



Minutes of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition Board of Directors meeting
October 24, 2017
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition offices, 1720 Market Street, San Francisco, CA

Directors in attendance	Adam Keats
	Amandeep Jawa (on the phone)
	Andy Thornley (President)
	Chema Hernandez Gil (on the phone)
	Jenn Fox
	Jeremy Pollock
	Jiro Yamamoto
	Leah Shahum
	Lisa Fisher
	Mary Kay Chin (Secretary)
	Nic Jay Aulston
	Shirley Johnson
	Directors absent
Lindy Kae Patterson	
Rocky Beach	
Staff	Brian Wiedenmeier (Executive Director)
	Tracy Chinn (Development Director)
	Janice Li (Advocacy & Policy Director)
Guests in attendance	Catherine Oreland (Member)
	Maureen Persico (Member)
	Ben Wong (Member)
	Katherine Roberts (Member)
	Dana Seabury (Member)
	Kelli Shields (Member)

Start	The meeting was convened with quorum at 6:30pm.
--------------	---

Agenda Item	Purpose	Presenter
1 Consent Calendar	Action	Andy Thornley
<p>Consent Calendar: September 2017 meeting minutes</p> <p>Approval: Motion to approve consent calendar. Leah moved. Jeremy seconded.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Jenn and Nic Jay joined the meeting at 6:34pm.</p>		
2 President's Report	Information	Andy Thornley
<p>Board@ emails Scott Yarborough – thanked the board for moving forward with ranked choice voting as the election method for board elections and had several questions about board recommendations. Questions were forwarded to the board</p>		



development chair for follow up.

Bay Area BART Task Force – is looking for a new San Francisco representative. If any board member or member is interested in joining this task force, please contact Shirley Johnson directly for more information.

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

Strategic Plan Update [See Appendix A]

- Folsom – newly awarded parking protected bike lane from Falmouth to 11th Street. Construction begins on Friday 11/1. SFMTA is hoping to have it completed by the holidays. Brian thanked the SOMA member committee for organizing and speaking up at SFMTA board meetings to make this happen.
- Howard will not be considered for near term improvements due to overhead wires.
- Planning for a protected bike lane on Valencia Street will begin by the end of 2017. The plan will be presented to the full SFMTA board on 11/14.
- Looking to expand Healthy Saturday's (car-free open streets in Golden Gate Park) throughout the full year. The SFBC is building coalitions with other park users, neighborhood associations and other community entities that were present when the first car-free GGP spaces were initiated in 2007. Some of the museums in the park are opposed, but this time Parks & Rec are in support of Healthy Saturdays. Staff will continue to mobilize members and work with the two supervisors' whose districts connect with GGP.

Lisa joined the meeting at 6:39pm.

- Continuing to fight for a two-way separated bike lane along the Embarcadero. Port of San Francisco is opposing developing the bike lane before the sea wall development has been decided. The SFBC believes planning should continue with the bike lane in conjunction with the sea wall. People Protected Bike Lane will be organizing an action north of the Ferry Building on Wednesday.
- Turk Street designs for the parking protected bike lane will finally move forward. There will be sizeable gaps to accommodate loading zones and emergency access, but SF Fire Department signed off and these are better than what is there now. The plan will go to SFMTA Engineering and then the full SFMTA board for approval.
- Bicycle ticket diversion - Starting in 2016, municipalities are now authorized to offer a bicycle ticket diversion program (i.e. "traffic school") for individuals who bike and received traffic tickets. The SFBC is in conversation with the SFPD & SFMTA to authorize a class that could be offered under this program.
- Transportation Task Force 2045 – SFBC is participating in this task force, which is co-led by the mayor's office and Supervisor Peskin, as chair of the County Transportation Authority. Other members include coalitions and organizations that care about how we fund transportation. The task force is looking at how to fill the gap in funding that is anticipated to be several billion dollars between now and 2045. The mayor's office is keen on a dedicated sales tax, which is inherently regressive so other options are being reviewed such as congestion pricing, vehicle license fee or a gross receipts tax.
- The bike facility at McLaren Park opened the previous weekend and hundreds of young people came out to experience the facility. A great example of community groups, riding groups and the city working together to make this possible. These open spaces are vital in helping individuals build lifelong riding habits and are very important.
- Paul Ave – we are following this very closely because Paul Ave is the best connector between 3rd Ave and Bayshore, two important pieces in the bike network. Three to four years ago SFMTA started planning and outreach for bike facilities that went in 6 months ago as paint buffered bike lanes on four blocks of Paul. This bike lane resulted in the removal of not an insignificant amount of street parking. Neighborhood residents and parishioners of the Cornerstone Baptist Church went to the SFMTA and Supervisor Cohen saying the bike lane did not serve their community nor were they properly consulted in the planning process. Supervisor Cohen held several community meetings, including one at Cornerstone, which the



SFBC attended. Five to six dozen African American community members attended and said the bike lane was not for them but for new gentrifying neighborhood residents. The SFBC did not speak at the meeting, just listened to what the community had to say. This facility speaks to the very issue of intersectionality in our transportation justice we are attempting to address in our new strategic plan. Brian believes there are two options to move forward: 1) Organize our members who support this bike lane and bring people out to speak in support of it or 2) hold back and encourage the SFMTA to do a more robust community listening and engagement process to see if there is a compromise alternative. Brian's concern with the first option is that it will alienate residents and set any bike advocacy movement in these outer neighborhoods back significantly and will position the SFBC as a gentrifying agent. Brian is recommending the staff go with the second option, step back and listen to the community members who are concerned with this and develop a better community engagement process. Brian cautioned the board that the SFBC may receive vocal complaints from members who would oppose the removal of the bike lane and if need be talking points will be circulated.

4	Pubic Comment	Information	Andy Thornley
<p>Katherine Roberts – would like to see the public comment moved from the beginning of the meeting to later so members can comment on the conversation the board is having in the meeting. She thanked the board for its move to adopt ranked choice voting as its election method.</p> <p>Maureen Persico – thanked the board and the SFBC for its support of People Protected Bike Lane and invited all to their next action on Wednesday, November 1st 5pm - 6:30pm at the Ferry Building.</p>			
5	Board Development	Information	Amandeep Jawa in lieu of Rocky Beach
<p>On track with the recently approved timeline and election process. Both sfbike.org/board and sfbike.org/2017boardelections are posted thanks to Frank. The candidate questionnaire is updated and viewable on the website. There are currently 13 interested candidates, 2 maybes and 5 candidates who've completed the questionnaire. Candidate interviews for board recommendations will start at the beginning of November and last through December 15th. The next Board Development meeting will be 11/2.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adam asked when the paper notice for election would be sent out. Andy clarified our bylaw requirement state notice must be sent no more than 90 days prior to the election, so the committee is looking at sending postcards in mid November. • Lisa asked when the voting would close. Brian stated voting closes 2/16 and certified results would be announced March 1st. Brian encouraged Board Development to finalize if there is to be a board meeting in February and when. 			
6	Finance	Information	Brian Wiedenmeier in lieu of Lawrence Li
<p>Due to chairperson's travel schedule there is a limited update this month. Brian summarized that while our deficit has not grown, there is still a significant deficit at our half way fiscal budget. Planning is already underway for the year-end appeal, Winterfest and other campaigns that will work to address this deficit.</p>			
7	Fundraising	Information	Leah Shahum & Tracy Chinn
<p>Update on the 2017 revenue plan:</p>			



- Lisa & Andy are hosting a house party at Bare Bottle 11/9 5-7:30pm
- Deep volunteered to host a house party in November
- Board donation challenge to raise \$5000 has reached \$3000 to date, there will be individual follow ups
- Started a pop up outreach outside the office at the Jug Handle every Friday to capitalize on the ground floor retail and access to a highly traveled bike lane. Two pop up events to date where 10 new members were recruited.
- Winterfest – with the added goal of raising an additional \$15,000 in sponsorship, development team has raised a total of \$23,000 towards the \$60,000 goal. Tracy recognizes the challenge of raising this additional sponsorship and acknowledges the full goal may not be met. There is an internal staff challenge to sell tickets; currently Charles is in the lead having sold 10 tickets. Tracy is extending this challenge to the board with \$5 discount code.
- Year-end appeal is coming up and the board will be asked to hand write notes to major donors. Staff will provide all the materials and letters will be available to pick up next week.

8 Governance	Information	Adam Keats
Nothing new to report. Next committee meeting in early November.		
9 Audit	Information	Amandeep Jawa
Committee will be drafting a new request for proposal, more updates to come.		
10 Membership	Information	Mary Kay Chin
<p>Committee is meeting on Thursday, November 9th and is working online prior to the meeting.</p> <p>11/13 there will be a lunch screening of Stylish Spokes at the San Francisco Urban Film festival.</p>		
11 Strategic Planning	Action	Shirley Johnson
<p>The committee presented the “final” draft to the board tonight (see appendix B) with the true final version to be presented at the November board meeting. The board will be asked to review the comments and resolve as many as possible.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian recapped the suggested edit of reordering the core values section and was open to having ‘transportation justice’ as our first goal, which sets the tone for the plan. Jeremy seconded having ‘joy’ as the last goal, ending on a positive note. Jeremy suggested ‘people power’ first then ‘transportation justice’. Lisa supported having ‘people power’ first as well. Lisa asked about the word choice of justice as opposed to equity. Brian clarified there was a robust conversation about word choice, with staff overwhelmingly supporting ‘justice’. Jenn supports staff and ending with ‘joy’. Brian suggested returning the order of values to the original order and there was no strong opposition. • Metrics measuring mileage of bike infrastructure on identified high injury corridors. Leah asked to clarify how many miles of identified high injury corridors, Brian clarified it was hundreds. Janice believes 18 miles annually is very ambitious and might at times not be achievable. Leah asked how many miles of infrastructure on high injury corridors are currently added, Brian stated 15 miles were added in 2016. Janice stated that because there is varying definitions of “safety improvement”, measuring these is tricky. Leah said the 18-mile goal sounded appropriately ambitious given the work with the city and tricky definitions. Brian summarized the conversation with staff had been a balance between ambitious and cautious. Janice pointed out that using mileage did not always get the plan where we wanted (ex. a mile of the Polk street contraflow is a highly valuable piece of the bike network but is not high mileage). Jenn 		



supported the value of the committee's work outside of the board meeting. Janice clarified the goal as an overall goal at the end of the five-year plan, whereas the annual measure can help to focus on project delivery across each year. Chema pointed out that if our plan was below the city's goal, the optics might appear off and that it is not the SFBC actually implementing the infrastructure. If the goals are not met staff should be able to identify what is preventing goal achievement.

- New development projects – Lisa clarified her original point was about looking at major new development projects that are adding new streets to the grid and making sure they are adding world class bike infrastructure at inception (ex. the waterfront development, Lake Merced, Balboa Reservoir, etc.). Brian asked how many projects would we be dealing with. Lisa confirmed there would be a lot. Brian clarified that this metric as is creates a new set of work that the SFBC does not currently do and if we are to keep it as is it might require a whole new staff position considering the projects in the works across the city. Lisa pushed back that a portion of it might not require new staff, but connecting with city staff that are already advocates for active transit. Brian clarified he has historically declined to weigh in on development projects due to the potential political fallout. Jenn suggested clarifying the metric as “major opportunities” and there might come times when it is within our mission and reach to weigh in on land-use policy but to keep it flexible. Chema supported this but stated this might be more of a staff tactic than a policy and our ability to weigh in will be a case-by-case basis, dependent on staff capacity. Lisa clarified this goal could be worded as a way for the SFBC to keep track of new development and Andy seconded this as a way to leverage partnerships with city staff who also hold active transit as a value. Jiro supported keeping the original goal. Brian clarified he was looking for board guidance specifically around land-use and if there was a goal in our plan, he could fall back on that when lobbied by advocacy groups or developers. Janice countered; saying to leave the specific goal out would give the SFBC the political flexibility when it comes to dealing with developers. Adam stated support of Lisa's original metric, which was for all new streets to have world-class bike infrastructure. Chema voiced support for the ability to target opportunities and having a flexible goal to make room for flexible targeting. Jeremy stated with the importance of land-use in our city, it would be irresponsible for us as a political organization not to call it out in our strategic plan. Shirley concluded the committee would review all this feedback and come back to the board.
- 50% decrease in bicycle crashes – Brian noted that by focusing on getting more people to report crashes, there will be an increase in reported numbers, which will make this goal unlikely. Shirley asked to clarify how number of crashes were measured, if by mile or per person. Brian clarified it would be a 50% decrease in crashes reported. Leah noted that this measure should focus specifically on injury crashes and this should be by rate not by number. Leah asked how 50% was picked as the number; Brian stated it was pulled from the city's Vision Zero goal for 2020.
- Sub goal of one car-free event spanning multiple neighborhoods on a large scale – Brian stated this would be one event for the whole five-year plan, but that it would be a large accomplishment and would most likely require a whole individual staff position to manage. Andy supported the idea but wanted to ensure it was achievable. Brian stated the event would not necessarily need to be organized by SFBC alone but could be a partnership with an organization already doing such events, such as Livable City, the organizer of Sunday Streets. Shirley asked would an event like this further our mission. Leah stated there is a value in having more car-free spaces because those allow more people to envision permanent car-free spaces in their lives and expands support for car-free spaces beyond just the “bike people”. Deep supported Shirley's question about value but highlighted the value of car-free spaces and the potential for us to have a large membership drive. Chema seconded Deep's statement and that we could support Sunday Streets to grow bigger. Chema also pointed out if we could connect with some of the already existing events in some of the outer neighborhoods to downtown, then that could highlight much of our already completed infrastructure. Jiro stated because this would be one event in a five-year plan organized across coalitions, it would be a reasonable item to add to our plan. Leah stated adding additional goals would be a lot of work for staff. Jenn supported staff decision-making and encouraged the staff take a deeper look at the return on an event of this size and bring that back to the board.
- Should we have a metric about valet bike parking? – Brian stated we already measure this but questioned if we should add this to the plan. Andy noted that adding racks is not technically in our control, although we have influence. Adam said that valet events could be outreach opportunities, which benefits our reputation



and reach. Brian will work with staff to develop a reasonable valet bike parking metric to be added.

- Bike theft reporting through a SFBC app – Shirley recapped that decreasing bike theft is one of the highest priorities for our members but how do we do that. Does SFBC take this on by creating an app and managing the whole process, which could translate to a lot of work and potentially a whole staff position? Adam noted the continued focus on bike theft by our members and asked if we are concerned about realistic impact, what part of this can the SFBC realistically own. Brian strongly encouraged the board to not include developing an app to address this.
- Ballot measures vs. coalition building – Brian asked if we focus on transportation funding or coalition building, which can be more difficult to measure. Andy stated he believed coalition building is a tactic not an outcome. Brian clarified that the committee had discussed coalition building being baked into the entire plan and if it is not called out specifically that it could appear as if we do not value it. Janice clarified coalition building was taken out of the values section during these drafts.

Chema left the meeting at 8:31pm.

Janice clarified her belief that coalition building is not a tactic but a concept and a strategy. Leah recognized the inherent difficulty in measuring success with coalition building and that focusing on transportation funding can be an easier way to measure success. Lisa supported a broader definition to allow for a less limited method to reach these goals. Jenn pointed out that coalition building is included in goal III and goal III.1. Nic Jay asked if not in this goal, where do we put coalition building in the plan. Janice does not support a specific metric on coalition building. Deep stated coalition building is not a goal in itself, but a value of how we do things. Jeremy pushed back and said there is value in building coalitions and the political power that comes from that. Deep countered that the point of building coalitions is not necessarily to build the coalition but for the coalition to do something to benefit all the members. Jenn recognized the value in having coalition building added, but questioned the value of its manifestation to the betterment of the SFBC. Brian proposed taking coalition building out as an objective and rewrite the people powered section of our values to include coalition building. The board supported this.

- Jeremy suggested calling out transportation network companies (TNCs), but they are currently regulated by the state. For the SFBC to have any impact we need to be focused on state level decisions – Leah asked for clarification. Jeremy stated after thinking about the loud and extensive member feedback regarding TNCs he included a specific metric (II.3.B) we can point to when having discussions with members about what the SFBC is doing to address this concern. Jenn proposed removing II.3.B because it did not go through the committee process and folding it into II.3.A. Brian supported this and will keep in mind Jeremy's suggestion. Jeremy agreed.
- Jenn pointed out the board should be conscious of the wording of our strategic plan as we are a board of a 501c4 and a 501c3 and the differences between those two types of organizations.
- Bike shops – Brian pointed out that we have little impact on the trends that are currently impacting the bicycle industry but there was a long discussion on the committee level about this. He was unsure if a specific metric in this area is wise considering we have little control of the larger market fluctuation in the industry. Andy seconded the difficulty in having actual impact on the market. Nic Jay clarified seeing bike shops as part of the bike infrastructure and the value of our organization supporting them as such. Lisa asked if it could be included as supporting biking in goal I. Leah stated seeing this as access and if it could be nestled as a strategy under our goals around equity. Nic Jay clarified seeing bike shops as part of the bike infrastructure because if bike riders have nowhere to get or repair bikes having bike lanes is meaningless. Brian asked where Nic Jay would include this language and Nic Jay said it could be included under membership or even the goal around infrastructure. Lisa seconded this could be included under connecting and educating members, specifically goal IV. Brian suggested that the committee could look at goal 4 for a place for this.

Jenn left the meeting at 8:43pm.



- Growing membership to 15,000 over the next five years – Brian posed the question of what is reasonable and attainable and how much resources we want to devote to this stretch goal. Staff had originally suggested 12,000 as the goal and Brian encouraged the board to take a realistic look at what it would take to reach this goal and the strategic implications on any decision. Adam asked if list growth metric was included in the plan, specifically around our email list. Brian stated he believed there could be higher dividends if we approached this as a list-serve growth versus membership growth strategy. Nic Jay asked how or if these two definitions were opposed. Brian clarified they are not but that list-serve membership would hopefully lead towards dues-paying membership. Lisa suggested keeping the due-paying membership goals to 12-13k and to add an additional goal around growing list-serve membership numbers. Brian supported this and added to include communications staff in drafting a realistic goal.
- Calling out demographics vs. “people who experience barriers to bicycling” – Brian noted the power and risk of calling or not calling out specific identities. Jeremy supported omitting calling out specific demographics but that this was in response to continued feedback of how SFBC events are not always welcoming to non-white and/or non-male members.

Chema rejoined the meeting 8:58pm.

- Education – Brian would like to go back to staff to specify classroom versus public engagement counts. Brian asked the board if they valued quantity or quality in this metric. Jiro, Adam, Andy and Jeremy all supported quantity. Lisa supported quality and pointed to Safe Routes valuing mode shift as a measure. Chema supported both and pointed the potential bicycle ticket diversion program as a potential metric measure.
- Definition of car-free space – do we define as permanent and temporary? Lisa encouraged to define it as temporary and to focus on permanent spaces in the next strategic plan. Adam suggested adding permanent to the goal. Brian clarified not including a size allows for more flexibility.
- Brian asked all board members review the draft plan and ask two questions:
 - Does it speak with one voice?
 - Does it sound coherent?

12	Adjourn	Action	Andy Thornley
-----------	----------------	---------------	----------------------

Motion to adjourn the October 24, 2017 SF Bicycle Coalition Board meeting. Jeremy moved. Leah seconded. Meeting adjourned at 9:10pm.

List of Appendices

Identifier	Title
A	October 2017 Strategic Plan Progress Dashboard
B	“Final” Draft Strategic Plan

Signature

Mary Kay Chin, Secretary	
--------------------------	--



Appendix A: October 2017 Strategic Plan Progress Dashboard

SF Bicycle Coalition October 2017 Strategic Plan Dashboard			
GOAL	SUBGOAL	Metric	DASHBOARD STATUS
Overall Goal: RIDERSHIP			
	Percentage bicycling occasionally	Professional poll; City data	
	Percentage bicycling frequently	Professional poll; City data	
Goal 1: CONNECTING THE CITY			
	50 mi of expanded/improved network	miles of new *and improved* bike facilities	
	50 biking network hot spots	# spot improvements	
	Support strengthening of regional connections, including the Golden Gate Bridge, Bay Bridge and regional transit	milestones, non-numerical	
	Open more bicycle access on local and regional transit systems and bridges so that at least half of San Franciscans believe that it is easy and inviting to travel regionally by bike	milestones, non-numerical	
	repave 90 blocks/year	blocks of bike routes repaved	
Goal 2: CATALYZE BIKING			
	50K attendance at Sunday Streets	Initially: # events Eventually: conversion rate	
	Teaching 1000 adults/yr	# adults taught in bike classes	
	Increase bike trips via bikeshare	Initially: bike share members Eventually: new users	
	Encourage increased biking among San Franciscans under 18, with 5% biking frequently and 25% biking occasionally	See above, "Overall Goal"	
	15K @ Bike to School	Initially: # BTSD participation Eventually: #BTSD conversion	
	100K @ Bike to Work	Initially: # BTWD participation Eventually: # BTWD conversion	
Goal 3: INTEGRATE INTO LIFESTYLE			
	75% parking requests win 3 mo	# new bike racks installed	
	1 bike corral/district	# bike corrals installed	
	Help 5k parents or caregivers begin & continue biking w/ their children, more often	Biking w/ Babies; YAFB newsletter subscription; bike train trainings; Family Biking workshops.	
	1K business integrate biking	# businesses tangibly engaged	
	outreach: every district & 3 languages	Deviation of people biking demographics from SF demographics: age, race, gender, income, zip code	
	75,000 people use valet	# of valet users	
	Member satisfaction	Member survey result average	
	An increasing number of members combine bicycling and transit trips	Member survey result	
	Support the implementation of easily-accessible, visible bike parking and sharing stations at and near major SF transit hubs	Station Siting	
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 60%	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	

DASHBOARD KEY	
Green	Ahead of Extended Goal
Yellow	Near Meeting Goal
Red	Behind Goal

Membership	Current count	9,518
-------------------	---------------	-------

sfbike.org	Users 15,682
Sept 24 - Oct 24, 2017	Pageviews 34,876
	Pages / Session 1.70
	Avg. Session Duration 00:01:26
	% New Sessions 65.53%



Appendix B: "Final" Draft Strategic Plan



Appendix B: "Final" Draft Strategic Plan

"FINAL" DRAFT

SF Bicycle Coalition 2018-2022 Strategic Plan Mission, Values, Goals, Objectives, and Metrics

Introduction

To be written by Lindy Kae. Include the word map of interviews and listening sessions (Anna Gore already created this).

Mission Statement

The San Francisco Bicycle Coalition works to transform San Francisco's streets and neighborhoods into safe, just, and livable places by promoting the bicycle for everyday transportation.

(action taglines: Advocate. Educate. Collaborate.)

Core Values

JOY: We celebrate bicycling as a fun, healthy way to get around and connect with each other and our communities.

SUSTAINABILITY: We fight climate change by enabling and encouraging more people to bike more often.

PEOPLE POWER: We create positive change through collective action.

TRANSPORTATION JUSTICE: We advocate for everyone's equitable access to safe, affordable, and healthy transportation to create a just city.

GOAL I: Demand high-quality infrastructure and push for visionary improvements to connect the city

Objectives:

1. Establish physically-protected bike lanes as the standard for bike improvements, especially on Vision Zero high-injury corridors.
 - A. 30 miles of protected bike lanes across every supervisorial district
 - B. 25% of approved bike lane projects include protected bike infrastructure
 - C. 18 miles of new and upgraded bicycle and pedestrian safety infrastructure constructed on high-injury corridors annually
 - D. 75% of new development projects install protected bike infrastructure

Commented [1]: Input from Nic Jay on the first draft that may be useful for writing the introduction:

We should have a part about the future of cycling in the city. An aspirational statement that brings people into the fold. A statement that brings people to the coalition as an active participant. We don't have a place in the strategic plan that focuses on how we open the door to other orgs and individual members. We have some places for members to be active, but we don't have a place that outlines the avenues and incentives to participate.

Commented [S2]: Feedback on first draft was to change to the following order, OK?

Commented [S3R2]: Brian and Janice prefer original order.

Commented [4]: This would be a shift from what we do today. Does the board want staff to spend more time on new development? How do we define new development? Is there a better way to state this metric (Lisa)?

Commented [5]: Only massive development projects are large enough where they would install things like protected bike lanes. The development issues I think we need to engage in are things like driveways and loading zones, car parking, VMT methodology, impacts from TNC and delivery, and wind generation. I suggest moving this concept to objective 2 and wording it something like I put for D.



2. Fight for street design and operations that prioritize safe, comfortable active transportation over fast driving

- A. 150 "hot spot" improvements
- B. 50% decrease in perceived danger biking in San Francisco
- C. 50% decrease in bicycle crash rate citywide
- C-D. Engage on land use policies and development projects to make the City safe and convenient for people who bike.

3. Expand car-free spaces within parks and on city streets.

- A. 15 regular open streets events per year
- B. 5 new open, car-free spaces
- C. One car-free event spanning multiple neighborhoods on a large scale

4. Work to eliminate double-parking and illegal loading/unloading in bike lanes.

- A. Enable double-parking reporting through 311 to establish a baseline
- B. 60% reduction in the number of illegal bike lane encroachments in high-injury corridors and 40% reduction elsewhere compared with baseline

5. Ensure bike access and capacity on bridges and local and regional transit.

- A. Secure full funding for construction of Bay Bridge western span path
- B. 50% increase number of people arriving and traveling by bike to BART and Caltrain

6. Make bike parking secure and plentiful.

- A. 3,000 additional bike racks/corrals installed
- B. Triple the number of locations with attended or otherwise secure bike parking service

7. Decrease bicycle theft.

- A. Establish a bike theft unit in San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)
- B. 50% increase in bicycle recovery rate
- C. 50% reduction in bicycle theft
- C-D. 50% increase in bike registration

Commented [6]: 1) this seems more of a tactic (or like, a line in the Advocacy Director's job description)

2) there is no realistic metric to attach here

3) I get the sentiment, and I've commented on this elsewhere that nothing in this strategic plan really encompasses the legislative and policy work I do, but I don't agree w/ this metric being shoehorned in like this

Commented [7]: I generally echo Janice's perspective. This is a well intentioned but vague point, although I do think we can attach metrics to it at some point, like "bike infrastructure doesn't significantly increase displacement of communities of color", etc.

Commented [8]: Is this enough? According to Matt Biggar's data compilation, 811 racks were installed from 2012 - 2013. At that rate, there would be over 4000 racks installed in five years. Given the increase in bicycling in SF, shouldn't we be strive for more in the next five years?



GOAL II: Build public support and political power to secure affordable and sustainable transportation for all San Franciscans.

Objectives:

1. Secure significantly more funding for bicycle infrastructure by winning local and regional funding measures.

A. 10% of all new transportation revenues are allocated to bicycle and pedestrian projects

QUESTION: Shall we add 1.B

B. Work with key organizations and advocacy partners to ~~pass~~ support three new ballot measures to promote affordable, accessible, and sustainable transportation

OR delete 1.B. and replace with an objective about coalition building such as:

2. Engage in coalition building with key organizations in San Francisco to promote affordable, accessible, and sustainable transportation

What would the metric be? How can we measure coalition building?

OR is it assumed that we are always coalition building, so an objective specifically about coalition building is not needed?

2-3. Ensure new and emerging mobility technologies and services, especially transportation network companies and delivery services, are safe and complement bicycling.

A. Enact city and state policies that positively integrate new and emerging mobility technologies into San Francisco's transportation network

A.B. Push San Francisco's representatives in the California State Legislature to introduce legislation to protect people who bike from TNCs

3-4. Elect powerful champions for bicycling as mayor of San Francisco, in key supervisorial districts, and to other important offices citywide.

A. All SF Bicycle Coalition-endorsed candidates are elected to office and are held publicly accountable to their constituents

Commented [9]: i like "win" over secure. "Secure is wonky, but everyone likes to "win!"

Commented [10]: I also like winning.

Commented [11]: Options for this metric:

- \$ amount brought in for partnership work
- # of (new) contacts via partnership/coalition work
- % of media mentions that also mentions an organizational ally
- # of organizational support letters per year
- Any metric measuring size of coalition(s)
- # of co-hosted events
- # of non-SFBC community meetings/committees/events we attend or staff

Commented [12]: Because members are so upset about TNCs, I feel like we need a stronger metric here.

Commented [13]: Has someone done a c3 review? I am assuming this strat plan is for both the ed fund and the SFBC. If so, it is very important to do that read and edits...

Commented [14]: Thanks for flagging this, Jenn. This plan is for the 501(c)(4) only. Brian will talk with Andy about doing a legal review. For example, could the plan explicitly state this is for the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (as opposed to the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition Education Fund)?

Commented [15]: OK. Your response makes it sound like the plan is for the c4, which sounds right to me.



GOAL III: Grow, engage, and empower our membership to strengthen our organization and deepen community support for bicycling.

Objectives:

1. Increase the number of members through grassroots organizing and strategic coalition building.
 - A. *Grow individual membership to 15,000*
 - B. *50% increase in the number of business members*
2. Build an organization whose members, board, and staff reflect San Francisco's demographics.
 - A. *Report annually on closing the gap between the organization's and San Francisco's demographics*
 - A-B. *Promote and help organize events that are welcoming to people who bike from a variety of races, ethnicities, ages, genders and sexual orientations*
3. Engage members and individuals to power our advocacy and increase our effectiveness.
 - A. *Maintain an average of at least 10,000 volunteer hours annually*
 - B. *Train 250 members in a leadership development program*
 - C. *Establish an organization-wide leadership ladder and increase member engagement by 10% at each level per year.*

GOAL IV: Introduce San Franciscans of all ages, identities, and backgrounds to the joy of bicycling and encourage more San Franciscans to bicycle more often.

Objectives:

1. Reach thousands of people through bicycle education and school safety programming.
 - A. *Reach 4,000 adults with bicycle education emphasizing the rules of the road*
 - B. *Reach 20,000 young people, parents, and caregivers*
 - C. *25% increase in the number of children biking to school*
2. Support bicycling for everyday transportation among communities that experience barriers to riding.
 - A. *Refurbish and distribute 1,000 bicycles through Community Bike Builds*
 - B. *50% increase in people who bike in SF identify as female, trans, or femme*
 - C. *Support the expansion of culturally inclusive, accessible and affordable bike share systems and bike share membership programs*
3. Educate all road users how to share the road safely and respectfully.
 - A. *Ensure SFPD continues to meet its Focus on the Five goals*
 - B. *Demand fair and equitable enforcement methods*

Commented [16]: "Nic Aulston":

Should this goal have a item about the health of the cycling community? Bike shops have been closing and are struggling to stay open, how do we have a goal that permits us to support them. Open houses, meet and greet, or establishing a connection with the existing informal bike shop owner group

Commented [17]: "Andy Thornley":

Good point, a viable and robust bicycle business community is important

Commented [18]: The bike industry is in crisis due to high cost, competition from online, low margin, rising cost of labor and lease space, high employee turnover. We already do a bike shop challenge, we have informal convening of bike shop owners, and work with bike shop staff to educate on advocacy. There is concern about raising this to a specific objective in the plan.

Commented [19]: Agree. As someone who used to work in the bike industry, the challenges it is facing are beyond the scope of SFBC's strategic plan.

Commented [20]: I agree that bicycle sales and repair are essential to maintain cycling.

Commented [21]: In 2012-2016, 5809 adults were taught to ride (according to data compiled by Matt Biggar). By writing only 4000 here, it could imply we plan to cut back on adult bike ed in the next five years. Do we?



C. Train 5,000 professional drivers

Appendices:

A: Definitions

B: Process used to create the strategic plan

Commented [S22]: Should definitions be moved to the beginning of the document?

Appendix A: Definitions

Car-free space	Temporary or p Permanent space for walking and biking without car access that previously allowed cars
Bicycle crash	A preventable situation in which a bicyclist greets the ground, a motor vehicle, or any other solid object in a way that can result in bodily harm and/or property damage
Focus on the Five	A citywide enforcement initiative that targets the five most dangerous traffic violations that contribute to traffic injuries and deaths
High-injury corridor	The 12% of streets where over 70% of severe/fatal injuries occur to people walking, biking, driving and motorcycling
Hot spot	A small area where there are safety concerns due to gaps in bike infrastructure
<u>Leadership ladder</u>	<u>A framework designed to deepen member engagement; it works by asking members to take increasingly important roles to walk up the figurative ladder to ultimately become leaders for the cause</u>
Open streets event	An event that temporarily opens streets to people by closing them to cars
Professional driver	Anyone who is compensated for their time driving, including TNC drivers for Uber and Lyft
Transportation network company (TNC)	An organization that uses mobile apps and the Internet to allow people to secure individual and carpooling rides from drivers in non-commercial vehicles. Examples include Uber and Lyft.
Vision Zero	A city policy to prioritize street safety and eliminate traffic deaths in San Francisco by 2024

Commented [23]: Suggest removing "temporary" because the metric is five car-free spaces in five years. Play streets could be considered a temporary space and there are dozens per year.



Appendix B: Process used to create this strategic plan

The table below provides an overview of the strategic planning process.

Phase	What	When
0: Initiation	Gather information from other organizations Organize panel discussion Create draft scope Hire consultant	March - December, 2016
I. Needs Assessment	Review of existing data Input from board and staff	January - February, 2017
II. Shaping Direction for Strategic Plan	Determine plan scope and duration Development of core values Design and prepare Phase III	February - April, 2017
III. Broad Stakeholder Input	Input from membership and external stakeholders Data analysis	April - June, 2017
IV. Development of Strategic Plan	Development of goals, objectives and strategies	June, 2017
V. Plan Writing	Drafting, revising, and presenting plan	July - October, 2017
VI. Plan Approval	Finalize and approve plan	November, 2017

Final Draft Strategic Plan

Page 6 of 8



Phase 0: Initiation

The committee contacted eight nonprofit organizations to gather information on their strategic planning processes to help inform our process. The committee also organized “Bike Talk: Growing Our Movement” with three distinguished panelists (Lateefah Simon, René Rivera, and Tamika Butler) to encourage dialog and discussion as we began the strategic planning process. The committee drafted a broad scope for the strategic plan and hired a consultant to facilitate the planning process.

Phase I: Needs Assessment

The consultant gathered existing data to assess our progress toward the 2012-2017 strategic plan and to set the stage for our next strategic plan. A survey of board and staff was conducted for a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis.

Phase II: Shaping Direction for the Strategic Plan

The committee reviewed the SWOT analysis to refine the scope of the strategic plan and to draft core value statements. Groups and individuals were identified for listening sessions and stakeholder interviews, respectively.

Phase III: Broad Stakeholder Input

A member open house was held to collect input on the draft scope from SF Bicycle Coalition members. Board members conducted 29 individual interviews with key stakeholders including advocates, politicians, and city officials. Committee members and board members co-facilitated listening sessions with the following groups:

- Council of Community Housing Organizations
- Former SFBC board candidates
- Former SFBC staff
- Major donors
- Neighborhood associations
- PODER & Bicis del Pueblo
- Regional bike coalitions
- Self-identified seniors
- SF Bicycle Advisory Committee
- SF Municipal Transportation Agency Livable Streets Division
- SF2G
- Walk San Francisco

The consultant compiled the data and provided summaries for the committee’s review.

Phase IV: Development of Strategic Plan

Based on the data collected, the committee developed draft goals, objectives and strategies to serve as the foundation for the strategic plan.

Phase V: Plan Writing

An online survey was administered to collect input from SF Bicycle Coalition members on the draft goals and objectives. Based on this input, the committee refined the goals and objectives for discussion at two forums for SF Bicycle Coalition members. The committee then synthesized the member input to write a first draft strategic plan including draft metrics for the full board to review and provide input. The committee compiled the board’s input to create a final draft strategic plan.

Phase VI: Plan Approval



Acknowledgement

Thank you to all who participated in interviews and listening sessions. Special thanks to the members strategic planning committee.

2016 committee members:

Amandeep Jawa, Andy Thornley, Andy Toebben, Brianne O'Leary Gagnon, Mary Kay Chin, Paul Supawanich, Shirley Johnson (chair)

2017 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)