

Cleveland Bike Share

The Potential and Possibility

Spring 2012

Weatherhead School of Management - MBA Practicum in Sustainable Value and Social Entrepreneurship (ORBH 430B)

Gabriel Forte, Amogh Garg, Indrajeet Ghatge, David Hanna, Kandy Hricik, MBA Candidates May 2012



Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to gather and summarize information on current United States bike sharing programs including initiation, funding, initial steps, sustainability, long term revenue sources, cost and demand factors, user demographics and the critical success factors. In addition, interviews were conducted with local stakeholders regarding potential work on bike sharing and to gain insight into the general climate regarding the potential for bike sharing programs. A small group meeting was also conducted with local biking advocates to identify potential barriers to success and assist in developing next steps. Summaries of the research, interviews and potential barriers are included within the report.

Next Steps

1. Establish position and governance structure to oversee research, planning and align partnerships for Cleveland bike-sharing program

While there is considerable interest among local stakeholders and potential grant and sponsorship funding sources, the project requires a formal leader with an appropriately connected governing body such as a recognized agency, existing committee or carefully selected board of directors to provide structure and accountability for moving the project forward. After discussion with the project sponsors, Chris Bongorno of University Circle Inc. and Brad Chase of GreenCityBlueLake (GCBL), and other local stakeholders such as Chris Alvarado, President of Bike Cleveland, and John Mitterholzer of the Gund Foundation, and a review of the evolution of other bike sharing programs, it is our recommendation that ownership of the research and planning should be conducted under the direction of Bike Cleveland, an advocacy organization for the biking community in Cleveland. While Bike Cleveland may or may not be a part of the ongoing governance structure should bike-sharing be implemented, it has an established governance structure and the regional connections to house the exploration of Cleveland bike-sharing. Coordination with Bike Cleveland may remove redundancies or inconsistencies with stakeholder messages regarding biking in Cleveland.

2. Obtain funding and dedicate appropriate resources for the project

Given the breadth of the project and to allow for appropriate research, community engagement, and follow-up, a dedicated resource should be allocated for exploring bike sharing in Cleveland. Subject to approval by the Board of Directors for Bike Cleveland,

we recommend that funding be requested for a fulltime bike share project manager. Upon further definition of the scope and timeline of this position, philanthropic funding should be solicited. Potential funding partners include local philanthropic organizations with a focus on health and wellness, economic development and sustainability including, among others, the Cleveland Foundation, Saint Luke's Foundation and the Sears-Swetland Family Foundation. Immediate responsibilities would include:

Engagement in national bike sharing community – Because of the emerging nature of bike share, the number of “information-seekers” exceeds the pool of experienced bike share cities. Of the ten existing bike share programs contacted multiple times and through multiple channels for the purpose of this research, only two responded with one agreeing to a ten-minute voice call and the other providing an annual report. They both referred to the multitude of requests for information received on a weekly basis as being impossible to manage. Bike sharing operators, consultants and advocates are currently offering regular conferences and webinars to release the latest information. Leveraging that type of opportunity for further engagement would permit learning from experienced bike-share programs. Outreach to bike share consultants and service providers would also provide significant and necessary information.

Engagement with local jurisdiction; transportation networks and leadership; advocates; and the public – The city will need to be engaged and supportive of the bike sharing program whatever business model is utilized. Programs run by non-profits, such as Denver Bike Share, include a city appointee on their board of directors. This enables them to more easily coordinate with the local jurisdiction on matters such as planning, obtaining permits, and co-coordinating with law enforcement. Since bike sharing works best when there is connectivity with mass transit and because the roadway component of bike ridership is critical, engaging local transportation leadership is important to the success of the program as it emerges.

Leveraging Bike Cleveland's relationships can serve as a contributor to success. Biking advocates frequently have knowledge of biking conditions that can be leveraged in developing the bike share program and will be a valuable source of volunteer engagement. It is also important to ensure coordination of biking initiatives within the area to reduce duplication or dilutive efforts. Bike education and awareness are critical components of bike share programs. Collaborative efforts with the existing biking programs permits bike sharing to build on that program base. To increase the effectiveness of a bike share when

implemented, the local community must be engaged. A series of public meetings about bike sharing would be strongly encouraged. In most successful programs, public meetings and social media connection with the public are strongly used to inform the development and ongoing operations of the bike share program.

Oversee additional study and the RFP process as determined appropriate –

After review of the completed research and consultation with bike share experts, decisions should be made regarding the need for further feasibility studies, demand forecasts or liability reviews. Several consulting groups, including those listed in the **Appendix A**, offer different levels of service for those considering bike sharing programs and will also assist with crafting the subsequent RFP if so desired. One consulting firm, MetroBike LLC, provided a price range of \$15,000 - \$24,000 for an RFP.

Engagement and communication with potential funding organizations –

While local stakeholders including potential grant-making organizations and sponsors have expressed sincere interest in the potential for bike share, all would require further detailed information including budget, timeline, accountability and actionable information to be in place prior to committing funds. Potential funding opportunities identified during research are discussed later in the report but continued communication including recurring updates is considered critical to the continued engagement of the sources.

Potential for Cleveland Bike Share

While there are multiple issues to work through, the research team is confident there is potential for a bike share program in Cleveland should the steps above be undertaken with positive result. As a result of the research conducted, the group has compiled the following suggestions to consider regarding timing, size and area to be served:

Timing – Given the amount of planning and coordination required by multiple entities and reviewing the timelines achieved by other programs, implementation in 18-24 months, in Spring 2014, appears achievable. There may be opportunities to tie the rollout with a nationally visible event such as the 2014 Gay Games and the 2015 Rock & Roll Hall of Fame 30th Anniversary Induction increasing national and local media coverage.

Area – The potential longer term bike share vision for Cleveland includes multiple areas connected by transit systems, such as University Circle, CSU, Downtown, Ohio City, Tremont

and Lakewood. The Greater University Circle area with its blend of rapid transit, destination locations, wellness-focused employers, shopping and entertainment areas in addition to the university population offers many of the factors required for a successful launch of Phase 1 of a bike share program.

Size – Given the strong recommendation of having stations approximately 1/3 miles apart and after reviewing destination and origins in the Greater University Circle area, it appears that between 18 -25 stations would be suggested with 180 – 250 bikes. We suggest that further demand analysis be done taking into consideration student population fluctuations and projected employee use by sponsors. Assuming reported pricing of approximately \$35,000 per station and \$1,200 per bike, initial capital budget estimate would be \$850,000 - \$1,200,000 in addition to operational and management expenditures.

Overview of Bike Share

Bike share is an emerging urban transportation program providing a network of bicycles available for low-cost public use around the city. Through a system of strategically placed bike share stations or hubs, members can pick up a bike at one station and return the bike at another making bike-share a great option for a wide variety of users.

From the early origins in Europe in 2004 and 2005, bike share programs have spread across the globe ranging in size from very small programs of four stations and 18 bicycles in Des Moines, Iowa to more than 20,600¹ bicycles in Paris. More than 16² bike share networks have been rolled out in the United States over the last five years with multiple new initiatives or considerable expansions to existing programs announced on a monthly basis. Regionally, Buffalo and Columbus have both announced bike share programs and Chicago is planning to add 4,000 bikes to its existing program over the next two years.

Bike share stations situated in densely populated areas, permit residents to become bike commuters without the expense and storage challenges of bike ownership and can enable families to reduce their dependence on auto transportation. Visitors to the area can purchase a short-term membership permitting them to greatly extend the reach of their visit, get out of the hotel room after a day of business meetings or a convention and explore other areas of the city. Bike-share programs, simply put, offers bikes where and when they are needed.

How would a bike share program look in Cleveland?

¹ (NYC Dept. City Planning, 2009)

² (Nice Ride Minnesota, 2012)

- An RTA user could take the Red line to the Cedar/University Circle station, pick up a bike at a station, ride to their place of employment and return the bike to a station located close to their workplace, reversing the process later in the day.
- Commuters coming into the city could park their cars at a peripheral parking lot, pick up a bike and return it close to their work, then pick up a bike before heading to lunch in Little Italy, Asiatown, East 4th St. or Tremont, where another bike station would be located. Since the first half-hour is free for members, no daily cost would be incurred.
- A student in the University Circle area wanting to go to downtown to attend a seminar could pick up a bike from one of the several hubs located on campus, ride it to the nearest RTA station (and return it to a hub close-by), take the bus to downtown, and use a bike again to get around downtown.

This vision of bike share for Cleveland is one that is being fulfilled in cities across Europe, Asia and North America.

Benefits of bike share programs

The potential benefits of bike share programs are typically discussed in the categories of **health, transportation, economic/job creation and enhancement of the urban environment.**

Denver Bike Sharing's 2010 annual report, for example, provided the following statistics for their 500 bike program: 6,333,332 calories burned, 1810 pounds lost, 312,121 pounds of carbon emission and 9,623 pounds of toxic pollutants avoidedⁱ³.

Some programs, such as Capital Bikes in Washington DC and Arlington, VA, enable individual members to track calories burned and collect carbon offset information. The information can then be compiled for benefits analysis purposes. Cities with bike share networks have reported that they reduce short trips and increase access to public transportation systems both of which can ease traffic congestion and parking constraints. Health, transportation and environmental benefits have proven to provide funding opportunities through federal and state grants in addition to private foundation funding and employer wellness initiative sponsorships.

Opportunities for economic benefits can exist in the structure of bike sharing through potential grants, sponsorships, advertising and fee generation although there are limitations based on the business model and local constraints regarding advertising. In addition, areas with a strong bike sharing program can realize additional economic gains through job creation to support the bike share operations and management. Formalized studies could not be identified on the

³ (Denver Bike Sharing , 2011)

influence of bike sharing on the local economy but anecdotal evidence would indicate an increasing number of bike share riders run short errands and visit areas within the bike sharing vicinity to conduct business reinvigorating smaller, local stores and vendors. Bike retailers, including independent retailers, report an increase in sales of bikes and gear as bike share programs frequently increase the number of bikers in general.

Bike share programs also require employees to operate the system, maintain the bicycles and hubs and recirculate the bikes thus creating additional opportunities for employment. Recent studies for bike sharing programs in New York ⁴ and Philadelphia⁵ indicate a number of programs that target job creation to youth and at-risk populations. Denver Bike Share reported the creation of 13 full time jobs with more anticipated as expansion efforts continue.⁶

The city benefits of bike share include positive press and recognition from various agencies and entities. Denver reported more than 775 media articles about their bike sharing program in 2010 including national and global press. In addition to media reporting, most bike sharing programs have a high level of community engagement utilizing both community meetings and social media to solicit new station or improvement ideas. Volunteer networks to roll-out the bikes, elevate general bike ridership, and educate riders provide further opportunity for community camaraderie and engagement. The National League of Cities Center for Research and Innovation details many of the benefits for cities and calls bike sharing, *“a cost effective and sustainable way to expand the portfolio of transit options⁷.”*

Planning a Bike Share Program

The key elements of planning a bike share program include an exploration of potential business models, ownership and oversight, funding mechanisms and the system distribution including number of stations and bicycles. Appendix B and C provided by B-Cycle from the January 2012 Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center meeting outline several United States bike sharing programs including Denver, Chicago, Miami, Minneapolis and others including the size of the bike share program, business model and funding mechanisms. **Appendix B** highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the various business models currently used for bike share programs in the United States. **The business model recommended by this team is the non-profit owned and managed.** This business model has mechanisms for strong participation by local jurisdictions, philanthropic groups and business organizations while leveraging operational

(NYC Dept. City Planning, 2009)

⁵ (JzTI and Bonnette Consulting, 2010)

⁶ (Denver Bike Sharing , 2011)

⁷(Kisner, 2011)

and funding expertise from the bike sharing community. **Appendix C** depicts the key considerations of planning a bike share program.

All bike share programs operate with a membership program with annual and casual (frequently 3, 5 or 7 days) memberships supplemented by usage fees on rides longer than 30 minutes. Memberships are typically connected to a credit card which acts as a loss prevention tool. Although theft was a problem in early generation bike sharing systems, technology improvements and experience have greatly reduced loss due to theft.

Critical Factors for Success

Studies for Philadelphia⁸ and New York⁹ in addition to current bike share program websites such as *Denver Bike Sharing*¹⁰ and *Nice Ride Minnesota*¹¹, reported similar critical factors for the success of bike share programs including the following:

Small bike systems don't work: For example, *Nice Ride Minnesota* notes that when DC had 10 stations, it had low utilization rates while the new system has 140 stations and more than 1 million trips during its first year of operation. Carl Voss, the volunteer coordinator for *Des Moines Bike Share* which began with 18 bikes, noted in an interview¹² that he would have started with a minimum of 35-50 bikes even with a comparably small four hub program.

Bike sharing works best in densely populated areas with multiple popular origins and destinations: Origins and destinations include mass transit stops and hubs, workplaces, schools and universities, recreational facilities, museums and shopping districts. Bike sharing is designed for short trips of under 3 miles and 30 minutes so areas with the most destinations and origins make the most sense with later expansion into dense residential areas.

Bike sharing should be heavily integrated with rapid transit systems: Bike sharing works best when used to supplement and extend rapid transit infrastructure. The *National League of Cities* notes that utilizing bike sharing programs to connect to other forms of transit can help cities maximize the utility of bus and rail lines.¹³

Bike sharing requires strong support from local jurisdictions: Even when non-profit or for-profit business models are utilized, city and/or county support is essential for the program to be

⁸ (JzTI and Bonnette Consulting, 2010)

⁹ (NYC Dept. City Planning, 2009)

¹⁰ (Denver Bike Sharing FAQs)

¹¹ (Nice Ride Minnesota, 2012)

¹² (Voss, 2012)

¹³ (Kisner, 2011)

able to operate. There are multiple considerations including hub placement, bike egress, signage and increased bicycle traffic that will require close coordination with the local jurisdiction planning committee and law enforcement agencies.

Hub placement is crucial: In addition to destination and origin placement, hubs (stations) should be placed no further than 1/3 mile apart. This allows for a secondary location to take or leave a bike if the first hub does not have a slot or bike available. The appearance and placement of the hub to allow for easy access and egress is also crucial, and a feeling of safety is also important.

Bike education and advocacy are important partners to bike sharing: All bike sharing programs should include education about bike riding, personal protection through helmet use and bike safety information. Expanding and improving biking capacity is also critical to the success of bike sharing.

Sustainable funding mechanisms are required. While grant and philanthropic funding are frequently available for planning the initial capital infrastructure and implementing the plan in the first few years, reliance on the philanthropic community for ongoing operational costs is not feasible. Revenue for ongoing operational costs must be generated from other sources such as memberships, usage fees, sponsorships, advertising sales and special interest funding. Some programs also utilize specially designated tax dollars.

Bike sharing programs must be inclusive: Because bike sharing memberships typically require credit card activation and use, special efforts are required to ensure the programs are inclusive of the unbanked members of the community. Inclusiveness allows the program to achieve greater success in meeting the health, wellness, economic and transportation needs within urban areas. In addition to opening up additional grant and sponsorship funding, philanthropic organizations and sponsors will require that the program be designed to meet needs in the underserved areas of the community

Opportunities for an Inclusive Program (*embedding sustainability*)

The typical bike share membership requires credit or debit cards ownership. This constraint can result in members of the community being excluded from a bike share program. There are, however, opportunities to work around that problem enabling bike sharing programs to fill a currently unmet low-cost transportation need for underserved members of the community.

Here are examples of opportunities and programs:

Bank on DC: *Capital Bikeshare* has partnered with Bank on DC,¹⁴ a consortium of financial institutions including banks and credit unions, who have devised programs to encourage and support financial wellness in the non-banked community members of greater Washington D.C. Bank on DC provides financial literacy education, accounts with access to credit or debit cards and reduced cost *Capital Bikeshare* memberships.

Subsidized *Hubway* (Boston Bike-share) memberships: The City of Boston Health Department provided a grant that offers *Hubway* memberships for \$5 including a free helmet¹⁵ for individuals meeting certain income criteria.

Employer-sponsored membership: Employers in urban areas with bike share programs are increasingly offering memberships as a part of the wellness or sustainability initiatives within their organization. An employer-sponsored membership program could be designed to ensure memberships are available to employees needing sponsorship. In addition to addressing employee wellness, memberships can resolve transportation challenges including access to mass transit and parking constraints.

Work-readiness program and education memberships: Memberships purchased by sponsoring agencies can be utilized to resolve transportation challenges. These types of memberships may be combined with a regional mass transit pass program that would allow a single card solution providing access to public transit and bike share.

Why Cleveland, Why Now?

While not a major focus of this research, it became obvious in our discussions with stakeholders and our research of bike sharing programs across the nation that “now” is the time for Cleveland to explore the potential for a bike share program.

In addition to the leveraging integration with ongoing initiatives such as Sustainable Cleveland 2019 and GreenCityBlueLake, a well-designed bike sharing program lends support to the policy priorities listed by the Greater Cleveland Partnership and the Council of Small Enterprise in their 2011/2012 Public Policy Agenda¹⁶ including advancing small business, accelerating economic inclusion, changing the face of Cleveland and strengthening global connections.

¹⁴ (Capital Bikeshares , 2012)

¹⁵ (City of Boston, 2012)

¹⁶ (Greater Cleveland Partnership Publications 2011 2012 Public Policy Agenda, 2012)

B-Cycle, a bike share firm in Madison, Wisconsin has an ongoing “*Who Wants It More Survey*” on their webpage where page visitors can express their desire for bike share (See Appendix D). As of April 24, 2012, Cleveland was fourth in the nation with almost 150,000 votes being cast¹⁷.

While there is still considerable work to be done to ensure alignment of demographics, demand and functionality, bike share programs are rapidly emerging as an expected feature of the urban landscape. Absence of a program could have a negative impact on prospective employers and residents.

Funding & Revenue Categories

Bike sharing programs offer solutions to urban challenges including health and wellness, transportation, environmental responsibility, congestion mitigation and establishing livable communities making grant and philanthropic funding for planning and infrastructure accessible in addition to sponsorships from employers and organizations.

Bike sharing programs and events have the potential for high local visibility and media coverage which can make sponsorship and advertising dollars a good match for ongoing operational costs. The potential for multiple funding opportunities should also be considered. For example, the **Cleveland Clinic Foundation** could provide grant funding for planning and infrastructure with the Cleveland Clinic providing sponsorships for hubs for employee use, subsidized memberships for employees and the purchase of advertising space on bicycles, helmets or hubs.

Examples of major funding sources include local and national corporations like **New Balance**, a primary sponsor for the *Boston Hubway* bike share, and **BlueCross BlueShield of Minnesota**, a primary sponsor of *Nice Ride* in Minneapolis. All bike share programs have multiple levels of sponsorships and advertising including hubs, helmets and bikes. Grant funding is available from numerous philanthropic organizations and government agencies and initiatives.

Throughout the course of this project, team members interviewed various stakeholders such as the **Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, Case Western Reserve University, Northeast Ohio Area Coordination Agency (NOACA), The Gund Foundation and Saint Luke’s Foundation**. Details regarding these interviews and potential funding opportunities are located in the Interview Notes section (**Appendix E**) of this document. Additionally, the minutes of the multi-stakeholder meeting are available in **Appendix F**.

¹⁷ (B-Cycle, 2012)

Conclusion and Commitment

Given the scope of the project and the constraints on time and resources, final determination regarding the feasibility and ongoing sustainability of a bike share program in Cleveland has not been determined.

However, our research indicates that there is sufficient interest from the biking, corporate and philanthropic community to aggressively explore the potential for bike share in Cleveland.

Our recommendations included in the executive overview details the steps necessary to continue this exploration. Interview notes and resources are contained within the **Appendix** to enable transition of the exploration. Our group members will make every effort to make themselves available for future discussions of their work and recommendations.

APPENDIX A

List of Consulting Firms that have been contacted by Indrajeet Ghatge and Kandy Hricik (and can be reached out to in the future) to further the Cleveland Bike Share program:

- 1) **MetroBike, LLC:** This is an internationally known bike-sharing consultancy and the first of its kind in North America. MetroBike assisted in the creation of North America's first bike sharing service, *SmartBike D.C.*, and in the planning, implementation, and management of the US's largest and only year-round and regional service, *Capital Bikeshare*. (<http://www.metrobike.net/index.php>). MetroBike, LLC also provides a Bike Share blog (<http://bike-sharing.blogspot.com/>) with links to feasibility studies, update, global bike share maps and information.
- 2) **Zagster (formerly CityRyde):** Zagster (<http://www.zagster.com>) has been around since 2007 consulting and installing easy to use/implement bike sharing and rental systems throughout the US and abroad. We're also known for developing the first ever methodology recognized by the UN and the World Bank that quantifies the impact of bicycling on carbon reduction.
- 3) **Amadeus Consulting** (<http://www.amadeusconsulting.com/Contact-Us.aspx>): Amadeus Consulting, a custom software development company, created the enterprise application system behind Boulder B-cycle's bike sharing program, which rolled out in Boulder on May 20, 2011.
- 4) **Alta Bicycle Share** (<http://www.altabicycleshare.com>) : Alta Bicycle Share designs, deploys, and manages bicycle share systems, enabling people to have all the advantages of owning a bike with few of the hassles. Alta partners include the PBSC Urban Solutions, also known as Bixi, (<http://www.bixisystem.com>) and Alta Planning + Design (<http://www.altaplanning.com/>). All sites contain substantial information.
- 5) **B-Cycle** (<http://bcycle.com>) B-Cycle is a Madison, WI company that designs, deploys, and manages bicycle share systems in more than 11 cities including Denver and Boulder, Colorado. B-Cycle is able to offer a variety of bicycle sharing programs according to the needs of its customers.

APPENDIX B

Potential Business Models for Bike sharing

Source: Denver Bike Sharing Annual Report (2010); Edits have been made by the team depending on its research

Our recommendation for Cleveland Bike Share: *Non-profit Owned and Managed*

APPENDIX C

Key considerations of planning a Bike Share Program in Cleveland

Critical factors for success:

- Strong support and engagement from city and business community
- Integration with transportation infrastructure (e.g. RTA)
- Continual community engagement (corporates, non-profits, schools, community centers, universities, museums etc.)
- Enterprise approach – Bike share, biking education, biking advocacy, safety, awareness
- Ensuring an inclusive program (program for “everyone”)

Challenges going forward:

- Creating vision of Cleveland Bike Share and sustaining commitment
- Calibration of demographics, demand and functionality
- Engaging leadership and expertise in rapidly emerging bike share climate
- Enrolling city and county attention, support and political will
- Winning high level funding and sponsorship support
- Ensuring an inclusive program

APPENDIX D

B-Cycle, a bike share firm in Madison, Wisconsin has an ongoing “*Who Wants It More Survey*” on their webpage where page visitors can express their desire for bike share. As of April 24, 2012, Cleveland was fourth in the nation with almost 150,000 votes being cast



APPENDIX E

Interview Notes (from meetings with various stakeholders)

Interviewee(s): John Mitterholzer, Sr. Program Officer

**Team Member(s): Gabriel Forté
Indrajeet Ghatge, Kandy Hricik**

Organization/Agency: The Gund Foundation

Date: Monday, April 16, 2012

Location: 45 Prospect Avenue West, Cleveland, Ohio

- John shared knowledge of Denver Bike Share and Boston Hubway emphasizing need for strong support from mayor and city officials in launching successful programs.
- Potential barriers that could exist in Cleveland including need for inclusive program and helmet laws.
- Team provided overview of research to date including opportunities to ensure development of inclusive program providing details of work in Washington D.C. with financial institutions and in Boston with Dept. of Health.
- Team discussed various mechanisms used by other programs to provide low cost or subsidized helmets at membership, various retail sites close to hubs and vending machines.
- John stressed importance of ensuring exit plan for philanthropy once infrastructure and programs are in place.
- Reviewed various funding mechanisms including NOACA, philanthropic organizations, potential sponsorships and grant funding.
- Discussed current role of Bike Cleveland, funded by Gund Foundation, and potential for bike share project manager to be stationed in Bike Cleveland.
- Supportive of potential bike share project manager under to continue research and engage for studies and RFPs while engaging civic, philanthropic and corporate support as appropriate.
- Discussed philanthropic funding opportunities for planning position such as Cleveland Foundation, Sear-Swetland Family, Saint Luke's Foundation and others.

Interviewee(s): Marc Von Allmen

Team Member(s): Kandy Hricik

Organization/Agency: Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordination Agency NOACA

Date & Location: Thursday, March 29, 2012, Telephone Interview

- Mission of NOACA, transportation planning in five county area, funding resources and allocation procedures
- Funding constraints in state of Ohio – govt. entity with corresponding ordinance (potential for CDC)
- Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funding – requires definitive decrease in emissions
- Transportation for Livable Communities Initiatives (TLCI) - Potential funding availability for planning efforts (20% match required, \$75K max)
- Funding requests on bi-annual basis moving to quarterly
- Potential areas of concern – Ensuring safe environment, appropriately measuring demand

Interviewee(s): LaTida Smith , Vice President

Team Member(s): Kandy Hricik

Organization/Agency: St. Luke's Foundation

Date & Location: Monday, April 2, 2012, Telephone Interview

- Mission and areas of focus for St. Luke's
- Program potential fit for Urban Health & Wellbeing portfolio
- Inclusive program is important component for funding consideration
- Potential planning funding available – would need more detail regarding budget and expected deliverables.
- Further information contact – Heather Torok, Urban Health & Wellness Program Director

Interviewee(s): Lee Jones, Director of Sales

Team Member(s): Kandy Hricik

Organization/Agency: B-Cycle LLC

Date & Location: Monday, April 2, 2012, Telephone Interview

- B-Cycle is prepared to assist in planning for Cleveland program as needed.
- B-Cycle has previously met with Cleveland Clinic and others in Cleveland to answer inquiries regarding potential for bike sharing program.
- He will forward information from the January 2012 meeting Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PIBC) on bike sharing programs.
- Discussed various business models, next steps and resource availability.

Interviewee(s): Carl Voss, Director (Volunteer)

Team Member(s): Kandy Hricik

Organization/Agency: Des Moines, Iowa Bike Sharing

Date & Location: Friday, March 23, 2012, Telephone Interview

- Des Moines program is small – 4 hubs, 18 bikes operated by group of volunteers
- Hubs sponsored by businesses close to the hub locations
- Indicates minimum number of bikes for feasible program – 35-50
- Hub cost \$30,000 - \$35,000 , Bike estimated cost \$1,200
- Next stage growth difficult because of resource constraints. Volunteers too busy trying to keep operating to generate community support, seek grants, donors and sponsorship

Interviewee(s): Christopher Alvarado, President

Team Member(s): Gabriel Forté

Organization/Agency: Bike Cleveland

Date: Friday, February 24, 2012

Location: Peter B. Lewis Building, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

- Discussed the scope of the project, letting him become aware of some of the activities that we were doing, such as researching how other cities have approached similar projects in the past, the group of shareholders that were recommended that Team contact, as well as some target locations for the bike stations.
- Mr. Alvarado provided Team with a large amount of information, such as federal funding opportunities like Transportation Enhancement (TE), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and other ways that bike programs have received monetary assistance. It should be noted that many of these suggestions also were in relation to programs that had huge city-wide assistance, whereas this program is being done from a non-profit level.

-
- Chris recommended that Team should look at is the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA), which is a nonprofit organization that handles federal transportation dollars.
 - He gave Team two bike sharing entities to contact, which were The Bike Rack and the Ohio City Bicycle Co-Op, and he gave Team two individuals in the Cleveland Clinic that would be of interest, Dr. David Pauer (head of Employee Wellness Program) and Chris Coburn (Director of Global Cardiovascular Innovation Center).

Interviewee(s): Stephanie Strong Corbett, Director of Sustainability

Team Member(s): Gabriel Forté

Organization/Agency: Case Western Reserve University

Date: Tuesday, February 28, 2012

Location: Phone Interview

- Stephanie was already familiar with the project due to her acquaintance with Brad and Chris.
- Recently completed a survey that was conducted prior to Team's undertaking of the project. Survey was conducted through The Daily (CWRU's daily newsfeed) via Survey Monkey, with several hundred responses. Team strongly considered creating and conducting another survey, but decided against it as the previous survey was done within the past few months, as well as a warning by Stephanie of potential survey fatigue.
- Another point of discussion was with Victoria Rusnak, a current Masters in Engineering and Management student who was looking for the viability of a bike sharing program on campus; her discussions and contributions are posted in another interview.
- Ms. Corbett spoke about a few other sources of transportation on campus, such as City Wheels (now defunct) and WeCar, which is a car-sharing program that advertises regularly throughout campus.
- A future person of interest that she highlighted was Dick Jamieson, who is the Vice President for Campus Services. Mr. Jamieson issued the clearance for WeCar, and is responsible for electrical charging spaces in parking garages; currently Veale Center and the MSASS Garage are the two locations that have them on campus.
- Ms. Corbett felt that Case Western needed three things for the program to be successful: bike safety programs (i.e. theft awareness and prevention, accident education), a low or no-cost way to implement it with current parking options, such as an introductory trial period for parking passes and services, and a system that interfaces w/ Case ID cards, which she believes could significantly cut down on bike thefts.

Interviewee(s): John Sirignano, Operations Manager

Team Member(s): Gabriel Forté

Organization/Agency: The Bike Rack

Date: Thursday, April 12, 2012

Location: The Bike Rack, 2148 East 4th Street, Cleveland, OH, 44115

- Most of the meeting revolved around the origins and function of The Bike Rack.
- Owned by the City of Cleveland and the Downtown Cleveland Alliance. City mulling options of whether to turn it into a self-functioning business or find a non-profit organization that it can be assimilated into.
- Retrieved various sources from John, including B-Cycle, Nice Ride (Minnesota's bike sharing system), and Alta Bicycle Share (a bike sharing consultation and design organization which operates worldwide). Team already had most of these sources at this point, but it was good to hear another perspective on those programs.

Interviewee(s): Matthew Pietro, Sustainability Specialist

Team Member(s):

Amogh Garg

Organization/Agency: University Hospitals Health System

Date: Tuesday, Feb 28, 2012, Telephone Interview

According to Matt the Bike sharing program will help in the following:

- Meet UH its aim to connect personal health with environmental health.
- Fulfill UH's commitment to serve the community.
- Creating some space in the car garages, which are jam-packed most of the time.

Potential hurdles in implementation of bike sharing program:

- Safety Concerns – Since University Circle is a busy surrounding there is a need to build separate paths or cycling tracks for cyclists.

- Air Quality Checks – As more population and hence more UH employees get exposed to outside air for an increased amount of time while riding the bikes there is a need to put an air quality check system in place.

How can UH support the bike sharing program:

- There is a possibility of funding if UH likes the details and the whole proposal of the bike sharing program.
- UH can also promote the bike sharing program by creating awareness among its employees about the benefits of bike sharing.

**Interviewee(s): Chris Parkinson, Project Coordinator
Garg**

Team Member(s): Amogh

Organization/Agency: Cleveland Clinic - Office for a Healthy Environment

Date: Wednesday, Mar 7, 2012, Telephone Interview

- What Clinic thinks about the bike sharing program and some other facts:

- Clinic advocates the idea of bike sharing strongly. A program similar in nature was proposed at Clinic, but didn't get materialized because of some other high priority projects at that time.
- Clinic also believes that bike rental is not feasible, but bike sharing is.
- A big chunk of Clinic's employee base lives within five miles of clinic and that's why there is a high probability of people riding the bikes to offices.
- A similar program, but much less in magnitude, was funded by Clinic.
- Clinic has some pre-defined sustainability goals and bike sharing program can help Clinic achieve these goals to a big extent.

- Concerns that Clinic foresee:

- Safety issues: There should be separate cycling tracks for people riding the bikes. If the bike sharing booths can also provide some safety equipments such as helmets then that would be great.
- Fund raising is challenging for these kind of programs

- Advice and how Clinic can contribute:

- Bike inventory should be carefully estimated. It should not happen that an employee took a bike in the morning to office and then in the evening there is no bike to return back home.
- Clinic is a strong favor of the bike sharing program. It can fund the program after looking at the blueprint and analyzing the details.

Interviewee(s): Victoria Rusnak, Contractor at Parker Hannifin, Current MEM Student at Case, and Part of CCC – “Case Cycling Community”

Team Member(s): Amogh Garg

Organization/Agency: Case Western Reserve University

Date: Thursday, Mar 1, 2012, Telephone Interview

- Victoria’s work:

- As a part of her entrepreneurship class, Victoria carried a feasibility study and tried to set the platform for a bike rental program.
- Her primary functions include gauging the interest of the student body at case in the bike rental program and also searching the funding sources.
- She worked with John Karol university and some other school to share the best practices
- She also approached Ohio city bike Co-op to determine how funds can be raised and how much these co-ops can contribute.
- She has developed a business plan and carried out surveys to know the interest of different stakeholders associated with this program.

- Suggestions:

- The bike sharing program should be non-profit as it’s tough to run the program as a for-profit venture.
- Funding is the biggest hurdle and should be actively looked for before any kind of concrete/major advancement.
- Without including Cleveland Clinic and University Hospital it might be little tough to launch and successfully run the bike sharing program in the University Circle area. It’s very important to include these two organizations.

APPENDIX F

Multi-Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Interviewee(s):

**Chris Bongorno, University Circle Inc.
Brad Chase, GreenCityBlueLake
Chris Alvarado, Bike Cleveland**

**Team Member(s): David Hanna,
Indrajeet Ghatge, Kandy Hricik,
Amogh Garg, Gabriel Forte**

Victoria Rusnak, Case Western Reserve University

Date: Monday, April 16, 2012

Location: Peter B. Lewis Building, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

Key Questions asked by Stakeholders:

- Who would be the main users of the proposed bike sharing program? Specifically, is there any way to gauge the percentage of users that are full time residents? Or is such a system more reliant upon tourists?
- What is the percentage of students that currently own bikes?
- Is there any available information regarding how often a University Circle Institutional Employee would use a bike sharing program to move across the University Circle area?
- Are there any core commuters that would potentially depend on this program outside of the optimum months? Would a winter shut down period potentially deter people from using this program?
- How can we make sure the bikes are located where they are needed? How often do other programs have to retrieve their bikes from unauthorized service areas?
- What does the outreach to the RTA system look like? How can we further enhance their willingness to cooperate in such a program?
- What are the ways that we can make biking safer? What are the safety issues that we may have missed? Also, is this area truly bike-able?
- Assuming that funding is issued in the future, would Bike Cleveland be willing to take ownership of this project?

Other Key Points Discussed:

- Discussed the importance of setting up an entity that is flexible and has the regional skill to ramp this program up in the future
- Possible regional authorities discussed are as follows; Cleveland Metroparks, Bike Cleveland and the RTA. Further, Chris Alvarado, President of Bike Cleveland acknowledged that such a program is aligned with Bike Cleveland's sets of goals and would, at this point, be willing to help with the marketing. Additionally, Chris acknowledged that at the very least, Bike Cleveland could be one of the groups that are willing to take this project forward.
- Discussed the County's feelings regarding such a program and how we would envision their potential future contributions, if any.
- Discussed the key differences between bike sharing and other similar programs; specifically the differences between bike sharing and bike rentals.
- Continually emphasized the importance of the ongoing support and backing within the local community

Works Cited

- Greater Cleveland Partnership Publications 2011 2012 Public Policy Agenda.* (2012). Retrieve April 24, 2012, from Greater Cleveland Partnership:
<http://www.gcpartnership.com/~media/Files/Publications/2011%202012%20Public%20Policy%20Agenda.ashx>
- B-Cycle. (2012, April). *B-Cycle Who Wants It More.* Retrieved April 24, 2012, from B-Cycle:
<http://bcycle.com/whowantsitmore.aspx>
- Capital Bikeshares . (2012). *Bank on DC.* Retrieved March 28, 2012, from Capital Bikeshares:
<http://www.capitalbikeshare.com/bankondc>
- City of Boston. (2012). *City of Boston Bikes.* Retrieved March 28, 2012, from City of Boston:
<http://www.cityofboston.gov/bikes/>
- Denver Bike Sharing . (2011). *2010 Annual Report.* Denver, Colorado: Denver Bike Sharing.
- Denver Bike Sharing FAQs.* (n.d.). Retrieved March 30, 2012, from Denver Bike Sharing:
<http://www.denverbikesharing.org/faqs.php#faq5>
- JzTI and Bonnette Consulting. (2010). *Philadelphia Bikeshare Concept Study.* Philadelphia.
- Kisner, C. (2011). Integrating Bike Share Programs into a Sustainable Transportation System. *National League of Cities City Practice Brief.* Washington D.C.: National League of Cities Center for Research & Innovation.
- MetroBike LLC. (2012). *The Bike-Sharing Blog.* Retrieved 2012, from The Bike-Sharing Blog:
<http://bike-sharing.blogspot.com/>
- Nice Ride Minnesota. (2012). *Nice Ride Minnesota About Us.* Retrieved March 30, 2012, from Nice Ride Minnesota: <https://www.niceridemn.org/about/>
- NYC Dept. City Planning. (2009). *Bike-Share Opportunities in New York City.* New York .
- Prevention Research Center for Healthy Neighborhoods, Case Western Reserve University. (2012, February 1). Obesity in Cleveland. Cleveland, Ohio, USA.
- Voss, C. (2012, March 23). Volunteer Coordinator, Des Moines Bke Share. (K. Hricik, Interviewer)