

TO: CHAIR AND MEMBERS
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DATE: 2019 February 20

FROM: DIRECTOR PLANNING AND BUILDING

FILE: 90400 02
Reference: Bike-Share

SUBJECT: BIKE-SHARING IN BURNABY

PURPOSE: To advise Council on developments and emerging opportunities for bike-sharing in Burnaby, and to initiate a pilot program.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. **THAT** Council direct staff to advance a Request for Qualification and, if applicable, a Request for Proposals to pilot a bike-sharing program, and the use the findings from that process to develop a policy framework for managing the use of the public realm by the private sector.

REPORT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City's three Sustainability Strategies all identify the provision of transportation choices and promotion of alternative modes as key strategic transportation goals for Burnaby. The Council adopted Vision, Themes and Goals guiding the update of Burnaby's Transportation Plan place continued emphasis on supporting travel choices that are enjoyable and supportive of our quality of life, and offer "*accessible and safe mobility in support of a healthy, green, prosperous and connected community.*"

The City of Burnaby has been approached by representatives of several operators of bike-sharing systems expressing an interest in launching operations in the City, including applications for business licenses. These bike-share program proposals provide the City with an opportunity to examine the potential for an operational model in support of strategic transportation objectives.

This report presents an overview of developments and emerging opportunities with bike-sharing in Burnaby, its potential impacts, regulation, and local context, as well as considerations to advance city policy to promote alternative modes and modal choice through a pilot project.

2.0 POLICY SECTION

Bike sharing is aligned with several of the City's Strategic Plans and Policies including:

- *Official Community Plan*'s transportation sub-goal of Promoting Alternative Modes, with the underlying direction of providing safe and convenient cycling facilities;
- *Burnaby Transportation Plan*'s recently-adopted goals and themes of a transportation system that is accessible, healthy, prosperous, safe, green and connected;
- *Environmental Sustainability Strategy*'s 'Move' Goal of a walkable, bikeable and transit-supported city that supports a healthy community and environment;
- *Social Sustainability Strategy*'s 'Getting Around' Strategic Priority that promotes mobility for all people moving around Burnaby in ways that are accessible, affordable, healthy, safe, and reliable, which help Burnaby to be more inclusive, liveable and resilient, by encouraging and promoting cycling; and
- *Corporate Strategic Plan*'s 'A Connected Community' and 'A Healthy Community' goals, and sub-goals of:
 - o 'A Connected Community'
 - 'Ensure that people can move easily through all areas of Burnaby, using any form of transportation'.
 - o A Healthy Community'
 - 'Encourage opportunities for healthy living and well-being.'

3.0 BIKE-SHARING

Bike-sharing is a service where bicycles are made available for individuals to use on a short-term basis, like a short-term rental. The bike-share system consists of a fleet of bicycles placed at various locations across a geographic operating area. Users are able to pick up a bicycle at one location and drop it off at any another designated location within the service area. Modern bike-shares are enabled by smart technology either available through the docking station (a high-tech bike rack) or the bicycle itself to provide rental access, payment and locking capacity via smart phone or other technology.

The underlying principle of bike-sharing is enabling individuals' use of bicycles on an "as-needed" basis without the costs and storage requirements of ownership. Bike-sharing can increase mobility choice and flexibility, reduce congestion and fuel use, provide for multimodal transport connections (e.g.. use of transit and cycling to make one trip), and even replace or supplement trips that may be circuitous or inconvenient by another mode.

Bike-sharing as a concept has been around for more than 40 years, with systems now operating in many cities around the world. The first modern municipal bike-share was launched in Paris (2007), with the first North American programs launching in the USA in Washington DC (2008), and in Canada in Montréal (2009). Major bike-sharing systems are now present in London, Paris, New York, Washington DC and several cities in China. Bike-share systems are operating at a significant scale in several Canadian cities including Ottawa, Hamilton, Toronto, Montréal, and Vancouver.

In 2017, the bike-sharing arena in North America underwent a dramatic shift with the introduction of dock-less technology (discussed below), and the proliferation of private, for-profit bike-share operators funded by venture capital. In contrast, earlier systems were often joint

ventures with government. The rapid increase of bike sharing companies and systems in North America provides opportunities and challenges for local governments wishing to advance mobility options whilst providing support for larger community goals such as affordable and sustainable transportation options and reduced carbon emissions. The pace and scale of change, as well as the introduction of new technologies and operating models, are placing a resource strain on cities as they work to keep pace.

3.1 Operating Models

There are two basic models of major bike-share systems (“docked” and “dockless”) with several governance and operating structures, each with a different approach to the common goal of providing access to bicycles. Common components of bike-share systems are bicycles, parking locations, software and technology.

3.1.1 Docked Systems

The most prevalent form of bike-sharing systems globally is kiosk-based docking systems, where bicycles are secured to and rented from technologically-enabled docking stations as illustrated in **Figure 1**. The introduction of smart technology to lock and unlock bicycles, where the docks themselves are the “smart” equipment, allows users to locate and pay for bicycle rentals using credit cards, digital membership keys or smart phones. In this system, each bicycle must be returned to a docking station at the end of its use, or be subject to higher fees.

These systems require space for the docking stations (typically on the boulevard or parking areas of the street). They are typically licensed operations with most cities requiring operating permits and business licenses, and are the most capital-intensive models. Examples of docked systems include bike-shares in Vancouver, Toronto, New York, and Washington DC.

The advantages of a docked system include its ability to control access (based on station locations and technology), streamlined maintenance (as all bicycles are parked at a limited number of locations) and reduced theft.

The disadvantages of a docked system include the high capital cost of implementation (due to the cost of the docking stations) and operating costs related to the need for rebalancing. The latter refers to the requirement for the operator to constantly shift bikes from stations that are full (and therefore cannot accept the return of additional bikes) to those that are empty (and thus have no bikes available to meet demand). For these reasons, a docked system is the most expensive form of bike-share systems in use. Typically docked systems have been publicly owned, with operation being either public or private. A viable system typically requires a public subsidy.

FIGURE 1: Docked Bike-Share Service in New York (NY)



3.1.2 Dockless Systems

The most recent innovation in the bike-sharing industry, dockless systems, came as a response to some of the challenges of traditional docked systems. The fastest growing form of bike-share, dockless systems rely on the bicycle as the “smart equipment”, where the necessary electronic components (location via GPS, locking and rental technology) are located on the bicycle itself. In this scheme, a user accesses a bicycle through an app on their smart phone which is linked to the internet and a credit card. The app directs the user to the nearest available bicycle and unlocks the bicycle. When the user ends the trip, the app locks the bicycle and charges the user.

These systems do not rely on established docks or kiosks. Some allow bikes to be parked anywhere within the service area, while others have demarcated locations as illustrated in **Figure 2**.

The smart bicycles are often equipped with a mechanism that locks the rear wheel, meaning that attachment to a rack or other structure is not required for security. GPS devices located within the bikes also help to prevent theft (in addition to helping users locate the nearest available bike). Examples of dockless systems include bike-shares in Victoria (BC), Westmount (PQ), Seattle, and numerous cities in China.

These schemes provide greater flexibility by eliminating the need for permanent docking stations, and provide more convenience for users in locating and dropping off bicycles. Because of the lack of docking infrastructure required, these schemes have the advantage of reduced capital costs, and thus tend to be inexpensive to implement and operate. As such, government subsidies have not been required, and these schemes are typically owned and operated privately.

The disadvantages of dockless systems include operation and maintenance, both for system operators who must locate and rebalance bicycles to meet demand, and cities who may have to manage the clutter of the public realm with abandoned bicycles. The latter has occurred where unregulated competition for market share has resulted in the flooding of the public realm with

more bicycles than demand. Further, vandalized bicycles, often stripped of their GPS capacity, are difficult for operators to track down. The potential lack of visibility that established stations provide is also a major disadvantage of docked systems.

FIGURE 2: Dockless Bike-Share with Marked Stations in Westmount, Quebec



3.1.3 Operating Structures and Business Models

There are three general operating structures typically found with bike-sharing systems:

- **Publicly Owned and Operated:** In this model, a public entity owns and operates the bike-share system. The procurement of the system is typically through capital budgets, and operating budgets primarily rely on revenues from user memberships and rental fees, but may be supplemented by subsidies or grants from the public owner. Examples of this model include Montréal (PQ), and London (UK).
- **Publicly Owned and Privately Operated:** This is the most prevalent operating model, in which a public entity provides support for a bike-share system that can be owned (fully or partially) by a public agency, and operated by a business or not-for-profit organization. The details of this model are diverse with many variations in how the system is implemented, operated, funded or sponsored in any given city. Funding examples include:
 - o Publically funded, such as in Washington (DC);
 - o Privately funded through corporate sponsorship or concession, as in New York (NY); or
 - o Combination where funding is from both public and private sources, as in Cleveland (OH).

A common model entails the public agency providing the initial capital costs for the system, with a private operator relying on revenues from user fees to fund day-to-day operations.

- **Privately Owned and Operated:** In this model, the bike-share system is owned and operated by a third-party organization with no financial support from government. Programs under this model can be operated by not-for-profit entities or private enterprise, the latter of which is the fastest-growing segment¹ of the bike-sharing industry. Examples of this model include Victoria (BC), Hamilton (ON), and two companies operating in Seattle (WA). Globally, this model of bike-share is supported by private venture capital funding.

3.2 Bike-Sharing in Metro Vancouver

The desire for a regional bike-sharing system was identified in TransLink’s Regional Cycling Strategy for Metro Vancouver (2011). The establishment of a regional system would “offer ‘first and last mile’ connections to transit, solve the issue of peak hour bicycle restrictions on SkyTrain, and provide opportunities to make short trips by bicycle as an alternative to taking transit.”²

The City of Vancouver, in support of its objectives of making cycling a viable sustainable transportation option, launched its public bike share system, “Mobi by Shaw Go”, in 2016. A docked system, Mobi operates 175 stations focused on a catchment area between Arbutus Street and Victoria Drive, from 16th Avenue to the False Creek shoreline including the Downtown peninsula. The system operates with over 1,500 bicycles, and is working to expand across Vancouver and other parts of Metro Vancouver.

Within the last year, several jurisdictions in the province have either piloted or are about to embark on processes to implement bike-sharing systems. In Metro Vancouver, the University of British Columbia and the Cities of Richmond and Port Coquitlam are undertaking 12- to 18-month pilots of bike-share systems beginning in 2018. Each is aimed at securing one or more providers to operate a public bike-share system at no cost to the city or university.

4.0 BIKE-SHARING IN BURNABY

Metro Vancouver municipalities, including Burnaby, have been approached by representatives of several operators of dockless and docked bike-sharing systems, expressing an interest in launching operations here. Bike-sharing offers numerous benefits and challenges to local governments. In Burnaby they include the following:

¹ In 2017, in the USA, the number of bike-share bicycles more than doubled to approx. 100,000. The majority of this increase (77%) came from private dockless companies. (NACTO Bikeshare Statistics, 2017)

² TransLink. *Regional Cycling Strategy Implementation Plan* (June 2013)

- **Advancing strategic and policy objectives:** Bike-sharing as a concept provides an opportunity for the City to advance policy objectives including the adopted Vision, Themes and Goals of the *Burnaby Transportation Plan*. Indeed, bike-share systems work best when they are part of a city’s overall transportation vision and network.
- **Supporting economic, social and environmental sustainability goals:** Access (whether physical, digital or financial) to shared mobility services such as bike-share, is an important public service that supports local economic development, access and affordability for peoples of all ages, incomes and abilities, and options for zero-emission mobility.
- **Supporting healthy transportation and modal choice:** Within the overall spectrum of urban mobility, bike-share has a role to play by providing cycling options that support active transportation and offer a convenient, comfortable, flexible, and affordable alternative way to get around within the City.
- **Supporting transportation affordability:** Bike-sharing is one element in addressing the affordability question by providing a convenient, cost effective, environmentally friendly mobility option, which fills the gap in short-distance mobility.
- **Solving public transit’s ‘Last Mile’ problem:** The attractiveness of transit is sometimes dampened by the problem of its inability to deliver travelers all the way from their point of origin to their destination. This “last-mile” problem is thought to deter transit use among riders with auto access, even when high-quality transit service is provided for the majority of the trip distance. While this problem can also be addressed by walking, taxi, or ride-hailing, cycling can help connect users to high-quality transit such as SkyTrain. Bike-sharing can facilitate this connection by making it easier to make one-way, shorter-duration trips such as between home and a SkyTrain station.
- **Provides data on travel patterns to facilitate transportation planning and decision making:** As a technology-driven solution, bike-sharing can provide data (via GPS trackers installed on the bicycles) to inform transportation planning priorities based on usage patterns.

4.1 Considerations for Implementing a Bike-share System

The rapid deployment and expansion of bike-sharing systems globally points to the attractiveness and adaptability of such systems to different situations within the urban mobility spectrum. However, challenges have also arisen. It is therefore important to approach any such implementation thoughtfully, with an eye to lessons learned in other jurisdictions. Considerations for implementing a system include:

- **Competing demands for use of public space:** Bike-sharing is one of numerous commercial enterprises seeking to operate on the City’s streets and sidewalks within the road allowance. As a finite and scarce resource, road allowances need to be managed to

maximize the efficient use of space and mobility both on and off-street including for public uses. Existing operators (i.e., transit, taxis and car-share operators) and potential future operators (such as ride-hailing enterprises, curbside electric vehicle charging stations, advertising kiosks etc.) are all competing for space within the same road allowance. This is further exacerbated in commercial areas, where these demands may be at the expense of high-demand public parking spaces. Off-street boulevard and sidewalk space is also in high demand with space for walking in competition with numerous existing uses such as garbage bins, bus shelters and benches, bike racks, newspaper boxes, sandwich board signs, etc. This points to the need for broader policy direction on how the City wishes to manage access to public space for commercial use.

- **Orderly operations:** For bike-share to be seen as an important public benefit, it has to be provided in an orderly, regulated and attractive manner, with appropriate licensing, operational and performance requirements, and active management and enforcement.
- **Over-supply:** One of the significant problems that has emerged in some cities, with the proliferation of dockless bike-sharing, is the over-supply of bicycles in an unregulated manner in a drive to achieve operating scale and market share. Operators have flooded the public space, resulting in supply far exceeding demand; the result has sometimes been chaos in the public realm, in part due to the random and haphazard way in which bicycles can be left in dockless systems.
- **Street clutter and sidewalk obstruction:** Other operational concerns noted for some dockless systems include problems arising from bicycles left by users in an unregulated manner such as obstructing access to sidewalks, damaging landscaping etc. and a proliferation of abandoned and damaged bikes in public spaces, illustrated in *Figure 3*.

FIGURE 3: Bike-Share Clutter (Seattle, WA and Beijing, China)



- **Safety and Helmet Law:** The provision of helmets and compliance with the *BC Motor Vehicle Act* (mandatory helmet usage) require mitigation to reduce risk and liability. Additionally, questions of helmet hygiene, fit, and safety need to be addressed if helmets are shared. For example, if a rider was injured while wearing a helmet supplied by the bike-share, but the helmet had been previously damaged (whereby the damage was not evident except by testing), there is a potential liability to be borne by the bike-share owner and/or operator, whether a private provider or the City.
- **Rapid change in the industry:** Innovation is accelerating the pace of change within the bike-sharing industry. The pace of emerging trends (including dockless bikes, electric bikes, electric scooters, etc.) and the accommodation of these technologies poses a challenge for cities. This has led to a variety of responses ranging from outright bans of dockless systems (Amsterdam, Netherlands) to permitting enterprises to operate without regulation (Beijing, China). This is partly due to the pace of change, but also to the requirement for the development of regulations to facilitate or manage some of these trends. For example, the City of Seattle notes that a key success factor to its roll-out of its latest bike-share program was the development of regulations prior to implementation of the bike-share, mitigating against many of the issues seen globally. Seattle developed a permitting process that included existing and new regulations, and operational requirements with appropriate oversight. However, this requires time and resources for local governments to advance strategic policy development, to facilitate the successful launching and operation of bike-sharing systems in their communities.
- **Interoperability across municipal boundaries:** In a region with multiple jurisdictions, one challenge is the need for a bike-share system to be able to operate across municipal boundaries, for several reasons: as a critical facilitator of the “last mile” connection to high-quality transit service; to enable longer trips to destinations of interest in other jurisdictions; and to provide residents the same mobility irrespective of residential location (whether near a municipal boundary or in the centre of the city). A single regional operator could facilitate these trips, however a scenario with multiple operators may result in discarded bicycles in jurisdictions where an operator has no operating license. This could place the burden for removal of “abandoned bicycles” on local jurisdictions.
- **Lack of access:** While bike-sharing has been touted as one element in addressing the affordability of transportation, the issue of social equity has been raised in communities where bike-sharing currently operates. Cost, lack of payment options, lack of access to smart phones, bank and credit card accounts are all potential barriers, that disproportionately affect those who are already disenfranchised and part of under-served communities.
- **Long-term financial sustainability:** Long-term financial, scalability and viability considerations are different for the docked vs dockless systems. Docked systems were primarily publically funded, and their business models were thus typically subject to public review. The financial viability of private dockless systems, which are primarily

venture capital funded, is less certain. First, as this segment of the bike-sharing industry is relatively new, there are no long-standing examples of financial viability³. Second, it's unclear how stable or sustainable the model for revenue generation (primarily from a combination of user deposits, usage fees, in-app advertising, and possibly from the sale of user data) is without continued venture capital investment. Some reports indicate that, after more than two years in operation, the top two dockless systems in the world, China's Ofo and Mobike, remain unprofitable and are scaling back operations. The third-largest bike-sharing company, Bluegogo, went bankrupt in late 2017 resulting in thousands of discarded bicycles.

- **Impact to City operations:** Globally, the impact of “rogue bike-shares” on city resources has been significant as city staff work to deal with abandoned bicycles in the public realm, clear sidewalks of clutter and undertake enforcement action. This has led some to argue that “ *a sustainable, equitable use of public resources, be those direct, or indirect should be applied, taking into consideration all costs of any bike sharing system, and not socialising private costs while maximising private profits.*”⁴ The cost of private bike-share operations should not be borne in any part by the City, but paid entirely by operators.
- **Regulatory consideration:** The City's current business licensing program requires compliance with applicable city bylaws. Current provisions within the City's *Street and Traffic Bylaw* prohibit the obstruction or encumbrance of public spaces, such as streets and sidewalks, without Council approval. Updating of the regulatory framework would be required to permit the operation of bike-sharing within the road allowance.
- **Data and Privacy:** The security and privacy of users' data is a major concern, given the value of the data, especially when linked to other consumer information such as credit card data, rider habits, addresses etc. The business model of bike-sharing is built on data-sharing platforms which operate by collecting data via apps, which can be a valuable commodity for private companies either for their own purposes, or to sell to third parties. Finding the balance between privacy, security and utility is a difficult proposition, especially for those service providers that are (or are subsidiaries of) off-shore enterprises.
- **Integration with other mobility services and payment systems:** New technologies and service innovations are providing more convenience and transportation options for users. However, with each new option, the opportunity arises for the integration into a common platform to enable users to plan and make the most convenient and financially transparent journey possible, without the need for multiple accounts for each service provider.

³ The first dockless platform was founded in 2014, as a voluntary bike share scheme on the campus of Peking University (Beijing, China). Ofo, as it came to be known, has now evolved into a private for-profit entity.

⁴ Platform for European Bicycle Sharing & Systems. *Unlicensed Dockless Bike Sharing – Common Position Paper*, 2017, pp.3.

Compatibility with integrated / cross-platform payment systems such as TransLink's Compass Card is an important consideration.

5.0 NEXT STEPS

The demand for access to the public realm for private use is a growing issue for the City. As such, staff propose the following approach with considerations to advance city policy to promote alternative modes and modal choice through a bike-share pilot project.

5.1 Proposed Approach

While bike-sharing shows promise in realizing benefits to residents and visitors of the City, there is currently no policy framework in place to enable and facilitate the operations of a publicly- or privately-financed bike-share system. A new policy framework for bike share should be considered within the context of a larger public realm approach to enable the operation of one or more provider(s) through Operating Agreements. These agreements would be structured to include requirements that respond to the full range of risks and considerations identified previously in this report, and would be supported by a fee structure to recover associated administrative and operational costs.

It is proposed that this approach be advanced in two steps: a) Request for Qualification (RFQ) from bike-sharing proponents; and b) a Request for Proposals (RFP) to pilot a bike-sharing program.

The RFQ is intended to identify industry interest from qualified proponents in a competitive bid process for a pilot bike-share. As numerous operators have expressed an interest in operating a bike-share system in Burnaby, an RFQ process would provide the fairest and most transparent approach in identifying potential qualified operators. Further, given the infancy of the industry within the Lower Mainland, and the concerns and issues raised in earlier sections of this report, an RFQ process would facilitate the screening of qualified and eligible proponents capable of delivering a pilot. Ascertaining qualifications through this initial process would streamline the delivery of a bike-share pilot by providing input towards the design of the RFP focusing on issues of highest concern to the City. The RFQ process would also provide the City with the option to delay or suspend the pilot if it was found that there are insufficient proponents with the capacity, ability or skill to satisfactorily implement the pilot.

Qualified proponents identified through the RFQ process would then be invited to respond to a RFP for a privately financed bike-share system. As the industry has matured over time globally, the need for local governments to provide financial support and incentives to facilitate the service has shifted towards a focus on regulation. The invited proponents would provide detailed proposals for the pilot based on the terms outlined in this report. Staff would recommend the issuance of a single permit for the pilot to enhance the potential for a successful bike-share by minimizing the dilution of potential market uptake across multiple providers, and to minimize the potential impact on staff and resources. The pilot would be limited to the operation of

bicycles, as provincial legislation related to the lawful operation of electric bikes, skateboards, scooters and other motorized personal devices has not been introduced.

At the conclusion of the RFP process, the selection of a proponent would be advanced through a report to the Planning and Development Committee with a recommendation to Council.

Experience in other jurisdictions indicates that dedicated staffing resources are a necessary consideration for the success of bike-sharing. Accommodation of a pilot program at no cost to the City is recommended. Any additional temporary resources that may be required to manage the program would be funded by the proponent. The outcome of the pilot will inform the development of a new policy framework to comprehensively manage and protect the public realm within the public right of way.

5.2 Why a Pilot?

The opportunity to assess a bike-share system through a pilot test is attractive as it:

- Provides the city with an **opportunity to assess** a bike share system and learn more without significant risks;
- Provides information and **data to inform** the development of a public realm management policy framework; and
- Offers an **advantageous testing ground** for current or new shared active transportation modes and technologies, by providing a more definite demonstration of the types of system and operational performances that can be obtained through these arrangements, and by providing useful information on how these can best serve in achieving city goals and objectives.

At the end of the pilot period, if the City determines that bike-sharing does not deliver value to its citizens and its transportation network, it can opt to discontinue public bike-sharing services in Burnaby. Alternatively, the City may opt to continue the pilot, open up permitting to multiple operators or issue a second RFP for a single vendor to provide bike-sharing services on an on-going basis.

5.3 Bike Share Pilot Framework

The pilot program would be designed to assist the city in determining the most effective approach for introducing bike-sharing and other shared active transportation to Burnaby while ensuring public safety. Staff recommend the initiation of a 18-month pilot that conforms with industry guidelines⁵ for the regulation and management of shared active transportation including bike-shares. The piloting would include:

⁵ NACTO Policy 2018: *Guidelines for the Regulation and Management of Shared Active Transportation, Version 1: July 2018* and NABSA *Dockless Bikeshare Regulation Preliminary Guidance, Version 1, January 2018*.

- An open procurement process for interested bike-share providers of docked or dockless technology, with a single operating license awarded;
- Preference may be given to industry-accredited operators and those with a regional presence in Metro Vancouver in consideration of regional connectivity;
- Data sharing requirements for the provision of accurate, complete and timely data about how services are used and, in an anonymized manner, who is riding;
- Provision of bicycles and equipment that is safe for public use and developed for the shared-use context;
- A permit and fee structure that covers all the City's administrative costs to regulate and manage the pilot program; and
- Any other permit conditions to be imposed on bike-share operators to ensure that the safety and convenience of roadway and sidewalk users is not unduly impacted.

The approach proposes a 12 month license agreement, with a month to month extension for the remainder of the pilot, rather than formal regulation to facilitate the operation of the approved bike-share. The City would work with the successful proponent to establish:

- service area coverage focusing on areas of highest bike-share potential;
- fleet size minimums and maximums;
- operational requirements and performance expectations for managing the service;
- parking requirements including placement and locking options; and
- community engagement requirements.

At the end of the 12 month license agreement, staff would review the data and outcomes of the program, consider feed-back received, and use the experience to inform bylaw and policy updates including the development of a public realm policy framework for access to the public right of way for commercial use. Concurrently, staff would report back to Committee and Council with a recommendation on whether to continue the program, thus providing a six-month transition period to any finalized service model.

6.0 CONCLUSION

Bike-sharing is well aligned with many of the City's strategic plans and policy directions. It supports the goals of a transportation system for Burnaby citizens that is accessible, healthy, prosperous, safe, green, and connected, and contributes to a viable transportation alternative that is affordable. However, it must be approached thoughtfully so as to mitigate the challenges that have been experienced in other jurisdictions and maximize the public utility of having such a

To: Planning and Development Committee
From: Director Planning and Building
Re: Bike-Sharing in Burnaby
2019 February 20.....Page 14

system. A pilot program provides a flexible, exploratory approach that reduces risk and informs the development of policy.

It is recommended that Council direct staff to advance a Request for Qualification and, if applicable, a Request for Proposal to pilot a bike-sharing program, and use the findings from that process to develop a policy framework for managing the use of the public realm by the private sector.


Lou Pelletier, Director
PLANNING AND BUILDING

LL/DL:sa/sla

cc: City Manager
Director Corporate Services
Director Public Safety and Community Services
Director Engineering
Director Finance
Director Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services
City Clerk