

BPAC Legislative Committee Meeting Notes

April 30, 2020 5:30 PM via Zoom

Notes prepared by George Naylor

OakDOT, LYFT and MTC Bike Share staff provided a presentation to the committee regarding the details of the implementation of the e-Bicycle bike share program and a proposed pricing structure. The presentation was led by Kerby Olsen, Shared mobility Coordinator for OakDOT, and also included Neal Patel, Community Affairs Manager with Lyft and Mike Nichols, Bike Share Planner at MTC. The e-bike share program is an addition to the existing classic bike share program that uses the classic bikes that require a bike share station. The virtual meeting was attended by 17 participants. BPAC Commissioners in attendance were Grey Gardner, Dianne Yee, Phoenix Mangrum and George Naylor.

Kerby Olsen led the presentation on the proposed e-bike share program. Lyft, the bike share provider, will be providing about \$90,000 in funds to pay for new bike racks to expand the e-bike program. The new e-bikes will have a lock and do not have to be tethered to a bike share station required by the classic bike share bikes. Since stations are no longer required for e-bikes, the area coverage will be greatly expanded to include most of Oakland (included on a map). A proposed set of additional charges, over and above the existing classic bike share membership and charges were presented, and would be applied to three different user categories – annual members, Bike Share for All (BS4A) members and casual riders. * Note – BS4A users of e-bikes would never have an e-bike share ride cost greater than \$1 whether in the fee cap area or outside the fee cap area, which was not described in the slides *

Comments and questions from Commissioners and the public, with responses from OakDOT, LYFT and MTC, included as follows:

1. The entire bike share amendment package, including the program pricing, will be presented to Oakland City Council for consideration at a later time. Council will have 30 days to accept or reject the pricing proposal, with subsequent discussion if not accepted. Input on pricing is still being solicited.
2. The added costs could make the bike-share less attractive and seem to run counter to the widespread acceptance of the bike share for the general public and be an effective alternative to cars, acting as a disincentive. Could also lose existing members that have been loyal supporters. Can LYFT look at added revenue sources, such as advertising? Current bike share is not operating at a profit, but will need to balance costs and revenues as the program goes forward.
3. Any stats on free bike share rides to first providers such as increased membership and ridership? 250 new members in the late spring, but no clear statistics available.
4. How sustainable is the expansion of the service area? Priorities are serving the flat lands of East Oakland, but some of the expansion is driven by requests, such as the hills above I-580 and Highway 13.
5. Concerned about affordability to low income riders with added charges. What funds does LYFT provide to the city? LYFT provides funding for added bike racks as well as providing funds if the

system makes a level of profit, plus liquidated damages if key performance indicators (KPIs) are not met. But returned funds are not consistent from year to year.

6. How has e-bike share impacted usage in SF? Still too early to know for sure, but total system ridership after e-bikes (in Feb 2020) ridership went up a lot (no specifics).
7. Can boundaries of the ride cap area be modified to expand to include Laurel and Fruitvale commercial districts to enhance utility for making trips from East Oakland? Will take that feedback in future updates to the program.
8. Any new bike stations in East Oakland? Currently not planning to add any in East Oakland proper. But can be added if funds are found to pay for the stations (\$80,000 per station) as part of development proposals or grant funds, etc.
9. What new effort and costs are required to implement the e-bikes? Should be described in light of the added costs associated with the program. E-bikes will need to be serviced away from a specific station and found based on GPS. Batteries will need to be swapped out when found. E-bikes are also more expensive from a cost perspective, relative to classic bike share.
10. Are the lack of docks an equity issue for East Oakland? Pricing is defined such that if there are no docks in the vicinity, there are no added charges to park the e-bike. Also, docks are more efficient where there is density, which doesn't exist in parts of East Oakland, so adding stations would not be efficient. However, 'virtual' docking stations could be provided through bike corrals to provide operating and maintenance efficiencies when finding the e-bikes.
11. Need bikes in Millmont. Yes, they will be provided.
12. A potential funding source could be an added user fee through rideshare service trips to cross-subsidize bike share charges. Fees would offset VMT and congestion impacts and be paid through users, not LYFT. Currently, SF earmarks rideshare fees to fund transit, but any fees like that would require a legislative change to implement to apply to bike share in Oakland.
13. Is there still a provision to provide 10 percent of all bike share bikes to Fruitvale and 10 percent in East Oakland as a KPI? Yes – still a part of the agreement.
14. How long does the pricing agreement go on and how often does it get revisited? There are price controls (2% per year + inflation adjustment for rates) that are part of the agreement, which will be in place for four years.
15. Any consideration to add in other pricing structures, like differentials for short rides, to incentivize new membership? The goal is to reduce auto trips. LYFT is looking at other pricing options, such as updated annual membership rates, and others to expand membership.

Meeting ended at approximately 6:30 PM. Not the end of the discussion, however. Feedback provided here will be added into pricing proposals as appropriate, and there will be another chance to comment before going to City Council.