LA METRO BIKE SHARE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

System Jurisdiction: Launch Date:

Applicability

The LA Metro Bike Share Performance Evaluation is intended to help Metro and its partners with regular check-in points to understand system performance and provide interventions where necessary to maximize the program's effectiveness. Evaluations are generally made every 6 months (with an exception to the first check-in at 6-8 months), and action items vary in severity as time in service lengthens. Monitoring occurs at the service area and station levels and are reviewed throughout the following timeline:

6-8 month check-in (1)	12 month check-in (2)	18 month check-in (3)	24 month check-in (4)	Continual 6 month check-ins (1)
Initial Assessment	Cursory Intervention	Follow-up Assessment	Detailed Intervention	On-going Assessments
• Measure bike share ridership within the jurisdiction • Identify under-performing stations and review stations for potential improvement	• Measure bike share ridership within the jurisdiction • If needed, perform cursory interventions to improve ridership • If needed, indentify stations for relocation within jurisdiction	• Measure bike share ridership within the jurisdiction to assess if interventions or station relocations improved ridership • If exceeding expectations, evaluate service area and stations for expansion	• Measure bike share ridership within the jurisdiction • If ridership is still below expectations, evaluate system for termination • If ridership is exceeding expectations, expand service area and/or stations within the jurisdiction	• Continue to measure bike share ridership within the jurisdiction • Continue to identify under-performing stations and review stations for potential improvement • Repeat steps 2-4 as needed

Anticipated Date (M/Y) for Check-ins:

6-8 month	12 month	18 month	24 month
☐	☐	☐	☐
date (check when completed)	date (check when completed)	date (check when completed)	date (check when completed)

Evaluator:

name (please print) date

date

6-8 Month Check-in

At 6-8 months since Metro Bike Share was launched in the jurisdiction, this initial check-in will track actual ridership to compare to the ridership estimates of the service area / community and also to flag any individual stations that should be monitored closely. If the system is performing below expected ridership levels, preparations should be made for future intervention. If the system is performing at or above expected ridership levels, attention may be focused on making the system even better. The lowest performing quartile of stations, with regard to usage, will be flagged for potential relocation and where possible, interventions to improve Station Performance Metrics will be started.

System Area Performance Metrics

Jurisdiction's average system ridership: LA Metro's average ridership:

Is this system within +/- 10% of LA Metro Bike Share's average system ridership? Yes ☐ No ☐

Station Performance Metrics

The following stations have been identified as the lowest performing stations (bottom quartile)

1. Station # Station Name/Location Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station | Yes ☐ No ☐ Maintenance Issues | Yes ☐ No ☐ Solar Issues | Number of Docks | Full and Empty Events | Yes ☐ No ☐ Visibility Issues

2. Station # Station Name/Location Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station | Yes ☐ No ☐ Maintenance Issues | Yes ☐ No ☐ Solar Issues | Number of Docks | Full and Empty Events | Yes ☐ No ☐ Visibility Issues

3. Station # Station Name/Location Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station | Yes ☐ No ☐ Maintenance Issues | Yes ☐ No ☐ Solar Issues | Number of Docks | Full and Empty Events | Yes ☐ No ☐ Visibility Issues

6-8 Month Check-in (Continued)

4. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes No	Yes No			Yes No

8. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes No	Yes No			Yes No

date

12 Month Check-in

At 6-8 months since Metro Bike Share was launched in the jurisdiction, this initial check-in will track actual ridership to compare to the ridership estimates of the service area / community and also to flag any individual stations that should be monitored closely. If the system is performing below expected ridership levels, preparations should be made for future intervention. If the system is performing at or above expected ridership levels, attention may be focused on making the system even better. The lowest performing quartile of stations, with regard to usage, will be flagged for potential relocation and where possible, interventions to improve Station Performance Metrics will be started.

System Area Performance Metrics

Jurisdiction's average system ridership: _____ trips per bike per day

LA Metro's average ridership: _____ trips per bike per day

Is this system within +/- 10% of LA Metro Bike Share's average system ridership? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Are interventions needed to improve system area ridership? ☐ Yes ☐ No

The following interventions were performed on the system area:

- ☐ Programs to encourage people to use bike share, including programs that reach out and support low-income and minority communities to use the system
- ☐ An analysis of the existing system and program membership zip codes to identify areas of the community that do not have a station nearby and need access to bike share
- ☐ An analysis of the existing stations to understand if additional points of interest warrant being added to the system
- ☐ An evaluation on how marketing strategies, including education, events, and outreach, have performed to determine, 1) how they could be modified to be more effective and 2) to help Identify new marketing strategies
- ☐ Other:

Station Performance Metrics

The following stations have been identified as the lowest performing stations (bottom quartile)

1. Station #	Station Name/Location	Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

12 Month Check-in (Continued)

2. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes No	Yes No			Yes No

6. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes No	Yes No			Yes No

12 Month Check-in (Continued)

7. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Yes ☐ No ☐ Maintenance Issues	Yes ☐ No ☐ Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Yes ☐ No ☐ Visibility Issues

8. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Yes ☐ No ☐ Maintenance Issues	Yes ☐ No ☐ Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Yes ☐ No ☐ Visibility Issues

The following stations have been identified for relocation:

1. Station #	Station Name/Location	New Station Name/Location

2. Station #	Station Name/Location	New Station Name/Location

3. Station #	Station Name/Location	New Station Name/Location

4. Station #	Station Name/Location	New Station Name/Location

date

18 Month Check-in

At a year and a half of operations, this check-in will see if station relocation or programmatic interventions benefitted the service area. Based on the service area performance levels (below, at, or above estimates), additional strategies will be employed to improve the system.
Service areas exceeding the projected ridership should be considered for expansion based on planning metrics (bike share suitability index and ridership estimates).

System Area Performance Metrics

Jurisdiction's average system ridership: _____ trips per bike per day

LA Metro's average ridership: _____ trips per bike per day

Is this system within +/- 10% of LA Metro Bike Share's average system ridership? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If interventions were performed at the 12 month check-in, were they successful? ☐ Yes ☐ No

How?

If this service area is exceeding projected ridership, should it be considered for expansion? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Station Performance Metrics

The following stations have been identified as the lowest performing stations (bottom quartile)

1. Station # Station Name/Location Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Station # Station Name/Location Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

18 Month Check-in (Continued)

3. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes No	Yes No			Yes No

7. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes No	Yes No			Yes No

18 Month Check-in (Continued)

7. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

The following stations were relocated at 12 months. How are those stations performing?

1. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Improved Performance
			Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Improved Performance
			Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Improved Performance
			Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Improved Performance
			Yes ☐ No ☐

The following stations have been identified as the highest performing station (highest quartile):

1. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Room for Expansion
			Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Room for Expansion
			Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Room for Expansion
			Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Room for Expansion
			Yes ☐ No ☐

date

24 Month Check-in

This system has been in operation for two years. At this time, service areas not meeting anticipated levels are subject to termination of service by either Metro or the jurisdiction, and redeployment of equipment to another service area. Service areas exceeding the projected ridership should be considered for expansion based on planning metrics (bike share suitability index and ridership estimates). When considering termination of the service area, equity, upcoming infrastructure/development, and efforts to support bicycling should be accounted for, and then it should be determined if additional time is needed to evaluate the service area.

System Area Performance Metrics

Jurisdiction's average system ridership: _____ trips per bike per day

LA Metro's average ridership: _____ trips per bike per day

Is this system within +/- 10% of LA Metro Bike Share's average system ridership? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If the average system area ridership is not meeting expectations, the following should be evaluated prior to termination:

Operations:

The average farebox recovery is within +/- 10% of LA Metro's system average: ☐ Yes ☐ No Farebox Recovery: _____

The average operating cost per trip is within +/- 10% of LA Metro's system average: ☐ Yes ☐ No Farebox Recovery: _____

Equity:

Based on the member demographic information collected, the percentage of members who are low-income or minority are representative of the demographics of the county: ☐ Yes ☐ No Percentage: _____

Based on the member demographic information collected, the percentage of members who are low-income or minority are representative of the demographics of the county: ☐ Yes ☐ No Percentage: _____

Support of Bicycling:

A bike facility or new development that could support bike share is planned within approximately 1 year: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Explain:

24 Month Check-in

If the service area is exceeding the projected ridership, the following should be evaluated to determine need for expansion:

The bike share suitability analysis prior to implementation included plans for future phases or expansion?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Explain

The ridership estimates support expanding bike share within the service area?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Explain

Which areas within the jurisdiction have been identified for expansion and why?

The following stations have been identified as the highest performing station (highest quartile):

1. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Room for Expansion
			Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Room for Expansion
			Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Room for Expansion
			Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Station #	Station Name/Location (New)	Average Monthly Ridership	Room for Expansion
			Yes ☐ No ☐

24 Month Check-in (Continued)

Station Performance Metrics

The following stations have been identified as the lowest performing stations (bottom quartile)

1. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

24 Month Check-in (Continued)

5. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

date

Continual 6 Month Check-in

After two years of Metro Bike Share in a new service area, this continual check-in every 6 months will track actual ridership to compare to the ridership estimates of the service area / community and also to flag any individual stations that should be monitored closely. If ridership drops below anticipated estimates or a low performing station is identified, follow the steps at 12, 18, and 24 month check-ins.

System Area Performance Metrics

Jurisdiction's average system ridership: _____ trips per bike per day

LA Metro's average ridership: _____ trips per bike per day

Is this system within +/- 10% of LA Metro Bike Share's average system ridership? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Station Performance Metrics

The following stations have been identified as the lowest performing stations (bottom quartile)

1. Station # _____ Station Name/Location _____ Average Monthy Ridership _____

_____ Distance to Nearest Station

Yes ☐ No ☐ Maintenance Issues

Yes ☐ No ☐ Solar Issues

_____ Number of Docks

_____ Full and Empty Events

Yes ☐ No ☐ Visibility Issues

2. Station # _____ Station Name/Location _____ Average Monthy Ridership _____

_____ Distance to Nearest Station

Yes ☐ No ☐ Maintenance Issues

Yes ☐ No ☐ Solar Issues

_____ Number of Docks

_____ Full and Empty Events

Yes ☐ No ☐ Visibility Issues

3. Station # _____ Station Name/Location _____ Average Monthy Ridership _____

_____ Distance to Nearest Station

Yes ☐ No ☐ Maintenance Issues

Yes ☐ No ☐ Solar Issues

_____ Number of Docks

_____ Full and Empty Events

Yes ☐ No ☐ Visibility Issues

Continual 6 Month Check-in (Continued)

4. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Station # | Station Name/Location | Average Monthy Ridership

Distance to Nearest Station	Maintenance Issues	Solar Issues	Number of Docks	Full and Empty Events	Visibility Issues
	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐			Yes ☐ No ☐