
AGENDA
Revised 3/6/12
Bend Metropolitan Planning Organization
Citizens Advisory Committee

Date: March 13, 2012
Time: 5:30 to 7:00 pm
Location: Board Room
Bend City Hall
710 NW Wall Street (Bend)
Contact: Tyler Deke, BMPO (541) 693-2113
Jovi Anderson, BMPO (541) 693-2122

1. Call Order/Introductions

2. Review and approve December 2011 (Attachment C) and January 2012 CAC meeting summary (Attachment A)

3. Cascades East Transit - Mt Bachelor Shuttle

Background: The CAC expressed interest in learning more about the recently launched Mt. Bachelor Shuttle service being operated by Cascades East Transit (CET). CET staff will provide an overview of the Mt Bachelor service and other initiatives underway.

Attachments: None

Action Requested: None. Information item

4. CAC Election of Officers

Background: The officers of the CAC shall be elected annually at the last regular meeting held during the calendar year. The term of office shall begin at the first regular meeting following election and extend until the first scheduled meeting of the following year. Officers shall serve no more than two consecutive terms, unless so requested by the Policy Board. Nominations will be taken from the floor. An election shall be held at the last meeting during the year, as provided in Paragraph 6.A above. The election was delayed until the current members were reappointed and new member appointed by the Policy Board [see Policy Board Meeting Minutes 1/19/12].

Attachments: None

Action Requested: Election of CAC officers.

5. Bend Public Transit Plan - Draft Existing Conditions Report

Background: The Bend MPO was awarded a grant to develop a new long-range public transit plan for the Bend area. MPO staff will review the draft Existing Conditions report.

Attachments: None. Printed copies of the documents will be available at the meeting. Copies of the draft Existing Conditions Report documents are also posted on the MPO website:
<http://www.bendoregon.gov/transitplan>

Action Requested: Review and provide input on the draft Existing Conditions Report

6. Bicycle Sharing Programs Overview

Background: A bicycle sharing program is a service in which bicycles are made available for shared use to individuals who do not own them. The central concept of these systems is to provide affordable access to bicycles for short-distance trips in urban areas, thereby reducing traffic congestion, noise, and air pollution. Bicycle sharing systems have also been cited as a way to solve the "last mile" problem and connect users to public transit networks. Staff will provide an overview of bicycle sharing programs.

Attachments: Bicycle Sharing Program Overview (Attachment B)

Action Requested: None. Information item

7. Next CAC meeting

A CAC meeting will not be held in April. CAC members are invited to attend a special meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee tentatively scheduled for April 4 at 10 a.m. The meeting will be focused on the Public Transit Plan.

The next regular meeting of the CAC is tentatively scheduled for May 8th at 5:30 p.m.

8. Adjourn



Accessible Meeting Information

This meeting event/location is accessible. Sign language, interpreter service, assistive listening devices, materials in alternate format, such as Braille, large print, electronic formats, or any other accommodations are available upon advance request. Please contact Jovi Anderson at (541) 693-2122, janderson@ci.bend.or.us and/or (541) 389-2245. Providing at least 3 days advance notice to the event will help ensure availability.

BEND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT Meeting Summary

January 10, 2012

Bend City Hall Boardroom, 710 NW Wall Street, Bend, Oregon

1. CALL TO ORDER – INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Lovely called the BMPO CAC meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. without a quorum of members-in-good-standing as all CAC terms expired on December 31, 2011. Present during the meeting were:

CAC members

Mike Lovely, *Chair*
Bill Wagner
Kyle Kendall
Michel Bayard
Robin Vora
Sheree MacRitchie

Staff

Tyler Deke, *BMPO Manager*
Jovi Anderson, *Program Technician*
Cameron Prow, TYPE-*Write II*

Visitors

David Ditz and Jerry Mitchell, *True Adams Company*

2. ELECT CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2012

Postponed to the next meeting due to lack of a quorum.

3. REVIEW/APPROVE MINUTES

Postponed to the next meeting due to lack of a quorum.

3. CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE BYLAWS

Mr. Deke presented the BMPO CAC Bylaws which were adopted on December 13, 2011, which had been corrected for typographical errors and to include the legally correct language regarding Title VI protected populations. Mr. Bayard, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Lovely, Ms. MacRitchie, Mr. Vora, and Mr. Wagner individually indicated their support for forwarding the CAC Bylaws as presented to the Policy Board.

4. BMPO PUBLIC TRANSIT PLAN

Mr. Deke presented a summary of the Project Charter (January 5, 2012, memo) including participants, goals, and milestones. Bend's fixed-route bus system began in 2007. The BMPO has received a Transportation Growth Management grant to develop a long-range plan as the five-year operations plan expires this year. This plan will facilitate the City's urban growth boundary expansion process, identify opportunities for infill and redevelopment projects, and help prioritize land uses along transit corridors. The project began in October 2011 and is expected to be done by the end of 2012.

Mr. Deke reviewed elements of the draft Public Involvement Strategy (December 27, 2011, memo) including project team and advisory committee roles, focused and ongoing outreach, target community groups, and key issues to address and track. Staff is coordinating with Cascades East Transit (Bend's bus system operator), Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council which is doing a regional transit study, and other agencies. The BMPO Technical Advisory Committee will be expanded for this project and will meet 4-5 times this year. CAC participation would be appreciated; the TAC's next meeting will be on February 15, 2012. Outreach efforts will include an internet survey, bus passenger survey, mobile outreach at community events, project webpage, e-mail updates to neighborhood associations and other interested parties, formal public meeting in fall 2012, and presentations to community groups.

Suggestions for public information outlets covered *Latino community, social media (Facebook), Commute Options, Costco and other large retailers, Bend Winterfest, Juniper Swim & Fitness Center, recreation groups, and high schools*. Ms. MacRitchie said that she was impressed by the breadth of the BMPO outreach efforts.

5. CAC MEMBERSHIP

Action: Consider recommendation of new CAC members to the Policy Board.

Mr. Deke said that the Policy Board must approve renewing and new members. He will present a slate of prospective members to the Policy Board on January 19, 2012.

All six CAC members indicated their willingness to serve another term.

Mr. Mitchell summarized his employment background (real estate development and transportation planning) in support of his application to become a CAC member. His current focus is on corridor plans and associated land use components.

Mr. Vora requested that Mr. Mitchell disclose new employment contracts as they occur to enable the BMPO to address concerns about potential conflicts of interest.

Mr. Bayard, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Lovely, Ms. MacRitchie, Mr. Vora, and Mr. Wagner individually indicated their support for Mr. Mitchell becoming the newest CAC member.

6. OTHER PROJECT UPDATES

Bike Share Program: Mr. Deke presented a draft overview (January 10, 2012) of research into the feasibility of Bend establishing this type of program. The Policy Board will consider this idea at their January 19, 2012, meeting. Mr. Vora expressed concern about the primary users and whether this would be a public or private operation. Mr. Lovely said Bend Community Center is operating a similar program. Ms. MacRitchie suggested targeting tourists, combining this program with "Ride the River" or partnering with tourists of breweries or historic buildings.

Geo-Bond Road Projects: Mr. Deke said that the City will hold "kickoff" public meetings on January 24. Construction will start late summer/early fall 2012 on three roundabouts: SW Simpson Avenue/Mt. Washington Drive, Powers Road/Brookwood Boulevard, and Empire Avenue/NE 18th Street. Construction on the Reed Market Road project is expected to start late in 2013, once the right-of-way and utility issues have been resolved. The 27th Street project is tied to the southeast sewer interceptor project. Information on these projects will be posted on the City website and staff will e-mail updates to the CAC.

TRIP 97: Mr. Deke said that the corridor plan for US Highway 97 will focus on policy issues such as getting the state to modify how it measures mobility. BMPO is now in contract negotiations with the consultant team which will be led by Kittelson & Associates. A detailed project update must be presented to the 2013 Oregon Legislature. Information will be posted on a project website.

Federal Transportation Funding: Mr. Deke said that the latest extension of the 2009 bill will expire on March 31, 2012. This bill will probably be extended to the end of this calendar year or at least through the upcoming election cycle. Extending the bill again would continue the existing programs and funding levels. The Highway Trust Fund and Transit Trust Fund contributions are down to 80% and legislators have been using General Fund dollars for the other 20%, but this situation cannot continue indefinitely.

One of the draft bills proposes eliminating all MPOs under 200,000 population, which would significantly decrease transportation funding to rural counties. The National Association of MPOs and other organizations are lobbying against that proposal.

Mr. Wagner said that the BMPO appears to be doing better under the extensions than it would under new legislation that favors funding larger metro areas.

Oregon Climate Change Legislation: Mr. Deke said that state agencies are about 80% done in developing draft scenario-planning guidelines. The six Oregon MPOs will use these guidelines to determine the impact on greenhouse gas emissions from all transportation modes in various growth scenarios. Policy Board Chair Mark Capell sits on the two policy groups overseeing that work. Mr. Deke, Bend Transportation Engineering Manager Nick Arnis, and Deschutes County Planning Director Nick Lelack sit on the two technical advisory committees. Keeping up with all the information coming out of this process is challenging. Eugene-Springfield, Salem, and Portland Metro MPOs will be test-driving these guidelines first, and the three smaller MPOs (including Bend) are monitoring how those guidelines work.

7. **ROUNDTABLE – MEMBER UPDATES**

Mr. Lovely said that Doug LaPlaca of *Visit Bend* has promised to speak with the resorts about encouraging tourists to use electric vehicles. He has been patrolling his neighborhood due to the presence of an arsonist. The new board of directors for Deschutes River Woods Neighborhood Association is willing to discuss the siting of transit stops and a park-and-ride lot. The store still opposes a transit stop on its property.

Mr. Vora asked about the Future of Public Transit Committee. What work is being done to implement sustainable long-term funding of transit? The Orchard District Neighborhood Association board declined Mr. Deke's offer to make a presentation about BMPO public involvement at the ODNA annual meeting, but will focus instead on water systems.

Ms. MacRitchie requested a status report on installation of charging stations for electrically fueled vehicles in Central Oregon.

8. **NEXT CAC MEETING:** Tuesday, March 13, 2012, 5:30 p.m. Ms. Anderson promised to post upcoming CAC meeting dates for 2012 on the BMPO webpage and to e-mail these to members.

9. **ADJOURN**

With no further business, Mr. Lovely adjourned the meeting at 6:49 p.m.

BEND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT Minutes

December 13, 2011

Bend City Hall Boardroom, 710 NW Wall Street, Bend, Oregon

1. CALL TO ORDER – INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Lovely called the BMPO CAC meeting to order at 5:36 p.m. with a quorum. Present during the meeting were:

CAC members

Mike Lovely, *Chair*

Bill Wagner

Michel Bayard

Robin Vora

Sheree MacRitchie

Staff

Tyler Deke, *BMPO Manager*

Jovi Anderson, *Program Technician*

Cameron Prow, TYPE-*Write II*

Visitors (None)

2. REVIEW/APPROVE MINUTES

Motion 1 (3/0/1): Mr. Wagner moved that the CAC approve the September 13, 2011, minutes as written. Mr. Bayard seconded the motion which passed with Mr. Bayard, Mr. Lovely, and Mr. Wagner voting in favor and Ms. MacRitchie abstaining due to her absence from that meeting.

3. CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE BYLAWS

Action: Discuss process for developing CAC Bylaws.

Mr. Deke said that Policy Board Bylaws require the CAC to develop and adopt formal bylaws. He presented the CAC Operating Guidelines and draft CAC Bylaws, reviewing CAC changes made at the September 2011 meeting.

Mr. Vora arrived at 5:44 p.m.

CAC discussion covered *definition of citizens traditionally underserved, frequency of meetings, historical low attendance of members, quorum, voting, and meeting procedures.*

Motion 2 (5/0/0): Mr. Wagner moved that the CAC revise Section 8 – MEETINGS AND VOTING, Paragraph E, to read: “Official action may be taken by the CAC when a quorum is present. A quorum shall consist of at least four (4) CAC members.” Mr. Vora seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Motion 3 (5/0/0): Mr. Bayard moved that the CAC approve the draft Bylaws, subject to Motion 2 (above) and the following changes:

- * Section 2 – PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS, Paragraph A to read: “The solicitation and consideration of input from all groups and citizens concerned with, interested in, and/or affected by MPO transportation plans or programs. The CAC shall make an effort to seek out and consider the needs of Title VI Protected Populations.”
- * Section 3 – MEMBERSHIP, Paragraph C to read: “The Policy Board shall appoint the members of the CAC, making an effort to include citizens in Title VI Protected Populations.”

- * Section 8 – MEETINGS AND VOTING, Paragraph F to read: “Each member shall be entitled to cast one vote on each issue voted on by the CAC. Voting will be recorded by voice vote. A minimum of four (4) affirmative votes is needed to pass a motion.” Paragraph G to read: “Meetings should be conducted according to *Robert’s Rules of Order* where they don’t conflict with the CAC Bylaws.”

Mr. Wagner seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

CAC members **by consensus** asked staff to verify and add to the Bylaws the legally correct language regarding Title VI protected populations under Sections 2.A and 3.C.

4. **BEND PUBLIC TRANSIT PLAN**

Action: Input on options for public engagement in transit planning process.

Mr. Deke reviewed the Bend MPO Public Transit Plan and Transit Corridor Land Use Assessment and summarized the history, purpose, funding constraints, and project timeline. The \$180,000 grant received for this project will be split between transit planning (2/3) and land use planning (1/3) to assess public facilities along transit corridors. The consultant team of DKS Associates (management), Nelson-Nygaard (transit), and OTAK (land use) started in October 2011 and will provide specific deliverables for each of the five tasks in the Statement of Work. Ridership data by bus stop is needed but is not yet available. Public outreach opportunities will include face-to-face community events (such as Winter Fest) as well as electronic avenues. The goal is to complete this project by December 31, 2012, although the state may be willing to extend that deadline if more time is needed.

CAC concerns included the *public outreach process and venues, infill and redevelopment constraints* (capacity of sewer and water systems), *project scope vs. timeline, survey demographics*, and *future bus stop locations* (senior complex on Century Drive).

Mr. Deke will contact neighborhood associations, Central Oregon Council On Aging, and Latino Community Association to schedule speaking opportunities. He will e-mail to the CAC the consultants’ draft outreach plan and draft transit plan as soon as they become available. He will also e-mail details of the February 15, 2012, meeting at which the consultants will be presenting a status report.

5. **ANNUAL LISTING OF FEDERALLY FUNDED TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS**

Action: Input on options for public engagement in transit planning process.

Mr. Deke reviewed the draft Annual Obligation Report required by federal transportation law [23 USC 134(h)(7)(B); 49 USC 5303(c)(5)(B); Federal Transit Authority/Federal Highway Administration guidance on annual listing obligated projects]. This report includes all projects/programs for which federal transportation funds were obligated in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011 (October 1, 2010 – September 30, 2011) for the Bend urbanized area. The list covers road, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities for the BMPO, Bend Metro Park and Recreation District, Cascades East Transit (CET), City of Bend, Commute Options, and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). He highlighted a few of the 18 projects listed: bus access to the Deschutes National Forest to reduce impact from visitors (traffic congestion, pollution) including shelters along Century Drive (summer 2012), repaving Century Drive from Bend’s urban growth boundary to Mt. Bachelor, sidewalks on 3rd Street between Franklin Avenue and Murphy Road, and pedestrian improvements near Ensworth Elementary and Bear Creek Elementary schools.

CAC concerns included *age and condition of Mt. Bachelor's independent bus fleet and upgrading Mt. Bachelor's park-and-ride lot in Bend.*

6. OTHER PROJECT UPDATES

Membership: Mr. Deke said two people are interested in joining the CAC. What selection process should be used? Following discussion, members suggested inviting them to attend the next CAC meeting.

Project Notification: Following discussion, members requested e-mail notice to the CAC and neighborhood associations about upcoming roundabout and street widening and rebuilding projects. Ms. Anderson reported that the estimated cost of these projects was available online.

TRIP 97: Mr. Deke said that city managers in Deschutes and Jefferson Counties are concerned about how the Oregon Highway Plan and State Transportation Planning Rule are hindering economic development. A corridor study on US Highway 97 between Madras and La Pine will be starting in early 2012. The goal is to identify and prioritize projects for an entire corridor and get consensus of all the cities along that corridor. The Oregon Legislature is viewing this as a pilot project that, if successful, might be duplicated elsewhere in the state.

Ms. MacRitchie left at 7:10 p.m. Mr. Vora left at 7:15 p.m.

Oregon Climate Change Legislation: BMPO Policy Board Chair Mark Capell sits on two policy committees working on greenhouse gas reductions statewide. This process is expected to wrap up in the next 12-18 months. Mr. Deke will provide an update at the next CAC meeting.

7. ROUNDTABLE – MEMBER UPDATES

Chair Lovely said he is planning to write an "In My View" piece for *The Bulletin*.

8. NEXT CAC MEETING: Tuesday, January 10, 2012, 5:30 p.m.

9. ADJOURN

With no further business, Chair Lovely wished everyone a happy holiday season and adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

Contents

What is a Bike Share Program? 1

What are the different types of bike sharing systems? 1

Can bike sharing and transit work together?..... 2

Do successful bike sharing programs share common traits? 2

What problems have bike sharing systems faced?..... 2

How much would it cost? 3

How are cities paying for bike sharing? 3

Starting a Bike Fleet or Community Bike Program..... 6

What is a Bike Share Program?

Bike sharing systems provide short-term bike rental through an automated system in urban cities and college campuses (source: Paul de Maio, MetroBikes LLC). Similar to carsharing, bike sharing systems contain a large bicycle fleet distributed in high and medium density areas. They both also require users to become members. Unlike carsharing, bike sharing systems allow for one-way trips and provide short-term (daily, weekly, etc.) membership options. Users check out a bike by credit card, membership card, and/or by cell phone at a docking station (similar concept to luggage carts at airports).

Bike sharing increases mobility by providing an additional, flexible transportation mode. It can increase the number of bicycling trips, introduce new people to active transportation, reduce peak-hour pressure on transit systems, provide the “last mile” connection between a transit stop and final destination, reduce automobile trips, and improve livability. There over 230 bike sharing programs worldwide.

What are the different types of bike sharing systems?

Bike sharing has evolved over its 40-year history and is often organized into three phases:

- **1st Generation:** No-tech, unstructured approach first implemented in Amsterdam in the late 1960s. Re-conditioned bikes painted common color, placed for free use throughout city with no restrictions. Bikes are often stolen or damaged. Examples include Amsterdam White Bikes (1969), Portland Yellow Bikes (1994-96), and Madison Red Bikes.
- **2nd Generation:** Low-tech, moderate expense. Singular design to deter theft, bikes unlocked through coin deposit lock. No tracking of bicycles; systems never reached critical mass. Examples include Copenhagen (City Bikes) and Helsinki.
- **3rd Generation:** High-tech, expensive (\$1500 - \$5500/bike). Smart Card or cell phone technology allows for quick access and better tracking of fleet. Cell phone activated

systems tend to have much lower capital (\$500-\$1500) costs than Smart Card systems but likely incur higher operating costs. Several highly publicized successful programs include Washington, DC; Montreal; Minneapolis and Paris (all Smart Card technology). Cell phone programs (aka "Call a Bike") are prominent in Germany. All North American bikesharing cities are using the Smart Card technology. Some argue that 3rd generation systems that include solar-powered, modular bike sharing stations should be characterized as "4th Generation." For purposes of this discussion, "3rd Generation" is intended to include bike sharing systems with these additional enhancements.

Can bike sharing and transit work together?

Bike sharing can reduce travel time and increase accessibility to transit, particularly on the first or last leg of a transit trip.

Nearly all bike sharing systems include bikes at transit centers and rail stations. Bike sharing could help alleviate problems associated with the limited storage space for personal bikes on buses and trains. [TriMet's survey of MAX riders](#) who brought their bikes onboard found that 59% reported that their destination was too far reach on foot. If the riders' final destination was within a conceptual bike sharing service area, bike sharing could negate the need for these riders to bring their bikes onboard.

In addition, [TriMet's Bikes-MAX report](#) found bike sharing would be a popular bike-transit alternative to bringing their bikes aboard TriMet (49% of all respondents). Of those who alighted MAX with their bikes downtown, 43% had final destinations within a ½ mile of the station (Bike-MAX Report, p. 11). The short distance could easily be satisfied by bike sharing (or walking).

Do successful bike sharing programs share common traits?

Shared characteristics of successful programs:

- Convenient, self-service model with Smart Card technology
- Progressive rate structure with first half hour free
- Bikes are widely available within usage area at conveniently spaced stations
- Transit network is extensive
- Bikes are placed in high density urban environment near employment centers and colleges/universities.

What problems have bike sharing systems faced?

Theft and vandalism: Parked outside or in use 24 hours a day in urban conditions, theft and vandalism has plagued many 1st, 2nd and 3rd generation bike sharing systems.

The problems that have plagued European systems has not materialized in North American. After several dozen thefts in the first six weeks, Montreal's Bixi operators made some structural

enhancements to its docking station, seemingly solving the problem. Minneapolis had only three thefts in its first season of operation. Denver and DC/Arlington's experience mirrors that of the Twin Cities.

Maintenance of bicycles and docking stations: Heavy use of bicycles and stations invariably leads to wear and tear. Most North American operators are constantly monitoring their fleet and stations for malfunction.

Helmet use: Among the 230-plus bike sharing systems in the world, Melbourne is the only system to require helmets (existing law).

Although bike crashes where cyclists do not wear helmets are more likely to result in traumatic injuries, logistical barriers to providing helmets are numerous:

- Staffing each bike sharing station to provide a helmet and make sure it is properly sized and fitted is cost prohibitive (e.g., Lyon, FR has 24,000 trips/day).
- Hygiene (think of helmets shared by thousands of strangers)
- Structural Integrity of helmets used by hundreds if not thousands of users.

To date, the US systems have had minimal reports of crashes. Surveys from Minneapolis and DC find that over half of users are wearing helmets.

How much would it cost?

Smart Card bike sharing systems range in price from \$4,500 - \$5,500 including the cost of docking stations, computer software, licensing, bikes, and other capital expenditures. Operating costs range from \$1250 - \$2300/bike, although some business plans purport that over 50% of operating costs can be re-captured through subscriptions, rental and user fees. Cell phone activated systems tend to have much lower capital costs (\$1000-\$2500/bike) than Smart Card systems, but require more staffing.

How are cities paying for bike sharing?

The old method for paying for 3rd generation bike sharing systems was to require a bike sharing system in exchange for the exclusive right to advertise on street furniture and transit shelters (e.g. DC's original SmartBike DC system). This method may not work where licensing agreements already exist.

In general, US cities have accessed large grants to cover the capital costs of systems and are using sponsorships, revenues from users and city money to cover operating costs. Minneapolis and Denver have both marshaled large grants that are being used to kick-start their bike sharing systems. Minneapolis budgeted \$1.75 million of federal money as a federal bicycle and pedestrian demonstration city for bike sharing and Denver's mayor is doing the same with a \$1 million gift from the Democratic Party for hosting the 2008 Democratic National Convention.

Private sponsors are attracted to bike sharing. Minneapolis has secured over \$3.5 million in private sponsors.

Costs associated with bike share systems fall into four categories:

- Direct capital costs (e.g., bikes and terminals)
- Direct operating costs (e.g., administration, maintenance, and electricity to power terminals)
- Associated capital costs (e.g., construction of the system for building the necessary infrastructure and streetscape improvements)
- Associated operating costs (e.g., maintenance of docking infrastructure and the existing bikeway network, insurance costs)

It is common for a public agency to undertake operation of a bike share system with an operating partner, as most bike share systems are not financially self-sustaining. Funding for public bicycle systems commonly comes through a combination of advertisements, user fees, and public government funds and operates as a public-private partnership.

BIKE SHARE PROGRAM OVERVIEW

ATTACHMENT B

	Capital Bikeshare CaBi (Washington DC) capitalbikeshare.com	New Balance Hubway (Boston, MA) thehubway.com	Denver B-cycle (Denver, CO) Denver.bicycle.com	B-Cycle (cities include: Chicago, Boulder, Broward, Des Moines, Madison, Omaha, San Antonio, Spartanburg)	Portland Bike Share (http://www.portlandonline.com/transportation/index.cfm?c=50814)
	Membership levels below include rides of 30 minutes or less. Additional fees are charged if you keep a bike longer than 30 minutes.				
Member ship Levels:	24 hours \$5.00 30 Day: \$25.00 Annual: \$75.00	24 hours: \$5.00 3 Day: \$12.00 Annual: \$85.00	24 hours \$6.00 7 Day: \$20.00 30 Day: \$30.00 Annual: \$65.00	Fees similar to others. (varies slightly)	Expected to go to bid 2012
Formed By:	The stations and bicycles are owned by the participating local governments and operated in a public-private partnership with Alta Bicycle Share.	The stations and bicycles are owned by the participating local governments and operated in a public-private partnership with Alta Bicycle Share.	City of Denver owns and operates the bike sharing system. System closed in the winter (12/9/11- 3/1/12)	Individual city or private entity. Chicago Bike Sharing Program will launch next year with TIGER grant III funding.	The stations and bicycles will be owned by the participating local governments such as City of Portland.
System:	110 Stations 1100 Bikes	60 Stations 600 bikes	50 Stations 500 bikes	Chicago (Summer 2012): 300 Stations/3000	TBD
Funding Source:	The \$6M bikeshare program is funded in the District by the CMAQ fund (80% federal, 20% local). The Arlington system includes \$835,000 for capital costs through a combination of funding from a grant through the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, Arlington County transportation funding and sponsorships by the Crystal City BID and the Potomac Yard Transportation Management Association.	Hubway is completely funded by grants totaling \$4.5 million including \$3 million from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), \$450,000 from the Boston Public Health Commission (BPHC) and \$250,000 from the Metropolitan Planning Organization's Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grant program.	Denver Bike Sharing, the operator of Denver B-cycle, is funded by individual foundations and government grants, corporate sponsorships, user memberships and transaction fees. Denver's B-cycle bike-sharing program received \$1 million in city and state funding. Implementation cost was \$2 Million; Yearly operating costs are about \$1.5 Million.	Chicago Bike Sharing Program will launch next year with TIGER grant III funding. Chicago Lakefront receives zero dollars in public funding. It launched July 30 with 100 bikes at six kiosks. The San Antonio bike share program took about 15 months to plan, design, and implement. A local non-profit has been formed to maintain and operate the system daily.	Metro Flexible Funding Allocation from STP and CMAQ. The Metro Council approved Regional Flexible Fund allocations on December 15, 2011. \$2 million in Flex Funds and \$2 million in private investments.

Starting a Bike Fleet or Community Bike Program

No two bike programs are likely to be the same. Don't be concerned if the nature and momentum on your project seems to be creating a new and different organizational structure or emphasis. There are lessons to be learned from the experiences of other. Here are some tips that might help:

What kind of bike is best? Likely, the bikes should be as simple as possible. Consider bikes without derailleurs. Internally-gear hubs or single-speed hubs require much less maintenance. These are commonly found on “comfort” or “cruiser” bikes. For ease of maintenance, some people suggest getting away from caliper brakes (hand brakes), but also consider that these are the brakes system that most adults are the most trained to use. Wide tires are more comfortable for the occasional rider, more durable and more stable. Wide saddles, as well, are comfortable for short rides. Similarly, an upright riding position instead of the bent-over “racing” position is favored. It can be advantageous to make the bikes distinctive. Most organizations that provide bicycles make them easy to identify by painting them a solid bright color. If you are going to purchase a number of bikes at the same time you might be able to negotiate a wholesale price. If the bikes are boxed you will need to arrange for their assembly, and if you need to repaint them, this may be an additional cost.

Who is going to maintain the bicycles? There is going to be wear and tear on the bicycle so an on-going maintenance plan needs to be part of the structure. The optimal strategy may depend upon the size of the programs and economies of scale. If your agency/company isn't interested in maintaining the bikes internally, they should consider partnering with a local bike shop to purchase the bikes and set up maintenance and repair contracts.

Where are the bikes housed? Issuing locks can serve a limited purpose. It is likely that you will need some sheltered storage -- maybe at one location and may multiple locations. Depending upon the local climate, this doesn't necessarily need to be indoors, but at least covered and secure. Bike lockers are an option, a fenced-off section of a parking lot or parking garage, or you can use a deep overhang with a chain-link fence around it. You might want to educate yourself further on [bicycle parking](#) issues to develop this aspect of your program.

What is it going to cost? Most of the elements of this kind of program are pretty scaleable: Bicycles, maintenance, storage and infrastructure, and insurance all increase with volume, but the start-up cost range can be quite wide: In 2008 US dollars; \$150 to \$500 per bike every couple years, maintenance and parts \$40 to \$120 per bicycle per year, storage and infrastructure might have an initial investment of hundreds to thousands of dollars per bike, and there is limited information on insurance costs. The larger the program, the more economies of scale you are likely to be able to capture, but these can be offset by administration costs and losses.

Why would corporate or government management be interested? To provide affordable access to bicycles for short-distance trips in an urban area as an alternative to public transportation or private vehicles, thereby reducing traffic congestion, noise, and air

pollution. Bicycle sharing systems have also been cited as a way to solve the "last mile" problem and connect users to public transit networks.

Organizational Tips and Strategies

Don't try to do too much. Think about sustainability from the beginning. Get a clear mission, define your niche -- initially the narrower the better -- and stick with it. It will be more sustainable, and you will be more productive if you do one thing well, rather than get overwhelmed and bogged down trying to organize something for everybody. Focus on making sure you gather the core space, people, and equipment to get your focused project happening and thriving.

As you perfect your core project you can always add other elements later. With the experience that you will have gained, you will have a better idea of what kinds of programs would most benefit your community.

Start your project with a small organizing or oversight group of committed like-minded people.

If you create a partnership with another organization, create a structure / relationship where the benefits to your mission at least equal the time and effort the collaboration is going to demand.

Address [liability / insurance issues](#) and protect the organizers/board.

Tap into the experience and knowledge of existing programs/projects.