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Today’s Briefing Purpose

• Update on King County Bike Share Partnership
• Overview of bike sharing
• Status of business plan development:
  – Program goal and objectives defined
  – Preliminary system sizing and phasing
  – Business model evaluation & recommendation
King County Bike Share Partnership

• King County Metro
• Sound Transit
• City of Seattle
• PSRC
• Seattle Children’s
• University of Washington
• Cascade Bicycle Club
• City of Kirkland
• City of Redmond
• Microsoft
King County Bike Share Partnership

• County-wide effort facilitated by King County
• Steering committee – Bike Share Partnership
• SDOT is a partner
• Consultant Team:
  – Alta Planning + Design
  – Alta Bicycle Share
  – Nelson /Nygaard
  – Nice Ride Minnesota
What is bike sharing?

- Extension of public transportation
- Dense network of bikes
- Short, urban trips, point A→B
Bicycle Sharing Around the Globe

~240 Worldwide

*Source: Bike Sharing Blog, December 2010
Bike Sharing Systems in North America

*Based on current publicly available information
Why Bike Sharing?

- Commitment to vibrant and healthy communities
  - Environmentally friendly
  - Travel option: 5-40% bike share trips are instead of car trips
  - Quieter
  - Better air quality
  - Healthy residents

- Extends reach of public transportation
- Reduces pressure on downtown parking
The Bicycle

- Designed specifically for bike sharing
- Sturdy design for a utilitarian life outdoors
- Simple, safe, easy to ride, and comfortable for a wide range of users
The Station

- Modular, easily moved to a new location.
- Bikes can be accessed at a station by a member key or credit card.
Station Placements

- Can be locally sensitive
- Permitting can be expedited by City
- Installation in less than 90 minutes
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Operations

• Bike Checking
  – Preventative cleaning

• Bike Maintenance
  – Proprietary tools and parts
  – Space needed for bike storage

• Rebalancing
  – Moving bikes from full stations to empty stations
  – Most challenging part of operations
Business Plan Purposes

• Define program elements appropriate for King County
  – System size, geography, and phasing
  – Governance and funding (business model evaluation and recommendation)

• Position program to pursue funding
Program Goal and Key Objectives

• Goal: Operate a countywide bike share system that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable.

  – More detailed set of objectives further articulate this goal
Challenges and opportunities identified by SDOT staff

- Helmet law
- Topography
- Sign code/advertising
- ROW permitting
- Start-up funds
- Multi-jurisdictional coordination
- Bike infrastructure
- Bike Master Plan update

“Not without inventing a helmet, you don’t!”

THE NEW YORKER, DECEMBER 21 & 28, 2009
Bike Share Suitability
Preliminary System Areas & Phasing

- **Initial Deployment**
- **Expansion**
- **Future**
### Preliminary System Size, Phasing and Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Bikes</th>
<th>Capital cost ($ million)</th>
<th>Launch cost ($ million)</th>
<th>Annual O&amp;M cost ($ million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>$3.60 – $4.05</td>
<td>$0.90 – $1.35</td>
<td>$1.80 – $2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$2.40 – $2.70</td>
<td>$0.60 – $0.90</td>
<td>$1.20 – $1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>$2.60 – $2.90</td>
<td>$0.65 – $1.00</td>
<td>$1.30 – $1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>$8.60 – $9.65</td>
<td>$2.15 – $3.25</td>
<td>$4.30 – $5.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluated Business Models

- **Privately Owned and Operated**
  - Miami, Chicago
  - City contracts with operator for street space only
  - Operator provides all funding for capital and operations

- **Direct Contract with Operator**
  - DC, Boston
  - Cities contract directly with operator
  - Mix of private and public funds committed by cities

- **Operating Non-Profit**
  - Minneapolis, Denver
  - Pre-existing or new non-profit
  - Directly manages and operates system
  - Funding via public, private, grants

- **Administrative Non-Profit (contract w/operator)**
  - Similar to Portland Streetcar
  - Non-profit exists to fund and guide program, but contracts to private operator
  - Funding via public, private, grants

Consultant recommendation
Next Steps

• Finalize business plan in late summer/early fall

• Pursue funding and implementation strategy

Desired outcome for county-wide approach: integrates transit, land use and employer-based strategies to lead to successful program