require ranked choice voting is fairly simple and can be accomplished almost entirely with the addition of one sentence to the Bylaws. (See proposed Article IV, Section 11.E, below.) However, several other provisions in the Bylaws have been identified that require amendment in order to eliminate potential conflicts and confusing language. All proposed amendments are indicated in strikethrough and underline in the proposal below.

The Committee recognizes that implementing a ranked choice voting system will involve a lot more detail than can or should be contained in the Bylaws. As such it is our goal to propose additional policies for approval by the Board that address these additional details. Crafting and discussing these policies will require more time and attention by the Committee, and most importantly, by staff, and as such would best be performed after Board approval of the Bylaws amendments (to avoid the possibility of significant wasted effort). That said, the Committee, working with the Executive Director, has started to explore the general outlines of these policies.

A primary goal of these further policies will be to balance the need to ensure that the new system fully satisfies the intentions of the Board with the need to permit sufficient



flexibility and empowerment required for successful and efficient implementation of the system. Some issues that will likely be addressed in these policies include the need to provide for written ballots, participation in the electronic voting system by members who do not have email addresses, authenticating voters, and the need to balance the simultaneously competing and complementary needs of economy, transparency, and fairness.

The Committee anticipates that the bulk of these policies will be proposed and voted on within a month or two of the Board vote on the Bylaws amendment, but additional policies could be proposed and voted on throughout the implementation of the system, as issues and questions arise.

IV. Costs / Burden

The Executive Director, working with staff, has prepared estimated that implementation of a ranked choice voting system will cost, if designed and fully administered by staff, approximately \$6660 in staff time. Of these costs, approximately half are required for our current election system, meaning that a ranked choice voting system represents an additional expenditure of approximately \$3300 in staff time for the first year. This figure is expected to drop in successive years as it includes one-time costs for the design and setup of the system.

The Committee intends to discuss further ways to reduce these costs, including the possible use of third-party resources, either in conjunction with staff time or in place of staff time. For example, third party vendors supply election support for all aspects of ranked choice elections. Using such a service to set up an election interface and for the tabulation of results could reduce our staff time commitment by 20-30%, with a correlated reduction in costs. While it is also possible to use a third-party vendor for the entire process, this would likely cost more than our estimate for doing it in-house. Weighing the costs and benefits of various combinations of in-house and third-party work will be a primary goal of the Committee's work on rank choice voting going forward, and will likely be an ongoing, evolving discussion.

V. Member Outreach on Proposal

The Committee recognizes that this proposal affects member voting rights. Although we are confident that the proposal does not require a member vote (as it does not "materially or adversely" affect those rights), we believe that it would be beneficial for us to reach out to members before the Board votes on the proposal, in order to provide an opportunity for members to give feedback and comments. As such, we are planning on sending a blog post to members (attached to a regularly-scheduled SFBC email) explaining the proposal and inviting members to comment and/or attend the May Board meeting.



PROPOSED MOTION:

Whereas, the Board of Directors seeks to conduct elections for Directors in the fairest manner possible, with the goal of achieving the most representative and diverse board as possible;

Whereas, ranked choice voting, also known as single transferable vote, is regarded as an exceptionally fair voting system while still being accessible and easily implemented;

Whereas, ranked choice voting is currently used in local elections in San Francisco;

Now therefore, the Board of Directors hereby adopts ranked choice voting as the system for electing future Directors, by amending the Bylaws of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition as follows, with deletions in ~~strike through~~ and additions underlined:

ARTICLE IV

MEMBER MEETINGS AND VOTING

...

Section 11. Manner of Voting.

A. Action by Ballot

...

ii. Content of Ballots. Any written or electronic ballot distributed to the members to vote on a matter shall set forth the proposed action and provide an opportunity to specify approval or disapproval of the proposal or to rank the candidates in an election of directors.

...

iv. Requirements for Valid Action. Generally, approval a decision by ballot shall be valid only when the number of votes cast by ballot within the time period specified equals or exceeds the

Author 4/24/17 12:04 PM

Comment [1]: A technical wording accommodation for RCV. A "proposed action" can include election of one or more directors, but an RCV ballot is not based on simply approving or disapproving individual candidates.

Author 4/24/17 12:04 PM

Comment [2]: A similar technical wording accommodation for RCV.



required quorum set forth in these Bylaws, and either the contest is conducted using ranked choice voting or the number of approvals equals or exceeds the number of votes that would be required to approve the action if the vote were taken at a meeting of the members.

...

B. Election Ballots. Any ballot used in the election of directors shall set forth the names of the candidates who have been properly nominated at the time the ballot is issued. The ballot shall also provide a at least one space for members to designate a vote for "write in" the name of a candidate not on the ballot.

...

...

ARTICLE V

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

...

Section 5. Election and Term of Office of Directors. An annual election of directors shall be held by written or electronic ballot as provided in Article IV of these Bylaws. All ballots shall include a space for voting members to "write in" the name of a candidate for the Board. Directors shall be elected to terms of two years, and approximately one half of the directors shall be elected in each year. Each director shall hold office until expiration of the term and until a successor has been elected.

Author 4/24/17 12:04 PM

Comment [3]: Note that the following paragraph, Part v (not shown), says the quorum requirement does not apply for elections of directors.

Author 4/24/17 12:04 PM

Comment [4]: A similar technical and clarifying wording accommodation for RCV. The "number of approvals" language is not really applicable to RCV and in any case is difficult to fully interpret.

Author 4/24/17 12:04 PM

Comment [5]: Allow more than one write-in candidate per ballot, which is a best practice for RCV, but do not require it.

Author 4/24/17 12:04 PM

Comment [6]: A technical wording accommodation for RCV. With RCV, a voter ranks candidates instead of designating votes for specific candidates.

Author 4/24/17 12:04 PM

Comment [7]: This sentence is somewhat out of place and repeats what is already stated in lines 34-35 on the previous page.



Goal 4: BIKE SAFETY		
	Reduce bike injury rate by 10%	Collision report
	Increase San Franciscan's awareness of bicycling as a legitimate form of transportation to 95%	Binder poll
	Increase the perception of the safety of bicycling in San Francisco to 80%	Binder Poll
	Decrease significantly the frequency of encroachment into bike lanes and bikeways	#parkingdirty, social media
	Ed for majority of frequent drivers	# professional drivers trained
	Support the City to proactively & systematically reduce speeding on the most dangerous biking streets	ASE & V0
	Reach 10,000 annually through street outreach events and other events such as Sunday Streets	petition signatures, BTWD bags (+ Sunday Streets attendance)
	1/4 of articles mention safety; 3 focus	Salesforce (quarter by quarter, not cumulative)
	Reach 100,000 annually through print and electronic communications	E-mail data, Tube times, Media hits
	Reach thousands annually through adult bicycle education, FFTW, SRTS & other classes	aggregate ed number: adult bike ed + FFTW + YAFB + SRTS bike classes+ YBike middle school PE
Goal 5: POLITICAL & PUBLIC SUPPORT		
	Increase clout via membership rise	Salesforce member count
	Ensure 20% of SF Bicycle Coalition members participate in actively advancing our organization's priorities	Salesforce member Engagement Score
	Increase to 85% the number of San Franciscans who believe that the City should do more to support bicycling.	Binder poll
	Increase to 75% the number of San Franciscans who believe that they City should do more to support bicycling.	Binder poll
	Increase funding for bicycling	Programmed % of MTA capital budget
	Neighborhood support	# letters of support/testimony/sign ons from neighborhood groups
	Business support	# letters of support/testimony/sign ons from businesses