

From: Fay [mailto:fay.patterson@bisa.asn.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 15 November 2017 4:24 PM
To: 'd.bennett@adelaidecitycouncil.com'
Subject: Dockless bike share

Dear Daniel,

Andrew Waugh has passed on a query from you about BISA's position on dockless bike share. We strongly support the idea of bike share. We have three areas in which we can make comment.

1) Managing issues with dockless systems

We are glad to see little evidence of similar issues arising here as have arisen in Melbourne around dockless bike share, but are aware of the potential for this to develop. We touched upon this in an email to Council sent in early September. A copy of this is provided below, in case you haven't seen it. This includes a link to our submission to the Parliamentary enquiry into parking and traffic movement, submitted in July 2017, which contained the following comments about dockless bike share:

"Dockless bike share systems that are being rolled out around the world with amazing rapidity have both positives and negatives associated with them. One risk is that footpaths may become cluttered with share bikes. We would advocate that all new bike share entrants be required to sign up to a common operational platform, which would include minimum quality standards for bikes, funding of a single maintenance provider, privacy and IT data controls, passing on bike location data to allow rebalancing of the system as required, and common docks being provided in the City to control bike share parking. (In suburban areas, such control would only be required at attractive locations and the bike share would generally operate without docks)."

(The common docks proposed were intended to help control parking at places like train stations and Rundle Mall, where pedestrian levels are high, bike numbers could be high and bicycles could fall onto footpaths, etc. At the moment, we're not aware that these are necessary but suggest the situation be monitored.)

Since then, Melbourne City Council has established a framework for dockless bike share. While I am not aware of its detail, we would be broadly supportive if ACC wished to go down a similar track.

2) Helmets and bike share

In addition, we did give some thought to the requirement for bicycle helmets and compliance with Mandatory Helmet Legislation (MHL):

"The Bicycle Institute's position on MHL is that it is a divisive issue and we have other priorities. However, we are sympathetic to councils that feel that MHL complicates the efficiency and efficacy of shared bicycle schemes, given the evidence that users of shared bicycle schemes have fewer crashes than other cyclists. We note that the Northern Territory's approach to MHL excludes off-road paths, has not resulted in higher injury rates than elsewhere in Australia and is associated with the highest cycling rates in the country."

Further to this, the Bicycle Institute has adopted a position of supporting a trial repeal of MHL for adults on off-road paths and non-competitive cycling. Our reasons are outlined in the [latest edition](#) of our Pedal Update newsletter.

3) Feedback: dockless bike share so far

We have noticed some complaints about bike share bikes occupying on-street bicycle parking rails. I understand from Andrew that ACC is not keen on providing infrastructure to cater exclusively for bike share bikes, but we would

suggest that installing additional parking around the City would be a useful response that other cyclists would also appreciate. We noticed and shared a photo of the bicycle parking provided along Rundle St via our Facebook page; this might be a space and cost-effective means of augmenting existing bike parking.

You'll note that in our email to Councillors we also supported ACC redirecting the \$1 million previously announced allocated to expanding the City Bike system to other infrastructure needs. However it is still desirable to maintain the current City Bikes system because of the different aims of the system compared to a commercial provider. Some feedback from Melbourne, for example, noted that a credit card is required to access the Orange bikes and only one bike at a time. This means that a parent can't hire a bike for an accompanying child – exacerbated by the minimum age limit for the system. Also, BikeSA has reported low-income and disadvantaged people using the City Bikes system and these people who couldn't necessary access a commercial system.

I hope this is of some help.

Regards,

Fay Patterson, MAITPM

Chair

chair@bisa.asn.au

0409 284 165

From: Fay [<mailto:fay.patterson@bisa.asn.au>]

Sent: Tuesday, 5 September 2017 12:19 PM

Subject: East-west bikeway route

Dear Lord Mayor, Deputy Lord Mayor and Councillors,

Regarding tonight's tabling of a preferred east-west Bikeway, the Bicycle Institute of SA would like to add our support to the preferred Flinders St/Franklin St route for all the reasons noted in the report.

In addition, we see an opportunity to easily and cheaply connect from the new Anzac Hwy underpass alongside the railway line to Sir Donald Bradman Drive, into the Park Lands trail and shared path/lights at Franklin Street. A dirt 'road' was constructed here to service the railway when it was being electrified and we'd like to see it returned to the care and control of Adelaide City Council. This would also bypass a difficult squeeze point on the West Tce bikeway.

We also agree with discussions regarding the City Bikes scheme, that the \$1 million allocated to this would better be spent on infrastructure. Here, we point to the desperate need for cycle facilities to be included as part of the North Tce tram extension works. FYI, our [recent submission](#) to the Parliamentary enquiry into parking and traffic movement included a framework for dockless bicycle share (p7) to prevent issues currently being experienced in Melbourne (and China) from occurring here.

Yours sincerely,

Fay Patterson, BE MAITPM

Chair

chair@bisa.asn.au

0409 284 165