THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

City Hall, Conference Room A
141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver

Wednesday, December 5, 2018 at 6:00 pm

MINUTES

Present: Andrew Robinson (Chair)
Trevor Bowden (Vice-Chair)
Rohan Soulsby
Carol Reimer
Martin Davies
Nooshin Kohan
Councillor Tony Valente

Staff: Daniel Watson, Transportation Planner
Rachel Fish, Committee Clerk

Presenter: Natalie Corbo, Transportation Demand Mgmt. Coordinator
Jennifer Draper, Manager, Transportation Planning

Apologies: Patrick Stafford-Smith (for Kris Neely)
Becke Gray
Christie Sacré
Matthew Carter

Quorum 5

1.0 CALL TO ORDER, OPENING COMMENTS, ADOPTION OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 6:05pm with a quorum present.

The Agenda was adopted as circulated.

The minutes of the meeting of November 7th, 2018 were adopted as circulated.

2.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

It was noted that potential agenda items for future meetings will be discussed at tonight’s round table.

6:08pm - Patrick Stafford-Smith arrived and expressed the Chambers interest in the E-Bike Share Program along with their willingness to participate.
3.0 E-BIKE SHARE PROGRAM

Natalie, Transportation Demand Mgmt. Coordinator, and Jennifer Draper, Manager, Transportation Planning introduced and presented on the E-Bike Share pilot program.

Key points included:

- The vision is to have a shared e-bike pilot for the North Shore.
- The City is having discussions with the Districts and potential operators.
- Council direction was to pursue a third party owned and operated system under a license agreement with the city, to report back to Council on the licensing framework we develop and to collaborate with the two Districts on the program.
- An e-bike share is strongly supported by a variety of objectives in the OCP.
- There’s a potential to support our Community Energy and Emissions Plan.
- Motor Vehicle Act regulations: a 32km/hr a limit imposed on e-bikes, no driver’s license is required but operators need to be over the age of 16 and a helmet is required.
- Upcoming Policy:
  - Translink has a new mobility working group with representatives from different Metro-Vancouver municipalities which help develop guidelines around ‘active personal share mobility’.
- Transportation Goals:
  - To increase cycling mode share, increase visibility of cycling in the city, and to increase mobility opportunities for a wide range of residents, employees and visitors.
  - Decrease barriers to cycling and decrease single occupancy vehicle use.
- Additional Benefits:
  - Economic development.
  - Enhanced tourist experience.
  - Improved first and last mile connections to transit.
  - Data to inform future infrastructure investments.
- Timeline:
  - Stakeholder engagement in winter, 2019.
  - Procurement in winter, 2019.
  - Program implementation spring/summer, 2019.
- Bike Share Overview:
  - Bikes are dockless enabled smart bikes, locked and unlocked using an app and can be left anywhere legally within a service area.
  - Pricing is more flexible than a city owned system.
  - Operators are responsible for maintenance of the fleet.
- Parking:
  - Exclusion zones are possible in major transit hubs.
  - City could limit pick-up and drop-off to specific havens.
- Data:
  - New world of data available.
  - Built into a license agreement with the provider.
  - Need other ways to determine who is not using the system and how to reach them.
• North Shore Pilot:
  o Dockless capability but constrained by havens.
  o Geofencing (restrictions around an area).
  o Limitations – how much we can address accessibility needs beyond conventional e-bikes.
  o No one has been able to fully integrate adaptive bikes, cargo bikes, or other less common types of bicycles into the system.
  o Limits with pricing structure – we want to support affordability. Most operators have programs to offer discounts to lower income residents.
  o Limited options for children and families – no child seats at this time.
• Technology Options:
  o Locking mechanisms include two types; wheel lock and lock-to’s.
• Charging:
  o Options include having operations staff swap batteries, a vending machine style station and/or requiring users to bring a battery to charge themselves.
• Helmets:
  o Some are provided on bikes, some focus on providing them directly to residents to bring with them.
• Apps:
  o Incentives for good parking and user surveys.
  o Need to consider access for people without smart phones and cash payments.
• Role of the City of North Vancouver and The Operator:
  o The City role is to set standards and key performance indicators, evaluate and select potential operators and have a long term role in enforcement.
  o Issues with bikes will be directed to the operator.
  o Education in terms of safe cycling, awareness into TDM programs and how to ride e-bikes safely will be led by the City.
  o It is up to the operator on how to deliver an excellent program based on standards the City has laid out.
  o The operator is responsible for removal of improperly parked bikes with an opportunity for the City to penalize the operator.

Questions/Comments from ITC:

• People will leave these all over the sidewalk, will there be consideration for people in wheeled devices?
  o A: Yes, we need to discuss where to have bikes in the public space.
• How many bikes will there be?
  o A: We don’t have a number yet, but we want to make sure we are able to meet the demand.
• Are you going to get that number from the proponents?
  o A: Yes, in a lot of processes the operator would propose a fleet size they are interested in and the City would discuss it. Another system is to start with a certain number that everyone can agree on, and then allow the fleet size to increase depending on ridership.
• Are the operators affiliated with bike manufactures?
  o A: There are a couple, mostly they work with separate suppliers.
• What’s stopping operators from dropping a bunch of bikes?
A: Operators see that municipalities have taken swift action when this happens. Legal action could be taken if it's done illegally.

- How much is the program contingent on the other municipalities participating?
  - A: We could do it without them. The City is the carrot for a lot of these companies. They are keen to work on this and are at the same stage as us.

- Are there any e-bikes in Vancouver?
  - A: The system has regular bikes.

- Where else are there bike shares in the lower mainland?
  - A: Vancouver, Richmond, Port Coquitlam, Port Moody and UBC.

- Is the City taking a lead on the bid?
  - A: This is to be determined.

- Translink will be interested to put them on their busses, is there a weight issue or infrastructure limitation with Translink?
  - A: It's limited to 50 or 55 lbs.

- What service area is being agreed on?
  - A: Employment density areas and town centres to get the best ridership.

- Single-family areas need to be considered as well.

- Are any car share programs sharing data with the City?
  - A: There was no provision for data sharing, they have been forthcoming when we make requests but it's nothing like the data we can request from bike share programs. We have identified that as a key element.

6:40–7:53 pm: the Committee separated into two groups to discuss key considerations.

Discussion:

- For service area, we focused on areas that had bike infrastructure, linking into major transit centers and ended up covering most of the city.
- There's an opportunity for people to have access to places for hiking.
- We considered shops and community centers and areas of high activity which evolved into being most of the city.
- We discussed haven locations in obvious places like the Quay, up Lonsdale at City Hall, Harry Jerome, Harbourside and Carson Graham, Edgemont and Delbrook Recreation Center, 3rd and St. David's, the bottom and top of Grand Boulevard, Park and Tilford, Lynn Valley Centre, Phibbs Exchange and Capilano University.
- Places we feel there shouldn't be e-bike stations is buffer areas around bus stops, fire halls, ambulance access points and hospitals. We discussed schools and how most students can't use e-bikes but people use the fields and parents could use them.
- We are concerned about all the emergency traffic near a hospital, we could put it on a side street that makes sense for safety purposes.
- Hospitals could turn over a few parking spots for havens.
- Regarding financial support from the City, they could provide havens, complete the cycling network (one group specified north-south routes), provide education on safety, performance networks, business partnerships, wayfinding, covered bike parking, bike racks and electricity for charging. The two main considerations were havens and completing the cycling network.
- Should be promoted to tourists in/from Vancouver – this could be written into the TOR.
• Metrics of success could include numbers of users, trips, average lengths and times of trips, active users, revenue, compass card data and compare it to e-bike data, gross trips, types and numbers of accidents, maintenance issues, app issues, number of calls and types to the City, metrics from other bike systems, and socioeconomic and geographic data.
• Other metrics of success are multiple uses by the same user, whether people are becoming more confident in riding via user surveys, distance travelled, how well the system is meeting the users last mile needs, track multi-modal use, whether people can access the e-bikes where and when they want them, satisfaction with the service area and how well the 3 municipalities are working together.
• It would be interesting to see the speeds people are getting to on the e-bikes.
• Priority infrastructure includes Boulevard Crescent (top of Grand Boulevard), Park and Tilford Second Narrows area needs improvement, same with Marine Drive out to the west of the city. Lonsdale Quay and bike storage needs to be considered. What infrastructure could we put in here?
• With the B-line it might be difficult to have a better separated bike infrastructure.
• Prioritize north-south separated bike infrastructure.
• Address the density from Moodyville to connect to the Green Necklace where there is higher density, retirees, high rises, Capilano and Marine.

Next steps:

• From a policy perspective we need to start thinking about anticipating a bit more e-bike activity and consider how they mix with conventional bikes.
• There isn’t a lot of policy guidance available.
• We will be sending an RFP in the New Year.
• We want to provide the right infrastructure.
• The RFP should give some acknowledgement to local operators/local bike manufacturers.
• We may end up with e-scooters at some point and they will be on the same infrastructure, you may need to anticipate that in advance. What’s been done on Keith might not work well with a multi-use path.
• We need to make sure there’s no way to exceed a certain speed if going downhill.
• What about posting speed limits on multi use paths?
  o A: It hasn’t worked in the past with Welch Street. Welch is 3m and is too narrow as a multi-use path, the only solution is separation.
• People ignore the fast/slow paths – signage could work.
• As the technologies arrive and the transportation landscape evolves, the challenge will be to operate at the same pace as the business models and technologies that are evolving. It means a change in how you think about infrastructure.
• There will be a need for more enforcement and education as a tool. A mix of enforcement, education and infrastructure.

The committee thanked Natalie and Jennifer for the presentation and look forward to seeing the results of the program in the near future.
4.0 COUNCILLOR UPDATE

Councillor Valente introduced himself, provided a bit of background on his experience and how he can provide insights to this Committee.

The Committee members introduced themselves to Councillor Valente.

5.0 ITC – ROSTER OF PROJECTS WORKSHEET

D. Watson updated the committee on City projects.

6.0 TRANSPORTATION EVENTS – MEMBER UPDATE

None.

7.0 ROUND TABLE

Andrew thanked Committee for their great work and participation. The Committee presented Andrew with a card and thanked him for his work on the Committee and for his time as Chair.

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 pm.

[Signature]

TREVOR BOWDEN Andrew Robinson, Chair