NYC Bike Share
DESIGNED BY NEW YORKERS
DOT’s multi-year public planning process for Citi Bike included 159 public bike share meetings, presentations and demonstrations since September 2011, plus another 230 meetings with elected officials, property owners and other stakeholders.

74% of New Yorkers support bike share (August 2012 Quinnipiac poll)

In total, DOT planners presented the public, Community Boards and other stakeholders with 2,881 technically viable options for the 600 bike share stations; almost 5 options for each station.

DOT’s interactive station planning map (nyc.gov/bikeshare) received over 10,000 station suggestions, and over 55,000 “supports” for these suggestions.
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In just the last five years, New York City has made huge strides in creating modern, safer streets. Drawing from Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s PlaNYC sustainability agenda, we’ve established more than 300 miles of bike lanes, 30 plazas and made expansive street safety redesigns to accommodate all street users citywide—all while recording the five safest years in city history and logging remarkable economic gains in corridors where projects were implemented.

Citi Bike presents a new way for New Yorkers to get around that takes advantage of these changes to our streets, and it also marks a new standard for public participation in planning. Behind every planned station on the street there are thousands of suggestions, handwritten notes on maps and direct comments to system planners and online from a vast spectrum of New Yorkers.

The station locations are a result of this multi-year public planning process, the most extensive ever undertaken for a transportation project in New York City—and surpassing community participation for any other public project undertaken anywhere. Citi Bike was literally designed by New Yorkers for New Yorkers and tailored to meet New York’s specific needs, block by block. While the resulting system is a testament to public involvement and to this agency’s dedication over 18 months, the benefits of Citi Bike will continue to be enjoyed for years to come, and even beyond the millions of people who will use the system.

Janette Sadik-Khan
Commissioner
Planning New York’s newest travel option

New York is a biking city. Bike ridership has grown fourfold in the last 10 years and biking is the city’s fastest growing transportation option for New Yorkers looking for a fast, safe, convenient and affordable way to get around. Polls released by Quinnipiac University’s Polling Institute in October 2011 and August 2012 found that more than 70% of New Yorkers support Citi Bike, New York City’s proposed bike share system. These findings are the culmination of growth in innovative, community requested and supported infrastructure, from the nation’s first protected bike paths to bike parking corrals. With bike safety remaining at the same high levels as a decade ago, despite 75% more riders on the street, cycling as a means of transportation continues to become a more attractive transportation option for New Yorkers.

Enthusiasm for Citi Bike is also reflected in numerous independent polls that show broad and sustained support for bike facilities. Communities across the city are increasingly requesting that lanes and other bike infrastructure be built in their neighborhoods. New York City, with its flat geography and high density, is perfectly suited to bike riding. Citi Bike will take advantage of these strengths by offering an unlimited number of affordable, short bike trips—provided to New Yorkers without using any public funds.

Over 70% of New Yorkers support New York’s proposed bike share system.
Another reason for the strong public embrace of bike share is the exhaustive and highly participatory planning process used to develop Citi Bike station sites within the system’s initial service area. This report describes and documents the process from 2011 to 2013.

Bike share lends itself to a community planning process. Successful bike share systems rely on an effective density of stations in a network, rather than on the specific placement of any single station. It was essential to cast a very wide outreach and communication net to introduce a new transportation system that many New Yorkers had not experienced before.

Choosing sites for 600 bike share stations across a wide area of Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens has been one of New York’s most participatory planning undertakings.
The rhythm of bike share planning in New York followed a pattern of DOT engagement, feedback from stakeholders, synthesis by DOT of many and diverse sources of input, and a return to stakeholders to discuss results. The work and process included these main steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with NYC City Council about the bike share program and planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of bike share program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings for City Council members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with business improvement districts and major property owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings for community board leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings for state and federal elected officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to community board committees and full board meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyc.gov/bikeshare website allows all New Yorkers to suggest bike share station sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations, open houses and exhibits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with civic organizations, block associations, city agencies and public authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of written input from many stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of maps with potential station sites to elected officials, community boards and other stakeholder groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 community planning workshops to provide hands-on forums for New Yorkers to discuss and suggest station sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of detailed feedback on potential station sites from all stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning work to synthesize specific input from all sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations and briefings to all stakeholders on draft final station site plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line posting of draft final station site maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up briefings for City Council members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of detailed feedback on draft station maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment of sites and maps to reflect additional feedback and input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reaching the Public

The planning process for the Citi Bike program established an open door policy, encouraging input early and often from the citizens of New York City. Beginning in the fall of 2011, DOT staff met repeatedly with community boards at the leadership, committee, and full board levels, elected officials, leaders of business improvement districts, and other business and civic organizations.

Early meetings explained the bike share concept, outlined the upcoming public process and gathered input on suggested sites. From the announcement of Alta Bicycle Share (known in New York as NYC Bike Share) as the New York City bike share operator in September 2011 to the end first phase of public outreach in February 2012, DOT staff met with the 15 Community Boards in the program area 39 times. In addition, over the same time period, DOT staff hosted 31 meetings with business improvement districts (BIDs) and other neighborhood and civic groups, and conducted 25 briefings for City and State elected officials.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

At each initial meeting, DOT staff provided stakeholders with maps showing a wide range of options for where bike share stations could be placed. DOT requested direct input on which locations might be desirable and which should be avoided. The maps showed three to five times the number of stations that would ultimately

“… it’s going to be a great program for the city. [DOT has] spent a lot of time qualifying these sites and getting feedback from residents.”

Manhattan CB3 committee chair David Crane (The Villager, April 19th, 2012)
be necessary, allowing for a significant degree of public influence from the earliest planning stages. In total, stakeholders considered 2,881 options for the 600 bike share stations. At each meeting, DOT provided maps showing the universe of possible station locations based on physical space and other technical criteria (see Appendix B) and invited participants to select where the stations should go in their communities or districts. Stakeholders were asked to take the maps for close review and return them to DOT at their convenience. Locations flagged as undesirable were removed from consideration.

Community boards, BIDs and community groups were also involved in suggesting potential station locations. Some organizations, especially Manhattan community boards, set up internal task forces to scout additional sites for consideration. Each site suggested by any source was subjected to a rigorous vetting process to ensure it met basic technical criteria (Appendix B). Qualifying sites were added to the map of options for further review. In addition, DOT staff and organizations such as the DUMBO BID, Flatiron/23rd St Partnership, Union Square Partnership and the Hudson River Park Trust conducted numerous site visits to review potential locations and find new ones.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Public outreach to announce the proposed system and its planning process went well beyond meetings. Following the announcement of New York City Bike Share (NYCBS) as New York’s bike share operator, NYCBS and DOT staff embarked upon a heavy schedule of bike share equipment demonstrations. The teams conducted twenty-one field demonstrations in six weeks, to introduce the public to the program and its planning process.

“Beginning with the initial planning session and throughout all of the community meetings, there was ample opportunity for our concerns to be heard.”

Grand Central Partnership
The demonstrations also provided an important distribution point for information. Over the course of nine months, DOT distributed thousands of wallet-sized cards asking New Yorkers to “Help plan the system” by directing them to the DOT bike share Website and interactive Suggest-a-Station map, videos and more information. The schedule of demonstrations was widely distributed via social media and print outlets. DOT added events to the schedule throughout the month to respond to community requests. Hundreds of New Yorkers came to the demonstrations to ride the bikes. Thousands more stopped by for information and to ask questions.

The demonstrations showcased key system features such as the ease of installation and the durability of the bikes, stations, and docks. New York is a four-season city, and the highly variable weather combined with intense use made durability of Citi Bikes a critical selling point for New Yorkers. The demonstrations also let New Yorkers see first-hand just how easily the no-excavation installation was completed. For each demonstration, staff arrived about an hour in advance to install a fully functioning station. This simple display of the sophistication of the bike share equipment helped allay fears that the deployment of bike share stations would disrupt traffic or that station locations, once selected, were set in stone.

TARGETING DIVERSE POPULATIONS

As part of the demonstration series, DOT engaged specific non-native English speaking constituencies. At the request of Manhattan Community Board 3, DOT hosted two Spanish language presentations and one joint Mandarin and Cantonese presentation in the winter of 2011-2012. DOT developed these presentations in close coordination with local service organizations such as the Grand Street Settlement, El Puente, and the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. In addition to online and print-media outreach,
publicity for these events involved heavy flyering and poster in local businesses and housing developments.

DOT also developed an open-house series which included bike share bicycles and a short video of bike share system features, which allowed hands-on outreach to continue on into the colder months. Open houses at places like the Whitehall Staten Island Ferry terminal and the Port Authority Bus Terminal allowed DOT to reach other audiences of potential bike share users who might work but not live in the bike share program area.

**PUBLIC EXHIBITS AND EVENTS**

As word spread about Citi Bike, DOT began to field requests from civic organizations, elected officials, private companies and property owners to present information about bike share. From September 2011 to August 2012, the DOT hosted, presented or attended 155 events. These included presentations at the New School, REBNY (Real Estate Board of NY), the 6th Avenue Association, the Brooklyn Heights Association, FXFowle Architects, the Turtle Bay Association, Stuyvesant High School, the Grand Central Branch of the NY Public Library and others, as well as a month long exhibition called *Two Wheel Transit: NYC Bike Share* at the AIA Center for Architecture. More than 2,700 visitors attended the exhibit during its month-long duration. The dialogue about Citi Bike also spread beyond

---

**Two Wheel Transit: NYC Bike Share**

On January 11th, 2012, the widely-attended *Two Wheel Transit: NYC Bike Share* exhibit opened at the AIA Center for Architecture on LaGuardia Place. The opening included a standing-room only presentation about Citi Bike with DOT Commissioner Janette Sadik-Khan. The exhibit featured graphics showing size and density of bike share systems around the world, comparing travel times in New York City on bike, subway and car, and had a computer so visitors to the show could suggest a location on the nyc.gov/bikeshare Website. As a further attraction, a demonstration bike share bike was mounted to the wall so that visitors could spin the wheels and see the front and rear lights automatically illuminate. Over 2,700 visitors came to see Two Wheel Transit during its month-long run.
DOT-organized events. In October 2011, the Park Slope Civic Council organized its own roundtable event to discuss opportunities for bike share station sites in Park Slope and feedback from the event was passed along to DOT for inclusion in the planning process.

NYC.GOV/BIKESHARE

On the virtual side, nyc.gov/bikeshare offered New Yorkers who might otherwise be unable to attend a community board meeting or community planning workshop an easy way to make their voices heard in the planning process.

Launched in September 2011, nyc.gov/bikeshare combined a highly interactive “Suggest-a-Station” map with a regularly updating list of events, informational blog entries and videos explaining the planned New York system.

Constant activity on the site ensured a steady stream of visitors and kept the site fresh and engaging. At the site’s peak in September 2011 it received 1,200 visits per hour. Since its launch, almost every other US city looking to introduce or expand bike share – Chicago, Washington DC, Portland - has replicated New York’s Website.

At the core of the Website was the interactive “Suggest-a-Station” map which was live from September 2011 to May 2012. Visitors were invited to place pins on the map identifying locations where they would want to see bike share stations, provide comments on why they thought a particular location was good and then share their suggestion via Facebook, Twitter and other social media. Visitors were also invited to support suggestions made by other visitors. The “Suggest-a-Station” feature was widely publicized online, and the AIA Two Wheel Transit...
show featured a computer set-up so visitors to the show could access the site while attending the exhibit. In total, New Yorkers placed over 10,000 suggestion pins on the map and “supported” already-placed pins over 55,000 times.

The nyc.gov/bikeshare site served as a two-way conduit to keep New Yorkers involved in the planning process. DOT staff used the suggestions from the Website to identify locations they might have missed in initial siting work, adding sites to the planning maps presented to community boards and other stakeholders. In addition, everyone who suggested a station location was invited to provide their e-mail address and zip code. Throughout the process, DOT used this information to notify interested individuals about nearby community planning workshops. The site also included a “contact us” feature. DOT staff responded to hundreds of questions regarding everything from job opportunities to suggestions for and concerns about specific stations sites.
Ensuring access for lower-income residents is a challenge that all American bike share systems have had to address. Two issues – a credit card requirement, needed to ensure that each bike rental can be linked to a specific person, and placement of bike share stations – have typically been the main barriers for low-income would-be users. Low-income people are less likely than middle- and upper-income people to have a credit card. Unlike the heavily subsidized European and Chinese bike share systems, American bike share programs to date have been small, only covering downtown areas and immediately adjacent residential neighborhoods. This often means that stations are not located in lower-income neighborhoods. In Washington DC, a special discount program developed with select “Bank on DC” credit unions has attempted to address the credit card and financial access issues. However, use of this program is limited and the lack of stations in lower-income neighborhoods still depresses Capital Bikeshare use among low-income residents.

In New York City, DOT chose to address issues of equity and access from both a siting perspective as well as affordability. DOT, the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA), community boards, and NYCHA Resident Advisors found locations for bike share stations in and around NYCHA housing campuses. At launch, there will be Citi Bike stations within one block of all 29 NYCHA properties in the program area. In addition, the DOT contract requires NYCBS to ensure that the Citi Bike program area cover a number of lower-income New York City neighborhoods.

To address financial access, DOT created two discounted annual memberships programs. The programs, one for NYCHA residents and the other for members of Community Development Credit Unions, offer annual Citi Bike memberships for $60, an almost 40% reduction in price. To develop these programs, DOT planners worked closely with NYCHA and the Department of Consumer Affairs Office of Financial Empowerment, the Nation Federation of Community Development Credit Unions, and community organizations such as Bed-Stuy Restoration, El Puente, and the Local Spokes Coalition.
Putting it all together
SYNTHESIZING YEARS OF INPUT AND DISCUSSION

HANDS-ON PLANNING

Fourteen community planning workshops—hosted from January to May 2012—formed the second phase of the outreach process. Borrowing from DOT’s experiences with other participatory planning projects such as the Select Bus Service community advisory committees, the workshops were an opportunity for both community groups and individual New Yorkers to weigh in directly on where stations should and should not go. The workshops were designed to elicit both general and specific input, ranging from overall street or sidewalk preferences, and details of specific sites. This range of feedback allowed DOT to eliminate specific locations and develop a stronger understanding of the types of locations that each neighborhood preferred.

In total, more than 250 organizations, publications, community groups and elected officials participated in the 14 workshops. These participants were important resources to help to get out the word to their communities. The workshops used interactive exercises and visual aids to stimulate in-depth conversations on transportation needs, how bike share could meet those needs, the program itself, safety, and station locations. Participants worked on table-sized maps showing all the technically qualified sites in their neighborhood and provided comment on specific locations.

Each workshop map offered a wealth of information for participants to use as they made

Workshops elicited both general and specific input, from general street vs. sidewalk preferences and details of specific sites.
Below are samples of the table-sized maps used at public workshops showing all the technically qualified sites in a neighborhood. Station options that received significant negative comments were removed from the plans.

MAP 1
MAP OF ALL POSSIBLE OPTIONS
(3-5 TIMES MORE STATION LOCATIONS THAN NECESSARY)

MAP 2
LOCATIONS WITH NUMEROUS “NO” VOTES AT THE WORKSHOP

MAP 3
PROPOSED PLAN PRESENTED TO THE COMMUNITY BOARDS
their decisions about what stations they might want to see in their neighborhoods. Each station was assigned an ID number, color, and shape. Colors identified the location’s recommendation history – red for sites recommended by the community board or elected official; purple for sites suggested by a local business, BID or local institution; blue for sites identified through the Website. Shapes indicated location in the streetscape – squares for street sites, triangles for sites on the sidewalk and circles for all others. Workshop participants then were able to place green, red and black stickers on the maps to indicate likes, dislikes and brand-new station suggestions. The map was overlaid with a 1,000-square-foot grid, with three to five options in each square. Selecting one station in each grid roughly corresponded to the desired bike share network density. A DOT moderator and note-taker were at each table to record comments and facilitate a conversation about the sites participants had chosen.

Each workshop was organized in close coordination with community boards, elected officials and local civic groups to determine dates, times and locations that would work best for as many people as possible. Business improvement districts such as the Downtown Alliance generously promoted workshops via their e-mail lists.

In addition, DOT sent targeted e-mails to all the people who had submitted station suggestions and support messages via the Website to invite them to the workshops in the areas where they had placed stations on the online map. Newspapers like El Diario and popular blogs like Streetsblog ran listings of upcoming workshops. DOT also posted all upcoming events prominently on its Website and alerted local blogs and publications.

Workshops were organized in close coordination with community boards, elected officials and civic groups.
SYNTHESIZING THE DATA

Eighteen months of meetings, demonstrations and discussion, 14 community planning workshops, and more than 10,000 online suggestions produced a vast quantity of information on where New Yorkers wanted to see Citi Bike stations. DOT’s first task was to code and synthesize the workshop results from nearly 3,000 possible station locations. Locations that received red “No” arrows during the workshops were removed and locations that received significant numbers of green “Yes” votes were highlighted. Suggestions for other stations not depicted on the maps were vetted by DOT staff to ensure they met the technical criteria. Comments received via the Website or recorded by note-takers at the workshops were added in. Stations that received votes via the Website were prioritized over stations that had not.

DOT planners then used a Geographic Information System (GIS) program to create a predictive model for how big each individual station would need to be. The model analyzed the surrounding land use (residential, commercial, parkland, schools, etc.), population, tourism rates and subway turnstile counts and other transit use throughout the program area. The model also made use of newly available taxi GPS data on origins and destinations of trips, as well as durations and times of day throughout the city.

The next step was to marry the public opinion information gathered in the workshops, through the Website, and through months of conversation with stakeholders to the overall map of technically viable locations and the station size model. DOT planners combined all the comments received over the multi-year process with the technical information in order to select one station within each grid square. A wide array of factors – specific requests or comments, neighborhood preferences, proximity to transit and other destinations, distance from other stations, access and proximity to bike lanes, station size in relation to the demand model – were all considered.

PREDICTIVE MODEL FOR BIKE SHARE STATION SIZE
DOT staff matched the overall community request profiles also generated in the workshops. For example, in Manhattan, Community Boards 2, 4, and 5 stated strong preferences that stations not be sited on sidewalks, while Brooklyn’s Community Board 3 and Queens Community Board 2 preferred locations on sidewalks. Stations selected in these areas were matched to these preferences.

In addition, following lessons learned in other bike share cities, DOT worked to meet the basic rules of station spacing, making sure that stations would be placed approximate 1,000 feet apart – a 3-5-minute walk. In areas where a lot of activity could be expected, for example around Penn Station or Grand Central Terminal, DOT also made sure to site adjacent stations that were larger than the average or placed additional stations in that area to meet the expected demand.

Constant dialogue with community groups, stakeholders and elected officials continued as DOT was analyzing input and developing draft network plans. DOT staff also responded to hundreds of comments and queries through its bikeshare@dot.nyc.gov e-mail and through the nyc.gov/bikeshare Website.

FINALIZING STATION SITES

As the draft station plan for each neighborhood was completed, DOT returned to the community boards for further comment and review. Meetings were again held with BIDs, elected officials and other stakeholders for additional comments. At each community board meeting, DOT planners showed the full initial range of options, highlighted stations that had received significant support or disapproval, and presented the draft plan.

Once DOT had presented the station siting plan to each community board, the full city-wide proposed plan was posted on nyc.gov/bikeshare. The Website featured the plan in both a Google Maps version and as a printable PDF. Both formats clearly indicate the size of each station and its location in the streetscape. In the months that followed, DOT worked closely with all the stakeholders to make adjustments to the plans. In total, 43% of the stations proposed in the draft plans were moved due to community request.

Perhaps the greatest testament to the effectiveness of bike share planning in New York is the degree of emulation seen around the country as bike sharing proposals proliferate. Chicago,
Portland, Columbus, and other municipalities have largely replicated the approach documented in these pages.

In New York, the Citi Bike planning process will continue as city government, the program sponsors and NYC Bicycle Share seek to expand the system to the projected level of 600 stations and 10,000 bikes. The expansion will lead to detailed station siting work in the Upper East and Upper West Sides, Park Slope, and Crown Heights. With the very high pre-launch approval rating noted at the outset of this report, and the high usage, demand, and popularity that bike share systems have seen in other large, transit-based cities, demand to expand the system even further is very likely. DOT’s proven outreach and participatory planning will allow additional parts of the city to adopt and take full advantage of this latest addition to New York’s rich menu of transportation choices.

One testament to the effectiveness of bike share planning in New York is the degree of emulation seen around the country.
APPENDIX A
Community Planning Workshops

The community planning workshops helped elicit feedback on where bike share stations should be placed in the New York City streetscape. The workshops rooms were set with 8 - 10 tables, each seating 8-10 people including a moderator and note-taker. Each workshop started on a rolling basis; as soon as a table filled with people, the session would begin. A Citi Bike was brought in to each workshop so that participants could check out the equipment while waiting for their table to fill. The three main sections of the workshop are as follows:

- Introduction
- Getting to know bike share board exercises
- Community map

INTRODUCTION

What is Bike share? In order to ensure that everyone had the same base level of knowledge about bike share, the workshop began with a 10 minute presentation discussing the planning process, features of the program, types of station locations, safety, and maintenance. The presentation was followed by 10 - 15 minute question and answer period.
GETTING TO KNOW BIKESHARE BOARD EXERCISES:

Using a large “board game” style table graphic, DOT moderators led participants through three exercises.

1. HOW WOULD YOU USE BIKE SHARE?

Participants were asked to place an arrow on a trip type (work/school, recreation, shopping etc) which they would consider making via bike share and then discuss their choice. This conversation helped to facilitate a discussion about the usefulness of bike share. Participants were then encouraged to place additional arrows on all types of trips for which they would use bike share. The note-taker recorded all the different types of trips and destinations suggested, and made special note of trips where multiple people placed flags. The exercise served as an ice-breaker.

2. WHERE SHOULD STATIONS GO?

The moderator asked participants to look at renderings of different types of station locations; sidewalk, curb lane, park verges, private property, etc. The moderator then facilitated discussion about the different station typologies and asked participants to think about where they would like and expect to see stations around the city. The note-taker distributed a short survey which participants were asked to fill-out identifying station typology preference and some use generator preferences. Surveys were collected, and the note-taker recorded the total on a tally sheet. The moderator then led the table in a discussion of why participants selected the types of sites they did. The purpose of the location exercise was to solicit participant feedback on generally preferred station locations in each district.

3. WHAT FEATURES SHOULD BIKE SHARE HAVE?

Using the large table graphic, the moderator was able to show participants images of the kiosk, membership key, smart phone apps, and more. The features section allowed DOT to solicit participant options on the usefulness of these features, and collect suggestions for additional features.
Workshop table graphic.
THE COMMUNITY MAP

After the board game exercises were completed, participants were shown a table-sized map of the community board which depicted all the technically qualified sites. The map was overlaid with the 1,000 square foot grid and each site was assigned an ID number, color, and shape. Colors identified the location’s recommendation history - if it was recommended by the community board, elected official, local business, business improvement district, local institution, or if it was identified by the general public through the web portal tool. Shape indicated location in the streetscape - if the station was to be located on a sidewalk, street, or “other” location. The map included three to five times more stations than would ultimately be necessary, giving participants ample choice for each grid square location. Participants placed stickers on sites to indicate their preferences: green arrows for stations they liked, red arrows to indicate dislike and black arrows on locations where they wanted to see a station but one was not already depicted. Throughout the placement of the arrows, the table moderator conducted a lively conversations asking participants to explain their thinking as they placed their respective arrows. The participants were able to continue to place arrows on sites and have discussions with others at their table and the moderator for as long as they wished. The note-taker recorded participant’s statements about site locations.
Appendix B
Bike-Share Station Siting Guidelines

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE SITING CRITERIA FOR BIKE SHARE STATIONS.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

• Sites must have unrestricted, 24/7 public access.
• Sites should ensure maximum visibility and access.
• Sites must not impede the use of any existing facilities, such as bus stops or fire hydrants.

SIDEWALK SITE REQUIREMENTS

• Preferred minimum sidewalk width: 16 feet. Medians may be considered.
• Sites should not interfere with existing pedestrian travel patterns.
• Lateral measurements for sidewalk sites shall not be:
  • Within 15 feet in front of the opening of subway stairs or subway elevators;
  • Sited on a sidewalk less than 15 feet from a bus stop shelter entrance; or
  • Directly in front of the main entrances to major buildings (e.g. Empire State Building)

ON-STREET SITE REQUIREMENTS

• Sites must meet DOT safety criteria.
• Minimum allowable curb-lane width: 8 feet.
• Sites may not be in bus stops.
• Sites may not be in lanes that become driving lanes at certain times (e.g., rush-hour lanes).
• Stations may be placed in non-parking areas in curb lanes, such as locations that have been “daylighted” to enhance safety and improve visibility.

PARKS, NYCHA, AND OTHER CITY PROPERTY

• Sites may be on Parks Department property or on other City properties at the discretion of the relevant agency.

PRIVATE PROPERTY

• Sites may be on private property at the property owner’s discretion.
• Sites on private property must have 24/7, unrestricted public access.
Appendix C
Planning Partners

Over the multi-year station siting process, DOT worked with the following partners:

| 133 Lafayette Corporation            | CodeGreen Real Estate           |
| 23rd Street Partnership/Flatiron BID | Columbus Ave BID                |
| 34th Street Partnership             | NYC Comptroller Liu             |
| 59 Maiden Lane Management Corporation | Concord Village Tenants Association |
| 5th Ave BID                         | Confucius Plaza Co-op           |
| 5th Avenue BID                      | Continuum Health                |
| 5th Avenue Park Slope BID           | Cooper Union                    |
| Adelphi University                  | Deutsche Bank                   |
| AIA Center for Architecture         | Diamond District BID            |
| Avenue of the Americas Association  | Downtown Alliance               |
| Bank of New York Melon              | Downtown Brooklyn Partnership   |
| Basketball City                     | DUMBO BID                       |
| Battery Park City Authority         | Durst Realty                    |
| Battery Park Conservancy            | East Midtown Partnership        |
| Bed-Stuy Restoration                | East River Ferry                |
| Bicycle Habitat                     | EWVIDCO                         |
| Bike & Roll                         | El Puente                       |
| Bike New York                       | Essex Street Market             |
| Borough of Manhattan Community College | Fashion Center BID            |
| Boston Properties                   | The Fashion Institute of Technology |
| Brookfield Properties               | Fischer Brothers Realty        |
| Brooklyn Borough President Markowitz | Flatiron/23rd Street Partnership |
| Brooklyn Brewery                    | Forrest City Ratner             |
| Brooklyn Community Board 1          | Foursquare                      |
| Brooklyn Community Board 2          | Friends of Duane Park           |
| Brooklyn Community Board 3          | Friends of the High Line        |
| Brooklyn Community Board 6          | Friends of Petrosino Square     |
| Brooklyn Community Board 8          | Ft. Greene Park                 |
| Brooklyn Community Board 9          | Fulton Area Business Alliance   |
| Brooklyn Heights Association        | Fulton Ferry Landing Association|
| Brooklyn Navy Yard                  | FX FOWLE Architects             |
| Central Park Conservancy            | Goldman Sachs                   |
| Chelsea Improvement Company         | Google                          |
| Chinese Chamber of Commerce         | The Gotham Organization         |
| Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association | Governors Island          |
| City University of New York         | Graham Avenue BID               |
| Clinton Hill Apartments              | Grand Avenue BID                |
|                                    | Grand Central Library           |
|                                    | Grand Central Partnership      |
|                                    | Grand St Settlement             |
|                                    | GreeNYC                         |
|                                    | GrowNYC                         |
|                                    | Heart of Brooklyn Cultural Association |
|                                    | Hines Realty                    |
|                                    | Hospital for Special Surgery    |
|                                    | Hudson River Park Trust         |
|                                    | Hudson Square Connection BID    |
|                                    | JRT Realty                      |
|                                    | JSRE LLC Realty                 |
|                                    | League of Conservation Voters   |
|                                    | LES BID                         |
|                                    | LES Credit Union                |
|                                    | LIC Partnership                 |
|                                    | Lincoln Center BID              |
|                                    | Lincoln Square BID              |
|                                    | Local Spokes                    |
|                                    | Lower Manhattan Construction Command Center |
|                                    | Madison Ave BID                 |
|                                    | Madison Square Garden           |
|                                    | Manhattan Borough President      |
|                                    | Stringer                        |
|                                    | Manhattan Community Board 1     |
|                                    | Manhattan Community Board 2     |
|                                    | Manhattan Community Board 3     |
|                                    | Manhattan Community Board 4     |
|                                    | Manhattan Community Board 5     |
|                                    | Manhattan Community Board 6     |
|                                    | Manhattan Community Board 7     |
|                                    | Manhattan Community Board 8     |
|                                    | Marriott                        |
|                                    | Memorial Sloan Kettering        |
|                                    | MiMA                            |
|                                    | MoMA PS1                        |
|                                    | Montague BID                    |
|                                    | MTA                             |
|                                    | Municipal Arts Society          |
|                                    | Myrtle Avenue BID               |
|                                    | Natural Resources Defense Council |
Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project
The New School
New York City Department of Environmental Protection
New York City Fire Department
New York City Housing Authority
New York City Police Department
New York Presbyterian Hospital
New York Public Interest Research Group
New York State Department of Transportation
New York University
New York’s Waterfront Bicycle Shop
Nicholas & Lence
NOHO BID
North Flatbush BID
Northside Merchant Association
NY Waterway
NYC & Co
NYC Council Member Brewer
NYC Council Member Cabrera
NYC Council Member Chin
NYC Council Member Comrie
NYC Council Member Garodnick
NYC Council Member James
NYC Council Member Lander
NYC Council Member Lappin
NYC Council Member Levin
NYC Council Member Mark-Viverito
NYC Council Member Mealy
NYC Council Member Mendez
NYC Council Member Quinn
NYC Council Member Reyna
NYC Council Member Rose
NYC Council Member Vacca
NYC Council Member Van Bramer
NYC Council Member Vann
NYC Department of City Planning
NYC Department of Citywide Administrative Services
NYC Department of Health
NYC Department of Park and Recreation
NYC Department of Sanitation
NYC Economic Development Corp.
NYC Office of Economic Empowerment
NYCHA Resident Leaders
NYS Assembly Member Brennan
NYS Assembly Member Camara
NYS Assembly Member Glick
NYS Assembly Member Gottfried
NYS Assembly Member Jeffries
NYS Assembly Member Kavanagh
NYS Assembly Member Kellner
NYS Assembly Member Leman
NYS Assembly Member Lopez
NYS Assembly Member Millman
NYS Assembly Member Nolan
NYS Assembly Member Quart
NYS Assembly Member Robinson
NYS Assembly Member Rosenthal
NYS Assembly Speaker Silver
NYS Assembly Member Towns
NYS Senator Adams
NYS Senator Dilan
NYS Senator Duane
NYS Senator Espaillat
NYS Senator Gianaris
NYS Senator Krueger
NYS Senator Montgomery
NYS Senator Squadron
NYU Polytechnic
Pace University
Park Slope Civic Council
Park Slope Food Co-op
Partnership for NYC
Partnerships for Parks
Pier 79
Port Authority Bus Terminal
Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
Public Advocate de Blasio
Queens Community Board 2
Real Estate Board of New York
Recycle-a-Bicycle
Red Lantern Bicycles
Related
Rockefeller Foundation
Rockrose
Rodale Press
Seward Park Co-Op
Silverstein Properties
SL Green
Stuyvesan High School
Sutton Area Community
TF Cornerstone
Times Square Alliance
Tishman Speyer
Transportation Alternatives
Turtle Bay Association
Two Trees Management Company
Union Square Partnership
U.S. Representative Clarke
U.S. Representative Nadler
U.S. Representative Rangel
U.S. Representative Towns
U.S. Representative Velasquez
U.S. Representative Maloney
Village Alliance
Vornado
Woodhull Hospital
Appendix D
In the News

From the very beginning, Citi Bike planning was heavily reported which ensured widespread participation.
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